

## SURVEY OF GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS ON PROPERTY CONTROLLED FOR HUNTING PURPOSES - RESULTS

At the September 2001 meeting of the Legislative Council's interim Judiciary B Committee, the committee asked for a survey of guides and outfitters to determine the amount of land controlled by guides and outfitters in this state. At the October 2001 meeting of the committee, the committee reviewed the survey and requested the survey be sent to the guides and outfitters. This survey was sent in mid-October 2001 with an enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. The Game and Fish Department provided 340 addresses of individuals who are licensed guides or outfitters. In mid-October, the Legislative Council sent the survey to the addresses, with an enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

The survey asked for the name of the business, the acres controlled for hunting, and comments. The acres for controlled for hunting question asked for the county, the number of acres in that county, and the game hunted on those acres. A copy of the survey is attached as an appendix.

One hundred one responses were returned to the Legislative Council office. The responses include some duplicate surveys sent to the same address and some duplicate information provided by guides who work for larger guiding companies that also returned surveys.

The responses are sorted by the type of game hunted on each distinct portion of land by the guides and outfitters and the table headings reflect this organization. A summary of the comments is at the end of this memorandum. Attached as part of the appendix are typed comments received.

<b>BIG GAME HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY          CONTROLLED BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS          (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
McKenzie - 6,500; 5,000 (lease); 4,200 + 600 (same company, different survey); 1,500 (own); 1,200 (own); 500; 500	20,000	1
Mountrail - 10,000; 4,300; 2,000	16,300	2
Billings - 8,580 (own); 1,000 (lease); 320	9,900	3
Bottineau - 5,000; 1,000; 680 (own); 600; 320 (lease)	7,600	4
Burleigh - 6,720; 40	6,760	5
Dunn - 6,500 (own)	6,500	6
McHenry - 4,000 (ranch purposes); 2,000 (for agriculture, hunting secondary; same company, different survey)	6,000	7
Williams - 4,000; 800	4,800	8
Eddy - 4,400	4,400	9
Golden Valley - 2,360 (own)	2,360	10
Dickey - 2,000 (own)	2,000	11
Pembina - 500	500	12
Bowman - 400 (own)	400	13, 14
Cavalier - 400	400	13, 14

<b>UPLAND GAME HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY CONTROLLED BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Hettinger - 30,000; 1,500 approximately; 3,000; 1,200 (own)	35,700	1
Morton - 6,000; 640	6,640	2
Adams - 2,000 (own); 2,000 (lease); 160 (landowner)	4,160	3
Grant - 3,000 (landowner)	3,000	4
McKenzie - 2,500	2,500	5
Bowman - 960 (own); 1,000 (own)	1,960	6
Mountrail - 1,000; 640 (preserve)	1,640	7
Griggs - 1,000	1,000	8, 9
Slope - 1,000	1,000	8, 9
Stark - 320 (landowner)	320	10

<b>UPLAND GAME AND BIG GAME HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY CONTROLLED BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Mercer - 7,000 (for agriculture, hunting secondary); 2,800 approximately	9,800	1
Adams - 4,000 approximately; 2,000	6,000	2
Sioux - 2,500	2,500	3
Grant - 1,500	1,500	4
Williams - 700; 320	1,020	5
Eddy - 878 (own)	878	6
Dickey - 140	140	7

<b>WATERFOWL HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY CONTROLLED BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Towner - 65,000 approximately	65,000	1
Cavalier - 15,000 approximately	15,000	2
McLean - 6,000+ approximately; 600 (pay per hunter)	6,600	3
Benson - 3,000	3,000	4, 5
Rolette - 3,000	3,000	4, 5
Ramsey - 2,500	2,500	6
Mercer - 1,280	1,280	7
Bowman - 200 (own)	200	8

<b>WATERFOWL AND BIG GAME HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Eddy - 2,500 (lease); 2,000; 2,000 (same company, different survey)	6,500	1
Nelson - 5,600	5,600	2
Benson - 2,800 (owned and rented for farming); 960 (own)	3,760	3
Walsh - 1,840 (own for agricultural purposes)	1,840	4
Logan - 1,000	1,000	5
Ramsey - 800 (own for agricultural purposes)	800	6

<b>WATERFOWL AND UPLAND GAME HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Stutsman - 7,000; 4,000 (own); 4,000 (own most)	15,000	1
Burke - 6,000	6,000	2
Kidder - 3,000 (own most); 2,000	5,000	3
Dickey - 3,300 approximately	3,300	4
Burleigh - 1,800; 560 (own)	2,360	5
Logan - 2,000	2,000	6, 7
Williams - 2,000 (own and rent for agricultural purposes)	2,000	6, 7
Mountrail - 1,600 (own)	1,600	8
Wells - 1,200	1,200	9

