

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1049

2005 HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES

HB 1049

2005 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1049
House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date January 6, 2005

Tape Number

1

Side A

x

Side B

Meter #

0-1054

Committee Clerk Signature

Karen Bonnet

Minutes: Chairman Nelson opened the hearing on HB 1049. Roll taken, Rep. Drovdal absent.

Rep. Hanson: The reason HB 1049 is important is to give resident hunters an equal decrease in license fees. Last session we reduced a non-resident license for deer from \$200 to \$50 after the second drawing. That is your ninth choice because you get four choices on the first go-round, you get four choices on the second go-round so on your ninth choice it's down to \$10. I have asked the chairman to hold this bill because there was a number of other bills coming in on deer licenses.

Chr. Nelson: Regarding the fiscal note that's included with this bill, you would take exception with then?

Rep. Hanson: \$1.4 million? That's usually what you do when you don't want a bill is put a big tag on it. If it's the management of the Game & Fish Dept. To get the deer herd down to their management level this bill wouldn't be needed because you wouldn't have a reduced fee then. All the licenses would go on a first and second.

Rep. DeKrey: Even at \$1.3 million dollars, as many deer as there are out there it would be a bargain for what it's costing drivers out there who are running into all the deer they're smacking.

Rep. Solberg: How did they determine this fiscal note?

Chr. Nelson: In analysis, they base it on 60,000-70,000 licenses I think it must be after the ninth choice. We will ask the Game & Fish to clarify.

Rep. Hanson: There were 60,000 left over after the second drawing this time but they had so many licenses out this time. They will probably have less issued next year because they want to reduce the herd.

Chr. Nelson: We will ask Game & Fish to expand on that.

Rep. Kelsch: Can we ask Rep. Hanson to listen for the third drawing?

Rep. Hanson: That's right. So actually you get eight choices before you get to this one.

Chr. Nelson: Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you Rep. Hanson. Is there further testimony in favor of HB 1049?

Brian Kramer, Representing North Dakota Farm Bureau: We have policies supporting the reduction of excess deer licenses and would support HB 1049.

Chr. Nelson: Are there any questions of Mr. Kramer?

Rep. Keiser: Mr. Chairman, Brian (Kramer) do you think that this reduction would have a significant impact on the number of third drawing licenses? If I'm going to hunt, and the cost is \$20 vs. \$10, is this going to achieve a reduction for the third license or is it going to cost us money for the same people who would hunt anyway or is it going to really create more demand?

Mr. Kramer: Mr. Chairman, and Rep. Keiser, I think the whole idea behind reducing and discounting the licenses is to reduce the deer population. We certainly see increased auto

accidents, those types of things, more depredation of livestock feeds when you have excessive deer numbers. Anything that we can do to reduce those numbers is positive. Is the dollar amount excessive? I wouldn't say that. However, on my personal experience, if I buy my first license at \$20 I can harvest a deer and have it processed. I can then be encouraged to buy a second license by the Game & Fish Department. If I don't need the meat, I can turn it over to a charitable organization. I'm as charitable as the next person, but why should I pay full price to do that? I think that, included with reducing the deer is an incentive to reduce the license fee itself.

Chr. Nelson: Any further questions?

Rep. Charging: Do you have numbers on depredation?

Mr. Kramer: Chairman and Rep. Charging, I don't have numbers with me today, however, our affiliated insurance companies have kept numbers for a long time and the price of those deer hits continue to escalate because our vehicles cost more and it costs more to fix them. The actual number of deer hits also has gone up exponentially over the last few years because of the increased population of deer in the state.

Chr. Nelson: You may continue.

Rep. Charging: In different parts of the region are (unintelligible).

Mr. Kramer: Absolutely I would concur with that.

Chr. Nelson: Are there any further questions for Mr. Kramer? Seeing none, thank you. Is there any further support for HB 1049? Seeing none, I'll ask for opposition to HB 1049.

Mike Donahue, Representing the North Dakota Wildlife Federation and United Sports

Group of North Dakota: We don't see the necessity of the bill. We don't want the fiscal note on it whether it's a half a million or a little over a million dollars. It does bring up a point that

we may be looking at it later. Right now we'd like to let the Game & Fish Dept. manage the system through the license fees. As this bill stands, we don't see the necessity of it.

