

From: MC

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 9:52 AM

To: Sen. Cathy Giessel

Cc: Sen. Fred Dyson; Sen. Peter Micciche; Sen. Click Bishop; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Anna Fairclough; Sen. Hollis French

Subject: Re: HB161

On Mar 31, 2014, at 12:11 PM, MC wrote:

> Dear Senators,

>

> I am opposed to HB 161.

>

> Non profits advocating for modification of the governors tag program as it exists today declared their "cost" associated with auctioning of tags as the rational basis for amending the existing legislation and why many of the available tags have not been utilized (auctioned) in recent years.

>

> It is more than reasonable to conclude that authorizing non profits to auction more tags and now monitoring of the proposed program by the Department is not going to be '0' cost.

>

> A fiscal note attached to the proposed legislation must be considered a legitimate part of the deal here should it not?

>

> Even then this program will not solve any financial problem for the Division. Especially not when 100% of the proceeds for the revenue for a tag is retained by a special interest organization. Not to mention the fact that the proposed 100% tags are the most sought after tags by resident hunters and will more likely than not will end up in the hands of non resident hunters...year after year after year.

>

> If in your collective wisdom you feel something needs done NOW then regroup. Go back to the beginning and consider simply limiting an amendment to include NO increase in the number of tags and only authorizing a non profit to retain 25% of the proceeds from the existing governors tag program. It seems then, there is more likely to be an increase in revenue to the Division and the original concern non profits have with their costs associated with the auctioning of a tag is no longer an issue.

>

> Mike McCrary