

**From:** April Neumann

**Date:** March 31, 2014 at 8:18:30 PM AKDT

**To:** <[Senator.Cathy.Giessel@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Cathy.Giessel@akleg.gov)>, <[Senator.Fred.Dyson@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Fred.Dyson@akleg.gov)>, <[Senator.Peter.Micciche@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Peter.Micciche@akleg.gov)>, <[Senator.Click.Bishop@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Click.Bishop@akleg.gov)>, <[Senator.Lesil.McGuire@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Lesil.McGuire@akleg.gov)>, <[Senator.Anna.Fairclough@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Anna.Fairclough@akleg.gov)>, <[Senator.Hollis.French@akleg.gov](mailto:Senator.Hollis.French@akleg.gov)>

**Subject:** Opposed to HB 161

Senate Resources Committee  
Sen. Cathy Giessel, Chair  
Testimony on CSHB 161

I'm writing you in regards to HB 161. After reading the Bill multiple times, and it's revisions, I cannot support it, and would encourage you and the other committee members, along with the Bill's sponsors and co-sponsors to reconsider your support. Even with the changes I think we are still headed down the wrong path. The path of Non-residents funding the Department, thus giving the Non-residents Sportsmen's groups, and the Guiding Industry more power and say over an All Alaskan Resource.

A lot of my heart burn comes from the additional Sheep tag being added. It will only dilute the value of the current Governors tag. And it would take another tag and hunting opportunity away from fellow Alaskans, all in the name of funding. Under the current language this Bill does not clarify which pool these additional permits would come from, out of the resident pool, or non-resident pool of permits. After doing a little math from the drawing supplement, there were 9471 application for the Alaska Resident only Sheep tags. And in addition to that you have 7 other draw hunts that combine both Non-residents, and Resident applicant's, totaling another 11,392. You could argue that 10,000 of those application are Alaskan Residents. Which would give you over 19,000 application divided by 3, for the number of permits one applicant can apply for.  $19,000 / 3 = 6333$  Alaskans who are hoping for a tag. Having said all that just to show you the demand by Alaskans for the tag this Bill would donate to a Non-resident. I've read in other comments where this one tag is only .7% of the draw tags available, however; it's 100% of 1 Sheep tag to me. Then, what does "conditions set by the commissioner" mean? Will this be a early season, same day airborne, etc.etc.etc. I'm totally against any special HUNT Conditions that fall outside the General Season, and Hunting Regs.

My second concern would be with the ramifications of allocating an Alaskan Resource to a Non-profit Organization, and that they would be allowed to keep 100% percent of the funds. To my understanding, that Non-profit Group is to be chosen/selected from a pool of qualifying Groups by the Commissioner. Now tell me that wouldn't get political in the future. This beauty contest of selecting the winning Organization should be done on a bidding process, with the winning org. taking the smallest percentage for themselves. Is a 100% allocation to a Non-profit group a practical application for the State when dealing with a natural resource for All Alaskans?

Then, there's the issue of the reasons way, the need for the percentage increase to be given to the Non-profit group from 10% to 30%, and allowing them to do what they want with it. This was done under the disguise to make it more attractive for Non-profits to compete for it. Now that argument is out the window with the language which now spells out that they must spend all of it in State, on programs approved by the Department. If this is the case, then why are we changing the percentage at all? The Organizations who have auctioned off the permits in the past are not asking for the percentage increase. This just doesn't add up, and would indicate that something else is going on behind the scenes. That may be a stretch, but then again, maybe it's not.

I've read the letters that are posted on the Alaska State Legislature web-site under the Documents for HB 161, for those that Support, and those that Oppose HB 161, and I noted that most of the supporting letters are coming from Organizations, while those that Opposed are coming from Alaskan Residents, that you, and your committee represent. Please keep this in mind, as other special interests try to influence your vote. I would also

like to say that the Letter written on the behalf of the AWCA by Mike Tinker, as well as Wayne Heimer's letter, and the ABHA letters all speak very well to these, and other important concerns.

Again, I encourage you to Kill this Bill, as it is currently written, or at the very least to slow this train down. Fast tracking this Bill is not in the Best interest of All Alaskans.

Thanks for your Time and Service to this Great State.

Sincerely

Frank Neumann

Chugiak, AK.

907-688-3953