

HB

124

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

FILE

(11)

Date Referred: March 31, 1989

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Date of Committee Action: 3/28/90

The FINANCE Committee considered:

HB 124

HOUSE BILL NO. 124 [INCREASE SPORT FISHING/HUNTING LIC. FEES]
"An Act relating to sport fishing and hunting licenses and to big game tags; and providing for an effective date."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- [X] be replaced with CS HB 124 (FIN) [] the same title
- [] have attached amendment(s) [X] a new title
- [X] do pass
- [] do not pass
- [] no recommendation
- [] individual recommendations
- [] additional referral to the _____ Committee

ADOPTS: _____ letter of intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(s): (Dept) APPROVES PREVIOUS: (Date/Dept)

- [X] fiscal impact Fish & Game [] fiscal note(s) _____
- [] zero fiscal note _____ [] zero fiscal note(s) _____
- [] zero with analysis _____ [] zero fn/analysis _____

SIGNING DO PASS:

SIGNING: (Check approp. column)

		Do Not Pass	No Rec	Amend
<u>[Signature]</u> Hoffmann	<u>[Signature]</u> Shultz		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<u>[Signature]</u> Larson	<u>[Signature]</u> Phillips		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<u>[Signature]</u> Swackhammer	<u>[Signature]</u> Rieger		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<u>[Signature]</u> Brown				
<u>[Signature]</u> Koponen				
<u>[Signature]</u> Wallis				

[Signature] Larson
Chairman's Signature
[Signature] Hoffmann

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: _____
 Title: "An Act relating to sport fishing and hunting licenses. . ."
 Sponsor: Rules
 Requestor: Governor

Agency Affected: Fish and Game
 BRU: Wildlife Conservation, Sport Fish, Administration
 Components: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING						
CAPITAL						
REVENUE	1013.0	3839.3	3850.0	3850.0	3850.0	3850.0

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER Fish & Game	1013.0	3839.3	3850.0	3850.0	3850.0	3850.0
TOTAL						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No FY 90 impact.

Prepared by: Beverly Reaume *[Signature]* Phone: 465-4120
 Division: Administration Date: 3/22/90
 Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 3 27 90
 Agency: Fish & Game

- Distribution (by preparer):
- Legislative Finance
 - Legislative Sponsor
 - Requestor
 - Office of Management and Budget
 - Impacted Agency(ies)

Adopted

* ASSUMPTIONS FOR LICENSE FEE FISCAL NOTE

3/22/90

RESIDENT	1989 ACTUALS		ANNUAL VALUE AT CURRENT FEE	ANNUAL VALUE AT INCREASED FEE	FY91 INCREASE (PARTIAL YEAR)	FY92 INCREASE
		%JAN-JUN				
HUNT	23189	42.1%	278268	549725	114246	271457
HUNT/TRAP	1516	62.4%	33352	60640	17015	27288
TRAP	1032	52.6%	10320	15480	2716	5160
SF/HUNT/TRAP	6363	52.6%	203616	286335	43510	82719
SF/HUNT	43548	42.0%	958056	1524180	237772	566124
FISH	115332	41.7%	1153320	1729980	240372	576660
FISH FARM	1	0	200	400	0	200
FUR DEALER	45	48.6%	4500	6750	1093	2250
TAXIDERMY	51	75.0%	7650	10200	1913	2550
GAME BIRD FARM	4	100.0%	80	200	120	120
DIP NET FISHING				155000	65100	155000
NONRESIDENT						
HUNT	8543	15.1%	512580	726155	32276	213575
HUNT/TRAP	35	15.1%	7000	8750	264	1750
FUR DEALER	1	0.0%	400	500	0	100
TAXIDERMY	4	66.7%	1600	2000	267	400
ALIEN HUNT	-	15.1%	-	90000	13590	90000
ALIEN TAGS	-	15.1%	-	162100	24477	162100
TAGS	-	14.4%	2936580	3413600	68691	477020
FISH	23338	23.7%	840168	1166900	77337	326732
FISH 14 DAY	63760	7.8%	1275200	1912800	49458	637600
FISH 3 DAY	64143	9.5%	641430	721609	7605	80179
FISH 1 DAY	0	9.5%	0	160358	15209	160358
TOTALS			8864320	12703661	1013030	3839341
DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION					397270	1498807
SPORT FISH DIVISION					615760	2340534

* .25 LICENSES AND DUPLICATES WERE LEFT OUT OF THESE CALCULATIONS
ASSUME THERE WILL BE 15500 DIP NET LICENSES SOLD

Original sponsor(s): Rules/Governor

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

2 CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 124 (Finance)

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the sale of merchandise by the
7 Department of Fish and Game, to sport fishing, trap-
8 ping, and hunting licenses, to big game tags, to
9 personal use salmon dip net fishing permits, to fur
10 dealer, taxidermy, fish farming, and game farming
11 licenses, and to duplicate licenses and tags; relat-
12 ing to the definition of resident in fish and game
13 laws; relating to use of revenue from sport fishing,
14 trapping, and hunting licenses and tags; relating to
15 the involuntary transfer of limited entry and in-
16 terim-use permits; and providing for an effective
17 date."

18 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

19 * Section 1. AS 16.05.050 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

20 (18) to authorize the production and sale of merchandise
21 bearing designs, labels, or words associating the merchandise with the
22 department; the merchandise may include posters, buttons, clothing,
23 calendars, and glassware.

24 * Sec. 2. AS 16.05.053 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

25 (b) The commissioner of administration shall separately account
26 for money collected under AS 16.05.050(18) that the department depos-
27 its in the general fund. The annual estimated balance in the account
28 may be appropriated by the legislature to the fish and game fund.

29 * Sec. 3. AS 16.05.130 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

1 (d) Revenue from the sale of general hunting, trapping, and
2 fishing licenses and tags together with the federal matching funds
3 from Pittman - Robertson, Dingell - Johnson/Wallop - Breaux programs
4 shall be used in strict accordance with federal guidelines to specif-
5 ically benefit purchasers of general hunting, trapping, and fishing
6 licenses.

7 * Sec. 4. AS 16.05.340(a)(1) is amended to read:

8 (1) Resident sport fishing license.....\$15 [\$10]

9 * Sec. 5. AS 16.05.340(a)(2) is amended to read:

10 (2) Resident

11 (A) small game hunting license.....15 [12]

12 (B) hunting license for both big and small game....25

13 "Big game" means those species listed in (a)(15) of this section.

14 * Sec. 6. AS 16.05.340(a)(3) is amended to read:

15 (3) Resident hunting and trapping license.....40 [22]

16 * Sec. 7. AS 16.05.340(a)(4) is amended to read:

17 (4) Resident trapping license.....15 [10]

18 * Sec. 8. AS 16.05.340(a)(5) is amended to read:

19 (5) Resident hunting and sport fishing license.....35 [22]

20 * Sec. 9. AS 16.05.340(a)(6) is amended to read:

21 (6) Resident hunting, trapping, and sport fishing license
22 45 [32]

23 However, the fee is 25 cents for an applicant who is the head of a
24 family or a dependent member of that family, or who is solely self-
25 supporting, upon proof presented by the applicant that the applicant

26 (A) is obtaining or has obtained assistance during the
27 preceding six months under any state or federal welfare program
28 to aid the indigent, or

29 (B) has an annual family gross income of less than.

\$5,600 for the year preceding application.

* Sec. 10. AS 16.05.340(a)(7) is amended to read:

(7) Nonresident special sport fishing license -- valid for the period inscribed on the license

(A) For 14-day license.....\$30 [\$20]

(B) For three-day license15

(C) For one-day license.....10

* Sec. 11. AS 16.05.340(a)(8) is amended to read:

(8) Nonresident sport fishing license.....50 [36]

* Sec. 12. AS 16.05.340(a)(9) is amended to read:

(9) Nonresident hunting license.....85 [60]

* Sec. 13. AS 16.05.340(a)(10) is amended to read:

(10) Nonresident hunting and sport fishing license.....135 [96]

A nonresident may not take a big game animal without previously purchasing a numbered, nontransferable, appropriate tag, issued under (15) of this subsection. The tag must be affixed to the animal immediately upon capture and must remain affixed until the animal is prepared for storage, consumed, or exported. A tag issued but not used for an animal may be used to satisfy the tagging requirement for an animal of any other species for which the tag fee is of equal or less value.

* Sec. 14. AS 16.05.340(a)(11) is amended to read:

(11) Nonresident hunting and trapping license....\$250 [\$200]

* Sec. 15. AS 16.05.340(a)(12) is amended to read:

(12) Fur dealers:

(A) Resident fur dealer biennial license.....150 [100]

(B) Nonresident fur dealer biennial license..500 [400]

* Sec. 16. AS 16.05.340(a)(13) is amended to read:

1 (13) Taxidermists:

2 (A) Resident taxidermy biennial license.....200 [150]

3 (B) Nonresident taxidermy biennial license...500 [400]

4 * Sec. 17. AS 16.05.340(a)(14) is amended to read:

5 (14) Fish farming biennial license.....400 [200]

6 * Sec. 18. AS 16.05.340(a)(15) is amended to read:

7 (15) Nonresident big game tags:

8 (A) Bear, black, each.....225 [200]

9 (B) [REPEALED.]

10 (C) Bear, brown or grizzly, each.....500 [350]

11 (D) BEAR, POLAR, EACH.....500

12 (E) [(E)] Bison, each.....450 [350]

13 (F) [(F)] Caribou, each.....325 [300]

14 (G) [(G)] Deer, each.....150 [135]

15 (H) [(H)] Elk, each.....300 [250]

16 (I) [(I)] Goat, each.....300 [250]

17 (J) [(J)] Moose, each.....400 [300]

18 (K) [(K)] Sheep, each.....425 [400]

19 (L) WALRUS, EACH500

20 (M) [(M)] Wolf, each.....175 [150]

21 (N) [(N)] Wolverine, each.....175 [150]

22 (O) [(O)] Musk oxen, each.....1,100

23 * Sec. 19. AS 16.05.340(a)(18) is amended to read:

24 (13) Game farming:

25 (A) Game mammal or game reptile farming biennial
26 license.....\$250 [200]

27 (B) Game bird farming biennial license.....50 [20]

28 * Sec. 20. AS 16.05.340(a) is amended by adding new paragraphs to read:

29 (19) Nonresident small game hunting license.....20..

(20) Nonresident alien hunting license.....300

A nonresident alien may not take a big game animal without previously purchasing a numbered, nontransferable, appropriate tag, issued under (21) of this subsection. The tag must be affixed to the animal immediately upon capture and must remain affixed until the animal is prepared for storage, consumed, or exported. A tag issued but not used for an animal may be used to satisfy the tagging requirement for an animal of any other species for which the tag fee is of equal or less value.

(21) Nonresident alien big game tags:

- (A) Bear, black, each.....300
- (B) Bear, brown or grizzly, each.....650
- (C) Bison, each.....650
- (D) Caribou, each.....425
- (E) Deer, each.....200
- (F) Elk, each.....400
- (G) Goat, each.....400
- (H) Moose, each.....500
- (I) Musk oxen, each.....1,500
- (J) Sheep, each.....550
- (K) Wolf, each.....250
- (L) Wolverine, each.....250

(22) Personal use salmon dip net fishing permit.....10

* Sec. 21. AS 16.05.340(c) is amended to read:

(c) The commissioner may issue a duplicate license or a duplicate tag as a replacement for a license or tag issued under (a) of this section. A fee of \$5 [\$2] shall be charged for each duplicate license or tag and the duplicate license or tag may [SHALL] not be issued unless the commissioner or a delegate is satisfied that the

1 original has been lost or destroyed. This subsection does not apply
2 to a 25-cent license issued under (a)(6) of this section.

3 * Sec. 22. AS 16.05.940(25) is amended to read:

4 (25) "resident" means a person who for the preceding 12
5 consecutive months has maintained a permanent place of abode in the
6 state and who has continually maintained a voting residence in the
7 state; and in the case of a partnership, association, joint stock
8 company, trust, or corporation, "resident" means one that has its main
9 office or headquarters in the state; however, a member of the military
10 service who has been stationed in the state for the preceding 12
11 consecutive months is a resident for the purposes of this paragraph,
12 and the dependant of a resident member of the military service, who
13 has been living in the state for the preceding year is a resident for
14 the purposes of this paragraph; [,] and a person who is an alien but
15 who for one year has maintained a permanent place of abode in the
16 state is a resident for the purposes of this paragraph;

17 * Sec. 23. AS 16.43.170(a) is amended to read:

18 (a) Except as provided in AS 16.10.333 - 16.10.338 and in
19 AS 44.31.230 - 44.31.250, entry permits and interim-use permits are
20 transferable only through the commission as provided in this section
21 and AS 16.43.180 and under regulations adopted by the commission. An
22 entry permit or an interim-use permit involuntarily transferred by
23 operation of federal law is void.

24 * Sec. 24. This Act takes effect July 1, 1990.
25
26
27
28
29

A M E N D M E N T # 1passed
6-3

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

BY REP. ULMER

TO: CSHB 124 (Resources)

Page 1, line 6, after "relating":

Insert "to the sale of merchandise by the Department of Fish and Game,"

Page 1, after line 11:

Insert the following new bill sections to read:

** Section 1. AS 16.05.050 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

(18) to authorize the production and sale of merchandise bearing designs, labels, or words associating the merchandise with the department; the merchandise may include posters, buttons, clothing, calendars, and glassware.

* Sec. 2. AS 16.05.053 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(b) The commissioner of administration shall separately account for money collected under AS 16.05.050(18) that the department deposits in the general fund. The annual estimated balance in the account may be appropriated by the legislature to the fish and game fund."

Page 1, line 12:

Delete "Section 1."

Insert "Sec. 3."

Renumber the following bill sections accordingly.

Amendment #2

By Rieger

adpt
u.c.

To (SHB 124 (Finance))

Page 5, Line 10, Insert a new Section 19 to read:

* Sec 19. AS 16.43.170 (a) is amended to read:

(a) Except as provided in AS 16.10.333 - 16.10.338 and in AS 44.81.230 - 44.81.250, entry permits and interim-use permits are transferable only through the commission as provided in this section and AS 16.43.180 and under regulations adopted by the commission. A permit involuntarily transferred under operation of federal law is null and void.

Adpt.
u.c.

#3

AMENDMENT TO CSHB 124 (FIN)

BY: SHULTZ

PAGE: 5

LINE: 20

Add a new subsection to read as follows:

Revenue from the sale of general hunting, trapping, and fishing licenses and tags together with the federal matching funds from Pittman - Robertson, Dingell - Johnson / Wallop - Breaux programs shall be used in strict accordance with federal guidelines to specifically benefit purchasers of general hunting trapping and fishing licenses.

Rationale:

In supporting this bill we are putting additional financial burdens on resident hunters, trappers, and fishermen. They have asked for some legal general assurance that the dollars they contribute be used according to federal guidelines.

adpt
u.c.A M E N D M E N T #14

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

BY REP. SHULTZ

TO: CSHB 124 (Resources)

Page 1, line ⁷Ø, after "tags;":

Insert "relating to the definition of resident in the fish and game laws;"

Page 5, following line 10:

Insert a new bill section to read:

"* Sec. 19. AS 16.05.940(25) is amended to read:

(25) "resident" means a person who for the preceding 12 consecutive months has maintained a permanent place of abode in the state and who has continually maintained a voting residence in the state; and in the case of a partnership, association, joint stock company, trust, or corporation, "resident" means one that has its main office or headquarters in the state; however, a member of the military service who has been stationed in the state for the preceding 12 consecutive months is a resident for the purposes of this paragraph, and the dependent of a resident member of the military service, who has been living in the state for the preceding year is a resident for the purposes of this paragraph; [,] and a person who is an alien but who for one year has maintained a permanent place of abode in the state is a resident for the purposes of this paragraph;"

Renumber the following bill section accordingly.

COPY

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH V STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU ALASKA 99811
907-465-3800

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

M E M O R A N D U M

March 22, 1990

SUBJECT: Definition of resident for the purposes of
AS 16.05 - AS 16.40

TO: Representative Richard Shultz

FROM: George Utermohle
Legislative Counsel

This memorandum accompanies an amendment to CSHB 124 (Resources), requested by Dave Stancliff on your behalf, relating to the definition of resident in AS 16.05 - AS 16.40.

The amendment provides that only the preceding 12 consecutive months be considered in determining whether a person has maintained a permanent place of abode in the state for the purpose of determining residency under AS 16.05 - AS 16.40. This amendment does not require the person to have been physically present in the state during the preceding 12 months, however the person must have maintained the requisite place of abode in the state during that time.

In order to satisfy the constitutional requirement (Article II, sec. 13, Alaska State Constitution) that the subject of a bill be expressed in its title, the appropriate additional language for the title is included as part of the amendment. The addition to the title of CSHB 124 (Resources) is necessary because the amendment of the definition of "resident" affects more subjects than those currently contained in the bill title.

If I may be of further assistance, please advise.

GU:mi
wkmi6/061

Enclosure



ALASKA OUTDOOR COUNCIL, INC.

3780 McGINNIS DR. JUNEAU, AK 99801
(907) 789-3450

POSITION STATEMENT ADF&G LICENSE INCREASES

HB 124

April 17, 1989

PROPOSED LETTER OF INTENT

It is the intent of the Alaska State Legislature that the costs of conducting projects under the ADF&G Divisions of Sport Fish and Wildlife Conservation be prorated between sportsmen funds (i.e. Dingell-Johnson/Wallop-Breaux, Pittman-Robertson and State Fish and Game Funds) and nonsportsmen funds (i.e. Federal ANILCA Subsistence, and State General Fund) based on species harvest levels for subsistence and non-subsistence users.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game is to provide the Legislature with a project budget annually for these two Divisions based on these projected harvests.



ALASKA OUTDOOR COUNCIL, INC.

3780 MCGINNIS DR. JUNEAU, AK 99801
(907) 789-3450

POSITION STATEMENT ADF&G LICENSE INCREASES

HB 124

April 15, 1989

The Alaska Outdoor Council has adopted a final position on HB 124 dealing with proposed Alaska Department of Fish and Game license increases.

This issue has been before the legislature for the past three sessions. During that time there has been considerable communications and debate between Alaskan sportsmen and outdoor user organizations and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The Alaska Outdoor Council and its member organizations are still concerned about alternative funding sources for the Department, long range planning, neglected active management programs in the Interior, prioritizing expenditures, misuse of sportsmen funds, distrust of the Department by the sportsmen and the identification of expenditures to non-consumptive user programs. We fully intend to continue working with the Department on these issues.

The membership of the Alaska Outdoor Council recognizes that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game may need additional funds for the Divisions of Wildlife Conservation and Sport Fish. We are concerned that these increases, however, benefit the users carrying a majority of the fish and wildlife management financial burden in the State.

The Alaska Outdoor Council can support HB 124 only if three basic modifications are made:

1. Amend 16.05.340 to add new section (f):

(1) Alaska Fish and Game Funds and Federal matching funds from the Pittman-Robertson, Dingell-Johnson/Wallop-Breaux programs cannot be used to finance subsistence uses of fish and wildlife nor for the management of fish and wildlife for subsistence purposes.

