

To the House Resources Committee, Rep. Lynne Gattis, the Interior delegation, and Eddie Grasser: On last Wednesday, I testified in opposition to HB 161, *An Act relating to auctions or raffles for big game harvest permits and to the selection of nonprofit organizations to conduct auctions and raffles for the Department of Fish and Game*. I was opposed to the bill, but did not testify very well. For that I apologize. One of the things I failed to mention was that **the bill may well require an attached fiscal note**. It will create an additional administrative burden for the Department of Fish and Game. I assume that the Department's employees are already working at capacity so identifying the "winning" non-governmental organization (NGO), drafting cooperative agreements, administering and enforcing the agreements, and managing a four-fold increase in permits for auction will require more work. I estimate a very efficient worker would require more than "quarter time" employment. The requirement might be as much as half time. I estimate an additional cost to ADF&G to do this administratively required work at approximately \$50,000 per year should HB 161 become law. **Additionally, Section 1 of the bill would deprive the Department's Fish and Game Fund of at least \$100,000 annually which would not be available for Pittman-Robertson match** funding at a three dollars to one ratio. Hence, the bill would make at least \$400,000 per year unavailable for expenditure by ADF&G. I am not certain whether this sort of foregone income should be included in a fiscal note, but the amount of money "lost" to ADF&G will be huge, primarily because a Dall sheep auction permit is included in the "*direct-to-the-NGO at 100% list*" in Section 1 of the bill. Section 2 of the bill would increase the "incentive" for NGOs to market these permits for ADF&G from 10% (which I consider reasonable) to 30% (which I consider userous). The amount of money at risk of never entering the Fish and Game Fund for the Pittman-Robertson "match" is immense, and should be fully recognized. Paradoxically, an earlier version of this bill intended to codify the "North American Wildlife Management Model" in Alaska law. That provision has been deleted with the realization that said model is already conceptually enshrined in our constitution. The paradox is that the present bill would turn that very model "on its head," by reversing the flow of conservation dollars from "user-to-agency" so it would become "agency-to-user." Administering the "agency to user" money would create the need for administrative expense, hence my suggestion of a fiscal note of at least \$50,000. Thank you for your consideration of these matters. I hope to be able to bring this to your attention in Committee hearing on Monday.

Respectfully,

Wayne E. Heimer

Dall Sheep Biologist/Manager-retired from ADF&G but still active 1098 Chena Pump Road Fairbanks, Alaska 99709