

From: Michael Tinker
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2014 10:14 AM
To: Vivian Stiver
Subject: CSHB161 Hearing and thoughts

Good morning. I'm going to be at the LIO for the 3:30 hearing of S. Resources. I'll be available for testimony. The Sen. should know that the parties on both sides of this issue have been working together and some new language has been proposed. (Nothing major but changes to tweak this thing in the direction of allowing more than one NGO because of the "conditions", and changing the percentages of the funds that can be given back to the NGO(s).)

There is some further problem in making sure Alaskans understand that by selling these permits to outside hunters we can't expect to raise enough more for the Fish and Game Fund to meet the needs of the Department. That is, Alaskans are going to need to pay a share too.

The low number of permits, in the whole program both existing and proposed, will not make a difference to opportunity for Alaskan hunters but may be perceived to lower opportunity. In other state's "governor's permits" multiple permits for the same animal, like our dall sheep, have lowered the value of each permit resulting in no net increase to the state. It will be difficult to avoid that with this legislation where the clear intent is to provide more.

The other issue is the appearance of "earmarking" the new funds for "education" purposes. While a priority right now, putting that purpose in statute removes the Department's ability to use the funding for something else in the future. Others are working to provide language to "direct" funding to education without requiring it be spent there.

Finally, there are other "big picture" issues with adding to the F&G Fund. For example, last weekend the Board of Game passed a new split resident musk ox tag fee resulting in some residents paying \$500 for a musk ox tag and some paying \$25. I'm wondering if this will pass legal muster. Since tag fees go into the F&G Fund, having such a split tag fee not only causes hard feelings but also results in a \$475 loss to the fund for each tag. As much as can qualify of F&G Funding is matched by federal Pittman-Robertson Funds at a three to one ratio. Pretty easy math to show a significant loss to the fund.

There are also license and tag fee structures that need attention and compliance efforts to treat all Alaskans fairly in making sure license money relates accurately to harvest of game animals.

CSHB 161 is not a cure, just a small part of the picture and the Sen. should understand that.

Have a great day.

--

Mike Tinker