

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SENATE RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE**

April 3, 2019

3:31 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Chris Birch, Chair
Senator John Coghill, Vice Chair
Senator Cathy Giessel
Senator Scott Kawasaki
Senator Jesse Kiehl

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Lora Reinbold
Senator Click Bishop

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

SENATE BILL NO. 87

"An Act relating to the taking of big game by nonresidents; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

SENATE BILL NO. 51

"An Act requiring the designation of state water as outstanding national resource water to occur by law; relating to the authority of the Department of Environmental Conservation, the Department of Fish and Game, and the Department of Natural Resources to nominate water for designation as outstanding national resource water; relating to management of outstanding national resource water by the Department of Environmental Conservation; and providing for an effective date."

- BILL HEARING CANCELED

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: SB 87

SHORT TITLE: LIMIT NONRESIDENT TAKING OF BIG GAME

SPONSOR(S): SENATOR(S) COGHILL

03/13/19	(S)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/13/19	(S)	RES, FIN

WITNESS REGISTER

KRISTY TIBBLES, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Game
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Did not provide a position on SB 87.

MR. MARK RICHARDS, Executive Director
Resident Hunters of Alaska
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of SB 87.

GARY COLBATH, Vice President
Alaskan Bowhunters Association
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of SB 87.

SAM ROHRER, President
Alaska Professional Hunters Association
Kodiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition of SB 87.

THOR STACEY, Director of Government Affairs
Alaska Professional Hunters Association
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition of SB 87.

ROD ARNO, Executive Director
Alaska Outdoor Council
Palmer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition of SB 87.

EDDIE GRASSER, Director
Division of Wildlife Conservation
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Explained the division's fiscal note for SB 87.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:31:49 PM](#)

CHAIR CHRIS BIRCH called the Senate Resources Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. Present at the call to order were Senators Giessel, Coghill, Kawasaki, Kiehl, and Chair Birch.

SB 87-LIMIT NONRESIDENT TAKING OF BIG GAME

[3:32:17 PM](#)

CHAIR BIRCH announced the consideration of Senate Bill 87 (SB 87).

[3:32:45 PM](#)

SENATOR COGHILL, sponsor of SB 87, provided an overview of the bill and explained that Alaska Statutes Title 16, Article 2 addresses Alaska Fish and Game rules regarding game management via the Alaska Board of Game for non-residents. He conceded that non-resident regulation is an issue where he does not agree with all his friends. He said SB 87 addresses the question on whether Alaska residents should get a preference when a restriction is necessary.

He referenced AS 16.05.255(d) as follows:

Regulations adopted under (a) of this section must provide that consistent with the provisions of AS 16.05.258, which is subsistence hunting, basically. Taking a moose, deer, elk, caribou by residence for personal or family consumption has preference over taking by nonresidents.

He said AS 16.05.258(d) is a principle that the Alaska Board of Game has operated under. He opined that for the most part the board has done "pretty good", but when coming to permits is another question. He remarked that the statute section has a "couple of operatives" and the "big one" changes "may" to a "shall," which makes the section "mandatory" rather than "permissive".

He said the committee will hear from both sides of the nonresident issue on why the "shall" gives a preference to Alaska residents and why "may" gives the Alaska Board of Game a "flex point". He emphasized that the bill addresses when it is necessary to restrict the taking of big game and the opportunity for residents to take big game is reasonably satisfied.

He explained that presently the law says, "May through a permit system limit the taking of big game by nonresidents." What SB 87 does through a hard requirement is say, "No, it must, then

through a permit system limit the taking of big game by nonresidents and nonresident aliens." He explained that part of the argument for the bill comes from an argument within the Alaska Board of Game that speaks to, "Have we treated the resident hunters at the level they should be treated or are we chasing dollars for nonresidents and that goes to the heart of the question."

[3:36:37 PM](#)

He emphasized that his intent is to fall on the side of residents and to make sure residents are taken care of. He said the committee will hear from both sides of the nonresident question, why some people feel like the Board of Game has been "tone deaf", and partly why the dollars that nonresidents bring in has not only been valuable to Alaska but has not been harmful to residents in taking big game as well.