Chr. Nelson: Any questions for Mr. Donahue? Seeing none, thanks. Any further opposition to HB 1049?

Harold Neameyer, Representing the Cass County Wildlife Club, Casselton, ND: SEE ATTACHED TESTIMONY. Opposed to the bill as written.

Bob Schaible, Representing North Dakota Outdoor Heritage Coalition: The coalition opposes HB 1049 because of the fiscal note, because over a million dollars of it comes out of the Game and Fish Department. Opposes at this time.

Chr. Nelson: Are there any questions of Mr. Schaible?

Rep. Nottestad: What was the unanimous proposal of two years ago for state funds ?

Mr. Schaible: I don't know.

Rep. Hanson: How many members do you represent?

Mr. Schaible: I have at least seven at this time.

Rep. Kelsch: You said you would be opposed as stated. What do you recommend as amendments?

Mr. Schaible: I would recommend going to a third drawing; after the third drawing lowering the fees. That keeps the income coming into the Game & Fish Dept. Not many people apply for the fourth drawing. Maybe someone from the Game & Fish could describe the fiscal impact of the bill itself.

Chr. Nelson: Any further questions? Is there further opposition to HB 1049?

Rep. DeKrey: I'd like to ask the Game & Fish a question. I'd like to know how much money they have in reserve right now.

Roger Rostvet, Dep. Dir. North Dakota Game & Fish Dept.: We have about \$34-35 million in our reserve account which is slightly more than one year's expenditure level. For the last 20 years, we've carried an equivalent amount for inflation. That money in reserve is maintained as 25-50% surplus of our biennial budget. The percentage of our overall biennium budget which is over \$40 million this year is consistent with our 25-50% reserve. We don't get general tax revenue so we do need the reserve so that we don't have to ask appropriations for general fund money.

Rep. DeKrey: The agency obviously opposes this bill. Does it have anything to do with the health of the herd? I am in an area with lots of deer and anything we can do to get rid of them is a help. A consideration of \$10 or \$20 (in license fees) isn't going to make any difference. We have reached a maximum in getting people out to hunt but we do need to reduce the herd. The groups who support the Game & Fish Dept. with their money are all opposed to it, so why is the agency not opposing the bill?

Roger Rostvet: I wouldn't say we're not opposing, it's just that there are alternatives. This issue was discussed at our Advisory Board Meeting this fall. It centered on having a differential licensing system which would reduce the price of the doe tag and increase the buck tag. There is such a demand in North Dakota for buck tags that over 80% of the applications on the first lottery are buck tags only. Very little interest in doe tags at that point because everybody knows that if you don't get your buck tag you can one, two or three multiple licenses. Another consideration is that fiscal note to this was significant because after the second lottery this year,

there were 60,000 licenses left and if you notice in the fiscal note, it goes up for the next year.

We assume that people would hold off applying even in the first or second go round until licenses are issued because they know licenses will be available. Mr. Hanson did make a good point that this record high number that we're basing these numbers on would go down in the next couple years assuming that we met our management goals. The thinking is that this would significantly increase the interest in does and make our management a lot easier. That probably isn't the case in most instances. This year we sold a record high number of deer licenses, 145,000, all but about 2,000 were sold. Those unsold licenses were in three particular areas, the Turtle Mountains, where about one half of the licenses left over were doe. It's a hard area to hunt. The other area is the northeast corner of the state, Unit 2D, which is the Pembina Hills, also a tough area to hunt. The third area was south of Devil's Lake, Unit 2L. It might make a difference in those three units out of the 38 units in the state. It would be nice to have an option later on in the season to offer a reduction in price to encourage people to go to those areas. Areas around Bismarck and most others where doe licenses are sold out. One size doesn't fit all.

Rep. Hunsakor: Roger, how much extra money did this bring in to the Game & Fish Dept. Over the previous year?

Roger Rostvet: About 50-60,000 licenses multiplied by \$20.

Rep. Porter: If the wording was changed on the bill so that a person had to participate in lotteries one and two in order to qualify for the final \$10.00 license, would it affect the total number of licenses? Could I wait through the first two lotteries and just walk in and purchase a license at the reduced rate?

