

Senator Dyson,

I am writing to you as a constituent living in Eagle River. I am deeply troubled by HB 161 concerning auctions and raffles for big game harvest, which is currently in the Senate Resources committee. I hope that as the Vice-Chair of this committee, you will take action to prevent this bill from reaching the full senate.

HB161 puts Alaska wildlife management on a very wrong path for Alaska hunters and those with a love for Alaska's wildlife resources. I apply year after year in a drawing for a once in a lifetime opportunity to hunt in specific areas or for specific species. This bill will allow an out of state hunter to buy that tag out from under me and every other Alaskan that would like the same opportunity. Many of the state's top hunts already give non-residents a better opportunity to hunt than residents. An example of this is the Kodiak bear hunts. A non-resident has a 30%-100% chance of drawing a tag, while a resident has a 1%-27% *chance of drawing the exact same hunting opportunity*. Representative Gattis has said that *"HB 161 does take permits out of the drawing pool; it does not take permits directly from Alaskan hunters. When a resident hunter enters into the drawing he has the same chance of winning a permit as a hunter from New York or Texas."* This is absolutely un-true for many of our coveted hunting opportunities. Unit 14C, right in our backyard, has separate sheep tags for residents and non-residents and as in the above example about Kodiak bears, non-residents have a much greater chance of drawing a tag. The Upper Eagle River drainage only allocates one tag to non-residents versus the multiple tags to residents. Call me cynical, but I've got a guess as to where the reduction in opportunity will occur.

The state does not need to sell out it's residents in order to raise a marginal amount of new funding. Further, I do not believe that flooding the auction market with twice as many permits will result in twice as much revenue. That argument does not hold up to the law of supply and demand.

I am also troubled by the fact that this bill triples the amount of money that the organizations get to keep when they auction one of Alaska's resources. During public testimony before the House, a representative of one of these organizations, Mike Crawford, was asked by Representative Tarr *"Mr Crawford, I'm just wondering, part of this discussion about the administrative burden for one of the nonprofit organizations and being more motivated to perhaps do more with the permits if you had a larger percentage of the proceeds. So would you be interested in support of legislation...just change that 10% to 30%?"* to which Mr. Crawford responded in the affirmative. My question is why do the residents of the State of Alaska need to provide three times as much motivation to these non-profit organizations for them to perform their stated goals of wildlife conservation?

In conclusion, I will propose that if the State needs additional funding for wildlife management I would fully support a resident tag fee. There were almost 29,000 black bear tags given to residents at no charge last year. If the State were to implement a \$5 tag fee, \$145,000 would be generated directly. In addition to that, the Federal Government would match that 3:1 with Pittman-Robertson funding. That \$5 fee generates \$580,000 for just one species. The state has only received \$460,000 from the auction process since 2009. As you can see, a resident tag fee

will provide a much larger benefit to Alaska wildlife resources than the auctions could ever hope to, without pulling the resources out from under the residents of this amazing State.

Please don't sell out our wildlife resources and hunting opportunities to out of state interests.

Sincerely,

Kyle H Jones
Eagle River, Alaska