SENATOR COGHILL affirmed that it is up to the committee to hear both sides of the nonresident issue as clearly as possible, without the vitriol. He said he has tried to be as even handed as he can. He said he has asked for invited testimony to lay out the nonresident issue before the committee for further discussions rather than listen to 50 to 60 people who have strong opinions but no solutions. He explained that his idea for the committee meeting is to bring the strong opinions that are thoughtful to the table and then ask the question whether the Alaska Board of Game can be trusted to continue the way they are or if they should be restricted.

He summarized that he has no malice towards anybody; however, he said the bill addresses whether nonresident permits should be restricted when the reasonable opportunity for residents comes under the specified restrictive conditions.

CHAIR BIRCH noted that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and the Alaska Board of Game are available to answer questions.

SENATOR KAWASAKI noted that a letter from the chair of the Board of Game did not support SB 87. He asked if the Alaska Board of Game voted on that position.

[3:39:43 PM](#)

KRISTY TIBBLES, Executive Director, Alaska Board of Game, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, did not provide a position on SB 87. She explained that the Alaska Board of Game did bring SB 87 up at the meeting in March. There was a request to submit

a letter and there was no objection to the chair doing so, but there was no motion or a vote by the board to do so.

SENATOR COGHILL pointed out that the board chairman stated that he was giving his opinion, but it was a board discussion.

CHAIR BIRCH asked whether the Alaska Board of Game is doing an adequate job of managing the allocation of big game. He asked Senator Coghill whether SB 87 proposes that the legislature insert itself into managing the allocation of big game.

SENATOR COGHILL reiterated that he introduced SB 87 because there are people that feel the Alaska Board of Game has been "tone deaf" to some nonresidents and the board needs to have a reason to tell the legislature why that is the case. He said if the bill helps the Alaska Board of Game to see a different perspective, then the legislation will help the legislature enter a discussion, whatever that may look like. He said his intent is to error on the side of taking care of the residents of Alaska first, but he wants to hear why the "may" or "shall" language will or will not be helpful.

[3:42:57 PM](#)

MR. MARK RICHARDS, Executive Director, Resident Hunters of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska, testified in support of SB 87. He said SB 87 allows for a conversation to start on issues that have been going on with the Alaska Board of Game for quite some time.

He quoted from page 7 of the Fish and Game's Alaska Hunting Regulations booklet:

Nonresidents are allowed to hunt when there is enough game to allow everyone to participate. When there isn't enough game, nonresident hunters are restricted or eliminated first. If more restrictions are necessary, seasons and bag limits may be reduced or eliminated for some residents.

He noted that the previous paragraph in the regulation booklet is nowhere in statute and is not how the Alaska Board of Game makes decisions. He added that the paragraph is an unfulfilled promise by the state that is in writing in the state's own hunting regulation booklet; SB 87 seeks to fulfill that promise.

He opined that SB 87 is very narrow and seeks to ensure that when wildlife populations are diminished, or there are

conservation or other concerns that lead to restrictions or reductions in resident hunting opportunities, that nonresident hunters are limited in opportunity first and they bear the brunt of any restrictions.

He asserted that SB 87 does not in any way affect the board's overall authority on allocation decisions. The board will still be allowed to offer unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunity in areas of the Interior while at the same time acknowledging that nonresident guided hunters taking 60 to 80 percent of the state's sheep creates conflict of field, overcrowding, and leads to less resident success rates.

MR. RICHARDS said moose draw permits where nonresident hunters receive 50 percent of the allocations will still be in statute and the board will still be allowed to allocate 40 percent of Kodiak brown bear tags to nonresident hunters. The board will also be able to create new must-be-guided species absent legislative approval to benefit the guide industry.

He remarked that his previous testimonial issue points are how and why Resident Hunters of Alaska (RHAK) was formed nearly three years ago, but the noted issues are not what RHAK seeks to address with SB 87.

[3:45:45 PM](#)

He explained that the existing statute, AS 16.05.256, essentially tells the Board of Game that whenever they need to restrict resident big game hunting opportunities, they "may" then put nonresident hunters on a draw permit system to limit their opportunity. However, RHAK has never seen the board take that action in the last 12 years. Rather than act to limit nonresident permits, the decisions the board has made over the past 12 years has restricted everyone equally. He noted that the board reduced the season and bag limits for the Central Arctic Caribou herd without having nonresident hunters bear the full brunt of the restrictions, which is a reason why the statute should be changed from "may" to "shall."