(2) If a State agency knowingly violates the provisions in (1), the fish and game license structure in AS 16.05.340 will revert to that which existed in 1988.

2. Amend 16.05.340 (a)(6) to delete:

However, the fee is 25 cents for an applicant who is the head of a family or a dependent member of that family, or who is solely self supporting, upon proof presented by the applicant that the applicant

(A) is obtaining or has obtained assistance during the preceding six months under any state or federal welfare program to aid the indigent, or

(B) has an annual family gross income of less than \$5,600 for the year preceding application.

3. Maintain the non-resident alien fees at the same level as the non-resident fees.

Specific discussions of each point are as follows:

1. Prohibiting use of sportsmen funds for subsistence.

At present, over 90% of the funds used to carry both the Division of Wildlife Conservation and the Division of Sport Fish are from excise taxes on sporting gear and sportsmen licenses. At the same time, the sportsmen are witnessing a dramatic reduction in opportunities to participate in hunting and fishing in Alaska--primarily due to the implementation of the Federal and State subsistence laws.

Rather than allowing the development of rational resource allocations between user groups, present court rulings regarding subsistence threaten to eliminate sportsmen from all major uses (i.e. the Kenaitze ruling regarding Kenai River kings and the Lime Village ruling affecting Nelchina caribou harvests). Major portions of the game regulations in Alaska already identify significant seasons where sportsmen are eliminated from participating.

Under present interpretations of the subsistence law, over 85% of Alaskans are eliminated from subsistence uses.

Under the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) up to \$5 million of Federal monies were authorized to implement the Federally mandated subsistence priority. To-date the State has never received even \$1 million in any one fiscal year. Most, if not all, of the subsistence implementation costs should be carried by the Federal grant program. The State has been negligent in not aggressively pursuing these Federal monies.

It is the feeling of most of Alaska's sportsmen that the State mandated portion of the subsistence priority should be carried from the State general fund. However, general fund monies in the Divisions of Sport Fish has been eliminated and the general fund monies in the Division of Wildlife Conservation has been cut in half the past three years. Thus, the sportsmen have been forced to carry an increasing financial burden.

In Alaska, one of the few remaining State taxes is licensing for hunting, fishing and trapping. The sportsmen feel that other taxes should be reinstated before increasing taxes on sportsmen to a greater degree.

The Alaska Outdoor Council proposes that the proportion of sportsmen and nonsportsmen funds (Federal subsistence monies and State general fund monies) for a particular program be prorated for that specific project based on projected harvests. This can be accomplished easily because:

- a). The Subsistence Division has exhaustive studies showing specific uses by species for each subsistence area identified by the Boards.
- b). The Division of Wildlife Conservation projects harvests for each species each year by game management units.
- c). The legislature appropriates based on project level funding.

In essence, Alaskan sportsmen are unwilling to carry the financial burden for a Federal mandated program in which they are unable to participate. In addition, they are opposed to contributing to a program which is creating increasing social unrest in Alaska and jeopardizing Alaska's common property resources.

Increasing sportsmen taxes at a time when the subsistence issue is increasing urban-rural tensions in Alaska is only going to contribute further to growing social strife.

The Alaska Outdoor Council represents 54 Alaskan sportsmen and outdoor organizations with over 11,000 members. To our knowledge, not one of the clubs support this license increase without this amendment.

2. Eliminating the 25 cent license.

This program has been severely abused in recent years with preliminary studies showing that up to 50% of the licenses are fraudulent. With every Alaskan receiving over \$800 annually from the permanent fund it isn't too much to ask that everyone who buys a license help contribute to conservation of our fish and wildlife resources used by everyone.

An alternative would be to have the Department of Health and Social Services make up the differences in income to the Fish and Game Fund if this is to continue as a social welfare program.

At present, every 25 cent license sold costs the State over \$1.25 for a net loss.

The Alaska Outdoor Council and its member organizations have consistently targeted 25 cent license reform as high priority legislation.

3. Reduction of non-resident alien fees.

The Alaska Outdoor Council is concerned that the proposed non-resident alien fees will price Alaska out of the market which will result in less fees from non-residents rather than larger total fees.

Hunting license and tag fees for comparable hunts by nonresidents
(In Canadian \$)

	Hunting License (nonres/alien)	Moose Tag	Grizzly Bear Tag	Sheep Tag	Total
Alaska (present)	\$60	\$300	\$350	\$400	\$1110
Alaska (proposed)	\$85	\$400	\$425	\$425	\$1335
Alberta	\$15 ^a	\$220	\$275	\$275	\$785
British Columbia	\$118	\$120	\$320	\$300	\$858
Yukon Territory ^b	\$150	\$155	\$525	\$260	\$1090

All three provinces require guides to hunt any big game

^a wildlife certificates

^b Yukon Territory tag fees payable only if game is taken

Comparable Costs of Hunts Elsewhere (from March/April Safari Magazine)

China	Argali sheep	\$34,900 ^a
China/Mongolia	Asian wapiti	\$3,295 ^a
USSR	Siberian Snow Sheep	\$15,000 ^b
	Saiga antelope	\$3,695 ^b
Spain	Fallow deer	\$2,300 ^a
	Red deer	\$3,900 ^a
Zimbabwe	Zebra, Cape buffalo, Sable and Kudu	\$15,000 ^a
Australia	Water buffalo	\$2,700 ^a
Botswana	Cape buffalo and Lechwe	\$10,000 ^a

^a airfare not included

^b cost from Moscow

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 3-2000
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-2000
PHONE: (907) 465-4100

March 2, 1989


The Honorable Curt Menard, Co-Chair
The Honorable Cliff Davidson, Co-Chair
House Resources Committee
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Co-Chairs:

Enclosed is background material regarding HB 124. Please note that while you will find the dates "1987 and 1988" in these documents, the assertions made and dollar amounts discussed are still pertinent. A letter addressed to Ron McAlpin, President, Alaska Outdoor Council, will provide you insight into the discussions ADF&G has held with that organization regarding the drafting of HB 124.

I look forward to discussing this very important bill with you on Tuesday, March 7.

Sincerely,



Warren W. Wiley
Assistant Commissioner

Enclosures

cc: House Resources Committee Members

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 3-2000
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-2000
PHONE: (907) 465-4100

March 22, 1989

The Honorable Cliff Davidson, Co-Chairman
The Honorable Kurt Menard, Co-Chairman
House Resources Committee
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Representatives Davidson and Menard:

At the Resources Committee Hearing of March 21, you asked that I respond briefly in writing to the position statement presented by the Alaska Outdoor Council (AOC) regarding House Bill 124. The Department wishes to respond to the AOC position statement in the order in which the Council has presented its comments.

In paragraph 3, the Council discusses alternative funding sources and several other subjects which ADF&G has been discussing with AOC board members in recent months. The department is presently reviewing several options for alternative funding sources, including establishment of a trust fund, special license decals for nonconsumptive users, and the potential for a volunteer program which might help the department reduce costs on certain projects. The department presently does identify expenditures for nonconsumptive user programs such as furbearer management, McNeil River Bear Sanctuary and Round Island Walrus Preserve. Those items are clearly identified within the budget structure of the Division of Wildlife Conservation.

The Council position statement lists three conditions under which its membership would support HB 124. The department wishes to address these in the following manner:

1. The fees as originally proposed in House Bill 124 were reached after a great deal of deliberation by the department. While they are higher than neighboring Canadian provinces, we do not feel they are so high as to discourage big game hunters wishing to visit our state. The precedent for establishing higher fees for nonresident hunters has long been recognized. We have discussed the fee structure proposed in HB 124, with knowledgeable hunters and guides. In addition, the Alaska Board of Game recently went on record as supporting HB 124 as it is written. The Southeast Regional Council, made up of more than a dozen Fish and Game Advisory Committees and the Alaska Sport Fishing Association have gone on record supporting HB 124 as it is written.


The Honorable Cliff Davidson -2-
The Honorable Kurt Menard

March 22, 1989

2. The department has worked closely with the Senate Resources Committee in developing CSSB 30, which address concerns regarding the 25-cent low income license. In recent days the department has attended hearings conducted by the Senate Finance Committee regarding CSSB 30, and we are presently working with that committee to address concerns the committee raised about how to best resolve what many see as a licensing problem. It appears there is a good possibility the Senate Finance Committee working with ADF&G will be able to develop language which will resolve the acknowledged abuses to the program in a manner which will not unfairly burden those Alaskans who generally need the relief granted to them through a low income license.
3. It is important to understand that ADF&G does not manage fish and game resources for any particular group of Alaskans. The resource is managed to assure a sustainable yield that will permit a reasonable harvest by all users. Programs are not developed nor funded based on a specific user group. It also must be recognized that a subsistence hunter contributes just as much to the Pitman-Robertson Fund as does a nonsubsistence hunter since both pay a federal excise tax on ammunition, fire arms, and associated hunting equipment. The department manages resources for a variety of user groups, and the Board of Game makes the decisions on who will harvest surpluses. A subsistence game hunter must also have a valid hunting license.

The department is aware of, and understands, the concerns of the AOC, and over the past several months we have worked with the Council to develop HB 124 to its present form. In response to concerns expressed by Council board members the department changed, readjusted, and deleted portions of an earlier draft in an attempt to address the concerns of the AOC. Clearly, we were not able to resolve all of these differences but I believe the working relationship we have developed with the Council and its member organizations will permit us to continue working in harmony toward resolutions of some of the philosophical and policy differences which might yet exist. We know the AOC and its member organizations understand the need for increased funding to the Department of Fish and Game and we appreciate their support.

Best Regards,


Warren W. Wiley
Assistant Commissioner

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 3-2000
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-2000
PHONE: (907) 465-4100

March 9, 1989

The Honorable Curt Menard
Co-Chairman
The Honorable Cliff Davidson
Co-Chairman
House Resources Committee
Alaska State Representative
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Representatives Menard and Davidson:

During your March 7 committee hearing on HB 124, you requested some additional information regarding the proposed increases in hunting licenses and nonresident tag fees. Specifically, you requested the projected costs of nonresident and nonresident alien tag fees at 10, 20, and 30 percent increases above those proposed in HB 124 (see Enclosure 1). We have also prepared for your use a summary of nonresident fees in some Canadian provinces (Enclosure 2) which are Alaska's main competitors for nonresident big game hunters.

As stated in the hearing, there were numerous factors used to decide on the recommended increases in nonresident license and tag fees. Since nonresident aliens pay no federal income taxes and generally no excise taxes on guns and ammunition, they pay little to support big game management in Alaska. On the other hand, nonresident U.S. hunters do make substantial contributions to Alaska's management programs. These hunters are also the primary source of income for the federal dollars (i.e., Pittman-Robertson funds) which we receive each year for wildlife conservation work.

Resident hunting license fees have been increased only once (in 1977) since Statehood. Nonresident tag fees were last increased in 1982 (see Enclosure 3). In recommending proposed fee increases, we took into account what nonresidents are already paying to hunt in Alaska, when the last tag fee increases occurred, and what other states and provinces are currently charging. We also considered specific species in terms of range distribution and abundance in Alaska and elsewhere, the status of the species in Alaska, interests of resident hunters, and what


The Honorable Curt Menard -2-
The Honorable Cliff Davidson

March 9, 1989

we believe to be a realistic marketability level without exceeding the point of diminishing returns.

We hope you find the enclosed information useful. If we can be of further assistance, please advise.

Sincerely,



Warren W. Wiley
Assistant Commissioner

Enclosures

cc: House Resources Members
Lew Pamplin, Director
Division of Wildlife Conservation

NONRESIDENT Big Game Tag Fees

Species	Current Tag Fee	HB 124	HB 124 +10%	HB 124 +20%	HB 124 +30%
Black Bear	150 \$200	\$225	\$248	\$270	\$293
Brown Bear	525* 350 -	-425 500	468	510	553
Polar Bear	500 500	2500	2750	3000	3250
Bison	350	450	495	540	585
Caribou	155* 300	325	358	390	423
Dall Sheep	300 400	425	468	510	553
Deer	122 135	150	165	180	195
Elk	110 250	300	330	360	390
Moose	250 300	400	440	480	520
Mountain Goat	210* 250	300	330	360	390
Muskoxen	100 1100	1100	1210	1320	1430
Walrus	500	1500	1650	1800	1950
Wolf	75* 150	175	193	210	228
Wolverine	75* 150	175	193	210	228

NONRESIDENT ALIEN Big Game Tag Fees

Species	Current Tag Fee	HB 124	HE 124 +10%	HB 124 +20%	HB 124 +30%
Black Bear	150 \$200	\$300	\$330	\$360	\$390
Brown Bear	525* 350	600 650	660	720	780
Polar Bear	500 500	3000	3300	3600	3900
Bison	350	650	715	780	845
Caribou	155* 300	425	468	510	553
Dall Sheep	300 400	550	605	660	715
Deer	105 135	200	220	240	260
Elk	220 250	400	440	480	520
Moose	300 300	500	550	600	650
Mountain Goat	210* 250	400	440	480	520
Muskoxen	100 1100	1500	1650	1800	1950
Walrus	500	2000	2200	2400	2600
Wolf	75* 150	250	275	300	325
Wolverine	75* 150	250	275	300	325

Canadian Provincial NONRESIDENT and NONRESIDENT ALIEN Big Game Tag Fees (in Canadian \$):

	Yukon		B.C.		N.W.T.		Alberta		Manitoba		Quebec	
	nonres	alien	nonres	alien	nonres	alien	nonres	alien	nonres	alien	nonres	alien
Black Bear	80	80	50	50	50	50	100	150	50	100	57	57
Grizzly Bear	525	525	320	320	500	500	138	275	--	--	--	--
Polar Bear	--	--	--	--	500	500	--	--	--	--	--	--
Caribou	155	155	120	120	100	100	--	--	--	--	128	128
Sheep	260	260	300	300	100	100	275	275	--	--	--	--
Deer	--	--	60	60	--	--	83	165	80	100	128	128
Elk	--	--	--	--	--	--	110	220	--	--	--	--
Moose	155	155	120	120	100	100	110	220	250	300	126	126
Goat	210	210	130	130	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
Muskoxen	--	--	--	--	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wolf	75	75	25	25	50	50	--	--	25	50	--	--
Wolverine	75	75	--	--	50	50	--	--	--	--	--	--

NOTES:

- (1) Fees listed for the Yukon and N.W.T. are combined "trophy and seal fees," payable ONLY after game is bagged.
- (2) Yukon: nonres license = \$75; alien license = \$150.
Grizzly bear fee listed for Yukon is for males; females (sows) = \$775.
- (3) B.C.: nonres license = \$19; alien license = \$118.
- (4) N.W.T.: in addition to trophy fees above, there are tag fees for wolf and wolverine; nonres = \$10 and alien = \$25.

History of License and Tag Fee Increases in Alaska

RESIDENT Big Game License and Tag Fees

<u>Year</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>HB 124</u>
License	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$12	\$12	\$25
Brown Bear	--	--	--	25	25	25
Muskoxen	--	500	500	500	500	500

NONRESIDENT Big Game License and Tag Fees

<u>Year</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>HB 124</u>
License	\$10	\$10	\$20	\$60	\$60	\$85
Black Bear	10	10	75	100	200	225
Brown Bear	75	75	150	250	350	425
Polar Bear	150	150	150	250	500	2500
Bison	50	50	100	250	350	450
Caribou	25	25	50	200	300	325
Dall Sheep	50	50	150	250	400	425
Deer	10	10	25	35	135	150
Elk	25	25	75	125	250	300
Moose	50	50	100	200	300	400
Mountain Goat	25	25	75	125	250	300
Muskoxen	--	1000	1000	1000	1100	1100
Walrus	100	100	100	250	500	1500
Wolf	--	--	50	50	150	175
Wolverine	--	--	25	50	150	175

NOTE: Effective in 1981, resident muskoxen tag fees for some areas were reduced to \$25.

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 3-2000
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-2000
PHONE: (907) 465-4100

October 31, 1988

Mr. Ron McAlpin
President
Alaska Outdoor Council
8341 East 11th Court
Anchorage, AK 99504

Dear Ron:

Warren Wiley has discussed with me the conference call he arranged Saturday, October 15, with you and several members of the board of the Alaska Outdoor Council. I understand that during the course of the three-hour conference you were able to cover many of the subjects we have had under discussion for the past several months. It is my understanding that Warren relayed to you again the department's position on several of the questions asked by AOC board members at our meeting last April which was intended, in part, to respond to a letter to me from Ron Somerville.

Much of your conversation involved the department's proposal to ask the Legislature for an increase in fishing and hunting license fees. This letter is intended to respond directly to questions you have raised in the past regarding that proposal and other issues of interest to AOC and other outdoors organizations.

As you know, fishery enhancement activities primarily intended to benefit the recreational fishery are funded with Dingell-Johnson (D-J) money which the state matches with general fund money. An exception is Clear Hatchery which uses a Fish and Game Fund match. Responding to concerns expressed by your organization, I stated at our meeting in April that the director of the Sport Fish Division has had, and will continue to have, the lead responsibility in determining the direction of the department's D-J funding allocations.

The deputy director for that division is now the D-J coordinator for the entire department. What this means is that Norval Netsch has the primary responsibility for determining exactly where D-J funds are to be used within the department. Naturally, I cannot totally abrogate my responsibility as Commissioner of a cabinet-level department

and I am sure you understand that. Just so you will know, in FY 90 we expect over \$9 million will be available in D-J funding. Budgets have been prepared that would allocate those funds so that 57.4 percent would go directly to the Division of Sport Fish operational costs, sport fisheries public access programs would account for 19.2 percent, Division of Sport Fish special projects would account for 3.8 percent, FRED Division projects would account for 18 percent, and Habitat Division projects would receive 1.7 percent of available D-J funding. As you can see, more than 80 percent of D-J funds will be allocated directly to the Division of Sport Fish with the remainder going towards sport fish projects undertaken by other divisions within the department. In each case, these funding levels utilizing D-J dollars have been, and will continue to be, determined by the Division of Sport Fish director.

One of the primary topics discussed with Warren has to do with increasing the fees charged for resident, nonresident, and alien hunting and fishing licenses. You now have an idea of the increases proposed in a bill which we have had drafted but which has not been submitted. I know that in the past some Alaska sportsmen have been curious as to just how revenues produced through increased license fees would be utilized. Enclosed you will find a list from the Game Division director and from the Sport Fish Division director outlining the general direction in which they would proceed given additional revenues. Also enclosed is information regarding license fee changes. You will notice these lists identify specific projects. As I am sure you realize, the possibility always exists that specific projects might have to be dropped or adjusted, but these lists will give you an excellent idea where added revenues from increased license and tag fee sales would be allocated.

As Warren mentioned to you, new revenues from the proposed \$10 resident big game tag fee would go directly to the Fish and Game Fund and then would be made available to the Game Division. Additional revenues are needed for the Division of Sport Fish to ensure that we can match the increased revenues expected from the D-J program and also so we can cover Sport Fish Division projects that are not eligible for matching D-J money.