<b>WATERFOWL, UPLAND GAME, AND BIG GAME HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Sargent - 25,000+	25,000	1
LaMoure (and Dickey) - 10,000 (for agriculture, hunting secondary) (owned and leased)	10,000	2
McHenry - 5,810 (owned); 960 (hunting rights); 500 (permission)	7,270	3
Barnes - 5,000	5,000	4, 5
McKenzie - 5,000 approximately	5,000	4, 5
Benson - 4,000	4,000	6
Renville - 2,400	2,400	7
Dickey - 2,000 (for agriculture, secondary)	2,000	8
Mercer - 1,640 (lease)	1,640	9
Pierce - 1,200	1,200	10
Cavalier - 400 (own)	400	11

<b>UNKNOWN HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
<b>Responses for Acres Owned in Each County</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Walsh - 500	500	1

<b>TOTALS</b>		
<b>Type of Hunting by Guides and Outfitters</b>	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Waterfowl	96,580	1
Big game	87,920	2
Waterfowl, upland game, and big game	63,910	3
Upland game	57,920	4
Waterfowl and upland game	38,460	5
Upland and big game	21,838	6
Waterfowl and big game	19,500	7
Unknown	500	8
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>386,628</b>	

<b>ALL HUNTING ON CERTAIN PROPERTY BY GUIDES AND OUTFITTERS (Ranked by Most Property Controlled by County)</b>		
	<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>Rank for Group</b>
Towner - 65,000	65,000	1
Hettinger - 35,700	35,700	2
Mountrail - 1,600; 1,640; 16,300	19,540	3
McKenzie - 5,000; 13,580	18,580	4
Stutsman - 15,000	15,000	5
McHenry - 7,270; 6,000	13,270	6
Eddy - 4,400; 878; 6,500	11,778	7
Benson - 3,000; 3,760; 4,000	10,760	8
Adams - 4,160; 6,000	10,160	9
LaMoure - 10,000	10,000	10
Burleigh - 6,760; 2,360	9,120	11
Williams - 2,000; 1,020; 4,800	7,820	12
Bottineau - 7,600	7,600	13
Morton - 6,640	6,640	14
McLean - 6,600	6,600	15
Dunn - 6,500	6,500	16
Dickey - 200; 3,300; 140; 2,000	5,640	17
Barnes - 5,000	5,000	18, 19
Kidder - 5,000	5,000	18, 19
Mercer - 1,280; 2,500	3,780	20
Ramsey - 800; 2,500	3,300	21
Grant - 3,000	3,000	22, 23, 24
Logan - 1,000; 2,000	3,000	22, 23, 24
Rolette - 3,000	3,000	22, 23, 24
Sioux - 2,500	2,500	25
Renville - 2,400	2,400	26
Golden Valley - 2,360	2,360	27
Walsh - 1,840; 500	2,340	28
Bowman - 400; 1,960; 200	1,560	29
Pierce - 1,200	1,200	30, 31
Wells - 1,200	1,200	30, 31
Griggs - 1,000	1,000	32, 33
Slope - 1,000	1,000	32, 33
Cavalier - 400; 400	800	34
Pembina - 500	500	35
Stark - 320	320	36

## **COMMENTS**

There were six topic areas to which the comments related--land usage, waterfowl hunting, nonresident hunters, guides, resident hunters, and other.

### **Land Usage**

The most common comment relating to land usage was that the individual completing the survey was primarily a farmer and that the land used was for agricultural purposes. These comments included that guiding was done as a source of secondary income or as a means to provide compensation for depredation. The second most common comment was that the individual completing the survey did not own or lease land for hunting purposes. In addition, these types of comments sometimes included that most hunting was done on private land after asking permission or that the guide used public land. All other comments were that guides should be limited to land they own, limited in the number of acres the guide may lease, or prohibited from using public land. However, there were two comments that guides should be able to use more public land.

### **Waterfowl Hunting**

As the comments relate to waterfowl hunting, the most common comment was that the numbers of nonresidents hunters should not be limited. However, the second most common comment was that there should be a limit on nonresident hunters. There were comments that if there is a limit on nonresident hunters, guides and outfitters should be guaranteed licenses. In addition, there were three other comments that may be construed as pro nonresident hunter. These comments were against a nonresident lottery, for the removal of hunting zones, and for increased bag and position limits.

### **Nonresident Hunters**

As the comments relate to nonresident hunters, apart from waterfowl hunting, the No. 1 overall comment in the survey was nonresident hunters are good for economic development and tourism. In addition, there were comments in favor of more nonresident deer licenses and for nonresident turkey licenses.

### **Guides**

As the comments relate to guides, the most common comment was that guides let nonclients hunt. Other comments included that there are too many guides and that out-of-state "outfitters" are the major source of controlling tracts of land.

### **Resident Hunters**

There were a few comments directed at resident hunters which all said the same thing--hunters can find access if they ask.

### **Other**

The final category of other included a couple of comments against a sales tax on guides and one unfavorable review of the survey form. There were other comments that were not included in this summary because they did not appear to be directly related to the study or were not conducive to summarization.

ATTACH: 1