[3:48:19 PM](#)

MR. RICHARDS opined that the legislature has granted broad authority to the Alaska Board of Game to determine all wildlife allocation decisions, but any institutional system over time needs to "have the hood open and inspected."

He noted that SB 87 was introduced the day before a recent Board of Game meeting when board chair said, "This board does not like

the word 'shall', 'may' to 'shall' ties our hands." He pointed out that there are other instances within Title 16 statutes that includes the provision "shall," even the word "must." He emphasized that "shall" is meant to tie hands by requiring a certain outcome that avoids situations like what occurred with the Central Arctic Caribou herd.

He summarized that some may oppose SB 87 because the legislation affects nonresident hunting opportunities that could impact some guides as well as some species which are not required to hire a guide. However, SB 87 is very narrow and only applies in circumstances where resident hunting opportunities are restricted or reduced. SB 87 applies if the Alaska Board of Game has determined it cannot allow wide open opportunity for everyone. Resident hunters must come first under circumstances when opportunities must be restricted. He said some may argue that the legislature should not interfere in Alaska Board of Game business, but the Alaska Legislature is fully capable of taking in information and making sense of a wide variety of issues.

[3:52:44 PM](#)

GARY COLBATH, Vice President, Alaskan Bowhunters Association, Anchorage, Alaska, testified in support of SB 87. He noted that the association has nonresident members as well. He said SB 87 helps to ensure that nonresident hunters face restrictions first in an equal or greater amount than resident hunters when there is a restriction on hunting rights like bag limits, tag availability, and season length due to declining wildlife populations, conservation concerns, or other environmental factors.

He specified that SB 87 is simply an insurance policy for resident Alaskan hunters that will require nonresident hunters' rights be first affected by any restrictions or reductions that the Alaska Board of Game decides to impose. SB 87 is very narrow and does not in any way affect the Alaska Board of Game's overall authority on allocation decisions. SB 87 does not change the board's ongoing authority to limit nonresident hunters; however, the board will have to consider and restrict the rights of nonresident hunters first when necessary.

[3:55:21 PM](#)

He noted that SB 87 could be opposed by the Alaska Professional Hunters Association and added that the chairman for the Alaska Board of Game does not support the bill. The Alaskan Bowhunters

Association does not see SB 87 as anti-nonresident or anti-guide, reiterating that the bill is narrowly focused.

He concurred with Mr. Richards' previous testimony on the need for the legislation due to Alaska Board of Game handling of hunting restrictions on the Central Arctic Caribou herd where residential hunting for personal and family consumption was not given preference over nonresidents. The result from the restriction shows that nonresident hunters now take 55 percent of the Central Arctic Caribou herd harvest. He opined that none of Alaska's residential hunters would travel to a state in the Lower 48 to hunt and expect to be regulated more favorably than the in-state residents.

[3:58:33 PM](#)

MR. COLBATH said the Alaskan Bowhunters Association hopes that sound management policies by the Alaska Board of Game and good conservation practices by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game never again requires additional hunting restrictions for any resident and nonresident hunters. However, SB 87 assures that nonresident hunters are affected first when additional hunting restrictions are required and resident rights will only be affected after nonresident considerations.

SENATOR KIEHL addressed the hunting regulations in the 26B management area that Mr. Richards and Mr. Colbath addressed for the Central Arctic Caribou herd. He read the regulations for the remainder of the 26B season in the Dalton Highway management controlled-use area and stated the following:

As I look in the reg book, residents at two bulls,
nonresidents at one. Residents: August to April,
nonresidents: August to September.

He asked if the restrictions that are currently in place satisfy the language of the bill.

MR. COLBATH asked Senator Kiehl to confirm that he questioned whether the current restrictions would be satisfied if the bill passed and the regulation read "shall."

SENATOR KIEHL confirmed that was his question.

MR. COLBATH replied yes; he believes that a restriction or limitation would be placed on nonresident rights that is equal to or more than the rights of residents.

[4:01:45 PM](#)

At ease.

[4:02:33 PM](#)

CHAIR BIRCH called the committee back to order.

[4:02:43 PM](#)

SAM ROHRER, President, Alaska Professional Hunters Association, Kodiak, Alaska, testified in opposition of SB 87. He noted that he is a master guide who owns a multigenerational guiding business in Kodiak.