During the last legislative session Warren and Game Division Director Lew Pamplin were called upon to testify regarding the twenty-five cent low income hunting license. On at least two occasions both Warren and Lew testified before the Legislature to provide figures compiled from licenses sold to indicate the number of twenty-five cent licenses sold and the location of their sale. They also provided information on the costs for administering this program with respect to lost revenues (i.e., it costs the state more to issue

twenty-five cent licenses than we receive from sale proceeds). There is a strong belief among many Alaskans, including members of your organization, that abuses may exist in that program. In that this license is seen more as a social welfare issue than a bona fide hunting license, the department is not seen as taking a lead role in any discussions regarding changes to that program. However, since ADF&G is now responsible for maintaining license sales records, we are in a position to provide any interested party with information on where the licenses are sold, how many are sold, and whether license sales are increasing or decreasing. One of the major concerns regarding the twenty-five cent license program is the fact that there is very little in the way of enforcement by license vendors. These vendors are not empowered to request applicants document their qualifications for such licenses. Although the law states that applicants must provide evidence, I am sure you understand that license vendors cannot be compelled to act as enforcement agents when selling licenses. Since you have asked for our assistance, and since it appears that this program may be the subject of further discussions by the Legislature, we are in the process of asking the Department of Health and Social Services to do a comparison for us on a list of randomly-selected names to determine what percentage of those names submitted also appear on state records as having received assistance during the prior six months. This report will only show what percentage of the names we submit actually received some form of state assistance. It will not identify license holders by name.

Another issue discussed during your conference call with Warren was the department's effort to attempt to identify certain costs of the Game and Sport Fish Divisions which might be related directly to projects specifically beneficial to subsistence users. As we have discussed in the past, and as I am sure you can understand, this is a very difficult undertaking. Nevertheless, I have asked that both Norval Netsch and Lew Pamplin make an attempt to assess ANILCA-related costs (over what we would normally spend for various projects if ANILCA did not exist) so we may request reimbursement from the federal government. However, we are all aware that the federal government has never fully funded our previous requests for ANILCA reimbursement. We will continue to identify those costs and document our requests for reimbursement to the federal government.

In our discussion, Warren mentioned briefly two of the bills AOC may attempt to sponsor during the coming legislative session. When and if these bills are introduced, the department will review them and be prepared to testify before the appropriate legislative committee. Based on what I understand of at least two of your proposals, it appears


October 31, 1988

the department would be in a position to support them pending our review of the actual legislation.

In response to your request last spring for a meeting between myself and members of your board, I arranged that every division director in ADF&G be on hand for a meeting in April. You will recall that our meeting with your board members lasted nearly four hours. At my direction, Assistant Commissioner Wiley traveled to Anchorage and Fairbanks to meet with your board members and members of the public to discuss not only the license increase issue but other issues of interest to the Alaska Outdoor Council and conservation and sportsmen's organizations across Alaska. I mention these events simply to reiterate my belief that the more we involve Alaskans in our work the more each of us will benefit. All Alaskans who are interested in our fish and game resources should have an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. It is imperative that ADF&G enjoy the understanding, support, and encouragement of those Alaskans who are concerned about our fish and game resources. In addition to participation through local advisory committees and regional councils, my staff and I continue to be available, as we have in the past, to discuss fish and game issues that concern Alaskans.

I sincerely hope this letter is a useful follow-up to Warrner's conversation with you on October 15. I look forward to your continued cooperation and support.

Sincerely,



Don W. Collinsworth
Commissioner

Enclosures

cc: Norman A. Cohen, Deputy Commissioner
Division Directors, ADF&G
Rod Swope, Governor's Office
Board Members, Alaska Outdoor Council
President, each member organization of the
Alaska Outdoor Council

MEMORANDUM

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

TO: Warren W. Wiley
Assistant Commissioner
Department of Fish and Game


DATE: October 29, 1988

FILE NO:

THRU:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-4180

SUBJECT: License Revenue
Enhancement Projects

FROM: 
Norval Netsch
Director
Division of Sport Fish

The January 1988 report entitled "The Need to Increase Funding for Sport Fish Management and Conservation in Alaska" provides background information on Alaska's sport fish program and describes current problems and needs, existing funding sources, and what we propose to do with additional funds. The report was widely distributed and is still pertinent. It addresses most of the questions that may arise, and we would be glad to make copies available to anyone interested (enclosure).

In response to requests for more specific details of how any additional funds would be spent, I believe it would be useful to reiterate the general activities covered in the January report, followed by a listing of individual projects and activity titles, locations, projected duration, and estimated costs. This list is not complete and the projects are not presented by order of priority; however, it does provide details on many of the needs recognized by Division of Sport Fish staff.

The following listing of projects and activities we would propose is taken from our January 1988 report:

- * New or expanded studies to provide information required for management of many species and in many areas. Examples include studies on:
 - ° Rainbow trout in Southcentral and Bristol Bay waters.
 - ° Cutthroat trout in selected Southeast waters from Ketchikan to Prince William Sound.
 - ° Grayling in waters where harvests are, or are suspected to be, reaching a point of management concern.
 - ° Steelhead in selected areas throughout their range.

- ° Various aspects of salmon management, including evaluation of enhancement efforts, mixed stock problems, collection of harvest and escapement data.
 - ° Dolly Varden/Arctic char that now, or in the future, would support a significant sport fishery. Areas include waters from southcentral Alaska to Kotzebue Sound.
 - ° Lake trout and burbot which are very slow growing, long-lived species that are extremely susceptible to overharvest.
 - ° Northern pike in areas where harvest is increasing and biological information is needed.
 - ° Halibut, rockfish, and ling cod in several areas where the sport fishing effort has significantly increased in recent years.
- * Strengthen area management capability. An increased level of effort in various areas of the state is needed to improve local fishery management expertise and to better serve the public.
 - * Provide additional enforcement effort in areas of intensive recreational fishing.
 - * Increase efforts directed at land use development projects, implementation of management plans for specific fisheries, and the development of cooperative plans by various state, federal, and local interests. Many of these are of vital importance to sport fishing, and considerable time is required to ensure that sport fish interests are addressed.
 - * Provide more and better information to sport fishermen and the general public in the form of publications, maps, brochures, videos, articles for the media, and personal appearances by department staff.
 - * Provide additional or improved access to areas where public use is now restricted due to land ownership or lack of facilities.
 - * Aquatic education. There is a need to educate all sectors and age groups on subjects related to aquatic resources,

conservation, and "how to" fish. This would be work done by department employees, as well as through cooperative efforts with schools, communities, and sportsmen's groups.

- * Constituency involvement programs. There is an opportunity to accomplish various projects through cooperative efforts between the Sport Fish Division and sportsmen's groups or communities. These include volunteer programs and jointly funded projects.
- * Economic evaluations. Accurate economic values associated with sport fishing are generally lacking. This would provide for continuing information on key economic values of sport fishing on a statewide basis.

Some of the details of specific projects on activities are listed below. Projects are not listed in priority order, nor are all the needs identified by staff listed. Also, some of these projects are in our FY 90 budget request for general funding--the success of which is yet to be determined.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Est. Costs (x 1000)</u>
Strengthen Management Capability	Interior/SC	Long-term	400/yr
Aquatic Education Program	Statewide	Long-term	75/yr
Sport Fishery Matching Grant Prgm.	Statewide	Long-term	250/yr+
Fisheries Mgt. Plan Development	Statewide	5 years+	100/yr
Improved Research Design & Data Mgt.	Statewide	Long-term	75/yr
Coho Research (4 areas)	SE	Long-term	160/yr
Chinook Research (Nahlin R)	SE	Long-term	60/yr
Charter Boat Logbook	SE	3 years	45/yr
Rainbow Trout Enhancement-Ketchikan	SE	Long-term	66/yr
Steelhead Enhancement-Juneau	SE	Long-term	40/yr
Steelhead Enhancement-Sitka	SE	Long-term	30/yr
Coho Enhancement-Sitka	SE	Long-term	10/yr
PWI Lake Surveys	SE	2 years	41/yr
PWI Marine Creel	SE	Long-term	61/yr
Cutthroat Trout Studies-Ketchikan	SE	3 years	43/yr
Steelhead Studies (4 areas)	SE	3 years	98/yr
Florence Lake Cutthroat Studies	SE	2 years	54/yr
Susitna River Coho Studies	SC	Long-term	381/yr
Kenai River King Mortality Studies	SC	2 years	98/yr
Willow Creek Weir	SC	Long-term	47/yr
Kenai River Coho Sonar	SC	Long-term	70/yr
Little Susitna King Mortality Studies	SC	Short-term	32/yr
Stock Separation Analysis	SC	Long-term	35/yr
Anchorage Area Salmon Enhancement	SC	Long-term	35/yr
Karluk Steelhead Studies	SC	Short-term	61/yr
Tebay Rainbow Trout/Steelhead Studies	SC	Short-term	38/yr

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>(x 1000)</u>
(cont.)			
PWS Cutthroat Studies	SC	4-5 years	25/yr
Bristol Bay Lake Trout Studies	SC	4-5 years	42/yr
Susitna River Northern Pike Studies	SC	4-5 years	35/yr
Resurrection Bay Groundfish Studies	SC	4-5 years	16/yr
North Slope Lake Trout Studies	Interior	5 years	38/yr
Kobuk Northern Pike Studies	Interior	5 years	52/yr
Tok Northern Pike Studies	Interior	5 years	48/yr
Tok Lake Trout Studies	Interior	2 years	40/yr
Tok Grayling Studies	Interior	5 years	32/yr

Since January 1988, an unanticipated need for state funds has emerged. Contrary to earlier predictions, the amount of Dingell-Johnson (D-J) funds available for sport fish programs in Alaska is projected to increase in FY 90 and may continue to increase over the next few years. These federal funds make up a significant part of our budget. However, D-J funds must be matched with at least 25 percent state funds, and sufficient state dollars may not be available from the fish and game fund in FY 90. If D-J appropriations increase as projected or if matching general funds currently utilized by the Divisions of FRED and Habitat are reduced, we will be facing the dilemma of having federal funds available for recreational fisheries programs that the state will, in essence, have to decline for lack of matching fish and game funds.

Enclosure

cc: Norman Cohen
Lew Pamplin
Frank Van Hulle
John Clark
Fred Gaffney
Paul Krasnowski
Mike Mills

Provided below is a listing of specific projects, locations, schedules, and estimated costs which we would propose conducting should there be an increase in license and tag fee revenues. Although this list is not complete nor in priority order, it does provide more detail in terms of important project needs identified by Game staff. The projects and associated costs represent needs in addition to current funding levels and work being done. We have other program functions which need additional funding, but other revenue sources (e.g., General Funds) are more appropriate to fund these projects than license revenues.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (X 1000)</u>
Marten research	GMU 4	5 years	56.0/yr
Increase goat surveys	GMU's 1, 5,	Annual	9.0
Expand moose survey and inventory work (S&I)	GMU's 1, 5 & 20	Annual	35.0
Expand deer S&I	GMU's 1, 3, 4, 6, & 8	Annual	31.0
Increase caribou censuses	GMU's 7, 9, 10, 11, & 13-15	Annual	24.0
Increase monitoring of factors affecting caribou carrying capacity	GMU's 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, & 17	Annual	14.0
Increase moose censuses	GMU's 7, 9, 11, 13-16, & 20	Annual	70.0
Expand Moose Research Center work--optimum carrying capacity and bull:cow ratios	GMU 15; Statewide Application	Annual	12.0
Improve moose survey techniques	Statewide	5 years	35.0/yr
Research goat/logging relationships	GMU 6	2 years	33.0/yr
Regional furbearer biologists	Interior & Southcentral	Annual	125.0*

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (X 1000)</u>
Increase wolf S&I	GMU's 11-26	Biennial	32.0
Expand furbearer S&I (e.g., lynx, marten, wolverine)	GMU's 6, 7, 9, 13-17, & 19-21	Annual	48.0
Improve lynx and wolverine survey techniques	Statewide	5 years	30.0/yr
Increase sheep surveys	GMU's 7, 11-16, 19, & 20	Biennial	25.0
Elk censuses	GMU 8	Annual	4.0
Moose habitat <u>enhance- ment and evaluation</u>	GMU's 1, 5, 7, 12, 14, 15, & 20	5 years	160.0/yr
Increase field presence and law enforcement	Statewide	Annual	45.0
<u>Predator-prey research and expand S&I</u>	GMU 13	Annual	125.0*
Mentasta caribou herd calf mortality study	GMU 11	One time	50.0
Southern AK Pen. caribou calf mortality study	GMU 9	One time	65.0
<u>Wildlife enhancement and fire management coordination</u>	Interior & Southcentral	Annual	140.0*
Test infra-red bear census technique	GMU's 8, 9, & 17	One time	12.0
Initiate public cabin use program on selected refuges	GMU's 14 & 16	Annual	100.0-1st yr; 25.0/yr
Special Areas manager	GMU's 6, 8, 9, & 14-16	Annual	65.0*
Increase caribou S&I and harvest assessments; revise management plans	GMU's 19, 20, & 21	Annual	15.0

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (X 1000)</u>
Research on grizzly bear population dynamics	GMU 22	3 years	15.0/yr
Expand muskoxen S&I	GMU's 18, 23, & 26	Annual	28.0
Tule white-fronted goose nesting and production surveys	GMU's 9, 16, 17, 19, & 21	3 years	35.0/yr
Maintain citizen participation in predator/prey management planning	Statewide	Annual	15.0
Conduct bison summer range habitat evaluation	GMU's 11, 19, & 20	Annual	8.0
Increase interaction with advisory committees	Statewide	Annual	45.0
Reinstate full-time asst. area biologists in Palmer and King Salmon	GMU's 9, 10, 14, & 16	Annual	60.0
Upgrade quality and expand content of regulation booklets	Statewide	Annual	18.0
Expand development of operational management plans	Statewide	Annual	25.0
Publish annual report of division activities to better inform public of division programs	Statewide	Annual	12.0
Expand hunter education program via TV network: curriculum and instructor training videos	Statewide	Annual	65.0 1st year; 5.0/yr
Determine economic value of Alaska's wildlife	Statewide	4 years	125.0/yr
Upgrade wildlife information data base	Statewide	4 years	20.0/yr

* Requires new positions.

Taken from "The Need to Increase Revenues for Wildlife Management and Conservation in Alaska"; ADF&G, Division of Game, December 1987.

WHAT WOULD INCREASED REVENUES BE USED FOR?

The proposed increases in license and tag fees for hunting in Alaska would affect both resident and nonresident hunters. Most of the funds would be used to restore or enhance game management and research projects that were eliminated or severely reduced as a result of losing nearly 1.5 million dollars in General Funds since FY86. Some game management programs that would receive additional funding include:

- ° moose survey and inventory work statewide and population censuses in heavily hunted areas and in selected locations where populations may be experiencing problems;
- ° caribou survey and inventory work statewide and more frequent population censuses of major herds;
- ° research and development of improved, more cost-effective and accurate big game and furbearer survey techniques;
- ° wolf, wolverine, marten, and lynx surveys and monitoring population trends;
- ° providing biological information to the public, local advisory committees, and the Board of Game for the state's regulatory process;
- ° Dall sheep and mountain goat surveys;
- ° moose habitat carrying capacity studies and modeling;
- ° reestablish moose habitat enhancement projects in portions of southcentral and interior Alaska;
- ° more field presence by staff and additional law enforcement activities;
- ° compilation, detailed analysis, and computerization of historic information on big game populations;
- ° technical assistance to land management agencies for use in making decisions affecting wildlife populations, habitats, and public use opportunities;
- ° wildlife information and education projects and the statewide hunter education program;
- ° additional emphasis on management planning; and

(OVER)

- more educational efforts to inform the public about the benefits of professional wildlife management and the ecological basis for regulated harvests.

It is important to recognize that many of these essential wildlife management programs would not receive additional funding, even if hunting license and tag fees were increased, unless the General Fund appropriations to the Division of Game remained near the current level.

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR

P.O. BOX 3-2000
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-2000
PHONE: (907) 465-4100

October 31, 1988

Mr. Ron McAlpin
President
Alaska Outdoor Council
8341 East 11th Court
Anchorage, AK 99504

Dear Ron:

Warren Wiley has discussed with me the conference call he arranged Saturday, October 15, with you and several members of the board of the Alaska Outdoor Council. I understand that during the course of the three-hour conference you were able to cover many of the subjects we have had under discussion for the past several months. It is my understanding that Warren relayed to you again the department's position on several of the questions asked by AOC board members at our meeting last April which was intended, in part, to respond to a letter to me from Ron Somerville.

Much of your conversation involved the department's proposal to ask the Legislature for an increase in fishing and hunting license fees. This letter is intended to respond directly to questions you have raised in the past regarding that proposal and other issues of interest to AOC and other outdoors organizations.

As you know, fishery enhancement activities primarily intended to benefit the recreational fishery are funded with Dingell-Johnson (D-J) money which the state matches with general fund money. An exception is Clear Hatchery which uses a Fish and Game Fund match. Responding to concerns expressed by your organization, I stated at our meeting in April that the director of the Sport Fish Division has had, and will continue to have, the lead responsibility in determining the direction of the department's D-J funding allocations.

The deputy director for that division is now the D-J coordinator for the entire department. What this means is that Norval Netsch has the primary responsibility for determining exactly where D-J funds are to be used within the department. Naturally, I cannot totally abrogate my responsibility as Commissioner of a cabinet-level department

and I am sure you understand that. Just so you will know, in FY 90 we expect over \$9 million will be available in D-J funding. Budgets have been prepared that would allocate those funds so that 57.4 percent would go directly to the Division of Sport Fish operational costs, sport fisheries public access programs would account for 19.2 percent, Division of Sport Fish special projects would account for 3.8 percent, FRED Division projects would account for 18 percent, and Habitat Division would receive 1.7 percent of available D-J funding. As you can see, more than 80 percent of D-J funds will be allocated directly to the Division of Sport Fish with the remainder going towards sport fish projects undertaken by other divisions within the department. In each case, these funding levels utilizing D-J dollars have been, and will continue to be, determined by the Division of Sport Fish director.

One of the primary topics discussed with Warren has to do with increasing the fees charged for resident, nonresident, and alien hunting and fishing licenses. You now have an idea of the increases proposed in a bill which we have had drafted but which has not been submitted. I know that in the past some Alaska sportsmen have been curious as to just how revenues produced through increased license fees would be utilized. Enclosed you will find a list from the Game Division director and from the Sport Fish Division director outlining the general direction in which they would proceed given additional revenues. Also enclosed is information regarding license fee changes. You will notice these lists identify specific projects. As I am sure you realize, the possibility always exists that specific projects might have to be dropped or adjusted, but these lists will give you an excellent idea where added revenues from increased license and tag fee sales would be allocated.

As Warren mentioned to you, new revenues from the proposed \$10 resident big game tag fee would go directly to the Fish and Game Fund and then would be made available to the Game Division. Additional revenues are needed for the Division of Sport Fish to ensure that we can match the increased revenues expected from the D-J program and also so we can cover Sport Fish Division projects that are not eligible for matching D-J money.

