

From: Zach Dunlap
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Sen. Cathy Giessel; Sen. Fred Dyson
Cc: Sen. Peter Micciche; Sen. Click Bishop; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Anna Fairclough; Sen. Hollis French
Subject: HB 161, Senate Resource Committee meeting 3-29-14

Dear Members of the Senate Resource Committee,

I wish to express my opposition to HB 161.

I have read the proposed bill, I have had discussions with many fellow Alaskan sportsmen; clearly this bill is trying to "fix" something that is not "broken".

During the course of my research and following this bill, it has occurred to me that the legislature has not fully taken into account the intent of the bill. Although this bill was written with good intentions, the author does not understand the impacts it will have.

In my humble opinion, HB 161 is a bill intended on producing more revenue. Yet this bill will not do what it is intended to do, rather the opposite. Add to that, limiting the availability of hunting opportunities for everyday Alaska residents.

In a recent article the bill's sponsor, stated that adding three Dall Sheep permits to the "Governors" list would only be .7% of the total Dall Sheep permits issued this fall. That number is correct, yet there are severe misunderstandings:

A) .7% of the total number issued changes the number available only by a small amount, yet the number of applicants will stay the same, thus lowering the odds of drawing such a sought after animal for all who apply.

B) Dall Sheep tags are the "top sellers" and most coveted tags by the groups auctioning them off. If you add more tags the value of each is depleted. The folks that are bidding and buying these sought after tags have the means (money) to do so because they know a good deal when they see one, most likely that is how they came to be able to afford such a high priced item. If you add more tags, or more supply, there will be less demand thus less money in return for said tags.

I firmly believe that there are other ways to attain the funding needed for conservation and wildlife management efforts in Alaska, one being raising the cost of permits and hunting licenses. I, personally, would be happy to pay a few more dollars for tags or licenses to ensure that Alaska's wildlife is being utilized by Alaskans who have worked hard and earned it, rather than wealthy people out of state buying "Governors" tags at an auction.

In conclusion, HB 161 will not benefit Alaska residents, Non-profit groups, and most importantly the research and conservation efforts funded by the sale of these "Governors" tags.

I urge this committee to consider the cause and effect of HB 161. Does the law now not work? Will this bill create a law that will positively affect Alaska and its wildlife?

Very Respectfully,

Zachery Dunlap

Anchorage, Alaska