MR. ROHRER explained that guide operations in Alaska are largely family affairs made up of many second and third generation guides. The guiding businesses are small family and community-based businesses with 80 percent serving fewer than 15 clients per year and 40 percent serving fewer than 6 clients per year.

He said Alaska's big game guiding has one of the highest rates of resident ownership of any other state industry. Approximately 90 percent are Alaska owned and many guides live in rural Alaska. Over 50 percent of the guiding industry's \$52 million in new dollars brought to the state stays in rural Alaska.

[4:04:40 PM](#)

He detailed his guiding business's impact at the local level as follows:

- \$23,000 charged to a client for a Kodiak bear hunt.
- \$2,500 goes to a local transporter who flies the hunters and guides to the field.
- \$4,000 pays the wages of local guides he employs.
- \$2,000 pays for a local packer and cook.
- \$1,000 spent on food from a local grocery store.
- \$500 for fuel at a local fuel dock.
- \$500 for miscellaneous supplies from a local sporting goods store.
- \$2,000 for business expenses like workers' compensation and liability insurance that is bought from a local broker.
- \$1,000 for maintenance costs for camp, equipment, and boats.
- Total costs: \$13,500 to put on a hunt.

He explained that his remaining profit of \$9500 is spent on local charities, home mortgage, property taxes, etcetera. He emphasized that all \$23000 is spent locally which benefits both

his family and his local community. He said his own example is what happens in rural communities across Alaska during each hunting season where small, local businesses support other small, local businesses.

[4:06:22 PM](#)

He opined that the guiding industry works in Alaska because the state is home to an incredibly vast wildlife resource. Alaska has eight big game species that are unique to the state that are all open to over the counter hunting opportunities. Alaska's world class resource sets the state apart from the rest of the country.

MR. ROHRER emphasized that Alaska's residents have opportunities to hunt the state's incredible resources as well, but nonresidents pay a much higher cost. While nonresident hunters only represent 13 percent of the hunters in the field, they pay over 72 percent of wildlife management in Alaska. Nonresident contributions ensure that resident Alaskans can continue to hunt for a very low cost.

He said the guiding industry's vision for the future is that guide businesses continue to remain viable long into the future by:

- Adding value to Alaska's iconic wildlife resources.
- Bringing opportunity and financial resources to rural Alaska.
- Nonresident hunters continue to pay the lion's share of Alaska's wildlife management.
- Resident Alaskans can continue to raise their families with strong hunting traditions for as little cost as possible.

MR. ROHRER opined that the guiding businesses' vision for the future is what managing Alaska's resources for the benefit of all Alaskans really looks like. Resident hunters can continue to have low-cost world-class hunting opportunities and small guide businesses continue to support their families and local communities.

SENATOR COGHILL asked him to breakdown the guiding industry numbers for nonresidents versus resident hunters.

MR. ROHRER answered that in 2015 the industry guided 154 Alaska residents. He noted that his business is contacted approximately six times a year by residents who generally want to go deer hunting. He said his guiding business guides approximately one to two resident hunters per year.

[4:09:28 PM](#)

THOR STACEY, Director of Government Affairs, Alaska Professional Hunters Association, Juneau, Alaska, testified in opposition of SB 87. He said his intent is to provide background information on the policy, legal, and regulatory framework that SB 87 would effect. He noted that he is a life-long Alaskan who had utilized wildlife as a resident hunter, registered hunting guide, federally qualified subsistence user, and trapper. He remarked that he has a personal level of use and interest in SB 87.

MR. STACEY addressed AS 16.05.407 regarding the requirement for nonresidents to hire a hunting guide, a requirement that dates to Alaska's territorial days. The guide requirement applies to hunting Dall sheep, brown and grizzly bear, and mountain goats. The reason for the hunting guide requirement is for safety concerns due to terrain, climate, and dangerous animals. The nonresident requirement created the hunting guide industry.

He emphasized that being a hunting guide is a privilege that guides understand they have. He pointed out that Alaskans commonly own the hunting resources and hunting guides do not in any way feel a sense of ownership for the resource because the resource is reserved for common use and equal access.