During the last legislative session Warren and Game Division Director Lew Pamplin were called upon to testify regarding the twenty-five cent low income hunting license. On at least two occasions both Warren and Lew testified before the Legislature to provide figures compiled from licenses sold to indicate the number of twenty-five cent licenses sold and the location of their sale. They also provided information on the costs for administering this program with respect to lost revenues (i.e., it costs the state more to issue

twenty-five cent licenses than we receive from sale proceeds). There is a strong belief among many Alaskans, including members of your organization, that abuses may exist in that program. In that this license is seen more as a social welfare issue than a bona fide hunting license, the department is not seen as taking a lead role in any discussions regarding changes to that program. However, since ADF&G is now responsible for maintaining license sales records, we are in a position to provide any interested party with information on where the licenses are sold, how many are sold, and whether license sales are increasing or decreasing. One of the major concerns regarding the twenty-five cent license program is the fact that there is very little in the way of enforcement by license vendors. These vendors are not empowered to request applicants document their qualifications for such licenses. Although the law states that applicants must provide evidence, I am sure you understand that license vendors cannot be compelled to act as enforcement agents when selling licenses. Since you have asked for our assistance, and since it appears that this program may be the subject of further discussions by the Legislature, we are in the process of asking the Department of Health and Social Services to do a comparison for us on a list of randomly-selected names to determine what percentage of those names submitted also appear on state records as having received assistance during the prior six months. This report will only show what percentage of the names we submit actually received some form of state assistance. It will not identify license holders by name.

Another issue discussed during your conference call with Warren was the department's effort to attempt to identify certain costs of the Game and Sport Fish Divisions which might be related directly to projects specifically beneficial to subsistence users. As we have discussed in the past, and as I am sure you can understand, this is a very difficult undertaking. Nevertheless, I have asked that both Norval Netsch and Lew Pamplin make an attempt to assess ANILCA-related costs (over what we would normally spend for various projects if ANILCA did not exist) so we may request reimbursement from the federal government. However, we are all aware that the federal government has never fully funded our previous requests for ANILCA reimbursement. We will continue to identify those costs and document our requests for reimbursement to the federal government.

In our discussion, Warren mentioned briefly two of the bills AOC may attempt to sponsor during the coming legislative session. When and if these bills are introduced, the department will review them and be prepared to testify before the appropriate legislative committee. Based on what I understand of at least two of your proposals, it appears


October 31, 1988

the department would be in a position to support them pending our review of the actual legislation.

In response to your request last spring for a meeting between myself and members of your board, I arranged that every division director in ADF&G be on hand for a meeting in April. You will recall that our meeting with your board members lasted nearly four hours. At my direction, Assistant Commissioner Wiley traveled to Anchorage and Fairbanks to meet with your board members and members of the public to discuss not only the license increase issue but other issues of interest to the Alaska Outdoor Council and conservation and sportsmen's organizations across Alaska. I mention these events simply to reiterate my belief that the more we involve Alaskans in our work the more each of us will benefit. All Alaskans who are interested in our fish and game resources should have an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. It is imperative that ADF&G enjoy the understanding, support, and encouragement of those Alaskans who are concerned about our fish and game resources. In addition to participation through local advisory committees and regional councils, my staff and I continue to be available, as we have in the past, to discuss fish and game issues that concern Alaskans.

I sincerely hope this letter is a useful follow-up to Warren's conversation with you on October 15. I look forward to your continued cooperation and support.

Sincerely,



Don W. Collinsworth
Commissioner

Enclosures

cc: Norman A. Cohen, Deputy Commissioner
Division Directors, ADF&G
Rod Swope, Governor's Office
Board Members, Alaska Outdoor Council
President, each member organization of the
Alaska Outdoor Council

MEMORANDUM

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

TO: Warren W. Wiley
Assistant Commissioner
Department of Fish and Game


DATE: October 29, 1988

FILE NO:

THRU:

TELEPHONE NO: 465-4180

SUBJECT: License Revenue
Enhancement Projects

FROM: 
Norval Netsch
Director
Division of Sport Fish

The January 1988 report entitled "The Need to Increase Funding for Sport Fish Management and Conservation in Alaska" provides background information on Alaska's sport fish program and describes current problems and needs, existing funding sources, and what we propose to do with additional funds. The report was widely distributed and is still pertinent. It addresses most of the questions that may arise, and we would be glad to make copies available to anyone interested (enclosure).

In response to requests for more specific details of how any additional funds would be spent, I believe it would be useful to reiterate the general activities covered in the January report, followed by a listing of individual projects and activity titles, locations, projected duration, and estimated costs. This list is not complete and the projects are not presented by order of priority; however, it does provide details on many of the needs recognized by Division of Sport Fish staff.

The following listing of projects and activities we would propose is taken from our January 1988 report:

- * New or expanded studies to provide information required for management of many species and in many areas. Examples include studies on:
 - ° Rainbow trout in Southcentral and Bristol Bay waters.
 - ° Cutthroat trout in selected Southeast waters from Ketchikan to Prince William Sound.
 - ° Grayling in waters where harvests are, or are suspected to be, reaching a point of management concern.
 - ° Steelhead in selected areas throughout their range.

- ° Various aspects of salmon management, including evaluation of enhancement efforts, mixed stock problems, collection of harvest and escapement data.
 - ° Dolly Varden/Arctic char that now, or in the future, would support a significant sport fishery. Areas include waters from southcentral Alaska to Kotzebue Sound.
 - ° Lake trout and burbot which are very slow growing, long-lived species that are extremely susceptible to overharvest.
 - ° Northern pike in areas where harvest is increasing and biological information is needed.
 - ° Halibut, rockfish, and ling cod in several areas where the sport fishing effort has significantly increased in recent years.
-
- * Strengthen area management capability. An increased level of effort in various areas of the state is needed to improve local fishery management expertise and to better serve the public.
 - * Provide additional enforcement effort in areas of intensive recreational fishing.
 - * Increase efforts directed at land use development projects, implementation of management plans for specific fisheries, and the development of cooperative plans by various state, federal, and local interests. Many of these are of vital importance to sport fishing, and considerable time is required to ensure that sport fish interests are addressed.
 - * Provide more and better information to sport fishermen and the general public in the form of publications, maps, brochures, videos, articles for the media, and personal appearances by department staff.
 - * Provide additional or improved access to areas where public use is now restricted due to land ownership or lack of facilities.
 - * Aquatic education. There is a need to educate all sectors and age groups on subjects related to aquatic resources,

conservation, and "how to" fish. This would be work done by department employees, as well as through cooperative efforts with schools, communities, and sportsmen's groups.

- * Constituency involvement programs. There is an opportunity to accomplish various projects through cooperative efforts between the Sport Fish Division and sportsmen's groups or communities. These include volunteer programs and jointly funded projects.
- * Economic evaluations. Accurate economic values associated with sport fishing are generally lacking. This would provide for continuing information on key economic values of sport fishing on a statewide basis.

Some of the details of specific projects on activities are listed below. Projects are not listed in priority order, nor are all the needs identified by staff listed. Also, some of these projects are in our FY 90 budget request for general funding--the success of which is yet to be determined.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Est. Costs (x 1000)</u>
Strengthen Management Capability	Interior/SC	Long-term	400/yr
Aquatic Education Program	Statewide	Long-term	75/yr
Sport Fishery Matching Grant Prgm.	Statewide	Long-term	250/yr+
Fisheries Mgt. Plan Development	Statewide	5 years+	100/yr
Improved Research Design & Data Mgt.	Statewide	Long-term	75/yr
Coho Research (4 areas)	SE	Long-term	160/yr
Chinook Research (Nahlin R)	SE	Long-term	60/yr
Charter Boat Logbook	SE	3 years	45/yr
Rainbow Trout Enhancement-Ketchikan	SE	Long-term	66/yr
Steelhead Enhancement-Juneau	SE	Long-term	40/yr
Steelhead Enhancement-Sitka	SE	Long-term	30/yr
Coho Enhancement-Sitka	SE	Long-term	10/yr
PWI Lake Surveys	SE	2 years	41/yr
PWI Marine Creel	SE	Long-term	61/yr
Cutthroat Trout Studies-Ketchikan	SE	3 years	43/yr
Steelhead Studies (4 areas)	SE	3 years	98/yr
Florence Lake Cutthroat Studies	SE	2 years	54/yr
Susitna River Coho Studies	SC	Long-term	381/yr
Kenai River King Mortality Studies	SC	2 years	98/yr
Willow Creek Weir	SC	Long-term	47/yr
Kenai River Coho Sonar	SC	Long-term	70/yr
Little Susitna King Mortality Studies	SC	Short-term	32/yr
Stock Separation Analysis	SC	Long-term	35/yr
Anchorage Area Salmon Enhancement	SC	Long-term	35/yr
Karluk Steelhead Studies	SC	Short-term	61/yr
Tebay Rainbow Trout/Steelhead Studies	SC	Short-term	38/yr

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>(x 1000)</u>
(cont.)			
PWS Cutthroat Studies	SC	4-5 years	25/yr
Bristol Bay Lake Trout Studies	SC	4-5 years	42/yr
Susitna River Northern Pike Studies	SC	4-5 years	35/yr
Resurrection Bay Groundfish Studies	SC	4-5 years	16/yr
North Slope Lake Trout Studies	Interior	5 years	38/yr
Kobuk Northern Pike Studies	Interior	5 years	52/yr
Tok Northern Pike Studies	Interior	5 years	48/yr
Tok Lake Trout Studies	Interior	2 years	40/yr
Tok Grayling Studies	Interior	5 years	32/yr

Since January 1988, an unanticipated need for state funds has emerged. Contrary to earlier predictions, the amount of Dingell-Johnson (D-J) funds available for sport fish programs in Alaska is projected to increase in FY 90 and may continue to increase over the next few years. These federal funds make up a significant part of our budget. However, D-J funds must be matched with at least 25 percent state funds, and sufficient state dollars may not be available from the fish and game fund in FY 90. If D-J appropriations increase as projected or if matching general funds currently utilized by the Divisions of FRED and Habitat are reduced, we will be facing the dilemma of having federal funds available for recreational fisheries programs that the state will, in essence, have to decline for lack of matching fish and game funds.

Enclosure

cc: Norman Cohen
 Lew Pamplin
 Frank Van Hulle
 John Clark
 Fred Gaffney
 Paul Krasnowski
 Mike Mills

Provided below is a listing of specific projects, locations, schedules, and estimated costs which we would propose conducting should there be an increase in license and tag fee revenues. Although this list is not complete nor in priority order, it does provide more detail in terms of important project needs identified by Game staff. The projects and associated costs represent needs in addition to current funding levels and work being done. We have other program functions which need additional funding, but other revenue sources (e.g., General Funds) are more appropriate to fund these projects than license revenues.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (X 1000)</u>
Marten research	GMU 4	5 years	56.0/yr
Increase goat surveys	GMU's 1, 5,	Annual	9.0
Expand moose survey and inventory work (S&I)	GMU's 1, 5 & 20	Annual	35.0
Expand deer S&I	GMU's 1, 3, 4, 6, & 8	Annual	31.0
Increase caribou censuses	GMU's 7, 9, 10, 11, & 13-15	Annual	24.0
Increase monitoring of factors affecting caribou carrying capacity	GMU's 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, & 17	Annual	14.0
Increase moose censuses	GMU's 7, 9, 11, 13-16, & 20	Annual	70.0
Expand Moose Research Center work--optimum carryingcapacity and bull:cowratios	GMU 15; Statewide Application	Annual	12.0
Improve moose survey techniques	Statewide	5 years	35.0/yr
Research goat/logging relationships	GMU 6	2 years	33.0/yr
Regional furbearer biologists	Interior & Southcentral	Annual	125.0*

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (X 1000)</u>
Increase wolf S&I	GMU's 11-26	Biennial	32.0
Expand furbearer S&I (e.g., lynx, marten, wolverine)	GMU's 6, 7, 9, 13-17, & 19-21	Annual	48.0
Improve lynx and wolverine survey techniques	Statewide	5 years	30.0/yr
Increase sheep surveys	GMU's 7, 11-16, 19, & 20	Biennial	25.0
Elk censuses	GMU 8	Annual	4.0
<u>Moose habitat enhance- ment and evaluation</u>	GMU's 1, 5, 7, 12, 14, 15, & 20	5 years	160.0/yr
Increase field presence and law enforcement	Statewide	Annual	45.0
<u>Predator-prey research and expand S&I</u>	GMU 13	Annual	125.0*
Mentasta caribou herd calf mortality study	GMU 11	One time	50.0
Southern AK Pen. caribou calf mortality study	GMU 9	One time	65.0
<u>Wildlife enhancement and fire management coordination</u>	Interior & Southcentral	Annual	140.0*
Test infra-red bear census technique	GMU's 8, 9, & 17	One time	12.0
Initiate public cabin use program on selected refuges	GMU's 14 & 16	Annual	100.0-1st yr; 25.0/yr
Special Areas manager	GMU's 6, 8, 9, & 14-16	Annual	65.0*
Increase caribou S&I and harvest assessments; revise management plans	GMU's 19, 20, & 21	Annual	15.0

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Estimated Costs (X 1000)</u>
Research on grizzly bear population dynamics	GMU 22	3 years	15.0/yr
Expand muskoxen S&I	GMU's 18, 23, & 26	Annual	28.0
Tule white-fronted goose nesting and production surveys	GMU's 9, 16, 17, 19, & 21	3 years	35.0/yr
Maintain citizen participation in predator/prey management planning	Statewide	Annual	15.0
Conduct bison summer range habitat evaluation	GMU's 11, 19, & 20	Annual	8.0
Increase interaction with advisory committees	Statewide	Annual	45.0
Reinstate full-time asst. area biologists in Palmer and King Salmon	GMU's 9, 10, 14, & 16	Annual	60.0
Upgrade quality and expand content of regulation booklets	Statewide	Annual	18.0
Expand development of operational management plans	Statewide	Annual	25.0
Publish annual report of division activities to better inform public of division programs	Statewide	Annual	12.0
Expand hunter education program via TV network: curriculum and instructor training videos	Statewide	Annual	65.0 1st year; 5.0/yr
Determine economic value of Alaska's wildlife	Statewide	4 years	125.0/yr
Upgrade wildlife information data base	Statewide	4 years	20.0/yr

* Requires new positions.

Taken from "The Need to Increase Revenues for Wildlife Management and Conservation in Alaska"; ADF&G, Division of Game, December 1987.

WHAT WOULD INCREASED REVENUES BE USED FOR?

The proposed increases in license and tag fees for hunting in Alaska would affect both resident and nonresident hunters. Most of the funds would be used to restore or enhance game management and research projects that were eliminated or severely reduced as a result of losing nearly 1.5 million dollars in General Funds since FY86. Some game management programs that would receive additional funding include:

- ° moose survey and inventory work statewide and population censuses in heavily hunted areas and in selected locations where populations may be experiencing problems;
- ° caribou survey and inventory work statewide and more frequent population censuses of major herds;
- ° research and development of improved, more cost-effective and accurate big game and furbearer survey techniques;
- ° wolf, wolverine, marten, and lynx surveys and monitoring population trends;
- ° providing biological information to the public, local advisory committees, and the Board of Game for the state's regulatory process;
- ° Dall sheep and mountain goat surveys;
- ° moose habitat carrying capacity studies and modeling;
- ° reestablish moose habitat enhancement projects in portions of southcentral and interior Alaska;
- ° more field presence by staff and additional law enforcement activities;
- ° compilation, detailed analysis, and computerization of historic information on big game populations;
- ° technical assistance to land management agencies for use in making decisions affecting wildlife populations, habitats, and public use opportunities;
- ° wildlife information and education projects and the statewide hunter education program;
- ° additional emphasis on management planning; and

(OVER)

- more educational efforts to inform the public about the benefits of professional wildlife management and the ecological basis for regulated harvests.

It is important to recognize that many of these essential wildlife management programs would not receive additional funding, even if hunting license and tag fees were increased, unless the General Fund appropriations to the Division of Game remained near the current level.

PUBLIC OPINION MESSAGE

DEAR: REPRESENTATIVE DAVIDSON

NAME: DENNIS CONFER
 TITLE:
 ADDRESS: 2509 KILKENNY CIRCLE
 CITY: ANCHORAGE ZIP: 99504
 PHONE: 338-3099
 BILL NO: HB 124
 SUBJECT: INCREASE SPORT FISHING/HUNTING LIC. FEES
 MESSAGE: BILL SEE'S REALISTIC BUT, COMBINED WITH SB 140 - BIG GAME CONSERVATION
 FEES AND COMMERCIAL USE FEES, COSTS INCREASE FOR NON-RESIDENTS DETER TOURISM,
 HUNTING. OVERALL RESULTS: LESS REVENUE TO STATE AND BUSINESSES. MOOSE FEES
 INCREASE OVER 60 PERCENT, HIGHEST FEES IN U.S. AND CANADA.

PMIO: 03103812
 DATE: 02/23/89
 TIME: 10:38:12
 LIONAME: ANCHORAGE LIO

COPIES: REPRESENTATIVES REPRESENTATIVES SENATORS

BARNES	BOUCHER	COGHILL
BROWN	COLLINS	SZYMANSKI
COTTEN	DONLEY	UEHLING
ELLIS	FURNACE	FAIKS
GRUENBERG	HANLEY	PEARCE
LEMAN	MARTIN	POURCHOT
PETTYJOHN	PHILLIPS	KELLY
ZAWACKI	BOYER	KERTTULA
SPOHNHOLZ	MENARD	RODEY
JACKO	FOSTER	STURGULEWSKI
NAVARRE	SHARP	HALFORD
HUDSON	DAVIS, M.	FAHRENKAMP

PUBLIC OPINION MESSAGE

DEAR: REPRESENTATIVE DAVIDSON

NAME: DON QUARBERG
 TITLE:
 ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 349
 CITY: DELTA JUNCTION, AK ZIP: 99737
 PHONE: 895-4215
 BILL NO: HB 124
 SUBJECT: INCREASE SPORT FISHING/HUNTING LIC. FEES
 MESSAGE: THIS BILL DOES NOT JUSTIFY THE COST INCREASE THAT SPORTSMEN MUST BE
 REJECT THIS BILL AND SUPPORT THE REPEAL OF THE MUCH ABUSED 25¢ LICENSE. THANK
 YOU.

PMIO: 02122603
 DATE: 03/01/89
 TIME: 12:26:03
 LIONAME: DELTA JUNCTION LIO

COPIES: REPRESENTATIVES SENATOR

SHULTZ	COGHILL
MENARD	
JACKO	
FOSTER	
NAVARRE	
FURNACE	
SHARP	
HUDSON	
DAVIS, M.	

STEVE COWPER
GOVERNOR



STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

22
4B124

January 27, 1989

The Honorable Sam Cotten
Speaker of the House
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Under the authority of art. III, sec. 18, of the Alaska Constitution, I am transmitting a bill relating to sport fishing and hunting licenses. This bill would raise the cost of a resident sport fishing license by \$5. Making a new distinction, the cost of a resident hunting license would be raised \$3 for small game, and \$13 for big game. The combination hunting and trapping license fee would be raised by \$13. The cost of two other combination licenses covering both sport fishing and hunting would be raised by \$18.

The bill would also raise nonresident sport fishing and hunting license fees by amounts ranging from \$5 to \$39, establish a new nonresident small game hunting license and raise nonresident tag fees on 13 species of big game. Finally, the bill would establish new nonresident alien hunting licenses, with a fee of \$300, and establish nonresident alien big game tags for 14 species, at rates higher than the nonresident tag fees.