Mr. Rostvet: Most people who buy extra licenses do participate in the first and second draw before the third, for doe tags, not buck tags. Those individuals are already participating, jockeying to see where the buck tags go.

Rep. Porter: There was a reference made to a third drawing, do we have such a thing?

Mr. Rostvet: After the second drawing, we hold them for a certain time, then start issuing them first come, first serve over the counter.

Rep. Porter: So there are only two actual drawings?

Mr. Rostvet: If we get too many applications in for the third application than there are licenses, we draw on those in a formal drawing.

Rep. Hanson: If you reach the goal of reducing the deer herd to a manageable number, what would be the price tag of this bill?

Mr. Rostvet: Our goal forecast would be 100,000 deer licenses, approximately half bucks and half does. It would create a significant reduction in that fiscal note. Half the tags would be doe tags at that time. Now, we're almost two to one.

Rep. Hanson: So the price tag would go down to nothing?

Mr. Rostvet: No, it wouldn't go to nothing. It would go down to about half what it is now.

Rep. Hanson: Well, you want to reduce it from the \$170,000 that you now have down to \$100,000. That should do away with the price tag of \$1.4 million dollars.

Mr. Rostvet: The numbers would reduce from 145,000 down to 100,000. However, it still would not affect that people are heavily applying for bucks in those first two drawings. After the second drawing, there would still be significant numbers of doe tags. It's not directly proportional; people would still use that first and second lottery trying to get buck tags.

Rep. Norland: Sometimes people purchase things because they're just reasonable. I know people who have \$20 doe tags purchased in May or June which they hang on to; they may have missed the buck drawing or don't get drawn. Many don't fill tags if they aren't bucks. If we lower it to \$10 why wouldn't everybody buy one? Montana did that a few years ago for elk; the kill ratio for the Montana residents was only a little higher than non-residents. The elk tags were only \$9 at that time so everybody bought one but most never killed one. I'm not sure that if we're not getting people to hunt at \$20 maybe it should be more than \$20. Maybe if you are going to shoot one, you need to pay more money so you will go out and do it. I think there are two reasons why people don't fill tags. First, the hype of putting in for the license is high in May and June, so you just do it. Then, everything from the Missouri River to the Montana border and Canada border is posted. Many of the farmers won't let them hunt the first weekend until they (farmers) get their own bucks and don't want others hunting early to scare the bucks off the land. After the first weekend or two they try to hunt, they get discouraged and may not get to shoot that doe. A \$10 tag might be a bigger effect.

Mr. Rostvet: You bring up some points that have been brought up before. We've not detected a reduction in doe success. In fact, in some areas they have actually gone up. The person with one doe tag shoots far more percentage than the person who has ten tags. The more tags a guy buys the higher his success rate. The guys who buy multiple tags are consumptive users. A high percentage of those multiple tags are filled.

Chr. Nelson: Any further questions? Is there further testimony on HB 1049?

Mike Donahue, ND Wildlife Federation & United Sportsmen of ND: Rep. Nottestad indicated that he had a question. If you like, I will take the question.

Page 9

House Natural Resources Committee

Bill/Resolution Number HB 1049

Hearing Date January 6, 2005

Rep. Nottestad: Were you in support of or against the lowering of the out-of-state ones two years ago?

Donahue: Originally we wanted \$100 but concurred to \$50.

Chr. Nelson: Any further questions of Mike? Seeing none, We will close the hearing on HB 1049.

2005 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1049

House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date January 13, 2005

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1		x	3200-3883 - brief

Committee Clerk Signature *Karen Bonnet*

Minutes: **Chr. Nelson** reopened the hearing on HB 1049. I will hold this bill until individuals can be here. It wouldn't be fair to people that were involved in the hearing that aren't here today.

Because of the events that took place (Mr. Schaible's collapse), we won't take action on those first two bills we had this morning. If we can, maybe we can look at them tomorrow.

Rep. Drovdal: I did check on the fiscal note you requested. They will not do a fiscal note unless an amendment is added. They said you could go to the agency and they do the fiscal note. If you wish I can certainly go to the Game & Fish and request it.