[4:12:16 PM](#)

MR. STACEY addressed hunting guide duties to the public as follows:

- Support and promote the hunting guides' core competencies as professionals, especially safety.
- Understand that animals are highly valued by Alaskans, both hunters and non-hunters alike.
- Must demonstrate a respect for the animals, land, and water.
- Must act as active stewards of the land and the wildlife resources when using them for commercial purposes.
- Must work as a group within the constitutional framework laid out for hunting guides:
 - Guides cannot lay claim in a "private property" sense of wildlife resources from a pure profitability prospective.
 - Guides must operate within the broad constitutional framework whether hunting guides like it or not.
 - There is no limited entries amendment in the state's constitution.

- Must treat other users with respect because valuable animals are being used for commercial use, food, and enjoyment.

He noted that Mr. Rohrer referenced the 13 percent allocation for nonresidents. He specified that hunting guides are a much smaller percentage of the 13 percent allocation. There are approximately 3,000 hunting guides out of the approximate 100,000 hunters that annually buy licenses in Alaska, some of which are resident hunters.

MR. STACEY said hunting guides support the Alaska Board of Game efforts to create regulatory allocation schemes for the benefit of all Alaskans, nonhunters and hunters alike. Many of the benefits hunting guides bring are to nonhunters and business owners.

He emphasized that "sustained yield is number one" and the resource must be sustainably managed. Hunting guides support the statutory mandates for resident preference as referenced by the bill's sponsor, Senator Coghill, for food, animals, and animals recognized for subsistence priority.

He said hunting guides support the existing preferences, especially with subsistence preferences. Hunting guides work with rural residents all around the state to make sure people are meeting their needs if hunting guides have extra meat available. Hunting guides share the resource with Alaskans all over the state.

He opined that a worst-case scenario from destabilizing regulatory schemes occurs when a sustainable resource is lost where the animal populations can no longer endure harvest and that the health of the wildlife itself is in jeopardy.

He said a worst-case scenario from a hunting guide perspective is a drawing hunt or permit hunt where hunting guides do not have a concession program in place. Hunting guides have opposed many efforts to put allocation proposals in front of the Alaska Board of Game where the resource is healthy and can endure the harvest. Proponents ask for permits to simply reallocate the resource where there is no concession program in place. He opined that hunting guides simply cannot live in a random-draw world without a concession underneath their feet. The effect of that situation most affects guides on state land. He noted that he and Mr. Rohrer do not operate or work on state land, but they

care about what happens to guides on state land as much as what happens to guides with concessions on federal lands.

[4:16:29 PM](#)

He explained possible worst-case scenarios for hunters as follows:

- High cost to participate would affect hunters if costs are raised to hunt:
 - Hunting participation will be lost, and future hunters will be lost.
- Complex regulatory schemes confuse and discourage hunter participation.
- Drawing-hunts require a random chance to participate:
 - Discourages hunter participation, especially young hunters hoping to get into the hunting world.
- Preference points benefit older hunters:
 - Hunters that have time for a lot of applications.
 - Discriminatory against younger hunters where they are not given the same opportunity.
- Land use and land access:
 - If land cannot be accessed, the resource cannot be accessed.
 - Undue burdens placed on hunters will result in losing hunter participation.

MR. STACEY addressed hunting participation rates as follows:

- National hunting participation rates since 1991:
 - Gone from 14 million hunters to 11.4 million hunters.
 - Percentage of the population has gone from 7 percent to 4 percent.
- Western state hunting participation rates since 1991:
 - Gone from 1.1 million hunters to 697000 hunters.
 - Percentage of population hunting from 4 percent to 2 percent.

He said when objectively looking at the policies around the country, especially in the western states, the examples that proponents of SB 87 are using to suggest that hunting guides should comply with, there has not been a success for hunter participation, states are losing hunters at a high rate. Policies that the proponents are suggesting should be put in place in Alaska have been a failure. The state's hunting guides would suggest that the other states would do better to follow Alaska's example: sustained yield, maximum benefit, allocation

authority kicked to a regulatory board to work specifically with groups and others. Hunting guides would suggest that Alaska's model is a better model and requires less impediments to the hunter.

MR. STACEY opined that SB 87 mandates another level of bureaucracy. Changing the word from "may" to "shall" in the statute mandates an additional burden of proof on the Alaska Board of Game process and additional pages will be required for the hunting regulations, mandating that will discourage hunter participation and will likely cost conservation dollars to the Division of Wildlife.

[4:20:07 PM](#)

CHAIR BIRCH asked if there are any other instances in state statute where there are other sideboards on the Alaska Board of Game regarding limiting nonresident access to game.