These increases would generate additional revenue to help offset the escalating costs of managing the State's fish and wildlife resources, and would provide for expansion of some existing programs. Present technology still requires labor-intensive activities to acquire the necessary data for proper, effective management, and operational costs of the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) are expected to rise in order to meet those demands.

Money received from the sale of state sport fishing and hunting licenses is deposited in the Fish and Game Fund, which was created at statehood and is described in AS 16.-05.100 and 16.05.110. As a dedicated fund, it is addressed

by the Alaska Constitution in art. IX, sec. 7:

The proceeds of any state tax or license shall not be dedicated to any special purpose, except as provided in section 15 of this article [the Permanent Fund] or when required by the federal government for state participation in federal programs. This provision shall not prohibit the continuance of any dedication for special purposes existing upon the date of ratification of this section by the people of Alaska.

(Emphasis added.) The Fish and Game Fund was created after the date of ratification of art. IX, sec. 7 of the Alaska Constitution. However, it is protected under the federal-government-requirement exemption. A federal regulation, 50 C.F.R. 80.2, adopted under the Pittman-Robertson Act, 16 U.S.C. 669 -- 777k, prohibits "diversion" of fees collected from the sale of fishing and hunting licenses to purposes other than administering the State's fish and wildlife agency. This is a precondition to participation in federal fish and game grant programs. Since the federal law provides matching money for revenue from the sale of fishing and hunting licenses, and does not specify the cost of those licenses, no problem of inconsistency with the federal requirement and thus no problem with the constitutional provision on dedicated funds will be encountered if these license fees are raised. The fees for both types of resident licenses have been increased only once since statehood. In 1977, sport fishing license fees were increased from \$5 to \$10 and hunting license fees were increased from \$7 to \$12.

P.L. 98-369, July 18, 1984, expanded the Dingell-Johnson Act to make additional federal matching money available to the State. Some of this money will be earmarked for motor boating and support facilities, and additional State matching money will be required to optimize use of this three-for-one money for capital projects.

With respect to the proposed new license and tag fees for nonresident aliens, the significantly higher fees can be justified because United States citizens, as a class, bear a greater proportion of the costs of fish and game management through payment of federal taxes (including Pittman-Robertson matching grants) than do nonresident aliens, who for the most part do not make the same tax contributions. In addition, enforcement actions against nonresident alien hunters cost significantly more than enforcement actions against residents of the United States outside of Alaska.


The Department of Law has advised that under the reasoning of Baldwin v. Fish and Game Comm., 436 U.S. 371 (1978), such fee differentials would be unlikely to pose equal protection problems under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, because the nonresident aliens are differently situated with respect to bearing both management and enforcement costs than are United States residents.

The higher fees for nonresident aliens will bring Alaska closer to other big game hunting areas of the world, which regularly charge much higher fees for individuals not resident in those countries. The proposed fees for nonresident aliens set out in this bill would thus still maintain Alaska's competitive edge, by being significantly less than fees charged by other countries to hunt similar species.

The bill has a delayed effective date of January 1, 1990, because hunting and fishing licenses are issued on a calendar-year basis.

In light of the availability of federal matching money, and the increasing management needs of the Department of Fish and Game, I urge your favorable consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,



Steve Cowper
Governor

THE NEED TO INCREASE REVENUES
FOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION
IN ALASKA

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Division of Game

December 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
WILDLIFE RESOURCES AND VALUES	2
WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?	3
WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITHOUT INCREASED REVENUES?	5
PROPOSED INCREASES TO HUNTING LICENSES AND TAG FEES	6
WHAT WOULD INCREASED REVENUES BE USED FOR?	9
APPENDIX A--Funding and Budget Details	11
APPENDIX B--Division Staffing, Qualifications, and Office Locations	18
APPENDIX C--Division Programs and Activities	20
APPENDIX D--Additional Options for Increasing Revenues	22
APPENDIX E--Related Issues	27

INTRODUCTION

The significant drop in world-wide oil prices in 1985 and 1986 resulted in major reductions in oil revenues to the State of Alaska. State government, like the private sector, experienced substantial declines in revenues which led to cutbacks in most departments' programs and personnel lay-offs. The Division of Game, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, had already initiated many "belt-tightening" measures, but the substantial drop in state revenues accelerated even more drastic cost-saving actions. Some positive aspects were associated with the initial drop in revenues--increased program efficiencies, more detailed examination of program priorities and staffing needs, and greater awareness by employees of the need to implement all available cost-saving measures. Further budget reductions have resulted, however, in the transition of what was a minimally acceptable wildlife management program, to one that is presently inadequate.

Additional income to the Fish and Game Fund and other revenue increases are essential if Alaska's valuable wildlife resources are to continue to prosper and provide substantial benefits to Alaska's citizens and the state's economy. Inflation has eroded the value of money and costs have increased dramatically. It is entirely reasonable that the costs of wildlife management should be borne to some degree by all users. It is also reasonable that those who make the most use of public resources should pay the most for that use--while still being sensitive to the ability of users to pay. The system should be equitable for all users. Although an increase in license and tag fees will provide some financial relief, other revenue enhancement measures will be necessary in the future if sound management of Alaska's wildlife resources is to continue.

If you have any questions or comments on the enclosed information, or would like to discuss various points in more detail, please contact any of the following Division of Game staff:

Lew Pamplin, Director, Anchorage (ph. 267-2231);
Don McKnight, Acting Deputy Director, Juneau (ph. 465-4190);
Dave Anderson, Regional Supervisor, Douglas (ph. 465-4265);
Dan Timm, Regional Supervisor, Anchorage (ph. 267-2193);
Dick Bishop, Regional Supervisor, Fairbanks (ph. 456-5156);
John Coady, Regional Supervisor, Nome (ph. 443-2271); or,
your local area game biologist.

Thank you for your interest and your support in this subject.

WILDLIFE RESOURCES AND VALUES

Alaska's wildlife is a legacy of immeasurable value and an attraction to both residents and nonresidents of the state which is exceeded nowhere in the world. The essence of Alaska to most Alaskans is its wild resources, and the image of Alaska to most visitors is its wildlife, spectacular scenery, and undisturbed wildlife habitat. The interrelated economic, cultural, aesthetic, and recreational benefits derived from wildlife by Alaskans are enormous. Vast economic gains result from both consumptive and nonconsumptive uses of wildlife in the state. Hunting and trapping activities generate millions of dollars annually by: the purchase of hunting and camping equipment, vehicles, and equipment maintenance; the contracting of guides and outfitters; the sale of furs; and expenditures for lodges/hotels, restaurants, and transportation services.

Calculating the present and future values of Alaska's wildlife is extremely difficult. Although we can determine how much a nonresident pays on the average to successfully hunt brown bears on the Alaska Peninsula (over \$10,000), we cannot easily determine the "value" of watching 50 bears at McNeil River falls, hearing a howling wolf pack, waiting for the first geese to arrive at Creamer's Field, watching a loon family on one of Anchorage's lakes, seeing 75 bald eagles in one tree in the Chilkat River Valley, or watching thousands of Arctic caribou from a hilltop.

Various studies indicate that the opportunity to view wildlife is of principal importance to tourists in deciding to visit the state. According to the 8th edition of the Alaska Blue Book, about 787,000 people visited Alaska in 1986, spending an estimated 727 million dollars which remained in Alaska. Nonresident visitor travel is responsible for nearly 11,000 jobs for Alaskans, and tourism is considered the third largest private sector industry in Alaska.

While it is impossible to determine the total economic value and personal benefits derived from harvesting game, the sheer number of animals harvested annually is indicative of the great importance of these resources to most Alaskans. During the past three regulatory years (1984/85-1986/87), the reported or minimum estimated hunter/trapper average annual harvests have been: beaver--over 12,300; bison--75; black bear--over 2,000; brown bear--1,100; caribou--over 15,000; Dall sheep--1,100; deer--over 20,000; elk--215; lynx--nearly 1,500; moose--7,200; mountain goat--over 500; muskox--100; land otter--nearly 1,800; waterfowl--over 107,000; wolf--825; and wolverine--600. Although total numbers are unavailable, many thousands of grouse, ptarmigan, hares, and other furbearers are taken annually.

Only "snapshots" of the values of Alaskan wildlife are currently available. Some of these include:

- ° sheep hunters spend over \$5.9 million annually; each resident and nonresident hunter spends approximately \$1,500 and \$9,800, respectively;
- ° in southeast Alaska, hunters in 1985 spent \$4.4 million for deer, \$800,000 for moose, and \$678,000 for goat hunting;
- ° the value of unprocessed furs (raw pelts) has recently been about \$5 million annually;
- ° a conservative estimate of the dollars needed to commercially replace the meat from harvested game is over \$40 million annually;
- ° fees paid to hunting guides have been recently estimated to exceed \$16 million annually, and the big game guiding industry contributes an estimated \$20.5 million annually to the state's economy;
- ° about 787,000 visitors in 1986, spending approximately 727 million dollars in Alaska, rated wildlife as one of their primary reasons for visiting our state; wildlife watching was the single most popular activity enjoyed by these visitors.

Aside from economic values, wildlife is integral to the culture, aesthetic enjoyment, and the quality of life for nearly every Alaskan. Whether we are hunters, trappers, viewers, and/or concerned citizens who derive satisfaction from just knowing that wild living resources exist in abundance, wildlife is of great personal importance to our lives. How many of us who grew up elsewhere would have made Alaska our home or would remain in Alaska if wildlife were no longer a predominant feature of the state? Probably few.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

The Division of Game is facing a serious financial problem in meeting its responsibility to manage Alaska's wildlife. Essential programs, ranging from collecting and analyzing information necessary to maintain populations, to providing services necessary for the public to fully enjoy and utilize wildlife, have been sharply curtailed by budget reductions. During the past two years, the Division of Game has experienced more than a 13 percent reduction in total funds, a 16 percent reduction in staff, the conversion of numerous full-time biologist positions to part-time status, and the closure of two area offices. For details on the division's funding and personnel resources, see APPENDIX A--Funding and Budget Details

and APPENDIX B--Division Staffing, Qualifications, and Office Locations.

Financial difficulties for the division have been developing for years. The division began its duties at statehood with a small budget and staff relative to Alaska's geographic size and diversity of wildlife and wildlife habitats. This situation was generally acceptable because of the relatively low use of wildlife resources. Alaska's human population was small and the state was not experiencing extensive development of its other resources.

Recent budget reductions have occurred when the need for biological information and the responsibilities of the division have increased dramatically. The state's human population has more than doubled since statehood. The impact on wildlife resources has been far greater. Nearly every area and wildlife population in Alaska is now readily accessible because of new roads and the increased use of aircraft, snowmachines, off-road vehicles, and boats. Changes in land status and ownership have reduced opportunities for using wildlife in many parts of the state while concentrating and increasing demand in other areas. The need for an expanded and diversified economy has resulted in new development projects which are sometimes in conflict with wildlife. In order for the state to encourage new development while, at the same time, ensuring that wildlife resources are sustained, comprehensive biological information is required. If Alaska is to "do it right," the department must be able to collect the information needed to carefully and realistically advise how development can proceed while minimizing both costs to developers and adverse impacts to wildlife and Alaskan's use of these resources.

The basic costs of conducting business have been increasing steadily as they have for everyone. For example, much of the information on game populations in Alaska must be obtained from aerial surveys. Air charter rates have increased precipitously because of inflation and increased insurance rates charged to operators. For example, in 1975 a supercub could be chartered for \$55/hour; the same aircraft now costs \$135/hour. Travel costs for personnel, like travel costs for all citizens, have also increased significantly, as have printing costs for regulations, personnel costs (over which the division has no control), and a multitude of other costs for collecting essential biological data and providing services to the public.

The Division of Game has been funded historically by hunting and trapping license revenues (Fish and Game Funds) and federal excise taxes on firearms and ammunition (Pittman-Robertson Funds). Since 1979, the Alaska Legislature has appropriated varying amounts of General Funds for use in divisional programs. General Funds have been used to finance specific programs for non-hunted wildlife, for managing areas closed to hunting such as the McNeil River and Walrus Island State Game Sanctuaries, and to help conduct other game management programs. From fiscal year

to help conduct other game management programs. From fiscal year (FY) 86 to FY 88, General Funds allocated to the division have decreased nearly 50 percent. Over the last five years, Pittman-Robertson Funds have been declining and Fish and Game Funds have generally stabilized. Budget declines have been accompanied by equally severe increases in costs. The net result has been an erosion of programs necessary for effective wildlife management in every area of the state.

Although the spectrum of wildlife management programs conducted by the Division of Game (see APPENDIX C--Division Programs and Activities) has been sharply diminished by budget reductions and rising costs in recent years, there is reason to look upon wildlife's future with optimism. Wildlife is owned by the public and its values are great. We believe that most Alaskans are willing to make a greater financial commitment to ensure professional management and conservation of wildlife resources for themselves and future generations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITHOUT INCREASED REVENUES?

The division is presently only "treading water" in terms of maintaining basic biological data gathering functions (e.g., big game surveys and inventories) and public service activities (e.g., support to advisory committees, public contacts, technical assistance). Without increased revenues the division will, in just a few short years, transition from a manager to a "caretaker" of Alaska's wildlife resources. Public interactions and assistance will diminish significantly, some additional area offices will be closed and consolidated into regional centers, and the number and type of special permit hunts (e.g., registration and drawing hunts) will be reduced or modified. Hunting opportunities will not change immediately, but many existing opportunities will gradually diminish because the biological information necessary to allow harvest of some big game populations will not be available. The department and the Board of Game will be forced into more conservative management strategies for some big game populations.

Assuming a more likely scenario that some revenues will continue to decline (e.g., Pittman Robertson Funds) and there is no increase in other revenue sources, other changes will be more dramatic and long-term ramifications more severe. These include:

- ° curtailment of research efforts to improve biological investigation techniques and to acquire a better understanding of wildlife population dynamics and the ecological factors affecting populations in different areas;
- ° decreased staff assistance and data input to other agencies making land-use decisions which affect wildlife populations, habitats, and public use opportunities;

- reduced data collection and analysis of big game population data by division staff resulting in more conservative recommendations to the Board of Game and further restrictions in many game seasons and bag limits, including closures when the status of populations is unknown;
- greater chance of unexpected changes in regulations (e.g., emergency closures) that would adversely affect users;
- further reduction or elimination of the more costly registration permit hunts which provide limited public use;
- no game transplants, habitat improvement projects, or other wildlife enhancement activities;
- greater opportunities for poaching because of reduced staff and field presence;
- major reductions in wildlife information and education programs, technical assistance to the public and other agencies, and staff interaction with the local public, particularly in rural areas; and
- elimination of public use programs in some state managed areas.

In essence, there would be an overall loss in public use opportunities for wildlife-related activities such as hunting, trapping, and viewing in special areas. The quality of life of all Alaskans would diminish as opportunities and benefits derived from professional wildlife management decrease.

PROPOSED INCREASES TO HUNTING LICENSES AND TAG FEES

The department has been considering various options for increasing revenues to fund game management programs. Many alternatives have been evaluated, some have been initiated or are in the process of implementation, and others are still under consideration (see APPENDIX D--Additional Options for Increasing Revenues). A combination of options to increase long-term revenues is the best approach for ensuring sound management of Alaska's wildlife resources in the future. No single option is likely to satisfy both revenue requirements and the desire to distribute costs equitably among wildlife users (see APPENDIX E--Related Issues).

Legislation has been introduced (Senate Bill No. 129) which would increase the cost of resident hunting and sport fishing licenses. The department supports this bill and has recommended amendments which would increase the cost of nonresident hunting and fishing licenses, increase nonresident tag fees for big game, and expand the number of species which require resident big game tag fees.

License fees vary widely in other states. Many states are currently considering increases in their license and tag fee structures. A major difference in the license fee structure between Alaska and elsewhere is that all other states require additional tags or other fees to hunt deer, antelope, moose, sheep, goat, elk, turkey, and upland birds. A deer tag, for example, ranges from \$4 in Oregon to \$30 in Kansas. Besides Alaska, only 13 other states do not charge additional fees to hunt deer. However, in some of those states, individual counties assess added costs. A tag to hunt black bears ranges from no charge in a few states to \$4 in West Virginia, \$15 in Washington, and \$25 in Colorado and Utah. For a resident in 11 western states to hunt small game and only two species of big game (deer and black bear), the average cost is \$34. This entitles the hunter to take one deer and one black bear.

In Alaska, a \$12 hunting license entitles a resident to hunt for up to six deer, up to three black bears, one moose, one bison, one elk, up to two mountain goats, one Dall sheep, one muskox, numerous caribou, and several to unlimited numbers of coyotes, foxes, lynx, wolves, wolverine, grouse, hare, and ptarmigan. A grizzly bear tag costs an additional \$25, and state and federal waterfowl stamps cost \$5 and \$10, respectively. When big game hunters are limited in number in some areas, drawing permit application fees are \$5 each. In consideration of the variety, number of animals which can be taken, and uniqueness of Alaska's game resources, Alaskan hunters are paying substantially less to hunt than residents of other states.

Increase Resident Hunting License from \$12 to \$20

Resident license fees have not been increased since 1977. Senate Bill (SB) 129 would increase resident hunting licenses from \$12 to \$20. This would generate additional revenues of approximately \$560,000 annually to the Fish and Game Fund.

Increase Nonresident License and Tag Fees

The department's proposed amendments to SB 129 would do the following:

- A. Increase the nonresident general hunting license fees from \$60 to \$85. Estimated increased annual revenues are \$138,000.
- B. Establish a nonresident small game hunting license for \$20. The intent is to provide opportunities to some nonresidents who would not normally hunt while visiting Alaska. Nonresidents who hunt only small game would not be required to purchase the more expensive general license. Estimated increased annual revenues are \$13,000.
- C. Increase nonresident tag fees for big game as follows:

<u>Species</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Black Bear	\$ 200	\$ 250
Brown/Grizzly Bear	350	500
Bison	350	500
Caribou	300	350
Dall Sheep	400	450
Deer	135	150
Elk	250	300
Moose	300	400
Mountain Goat	250	300
Muskoxen	1,100	no change
Wolf	150	450
Wolverine	150	450

Estimated increased annual revenues are \$460,000.

Estimated increased annual revenues from A, B, and C above are \$611,000.

Expand Resident Big Game Tags

Currently, residents must have a big game tag to hunt muskox and brown/grizzly bear in most game management units. Additional amendments to SB 129 would expand the tag fee structure whereby a tag would be required for residents to hunt most big game species, but would not be required for each animal taken in a multiple bag limit. For example, a resident hunter would pay a tag fee to hunt deer on Kodiak Island, but could harvest the legal bag limit (up to 5 deer). Resident tag fees could be established as follows:

<u>Species</u>	<u>Tag Fee</u>
Black Bear	\$10
Brown/Grizzly Bear	no change
Bison	40
Caribou	10
Dall Sheep	25
Deer	10
Elk	15
Moose	10
Mountain Goat	10
Muskoxen	no change
Wolf	-0-
Wolverine	-0-

Estimated annual increased revenues are \$900,000.

Passage of SB 129 with the amendments proposed by the department would generate approximately \$2.0 million in increased annual revenues to the Fish and Game Fund.

WHAT WOULD INCREASED REVENUES BE USED FOR?