Chr. Nelson: If that is the number we're going to get we'll discuss the information. With that we'll give the subcommittees a chance to meet and begin their work now. We will adjourn this committee.

2005 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1049

House Natural Resources Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date January 20, 2005

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
2		x	611-885

Committee Clerk Signature

Karen Bonnet

Chr. Nelson: Re-Opened the hearing on HB 1269; called roll, 1 absent.

What are the committee's wishes?

Rep. Hanson: I move Do Not Pass.

Chr. Nelson: We have a Do Not Pass motion, is there a second?

Rep. DeKrey: Second.

Chr. Nelson: Committee discussion?

Rep. Hanson: I made the move to kill this bill because I think we can probably combine it in another bill if necessary. We're getting too much pressure on the deer bucks, both mule deer and white tail. We don't need it. I would carry it.

Chr. Nelson: There is another bill that addresses the same issue that we will be hearing tomorrow. Any further committee discussion?

DeKrey: Question.

Page 2

House Natural Resources Committee

Bill/Resolution Number HB 1049

Hearing Date: January 20, 2005

Chr. Nelson: Question has been called for Do Not Pass motion on HB 1049. Clerk will call the roll.

Do NOT Pass VOTE: 13-Yeas, 0-Nayes; 1-Absent; Carrier: Hanson

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
12/17/2004

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1049

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2003-2005 Biennium		2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				(\$1,300,000)		(\$1,400,000)
Expenditures						
Appropriations						

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2003-2005 Biennium			2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2. **Narrative:** *Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.*

This bill reduces the fee for doe tags after the second deer lottery. Based on 2004 numbers, this could involve 60 to 70 thousand license per year. The revenue reduction will be for the game and fish fund.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

Based on 2004 sale, it is estimated that for the first year of the 2005 biennium, 60,000 doe tags would be sold at the \$10 reduced fee and 70,000 would be sold for the second year. The total reduction in revenue would be \$1,300,000 for 2005-2007 and \$1,400,000 for 2007-2009.

Note that the number of doe tags issued in 2004 was a record high. It is uncertain whether this high number will be issued in future years.

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.*

Name: Paul Schadewald
Phone Number: 328-6328

Agency: ND Game and Fish Department
Date Prepared: 12/20/2004

Date:

Roll Call Vote #:

1/20/05
1

2005 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1049

House

NATURAL RESOURCES

Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number :

Action Taken :

Do not Pass

Motion Made By :

Hanson

Seconded By :

DeKrey

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman - Rep. Jon O. Nelson	✓		Rep. Lyle Hanson	✓	
Vice Chairman - Todd Porter	✓		Rep. Bob Hunsakor	✓	
Rep. Dawn Marie Charging	✓		Rep. Scot Kelsh	✓	
Rep. Donald L. Clark	✓		Rep. Dorvan Solberg	✓	
Rep. Duane DeKrey	✓				
Rep. David Drovdal	✓				
Rep. Dennis Johnson	✓				
Rep. George J. Keiser		Absent			
Rep. Mike Norland	✓				
Rep. Darrell D. Nottestad	✓				

Total (Yes)

12

No

0

Absent

Keiser

Floor Assignment

Hanson

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
January 21, 2005 3:12 p.m.

Module No: HR-14-0872
Carrier: Hanson
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1049: Natural Resources Committee (Rep. Nelson, Chairman) recommends DO NOT PASS (13 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1049 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

2005 TESTIMONY

HB 1049



Cass County
WILDLIFE CLUB
Box 336
Casselton, ND 58012



TESTIMONY OF HAROLD NEAMEYER
CASS COUNTY WILDLIFE CLUB
PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCE COMMITTEE

ON

HB 1049

JANUARY 6, 2005

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Harold Neameyer speaking on behalf of the Cass County Wildlife Club. The Cass County Wildlife Club is supportive of the attempt to make the deer license more affordable after the second drawing. This proposed change would make many hunters more willing to seek additional licenses. However, the club fears that the loss of revenue will be excessive, which may be detrimental to the overall budget.

Because of the anticipated loss of revenue, the Club opposes HB 1049 at this time.