MR. STACEY replied that there are multiple layers of residence preference currently built into the statutes. He pointed out that there are subsistence and resident hunting priorities in regulation and statute.

SENATOR KAWASAKI noted that 60-80 percent of sheep hunting opportunities in the Interior go to nonresidents, the Alaska Board of Game allocates 40 percent of Kodiak brown bear to nonresidents, and the moose draw permit allocation is at least 50 percent for nonresidents. He asked why those numbers are so high.

MR. STACEY answered that the sheep numbers are based on actual harvest where 80 percent of the sheep are harvested by nonresidents, but the actual participation rate is 15 to 30 percent nonresident. The nonresident participation rate for Kodiak brown bear is 37 percent. The nonresident moose hunting participation rate is a very specific example in a very remote part of the state where tag utilization is higher for nonresidents.

[4:25:39 PM](#)

SENATOR KIEHL asked which animals SB 87 specifically affects.

SENATOR COGHILL answered that any animal that falls under the definition of "big game," which is a category that is different from food animals. Big game includes sheep and bear.

[4:27:23 PM](#)

ROD ARNO, Executive Director, Alaska Outdoor Council, Palmer, Alaska, testified in opposition of SB 87. He explained that the council opposes the bill because the legislation is unnecessary.

He pointed out that AS 16.05.255(b) addresses subsistence provisions with a resident preference versus nonresidents. He added that a court case decided in 1955, Shepard v. State of Alaska, clearly shows that the state has the authority to give preference to residents. The court considered nonresidents as "trophy hunters" in the Shepard case. He noted that when federal management came into the state the decision was made that sheep and bear were traditionally not considered to be subsistence animals and they were the primary animals for the guide industry, that is why the animals were left out of AS 16.05.255(d).

[4:30:49 PM](#)

MR. ARNO cited art VIII, sec. 2, Constitution of the State of Alaska as follows:

The legislature shall provide for the utilization, development, and conservation of all natural resources belonging to the State, including land and waters, for the maximum benefit of its people.

He said the benefit is for the people, not just hunters. He opined that reserving a portion of high quality game for nonresidents to help pay for management benefits all Alaskans.

He noted that the number of nonresident hunters has not fluctuated much since the 1980s, averaging between 10,000 and 15,000, so there has not been a constant increase in the number of nonresidents.

MR. ARNO pointed out that the legislature is considering several proposals to cut state government. He asked committee members if they really want to add game management to their budget list. He noted that the nonresident game management proportion pays for 70 percent of wildlife management. He remarked that he is fearful of believing that residents would pick up the funding slack if nonresident opportunity is reduced.

[4:33:55 PM](#)

He opined that the Alaska Board of Game process allows for ample public participation. Previous legislators created a functional, accessible, and transparent system that allows the legislature to avoid the business of allocating game. He opined that the

majority of Alaskans would prefer to "battle it out" with the Alaska Board of Game rather than the legislature.

SENATOR GIESSEL reviewed the fiscal note from the Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation. She said the analysis on page 2 regarding the Pittman Robertson Wildlife Restoration Program (PR Fund) projects a potential loss of \$22.6 million, and a \$7.5 million potential loss from licenses and tags. She pointed out that under Statewide Support Services, a revenue loss is not quantified, but there would probably be changes in how meetings are scheduled. She clarified that the fiscal notes are not exactly zero.

CHAIR BIRCH agreed that it was a very good point. He asked Director Grasser to comment on the Fish and Game fiscal note for clarification.

[4:37:40 PM](#)

EDDIE GRASSER, Director, Division of Wildlife Conservation, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, explained that the division submitted a zero fiscal note with some information about possible cost because they didn't know the impact without putting it into practice.

SENATOR KIEHL asked for a breakdown of the nonresident fees by species so the committee would look at whether this was disproportionately on the brown and grizzly bears and Dall sheep or spread evenly among the deer and caribou.

CHAIR BIRCH asked Mr. Grasser to follow up with the information that Senator Kiehl requested.

MR. GRASSER agreed.

[4:39:09 PM](#)

CHAIR BIRCH held SB 87 in committee.

SENATOR COGHILL stated his intention to take all the information presented and bring forward something that either corrects or over argues each point.

[4:40:13 PM](#)

There being no further business to come before the committee, Chair Birch adjourned the Senate Resources Standing Committee meeting at 4:40 p.m.