The proposed increases in license and tag fees for hunting in Alaska would affect both resident and nonresident hunters. Most of the funds would be used to restore or enhance game management and research projects that were eliminated or severely reduced as a result of losing nearly 1.5 million dollars in General Funds since FY 86. Some game management programs that would receive additional funding include:

- ° moose survey and inventory work statewide and population censuses in heavily hunted areas and in selected locations where populations may be experiencing problems;
- ° caribou survey and inventory work statewide and more frequent population censuses of major herds;
- ° research and development of improved, more cost-effective and accurate big game and furbearer survey techniques;
- ° wolf, wolverine, marten, and lynx surveys and monitoring population trends;
- ° providing biological information to the public, local advisory committees, and the Board of Game for the state's regulatory process;
- ° Dall sheep and mountain goat surveys;
- ° moose habitat carrying capacity studies and modeling;
- ° reestablish moose habitat enhancement projects in portions of southcentral and interior Alaska;
- ° more field presence by staff and additional law enforcement activities;
- ° compilation, detailed analysis, and computerization of historic information on big game populations;
- ° technical assistance to land management agencies for use in making decisions affecting wildlife populations, habitats, and public use opportunities;
- ° wildlife information and education projects and the statewide hunter education program;
- ° additional emphasis on management planning; and

- ° more educational efforts to inform the public about the benefits of professional wildlife management and the ecological basis for regulated harvests.

It is important to recognize that many of these essential wildlife management programs would not receive additional funding, even if hunting license and tag fees were increased, unless the General Fund appropriations to the Division of Game remained near the current level.

APPENDIX A

Funding and Budget Details

Since statehood, Division of Game operations have been funded primarily from two sources: (1) Pittman-Robertson (P-R) Funds (federal dollars); and (2) the Fish and Game Fund. The P-R Funds, derived from an 11 percent excise tax on firearms, ammunition, and archery equipment, are collected by the U.S. Department of Treasury and are apportioned annually to individual states by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the basis of each state's size and number of licensed hunters. Alaska, because of its size, receives the maximum apportionment (4 percent of the fund). States match P-R monies on a 1 state dollar to 3 federal dollar basis.

To receive P-R money, a state must have adopted laws which require that all hunting and sport fishing license revenues be used exclusively for the "protection, propagation, investigation, and restoration" of sport fish and wildlife resources. These statutes thereby established a Fish and Game Fund which is comprised of license and tag revenues, permit application fees, duck stamp revenues, and monies from the sale of hides. Fish and Game Fund dollars are used to match federal aid dollars and to support programs which are not eligible for funding under the P-R Act (law enforcement, animal control, establishing and publishing regulations, public inquiries, and information programs).

Since 1979, the state Legislature has appropriated varying amounts of monies from the state's General Fund to the Division of Game. These monies have been used to fund the division's nongame program, habitat enhancement, predator control, visitor programs at the McNeil River and Walrus Island State Game Sanctuaries, law enforcement and public service activities, and to supplement funding for various other projects.

Because of reduced budgets, the division has recently established four program receipt accounts which accrue funds for specific activities. Users of the Rabbit Creek Rifle Range in Anchorage and the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary are required to pay fees which help to fund these programs; Delta Bison Range maintenance is partially funded through an additional \$5 application fee for Delta bison permits; and the division sells hides and skins of animals taken in defense of life and property, donated, or acquired through other sources.

The division has a special projects budget component funded entirely from outside sources of monies such as federal agencies and the private sector. Most marine mammals research conducted by the division, for example, is funded by the federal agencies responsible for those resources. Because the amount of special projects funding is highly variable from year to year and is directed to specific projects, the division cannot (and should

not) depend on these funds to maintain full-time staff working on routine game management projects.

The other element of funding for the Division of Game is Capital Improvement Projects (CIP). Past CIP funds have been used for such projects as: construction of the Potter Marsh boardwalk; upgrading facilities at McNeil River and the Rabbit Creek Rifle Range; wildlife enhancement work on the Delta Bison Range; moose habitat enhancement; and land acquisition and survey work on state game refuges. The division presently has only one CIP, waterfowl enhancement, which is funded with the proceeds from the sale of duck stamp prints. This CIP funds one permanent seasonal employee who is responsible for the state's waterfowl enhancement program.

During recent budgetary years (FY 80-FY 88), P-R money, the Fish and Game Fund, and General Funds have comprised an average of 45 percent, 37 percent, and 18 percent of the division's total operating budget, respectively. General Funds comprised a small percentage in the early 1980s, a larger portion in the mid 1980s, and a steadily declining percentage since FY 86 (Table 1). Revenues from the federal P-R program have declined since 1983, despite increasing inflationary costs of firearms, ammunition, and archery equipment. Manufacturers believe that future sales will continue to gradually decline. Unless additional items of outdoor equipment are taxed for this purpose or the 11 percent excise tax rate is increased, the long-term prognosis for P-R funding is not good.

Revenues from hunting licenses and tags are also expected to decline in the foreseeable future unless the price of licenses and tags is increased. General resident license sales peaked in 1984 and subsequently declined (Figure 1). Nonresident license sales generally increased from 1977 to 1984 and then stabilized or slightly declined (Figure 2). Only low income 25¢ license sales increased, but these cost the state over \$1 each to process (Figure 3). From 1976 through 1986, resident, nonresident, and 25¢ resident low-income license sales increased 22 percent, 17 percent, and 202 percent, respectively (Figure 4).

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
DIVISION OF GAME

Table 1. Operating Budget--Funding Sources FY80 - FY88 (in thousands of dollars).

	FY80	FY81	FY82	FY83	FY84	FY85	FY86	FY87	FY88
Federal Funds	3,080.1	4,032.4	4,174.2	5,139.3	5,159.4	3,731.8	4,300.0	3,750.0	4,200.0
General Funds	192.6	420.9	1,264.1	2,067.7	2,314.3	2,612.9	3,069.8	1,934.8	1,526.1
Fish and Game Funds	2,243.4	2,641.7	3,096.0	2,998.3	2,955.3	4,468.2	3,900.0	4,450.0	4,000.0
*Total Operating Budget	5,516.1	7,095.0	8,534.3	10,205.3	10,429.0	10,812.9	11,269.8	10,134.8	9,726.1

* Does not include program receipts for user fees (e.g., Rabbit Creek Rifle Range).

RESIDENT HUNTING LICENSE SALES

- 14 -




Figure 1.

NON-RESIDENT HUNTING LICENSE SALES




Figure 2.

\$0.25 HUNTING LICENSE SALES

- 97 -





Figure 3.

% CHANGE IN HUNTING LICENSES BY TYPE



APPENDIX B

Division Staffing, Qualifications, and Office Locations

During the past 2 years, there was a 16 percent reduction in total positions and a 25 percent reduction in full-time positions. Several full-time positions were converted to seasonal or part-time. The number of positions in broad job classes for the last 3 years is shown below.

	<u>FY86</u>	<u>FY87</u>	<u>FY88</u>
Biologists	104	91	86
Technicians	35	26	25
Administrative and Clerical	42	40	39
Other Technical	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
TOTAL	194	169	162

Nearly 70 percent of the division's positions are biologists and technicians, about 24 percent have administrative (including supervisory functions) or clerical duties, and the remainder fulfill other technical functions such as computer programming, data entry, and statistical work.

Division of Game staff are recognized and respected world-wide for their expertise and professional capabilities as wildlife managers. All biologists have at least a B.S. degree in wildlife management or a closely related field, more than half also have an M.S. degree, 16 have a Ph.D degree, and two have Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degrees. Most of the technicians and technical staff have a B.S. degree and some also have master's and doctorate degrees. Experience with management of Alaskan wildlife averages over 10 years for staff biologists and nearly 14 years for the division's biological supervisory staff.

The Division of Game currently has staff in 24 communities across Alaska, located as follows:

Headquarters -- Juneau
Regional Offices -- Douglas, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Nome
Area Offices -- Ketchikan, Petersburg, Sitka, Cordova, Soldotna, Homer, Palmer, Glennallen, Kodiak, King Salmon, Dillingham, Tok, Delta, McGrath, Fort Yukon, Galena, Bethel, Kotzebue, and Barrow.

In recent years, offices in Ambler, St. Marys, and Yakutat were closed, and management activities were consolidated into other offices. The most effective wildlife management and public service is attained by biologists living and working with people in many communities. However, the monetary cost of maintaining these offices is high, particularly in "bush" Alaska.

APPENDIX C

Division Programs and Activities

Alaskans sometimes ask "What do you do with the money from hunting licenses and drawing permit applications?" or "What are you really doing for wildlife and for us?" Most individuals recognize that the Division of Game provides hunting regulation books each year. Most people know that we answer questions and provide assistance to people desiring information concerning hunting and other wildlife-oriented activities, and that we help those with a moose in their yard, or bats in their attic. Many in Anchorage know that we administer the Rabbit Creek Rifle Range; in Fairbanks people go to Creamer's Field Refuge to watch the spring waterfowl migration; people contact us to visit the McNeil River bear sanctuary or Round Island to see walrus. We do all of these things, but we do many more.

Our overall statutory responsibilities are to manage, maintain, protect, improve, and extend Alaska's wildlife resources for beneficial uses by the public. In simple terms, we monitor the status of Alaska's wildlife populations so people can use and enjoy these natural resources. We also conduct research to learn, for example, more about habitat requirements, how to more efficiently and reliably monitor population status, how to determine the effects of various hunting and trapping regulations, and how to better protect or mitigate the loss of wildlife and their habitat. The information we collect is used by the Board of Game to develop hunting and trapping regulations to assure sustained yield of our wildlife while providing optimal opportunity for the public to enjoy these resources. The information we collect and analyze is also used by the general public, the Alaska Legislature and Congress, local advisory committees, guides, tourists, other agencies and wildlife biologists worldwide, environmental and sportsmen's groups, conservation organizations, and a host of others.

A few of our specific activities include:

- ° conducting aerial population trend counts and censuses of moose, caribou, sheep, goats, bears, furbearers, waterfowl, and other wildlife;
- ° conducting research projects to learn more about moose nutrition and the number of moose an area can support; to develop ways to accurately census moose, bears, wolves, lynx, and many other species; to determine why moose densities in some areas are low; to identify factors affecting growth of caribou herds and how developments within their range may affect the animals; to determine when, where, and why moose migrate and what habitats they prefer; to identify the effects of lead shot ingestion on Alaskan waterfowl; and to evaluate how current timber harvesting practices affect deer and other wildlife;

- ° conducting annual harvest monitoring of hunted and trapped wildlife using harvest tickets, permits, questionnaires, fur sealing certificates, and reports from the public;
- ° compiling, printing, and distributing hunting and trapping regulations;
- ° analyzing various data to formulate proposed hunting and trapping season changes and presenting changes and wildlife status information to local advisory committees, the Board of Game, and the general public;
- ° performing habitat enhancement in selective areas for moose, waterfowl, hares/lynx, and other species;
- ° conducting wildlife education programs and a hunter education program statewide;
- ° working with other agencies and private landowners to assure proper wildlife protection and optimum public use on lands throughout Alaska;
- ° answering tens of thousands of questions each year from the general public about Alaska's wildlife;
- ° helping people who have problems with wild animals and assisting wildlife in distress;
- ° developing measures to reduce moose/vehicle collisions on Alaska's highways and the railroad; and
- ° assisting the Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection in law enforcement activities.

As a state agency, the division must comply with certain purchasing, budgeting, expenditure accounting, and other administrative procedures. Staff time and funds must be obligated to program administration, planning, budgeting, and similar duties that are required and necessary to ensure an efficient and financially accountable operation.

APPENDIX D

Additional Options for Increasing Revenues

Summarized below is a listing of additional options being considered for increasing revenues and their status; other options may exist and will be evaluated over time. Where available, estimates of anticipated revenues have been included.

Option I: Establish a Resident Big Game Tag

Currently, residents must have a big game tag to hunt muskox and brown/grizzly bear in most game management units. The Alaska Legislature could expand the resident tag fee requirements to create a single big game tag for hunting all species except brown/grizzly bear and muskox. If this tag were to cost \$10, increased revenues would be \$700,000 to \$800,000 annually.

Status: Under departmental consideration; would require action by the Alaska Legislature.

Option II: Establish a Nonresident License for Foreigners

The Alaska Legislature could establish a nonresident license specifically for foreign citizens. A non-U.S. citizen, living in or outside of Alaska, would be required to purchase a special license to hunt in Alaska. On the average, about 400 foreigners hunt annually in Alaska. If a license for these hunters were to cost \$500, the annual increased revenues would be about \$200,000.

Status: Under departmental consideration; would require action by the Alaska Legislature.

Option III: Repeal Transferability of Nonresident Big Game Tags

Nonresidents are required to purchase tags to hunt all species of big game. However, a tag issued but not used for one species may be used to hunt another species for which the tag fee is of equal or less value. The Legislature could repeal this transferability provision and thereby increase revenues at least \$200,000 annually.

Status: Under departmental consideration; would require action by the Alaska Legislature.

Option IV: Eliminate or Change the Structure of the 25¢ License

The origin of the 25¢ license dates back to statehood when the Alaska Legislature adopted into state law portions of the Territorial Fish and Game Code. In subsequent years, there were several legislative amendments. The last change was in 1979 when the annual income requirement was changed from less than \$3,600 to \$5,600. Since 1979, to qualify for this license, a person must: (1) be an Alaska resident and not a member of U.S. armed

services stationed in Alaska on active duty; (2) be the head or dependent member of a family, or be solely dependent on oneself for support; and (3) be obtaining (or within the past 6 months have received) state or federal welfare assistance, or have a gross annual family income for the preceding year of less than \$5,600. From 1976 to 1986, the number of 25¢ license holders has increased over 200 percent to about 16,000 in 1986. It presently costs the state about \$1 to issue a 25¢ license to a qualified resident.

- A. Maintaining the current 25¢ license would continue to result in a net loss to the state of about \$12,000 per year.
- B. Eliminating the 25¢ license would save \$12,000 per year in administrative costs and provide unknown additional revenues to the Fish and Game Fund. Assuming 16,000 additional resident licenses were sold at \$20 each, increased revenues would be \$320,000 annually.
- C. Increasing the cost of a "low-income" license to \$5 would generate additional revenues of up to \$80,000 annually.
- D. In July 1987, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies passed a resolution which recommends ". . . as a guideline that the cost of a special hunting and fishing licenses for select population groups be no less than one-half of the regular license fee . . ." If this guideline were adopted in Alaska and if the general resident license cost \$20, the "low-income license" would cost a minimum of \$10 and generate up to \$160,000 annually in additional revenues.

Status: Under consideration in the Alaska Legislature; passage of SB 75 would eliminate the 25¢ license.

Option V: Department Authority to Establish Fees for Other Public Use Opportunities and Services

Limited authority has been granted by the Alaska Legislature to the department to establish user fees for various activities. By creating "program receipts" accounts for specific programs, income generated from certain public service projects can be used to fund those programs. For example, the Rabbit Creek Rifle Range in Anchorage is currently operated by funds received from user fees charged for shooting at the range. In 1987, user fees were established for visiting the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary to view brown bears.

Status: Continue existing user fee programs and expand where possible (e.g., establish visitation fee for Walrus Island State Game Sanctuary).

Option VI: Establish Wildlife Trust Funds

It may be possible to establish wildlife trust funds for managing specific programs. Under this option, funds would be received from private donations and invested for long-term operation of selected programs such as McNeil River and Walrus Island Sanctuaries, nongame wildlife, and state game refuges.

Status: Under departmental consideration and legal review.

Option VII: Establish a Nongame Wildlife Fund

The Alaska Legislature could establish a "Nongame Wildlife Fund" for generating revenues to help cover costs of the division's nongame wildlife program. Revenues collected from various sources could be deposited into this fund for use in management of nongame species and increasing opportunities for nonconsumptive uses of Alaska's wildlife.

Sources of revenue for the Nongame Wildlife Fund might include: (1) collection of a lodging tax (e.g., 1 percent) from hotels, motels, lodges, cruise ships, and other facilities in the state for each bed, berth, or camping space occupied from June 1 through September 30 of each year; (2) establishment of a Permanent Fund Dividend "checkoff" (similar to the Olympics checkoff) or a refund checkoff on state income tax if reinstated in the future; and (3) increase tax (e.g., 5 percent) on vehicle registration and license plates. Revenues from these sources have not been projected.

Status: Under departmental consideration and legal review.

Option VIII: Liquidated Damages for Violations of Fish and Game Laws

Some states presently have a system, wherein a game law violator is assessed not only a fine for the act committed, but also assessed the "cost" or value of the animal(s) taken illegally. An economic value of one animal of each species is established by law, and this amount is automatically assessed the violator upon his conviction, in addition to the fine for the offense. For example, the "value" of a moose might be \$1,000; caribou, \$500; duck, \$25; etc. This assessment is specified in law, and would apply to major violations such as wanton waste, hunting out of season, exceeding bag limit, etc., but not for violations such as failure to carry a license, shooting from a road, or taking before or after legal shooting hours.

Status: The option would require specific legislative action addressing this new concept for Alaska and for allowing deposits of court fines into the Fish and Game Fund.

Option IX: Create a Wildlife Conservation Stamp (Tag)

A wildlife conservation stamp (tag) could be established for anyone desiring to contribute to wildlife management and conservation in Alaska. A wildlife conservation stamp (tag) would be voluntary and could be coupled with an annual art contest and print sales. Some states have tried this option on a voluntary basis with little overall success.

Status: Under departmental consideration; would require action by the Alaska Legislature.

Option X: Auction or Raffle High Demand Permits

The department currently issues permits for various hunts based on a lottery system in which each applicant is limited to one chance per hunt. In this system, the chance of an individual drawing a permit for a special hunt is not determined by the amount of money a person is willing to spend, since each applicant is charged the same application fee. The Board of Game recently changed this system to allow up to 3 applications per species but for different hunts.

Given specific legislative authority, a few permits could be issued based on the amount of money an applicant is willing to spend. This could be done by a raffle in which applicants could purchase as many chances as they desire, or by public auction in which the permits would be awarded to the highest bidders.

A state-run raffle or auction for selected permits could be administered in several ways: different opportunities could be designed for residents versus nonresidents; only a few permits from the most popular hunts could be designated (e.g., Tok sheep, Delta bison, Kodiak brown bear); and highly sought special permits for nonconsumptive use (e.g., McNeil River) could be included. Some states have implemented this option with considerable success.

Status: Under department consideration; would require action by the Alaska Legislature.

Option XI: Establish a Dedicated Fund for Fish and Game Management Based on Revenues to the State from Development of Nonrenewable Resources

One way of ensuring that the revenues generated by the development of nonrenewable resources will continue to benefit Alaskans indefinitely is to dedicate a portion of those monies to the perpetuation and development of renewable resources. Implementation of this option would require an amendment to the Alaska Constitution to allow establishment of a dedicated fund. Legislation to allocate a set percentage of the annual fund revenues to various divisions within the department would also be required.

Under this option, an established percentage of revenues received by the state from development of nonrenewable resources (like oil/gas, hardrock minerals) would be deposited annually in a dedicated fund for management of Alaska's fish and wildlife resources. The amount of revenues deposited into the fund each year would vary depending upon the production rates of nonrenewable resources, state royalty shares, and the market value of resources being exploited.

This innovative approach, like Alaska's Permanent Fund, could serve as a possible long-term solution to fisheries and wildlife management funding problems. The Division of Game's budget could increase substantially and provide many more management programs for the public--for example, funding for marine mammal management, large-scale habitat improvement projects, purchase/acquisition of important habitats, and operation of more public use areas such as McNeil River.

Status: Under departmental consideration and review by some legislators.

Option XII: Increase General Fund Revenues

As previously discussed, General Fund dollars appropriated to the department overall, and the Division of Game in particular, have been reduced substantially since FY 86. General Funds appropriated to the division could be increased. One thing is certain--the current General Fund appropriation, coupled with other revenue sources, does not provide the necessary funds to ensure a viable long-term and comprehensive wildlife management program in Alaska.

Status: General Funds are appropriated by the Alaska Legislature.

APPENDIX E

Related Issues

The Department of Fish and Game recognizes that the need to increase revenues raises various issues and concerns. The department has tried to fully consider those concerns in developing various funding proposals. While many of the major issues that the department or others have identified as being related to the proposed increases in license and tag fees have already been discussed in this document, additional issues and the department's current position on them, are addressed below.

A. The 25¢ Resident Sport Fishing, Hunting and Trapping License

Senate Bill 75 would repeal the 25¢ resident sport fishing, hunting and trapping license. While passage of this bill would result in increased revenues to the Fish and Game Fund (see APPENDIX D--Additional Options for Increasing Revenues, Option IV), the department is maintaining a neutral position on this bill. Many Alaskans support the concept of providing hunting and fishing opportunities to those who otherwise could not afford to participate. Unfortunately, the qualifications of individuals receiving the 25¢ licenses are seldom verified. Thus, the program is subject to greater abuse than any other public assistance program administered by the state. There is considerable evidence that significant numbers of the 25¢ licensees purchase those licenses fraudulently. For these reasons, the department would like to see the existing law amended to limit program abuses and save administrative costs.

B. Disproportional Costs of Fish and Wildlife Management are Paid by Sportsmen

Some sportsmen feel that they have been singled out to pay a disproportionate share of the costs of fish and wildlife management. They pay excise taxes on purchases of hunting and fishing equipment that are used for the Pittman-Robertson and Dingle-Johnson Funds (see APPENDIX A--Funding and Budget Details). They also contribute directly to the Fish and Game Fund by their purchases of hunting and fishing licenses and tags. And as Alaskan citizens, they have a stake in the General Fund monies that are allocated by the Legislature to the department. Why has the department chosen to try to increase its revenues by adding to the costs of hunting and fishing?

The department is considering many alternatives for raising additional revenues (see PROPOSED INCREASES TO HUNTING LICENSES AND TAG FEES and APPENDIX D--Additional Options for Increasing Revenues). Some alternatives that affect only nonconsumptive uses are being considered and several have already been implemented. The decision to seek increases in license and tag fees was made for several reasons. Alaska provides its residents with many unequalled hunting and fishing opportunities. Alaskans

harvest more species of fish and game over longer seasons and with more generous bag limits than is available or possible anywhere else in the country. Despite having one of the nation's highest per capita incomes, Alaska's resident license and tag fees are among the lowest of all states. Consumptive users of fish and wildlife resources benefit materially from the animals that they harvest. It is reasonable that those who take public resources for their personal use should pay more for the privilege to do so.

The operational costs to the department for assuring well-managed consumptive uses are greater than those for nonconsumptive uses. The Boards of Fisheries and Game require a greater amount of more precise information in order to make sustained yield harvest and allocation decisions. The cost of acquiring this information through population survey, census, and inventory work, harvest monitoring and reporting systems, stock separation and identification work, and research have increased steadily. Consumptive users make far greater demands for public services offered by the department, and a large portion of the department's administrative costs are related to resource use (for example, the publication of the sport fishing, hunting, and trapping regulations and the administration of the permit lottery system). All of these costs have risen steadily over the past ten years, yet the cost of licenses has not changed since 1977.

C. Sportsmen are Asked to Pay More While Opportunities for Hunting and Fishing are Being Reduced

It is true that recent state and federal legislation has changed some of the hunting and fishing opportunities previously available to all Alaskans. The creation of new national parks, preserves, monuments and refuges, transfer of public lands to private ownership, and the establishment of subsistence and resident use preferences, have resulted in decreased opportunities for many people, especially those living in urban areas of the state and nonresidents. These changes have occurred simultaneously with a rapidly growing human population and increased demand on Alaska's resources. All of these factors have made the department's job more complex and significantly increased operating costs. The department has a major role in working with the federal government, other state agencies, and the private sector to provide public use opportunities of fish and wildlife resources. If revenues do not increase, our ability to maintain or enhance future opportunities will be diminished.

D. The Department of Fish and Game Listens Only to Certain User Groups

Nearly all special interest user groups have at one time or another suggested that the department caters to the needs of the "other" user groups. One sportsmens' organization wrote that "sport hunters have been methodically ignored." A recent letter to the editor of Alaska's largest newspaper suggests just the

opposite, that only the sport hunters' voice is heard. There is increased friction between nearly all user groups: some sport fishermen are unhappy with the amount of salmon allocated to the commercial fishermen and vice versa; some rural subsistence hunters do not want urban sports hunters in "their" area, while some sport hunters dislike the whole idea of a subsistence preference; some people would like to see all fur trapping eliminated in the state, while others would like to see greater emphasis on predator control.

The truth is that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game does not make the decisions as to "who gets what resource." The Boards of Fisheries and Game are the administrative entities which have the responsibilities for allocating fish and wildlife resources within the existing laws. It is a difficult job. As the population of Alaska has grown and diversified, the demands for fish and wildlife resources have increased and changed. The state of Alaska's system for establishing fish and game regulations is perhaps the most open to public input of all the 50 states. Nonetheless, it is impossible to satisfy all users, and there are bound to be conflicts among them. The department should not be put into the position of acting as referee. The department strives to serve all Alaskans, however diverse their views.

E. Enforcement of Existing Fish and Wildlife Laws is Inadequate

It is an unfortunate truth that there are a number of Alaskans who participate in fishing, hunting, and trapping activities without purchasing the required licenses and tags or who violate other fish and game laws and regulations. It is impossible to estimate how many people are involved in such activities, but it is certainly true that if all people obeyed the laws and regulations, additional revenues would be generated and wildlife resources would be in better shape. It is also impossible to correct this problem by law enforcement action alone. Alaska is simply too large to contemplate the number of enforcement officers that would be required to adequately cover all areas. The Department of Public Safety, Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection, is primarily responsible for enforcing fish and game laws. Like all state agencies, they too have had to deal with budget reductions. Fish and Wildlife Protection Officers are stationed throughout the state in such a way as to maximize their efforts.

The Department of Fish and Game assists in law enforcement through the deputization of field personnel. The department also recognizes that education is an important factor in encouraging all citizens to comply with fish and game laws. The department encourages compliance with the laws by sponsoring a number of education programs and publishing a variety of information pamphlets to inform the public on what the regulations are, how they are established, and why they are necessary. We would also like to see better compliance with fish and game regulations and more comprehensive enforcement.

F. "State Government is Already Too Big." How Can the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Justify Seeking More Money When the Alaskan Economy is Shrinking?

It might seem logical that as the Alaskan population declines and the economy shrinks, the public need for services performed by the department would also decline. In fact, just the opposite is true. The recession that Alaska is currently experiencing causes additional work for the department to meet our mandated responsibilities. In order to stimulate the economy, most of the public would like to diversify Alaska's economic base by promoting the development of both renewable and nonrenewable resources. The department plays a critical role in providing the biological and public use information necessary for regulatory decisions affecting resource development activities. Both federal and state laws place conditions on some developments which are intended to protect the natural environment. By providing pertinent data and technical assistance for proposed developments, the department can help to speed the decision-making process and ensure compatibility of developments with public fish and wildlife resources.

During times of economic hardship, some segments of the public increase their utilization of fish and wildlife resources. This creates the need for additional and more precise population assessment information for the Boards of Fisheries and Game to use in establishing seasons and bag limits and making allocation decisions.

THE NEED TO INCREASE FUNDING
FOR SPORT FISH MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION
IN ALASKA

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
SPORT FISH DIVISION
JANUARY 1988

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS: Present funding is not sufficient to allow the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to keep pace with sport fish management needs resulting from increasing fishing pressure and conflicts between user groups. This packet provides background information in support of a license increase that will be considered during the 1988 legislative session. Proposed increases in resident and nonresident sport fishing licenses would provide an additional \$1.8 million annually to the Sport Fish Division for a variety of management, research, and public interaction activities. Public support is requested.

PURPOSE OF THIS INFORMATION PACKAGE

The mission of the Sport Fish Division of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is to manage, protect, maintain, improve, and extend the state's recreational fishery resources to provide a diverse mix of present and future fishing opportunities that address the desires of the angling public and contribute to the Alaskan economy.

To carry out this mandate, the Sport Fish Division conducts a wide range of activities, including fishery management, research, planning, habitat protection, access development and public interaction.

The Department of Fish and Game is concerned that present funding does not enable the Sport Fish Division to maintain the level of service that is required with increasing fishing pressure, limited public access, user conflicts, and other public use needs. An increase in license fees provides the most feasible option to meet these most important needs. Legislation to increase license fees was introduced at the department's request in 1987; it will be considered during the legislative session starting in January 1988.

This information package has been prepared by the Sport Fish Division to summarize the present Sport Fish program and its limitations, and in general terms, what additional programs can be accomplished with any additional funds received, should the license increase legislation be approved.

If the reader has questions, would like more detailed information, or would like to discuss fisheries activities of the Sport Fish Division, please contact any of the following:

Norval Netsch, Director, Sport Fish Division, Juneau
(465-4180)
Frank Van Hulle, Deputy Director, Sport Fish Division, Juneau
(465-4180)
Gary Sanders, Region I, Juneau (465-4270)
Paul Krasnowski, Region II, Anchorage (267-2218)
John Clark, Region III, Fairbanks (456-4359)
or any Sport Fish Division employee.

We are asking for your support for better protection and management of Alaska's sport fish.

THE PROBLEM

There has been a steady increase in fishing pressure over the years which continues in spite of recent decreases in the state's population. For example, there were 201,058 anglers in Alaska in 1977; 249,229 in 1981; and 359,383 in 1986. These fishermen fished 2,071,412 angler days in 1986 compared to 1,420,172 in 1981. In addition, there has been steady growth in the number of lodges, guides, and outfitters in many areas of the state. Some areas that received little or no fishing pressure now have considerable use by fishermen and commercial operators. Sport fish harvest has increased from 2,528,056 fish (all species) in 1981 to 3,163,433 fish in 1986 and continues to increase in spite of reduced bag limits and more restrictive regulations for many waters. The total value of sport fishing in Alaska is unknown, but an economic study indicates that in 1986 sport fishermen spent \$127 million in the southcentral area of the state alone. Sport fishing in that area generated 2,840 full-time equivalent jobs in Alaska. Obviously, the contribution of sport fishing to the state economy is significant.

At the same time, refinements in commercial fisheries management have allowed for increased commercial harvest rates and development of new fisheries for salmon, halibut, and other species that are important to the sport fishery as well. Superimposed on both of these user groups is the use of fishery resources for subsistence and personal use. Conflicts between user groups over the use of limited resources have occurred and can be expected to increase. In combination, the increasing demands on finite fishery resources require more precise management to assure reasonable harvest levels while ensuring stock conservation.

The need for more access, public information, management planning, and coordination has also greatly increased. Although the Sport Fish Division budget has increased over the years, it does not approach the amount needed to adequately manage and protect the resources under the current harvest and public pressures. For example, we have individual biologists responsible for management of recreational fisheries in more waters than are contained in some of the larger lower 48 states (one AYK area biologist is responsible for an area the size of Texas); we have major river systems with world-class fisheries for which we have no current biological information; and we have many areas where public access is now limited or nonexistent, while nearby areas are over-crowded. Without the ability to conduct studies and collect data required for management, we will be faced with crisis situations to correct fishery resource problems that may require extraordinary measures, rather than preventing the problems before they occur. The days when superficial information was enough to manage an Alaskan recreational fishery due to light fishing pressure are history. We must pay the cost of adequate management or accept the fact of lost sport fishing opportunities.

THE ALASKA SPORT FISH PROGRAM

The recreational fisheries programs for the state are coordinated by the Sport Fish Division. Of approximately \$12 million received from all sources, more than \$9 million are used directly by the Sport Fish Division. The remaining funds are expended by FRED and Habitat Divisions to accomplish specific sport fish related projects, such as hatchery production of sport fish, under specific agreement with the Sport Fish Division.

Sport Fish Division

Primary activities within the Sport Fish Division can be categorized as fisheries management, research, and access. Management activities involve day-to-day fishery monitoring, data analysis, and regulation of sport fisheries. Professional fisheries biologists based in twelve offices statewide are responsible for all resident and anadromous species and stocks of fish that are targeted by recreational anglers. Management staff work closely with local users, sportsmen's groups, fish and game advisory committees, and staff of other divisions. They provide information to the Board of Fisheries during regulatory hearings. Many of the projects funded in this component deal with highly seasonal and frequently intense salmon fisheries which may require inseason management actions.

The division staff conduct research projects on resident species such as rainbow trout, grayling, char, whitefish, northern pike and burbot. These projects are designed to provide specific information on population abundance, size, and survival, and the impact of increasing fishing pressure. The information derived from Sport Fish Division research feeds directly into the management and regulatory process.

Purchase and development of access for recreational fishing is a rapidly growing portion of the Sport Fish Division program. An amendment to the D-J Act mandates a minimum of 10 percent of the federal funds be used to improve boating access. Monies can be spent to buy land for public use or to improve public areas by building roads, parking areas or boat launches. Because of the importance of access to sport fisheries in recent years, the division has significantly exceeded the required 10 percent.

Additional support services such as data management, planning, publications, and administration fill out the Sport Fish Division program.

FRED Division

The growth and development of sport fisheries throughout Alaska has paralleled or exceeded human population growth and increases in tourism. Fishermen near population centers are experiencing sharply increasing competition for limited fisheries resources. Hatchery production of trout, grayling, char, sheefish, and salmon is an important tool which complements conservative management of wild fish stocks, provides

increased angling opportunity and redirects effort from more vulnerable wild stocks.

In southeast Alaska, stocking efforts are directed at enhancement of steelhead, chinook and coho sport fisheries. In the interior, hatchery production has been realigned to provide salmon, rainbow trout, char, lake trout, sheefish, and grayling for landlocked lakes. Most of FRED Division's sport fish funding in southcentral is used to provide catchable and fingerling rainbow trout for Anchorage, the Mat-Su Valley, and Kenai Peninsula. The balance is split between release of chinook and coho smolt in areas where minimal interception by commercial fisheries and maximum use by recreational fisheries can occur.

Habitat Division

The Habitat Division has the responsibility to represent the department in many of the planning efforts of other agencies and to provide habitat protection recommendations for developmental activities that may affect fish and wildlife. This results in protection of many living resources of the state and helps assure long-term public enjoyment of these resources. Money from the recreational fisheries program is a minor portion of the Habitat Division budget. It is utilized for maintenance and update of the catalog of anadromous waters and for involvement in planning activities with other agencies to protect habitat and assure proper management of recreational fisheries.

SPORT FISH DIVISION FUNDING SOURCES

Funds for the Sport Fish programs are provided through three major sources:

1. Fish and Game Funds. This is money derived from the sale of hunting and sport fishing licenses. This money is deposited in the fish and game account and may not be directed to a purpose other than the protection, propagation, investigation, and restoration of sport fish and game resources, and the expenses of administering the sport fish and game programs of the department. Money from the sale of these licenses does not go into the general fund. By department policy, funds received from the sale of fishing licenses are credited to a sport fisheries account and the Sport Fish Division budgets against these funds to the extent they are available (Appendix A). Over the years most of the fishing license funds have been used by the Sport Fish Division, but during 6 of the 27 years of records shown in Appendix B, some of these funds have gone to the Habitat and FRED Divisions for recreational fisheries activities. There have been no increases in the cost of sport fishing licenses since 1977.
2. Dingell-Johnson (D-J) Funds. This is money provided by the U.S. Government derived from a federal excise tax on fishing tackle and is the major source of funding for the recreational fishing program. These monies are administered by the U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service and allocated to the states by a fixed formula. These funds can be used only for certain approved activities that benefit the sport fishery and are matched with state money at a ratio of one state dollar to three federal dollars. In 1986, the amount of money received from this source was expanded by the Wallop-Breaux amendment which taxed additional items and included a portion of the federal fuel tax. This new amendment included a provision that a minimum of 10 percent of these funds be spent on boating access purchase and development. All D-J funds received by the department are prioritized and coordinated by the Sport Fish Division.

3. **General Funds:** These are state funds that finance most operations in state government. In past years, the Sport Fish Division has received over \$1.0 million per year of general funds. Since 1986, Sport Fish has not received any general funds in the operating budget. FRED Division receives \$600,000 and the Habitat Division receives \$52,000 from the state's general fund to match D-J money used in the recreational fisheries program. Appendix C provides a summary of the recreational fisheries program funding.

WHAT WOULD BE DONE WITH INCREASED FUNDS?

As the legislation was originally proposed (Appendix D), the resident sport fishing license would increase from \$10 per year to \$15, and the resident hunting and sport fishing license would increase from \$22 to \$35 per year. This would generate an estimated \$875,000 per year. A proposed amendment to the bill would increase nonresident license fees as well (Appendix E) would result in an estimated \$1.85 million increase in funds (details by type of license, Appendix F).

Project activities and priorities are developed during the annual budget cycle that involves several levels of decisions from the Sport Fish Division, through the department, the Governor, and the Legislature. When additional funds become available, the Sport Fish Division will implement the following types of projects:

- * New or expanded studies to provide information required for management of many species and in many areas.
 - Rainbow Trout in many southcentral and Bristol Bay waters.
 - Cutthroat trout in Southeast waters from Ketchikan to Prince William Sound.
 - Grayling in waters where harvests are, or are suspected to be, reaching a point of management concern.
 - Steelhead in selected areas throughout their range.

- Various aspects of salmon management including evaluation of enhancement efforts, mixed stock problems, collection of harvest and escapement data.
 - Dolly Varden/Arctic char that now or in the future would support a significant sport fishery. Areas include waters from southcentral Alaska to Kotzebue Sound.
 - Lake trout and burbot which are very slow growing, long-lived species that are extremely susceptible to overharvest.
 - Northern pike in areas where harvest is increasing and biological information is needed.
 - Halibut, rockfish, and ling cod in several areas where the sport fishing effort has significantly increased in recent years.
- * Strengthening area management capability. An increased level of effort in various areas of the state is needed to improve local fishery management expertise and to better serve the public.
 - * Increasing efforts directed at development and implementation of management plans for specific fisheries, and for cooperative plans being developed by various state, federal, and local interests. Many of these are of vital importance to sport fishing and considerable time is required to assure that sport fish interests are addressed.
 - * Providing more and better information to sport fishermen and the general public in the form of publications, maps, brochures, videos, articles in the media, and personal appearances by department staff.
 - * Providing additional or improved access to areas where public use is now restricted due to land ownership or lack of facilities.
 - * Aquatic education. There is a need to educate all sectors and age groups of the public on many subjects related to aquatic resources, conservation, and "how to" fish. This would be work done by department employees, as well as through cooperative efforts with schools, communities, and sportsmen's groups.
 - * Constituency involvement programs. There is an opportunity to accomplish various projects through cooperative efforts between the Sport Fish Division and sportsmen's groups or communities. These include volunteer programs and jointly funded projects.
 - * Economic evaluations. Accurate economic values associated with sport fishing are generally lacking. This would provide for continuing information on key economic values of sport fishing on a statewide basis.

Department Policy
Use of the Fish and Game Fund

The following policy is established to: 1) fund approved activities in accordance with the purposes establishing the Fish and Game Fund, 2) insure future participation in both Federal Fish and Wildlife Restoration Programs, and 3) provide the Division of Game and the Division of Sport Fish with the opportunity to develop and insure fiscal responsibility in program development and budget implementation.

The revenues generated from hunting, sport fishing and trapping licenses, associated fees and other designated revenues as deposited in the Fish and Game Fund shall be used as follows:

1. The Divisions of Game and Sport Fish shall be allowed to request funding for projects to the extent of fish and game revenues available or projected to be collected. The Division of Game shall budget against the sale of hunting and trapping licenses and associated fees and revenues deposited in the Fish and Game Fund. The Division of Sport Fish shall budget against revenues collected in association with fees generated from fishing activities.
2. A divisional budget, developed against anticipated revenues which fail to materialize, shall adjust it[s] program to recognize such shortages within that appropriation.
3. Any monies deposited in the Fish and Game Fund from sources other than license fees and tags shall be credited to the appropriate division. Funds not readily identified or general in nature (e.g. non-specific donation) shall be credited equally to each account.
4. The Division of Administration will prepare and maintain the necessary records to identify appropriate fund balances.
5. Each division will budget to maintain a year end balance for shortfalls in anticipated revenues.

/s/ Don W. Collinsworth

Don W. Collinsworth, Commissioner

5-21-83

Date

Department of Fish and Game
Fish and Game Fund
Revenues and Budgets for FY61 to FY88 /8

Fiscal Year	Sport Fisheries Revenues	Sport Fisheries Budget	+/- Receipt	Revenues	Game Budget	+/- Receipt	Revenues	Total Budget	+/- Receipt
1961/1	\$519.1	\$390.0	\$129.1	-0-	-0-	\$27.7	\$519.1	\$390.0	\$156.8
1962/1	\$876.2	\$658.1	\$218.1	-0-	-0-	\$207.7	\$876.2	\$658.1	\$425.8
1963	\$549.6	\$512.5	\$37.1	\$1,008.0	\$997.7	\$10.3	\$1,557.6	\$1,510.2	\$47.4
1964	\$692.0	\$648.4	\$43.6	\$905.4	\$734.6	\$170.8	\$1,597.4	\$1,383.0	\$214.4
1965	\$644.8	\$512.4	\$132.4	\$1,052.3	\$946.1	\$106.2	\$1,697.1	\$1,458.5	\$238.6
1966	\$768.2	\$613.7	\$154.5	\$1,093.3	\$942.4	\$150.9	\$1,861.5	\$1,556.1	\$305.4
1967	\$785.6	\$640.4	\$145.2	\$1,114.6	\$1,095.6	\$19.0	\$1,900.2	\$1,736.0	\$164.2
1968	\$799.5	\$690.4	\$109.1	\$1,694.7	\$1,599.8	\$94.9	\$2,494.2	\$2,290.2	\$204.0
1969	\$934.2	\$895.4	\$38.8	\$1,607.9	\$1,731.5	(\$123.6)	\$2,542.1	\$2,626.9	(\$84.8)
1970	\$1,125.9	\$1,374.5	(\$248.6)	\$1,917.1	\$1,986.2	(\$69.1)	\$3,043.0	\$3,360.7	(\$317.7)
1971	\$882.1	\$1,246.3	(\$364.2)	\$1,374.1	\$2,288.5	(\$914.4)	\$2,256.2	\$3,534.8	(\$1,278.6)
1972/2	\$675.2	\$981.0	(\$305.8)	\$899.3	\$1,009.0	(\$109.7)	\$1,574.5	\$1,990.0	(\$415.5)
1973/3	\$1,583.8	\$1,994.9	(\$411.1)	\$3,003.2	\$2,161.1	\$842.1	\$4,587.0	\$4,156.0	\$431.0
1974/4	\$1,379.5	\$2,161.1	(\$781.6)	\$3,300.0	\$1,994.9	\$1,305.1	\$4,679.5	\$4,156.0	\$523.5
1975	\$920.4	\$1,373.7	(\$453.3)	\$1,386.9	\$1,526.2	(\$139.3)	\$2,307.3	\$2,899.9	(\$592.6)
1976	\$1,164.8	\$1,121.7	\$43.1	\$1,238.2	\$1,160.4	\$77.8	\$2,403.0	\$2,282.1	\$120.9
1977	\$1,436.0	\$941.8	\$494.2	\$1,371.1	\$1,474.5	(\$103.4)	\$2,807.1	\$2,416.3	\$390.8
1978	\$1,905.3	\$1,842.1	\$63.2	\$2,047.0	\$1,632.0	\$415.0	\$3,952.3	\$3,474.1	\$478.2
1979	\$2,186.0	\$2,394.4	(\$208.4)	\$2,163.8	\$2,439.6	(\$275.8)	\$4,349.8	\$4,834.0	(\$484.2)
1980	\$2,241.9	\$1,865.1	\$376.8	\$2,596.1	\$1,676.7	\$919.4	\$4,838.0	\$3,541.8	\$1,296.2
1981	\$2,886.2	\$2,284.6	\$601.6	\$2,584.6	\$2,808.2	(\$223.6)	\$5,470.8	\$5,092.8	\$378.0
1982	\$2,590.2	\$2,725.2	(\$135.0)	\$2,618.4	\$3,023.4	(\$405.0)	\$5,208.6	\$5,748.6	(\$540.0)
1983	\$3,537.5	\$2,850.0	\$687.5	\$2,883.5	\$3,399.0	(\$515.5)	\$6,421.0	\$6,249.0	\$172.0
1984	\$3,466.0	\$2,945.0	\$521.0	\$3,651.0	\$2,955.0	\$696.0	\$7,117.0	\$5,900.0	\$1,217.0
1985	\$3,580.0	\$3,730.4	(\$150.4)	\$3,706.0	\$4,469.2	(\$763.2)	\$7,286.0	\$8,199.6	(\$913.6)
1986/5	\$4,054.1	\$3,975.0	\$79.1	\$3,767.3	\$3,900.0	(\$132.7)	\$7,821.4	\$7,875.0	(\$53.6)
1987/6	\$4,000.0	\$4,081.8	(\$81.8)	\$3,900.0	\$4,450.0	(\$550.0)	\$7,900.0	\$8,531.8	(\$631.8)
1988/7	\$4,050.0	\$4,026.0	\$24.0	\$3,950.0	\$4,000.0	(\$50.0)	\$8,000.0	\$8,026.0	(\$26.0)
Total	\$50,234.1	\$49,475.9	\$758.2	\$56,833.8	\$56,401.6	\$667.6	\$107,067.9	\$105,877.5	\$1,425.8

Notes:

- (1) Detail amounts for 1961 and 1962 Game Division was not available. The only data available was the net of revenues and expenditures.
- (2) Includes Habitat Program of \$ 39.6 (Game \$ 26.7 and Sport Fish \$ 12.9).
- (3) Includes: Protection XFER to DPS (Game \$800.0 and Sport Fish \$136.2); Habitat Program \$38.1 (Game \$25.7 and Sport Fish \$12.4); and Hatcheries from Sport Fish \$50.0.
- (4) Includes Habitat Program \$39.8 (Game \$25.8 and Sport Fish \$14.0); and Hatcheries from Sport Fish \$75.0.
- (5) Includes \$ 500.0 funding to FRED from Sport Fish, and \$ 296.4 interest paid to the fund.
- (6) Includes \$ 250.0 funding to FRED from Sport Fish; revenues and budget amounts estimated thru end of FY 1987.
- (7) Revenues based FY1987 estimated receipts with an allowance of 2-3 percent increase in total collections. No allowance for permit or licence fee increases. Budget amount taken from FY1988 Governor's Budget Request.
- (8) The reader should note that all amounts presented for years prior to FY1976 (1961 - 1975) have not and can not be proved. The data presented for those years should be used with caution and not presented as fact.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 FY 1988
 RECREATIONAL FISHERIES PROGRAM TOTALS
 (All costs in thousands of dollars)

	HQ	RTS	Region I (South- east)	Region II (Central)	Region III (AYK)	Statewide Total
SPORT FISH DIVISION						
Administration	350	152	183	231	98	1,014
Access						1,380
Planning	18		50	40		108
Data Mgmt.		375				375
Reports, Publications						
Regulations	105					105
Fisheries Mgmt.	105	245	841	1,473	593	3,257
Fisheries Research	125	309	591	1,079	795	<u>2,899</u>
Sport Fish Division total	= \$3,708 Fish and Game Fund =					\$9,138
	+ 5,430 D-J					
	+ 0 General Fund					
FRED DIVISION						
Hatchery Production			409	1,670	366	2,445
Reports, Publications	43					<u>43</u>
FRED Division Total	= \$ 250 Fish and Game Fund =					2,488
	+ 1,652 D-J					
	+ 586 General Fund					
HABITAT DIVISION						
Anadromous Catalog						51
Planning			63	97		<u>160</u>
Habitat Division Total	= \$ 0 Fish and Game Fund =					211
	+ 156 D-J					
	+ 53 General Fund					

DEPARTMENT SPORT FISH PROGRAM TOTAL \$11,837

1 IN THE SENATE

BY THE RULES COMMITTEE BY
REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

2

SENATE BILL NO. 129

3

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4

FIFTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5

A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to sport fishing and hunting li-
7 censes; and providing for an effective date."

8 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9 * Section 1. AS 16.05.340(a)(1) is amended to read:

10 (1) Resident sport fishing license..... \$15 [\$10]

11 However, the fee is 25 cents for a resident who is blind.

12 * Sec. 2. AS 16.05.340(a)(2) is amended to read:

13 (2) Resident hunting license 20 [12]

14 * Sec. 3. AS 16.05.340(a)(3) is amended to read:

15 (3) Resident hunting and trapping license 30 [22]

16 * Sec. 4. AS 16.05.340(a)(5) is amended to read:

17 (5) Resident hunting and sport fishing license 35 [22]

18 * Sec. 5. AS 16.05.340(a)(6) is amended to read:

19 (6) Resident hunting, trapping, and sport fishing
20 license 45 [32]

21 However, the fee is 25 cents for an applicant who is the head of
22 a family or a dependant member of that family, or who is solely self-
23 supporting, upon proof presented by the applicant that the applicant

24 (A) is obtaining or has obtained assistance during the
25 preceding six months under any state or federal welfare program
26 to aid the indigent, or

27 (B) has an annual family gross income of less than
28 \$5,600 for the year preceding application.

29 * Sec. 7. This Act takes effect January 1, 1988.

March 19, 1987

The Honorable Jack Coghill
Alaska State Legislature
P. O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99802

Dear Senator Coghill:

I have reviewed SB 129 dealing with resident sport fishing and hunting license fees. I would like to propose a set of amendments to that bill. The proposed amendments would increase nonresident game license and tag fees, implement a tag fee structure for resident big game hunters, institute a new small game license, and increase nonresident sport fish license fees.

I would be somewhat reluctant to go after such a broad-sweeping increase in user fees, if we were not faced with significant declines in both general fund dollars and in the federal aid (Pittman-Robertson) funds for the Game Division and the need for state match for federal funds in sport fisheries which mandates expanded programs and land access purchases and developments.

If our forecasts are in the ballpark, and we think they are, and if these proposals were fully enacted, we would still fall short of maintaining funding for the Game Division at the FY 86 level.

The increase in the sport fish nonresident license would preserve the 1:3.6 ratio we currently have between resident and nonresident fees.

The following is the proposed package of amendments:

GAME

Increase nonresident license and tag fees

1. Increase ~~nonresident~~ hunting license fees from \$60 to \$85; estimated increased revenues - \$138.0.

March 19, 1987

2. Establish a nonresident small game hunting license for \$20; estimated increased revenues - \$13.0.
3. Increase nonresident tag fees for big game as follows:

<u>Species</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
black bear	\$ 200	\$250
brown/grizzly bear	350	500
bison	350	500
caribou	300	350
Dall sheep	400	450
deer	135	150
elk	250	300
moose	300	400
mountain goat	250	300
muskoxen	1,100	no change
wolf	150	450
wolverine	150	450

Increases in nonresident tag fees would generate additional revenues estimated at \$460.0.

Total estimated increased revenues from implementing (1), (2), and (3) above would be approximately \$611.0.

Establish resident big game tags

Establish resident tag fees for selected big game species (there is already a brown/grizzly bear tag fee which costs \$25). The tag fees would be required for residents to hunt a particular species but would not be required for each animal taken in a multiple bag limit. For example, a resident hunter would have to pay a tag fee to hunt deer on Kodiak Island but could harvest the legal bag limit (up to 5 deer). Resident big game tag fees could be established as follows:

<u>Species</u>	<u>Tag Fee</u>
black bear	\$ 10
brown/grizzly bear	no change
bison	40
caribou	10
Dall sheep	25
deer	10
elk	15
moose	10
mountain goat	10
muskoxen	no change

March 19, 1987

All residents would be required to have the specified big game tag for the species they are hunting. Estimated annual revenues would be \$900.0 to \$1,100.0.

Combined revenues from these options would generate an additional \$1.5 to \$1.7 million. These options, coupled with an increase in resident hunting license fees, would provide a minimum of \$2.0 million annually to the Fish and Game Fund.

SPORT FISH


Increase nonresident license fees

1. Increase the nonresident 3-day sport fishing license fee from \$10 to \$15 (cost per day \$5); estimated net increase \$263.0.
2. Decrease the nonresident 14-day sport fishing license to 10 days and increase the license fee from \$20 to \$30; estimated net increase \$520.0.
3. Increase the nonresident annual sport fishing license from \$36 to \$50; estimated net increase \$224.0.

The above increases in revenue are estimates based on the assumption that present sales will not decrease from the 1985 base for the class of license indicated.

I would appreciate your review of these recommendations and would be happy to discuss them at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Don W. Collinsworth
Commissioner

cc: Governor Steve Cowper
Senator Jim Duncan
Senator Dick Eliason
Representative Peter Goll
Bob Evans, Governor's Office

PROJECTED REVENUES BASED ON 1986 SALES AND NEW COSTS

Residency Status	License Type	Rate	Number Fishing	Number Hunting	Gross Revenues Fishing	Gross Revenues Hunting
R	Fish	15	110,751		\$1,661,265	
R	Hunt	20		26,911		\$ 538,220
R	Hunt/Trap	20/10		1,996		39,920
R	Fish/Hunt	15/20	42,794	42,794	641,910	855,880
R	Fish/Hunt Trap	15/20/10	7,967	7,967	119,505	159,340
Total			161,512	79,668	\$2,422,680	\$1,593,360
NR	Fish 10-day	30	52,521		\$1,575,630	
NR	Fish	50	16,934		846,700	
NR	Hunt	80		5,554		444,320
NR	Fish/Hunt	50/80	1,080	1,080	54,000	86,400
NR	Hunt/Trap	80		37		2,960
NR	Fish 3-day	15	52,682		790,230	
NR	Mil Fish	10	6,910		69,100	
NR	Mil SG/Hunt	12		775		9,300
NR	Mil Fish/ SG/Hunt	10/12	884	884	8,840	10,608
Total			131,011	8,330	\$3,344,500	\$ 553,588
R	Fish/Blind	0.25	6		1	
R	25c	0.25	15,943	15,943	1,992	1,992
	R Total		177,461	95,611	\$2,424,674	1,595,352
	NR Total		131,011	8,330	3,344,500	553,588
	R/NR Total		308,472	103,941	\$5,769,174	\$2,148,940

PROJECTED FISHING LICENSE REVENUES \$5,769,174
 Actual 1986 license Revenues \$3,920,798
 Potential Increase \$1,848,376
 (With increase in resident and nonresidential fees.)

STATE OF ALASKA
1989 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL VERSION: CSHB124
PUBLISH DATE: 03-22-89

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: 03-28-89
Title: An Act relating to sport fishing, trapping and hunting...
Sponsor: Governor Cowper
Requestor: _____

Agency Affected: Fish and Game
BRU: Sport Fish, Wildlife Conservation Administration
Components: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING						

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE		948.1	3388.5	3765.0	3765.0	3765.0
---------	--	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER Fish & Game		948.1	3388.5	3765.0	3765.0	3765.0
TOTAL						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : (Attach a separate page if necessary)

See enclosed.

Prepared by: Beverly Reaume *Beverly Reaume* Phone: 465-4120
 Division: Administration Date: 03-28-89
 Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 3/28/89
 Agency: Fish and Game

Distribution (by preparer):
 Legislative Finance
 Legislative Sponsor
 Requestor
 Office of Management and Budget
 Impacted Agency(ies)

RECEIVED
 MAR 31 1989

LEGISLATIVE FINANCE

CSHB124.
 * ASSUMPTIONS FOR LICENSE FEE FISCAL NOTE

RESIDENT	FY88 ACTUALS		ANNUAL VALUE AT CURRENT FEE	ANNUAL VALUE AT INCREASED FEE	FY90 INCREASE (PARTIAL YEAR)	FY91 INCREASE
	%JAN-JUN					
HUNT	67262	42.1%	807144	1651550	355378	844406
HUNT/TRAP	8362	62.4%	167240	334480	104280	167240
TRAP	1155	52.6%	11550	17325	3040	5775
FISH	161409	41.7%	1614090	2421135	336405	807045
FISH FARM	2	0	400	800	0	400
FUR DEALER	35	48.6%	3500	5250	350	1750
TAXIDERMY	36	75.0%	5400	7200	1350	1800
GAME BIRD FARM	7	100.0%	140	350	210	210
NONRESIDENT						
HUNT	8106	15.1%	486360	689010	30625	202650
HUNT/TRAP	50	15.1%	10000	12500	378	2500
FUR DEALER	1	0.0%	400	500	0	100
TAXIDERMY	3	66.7%	1200	1500	200	300
ALIEN HUNT	-	15.1%	-	90000	13590	90000
TAGS		14.4%	2898120	3417050	74726	518930
FISH	18154	23.7%	653544	907700	60158	254156
FISH 14 DAY	58413	7.8%	1168260	1752390	45310	584130
FISH 3 DAY	56723	9.5%	567230	850845	26900	283615
TOTALS			8394578	12159585	1053400	3765007
ASSUME THE HIGHER FEE WILL CAUSE A 10% REDUCTION IN SALES					948060	3388506
DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION					526164	1652095
SPORT FISH DIVISION					421896	1736051

* .25 LICENSES AND DUPLICATES WERE LEFT OUT OF THESE CALCULATIONS