

2009 SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES

SB 2264

2009 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2264


Senate Natural Resources Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 29, 2009

Recorder Job Number: 8086

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Senator Lyson opened the hearing on SB 2264, relating to a special season-long nonresident small game hunting license fee. All committee members were present.

Senator Jerry Klein introduced the SB 2264. We in central North Dakota have come to enjoy our nonresident hunters and know them by name. This bill is a result of a visit from a gentleman born and raised in Harvey but moved out west to make his living and is now retired. He owns a home and vehicle in Harvey and comes back for a couple of months every year. He told me he would like to purchase one season-long license for pheasant hunting. Currently your \$85 license will allow nonresident hunters to hunt for 14 days. You can hunt the whole season for an extra \$40. There are 27,322 people buy one license, 625 where two licenses are purchased, 51 who buy three licenses, four people bought 2 and three people bought 5 licenses. The other concern I had is that we have been seeing a decline in nonresident small game hunters by about 4%. My thought was that we will probably sell another 1,000 licenses because there are folks who have kids in other cities who want to come home for the weekend to hunt. I am hoping they will buy the season long license instead of multiple licenses. I calculated by reducing the amount of one license purchases by 1,000 and

increasing the additional licenses we should see an additional \$91,451. We plan to donate that money to PLOTS.

Senator Freborg asked if there is a way to figure out what the loss or gain would be in allowing them to hunt the entire season on one license for \$125 as compared to two licenses for \$170.

Senator Klein as I looked at the current method of calculation, we gather an additional \$57,885 by the multiple licenses. I believe we will have people who will spend that money on a season-long license even if they are possibly not going to stay here.

Dana Bohn, Executive director for the Tourism Alliance Partnership, spoke in favor of the bill (see attached testimony #1).

Mike Rude, President of the North Dakota Retail Association, we also stand in strong support of this bill. We believe it is good for tourism and economic development in the rural areas. It is great to see these guys coming back on a steadier base and it is good for all the businesses we are associated with.

Terri Thiel, Executive director of The Western Edge, was not present but had written testimony in favor of the bill (see attached testimony #2).

Foster Ray Hager, representing Cass County Wildlife Club, spoke in opposition to the bill (see attached testimony #3).

Roger Kaseman, representing the North Dakota Wildlife Federation, spoke in opposition to the bill (see attached testimony #4).

Senator Schneider can you give us an idea as to where the Game and Fish Department would absorb that \$30,000 loss if it were to materialize?

Paul Schadewald, North Dakota Game and Fish Department, Game and Fish Department get about \$7,000,000 from nonresident licenses and about \$5,000,000 from resident licenses. I

don't think we would cut a program or enhance a program very much. We have to be that flexible.

Senator Erbele in a lot of small communities in my area we are seeing a decline in nonresident hunters. Some of it is due to the economy and some because of drying potholes and so on. What is your statewide trend? What have you seen in the last 5 years?

Paul Schadewald it goes on year to year bases. Up until 2008 we had been seeing a good consistent rate. We sell 100% of the nonresident waterfowl licenses electronically we saw about a 20% decline. We sell about 85% of the small game licenses electronically and we are seeing a decline of about 5%.

Senator Lyson closed the hearing on SB 2264.

2009 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2264

Senate Natural Resources Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 29, 2009

Recorder Job Number: 8178

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Senator Lyson opened the discussion on 2264.

Senator Triplett the tourism folks liked it. They thought it would get people here for longer periods of time. It seems like we had alternating testimony on the fiscal note. Some people thought it would cost money and some people thought it would make the state a little bit of money, but it was small amounts in either direction.

Senator Freborg I don't think anyone knows what will happen with the fiscal impact of this bill. I really can't believe we are allowing someone to hunt the entire season for \$125 when they buy two of the two week licenses for \$170. When I visited with the sponsor of the bill, he knew quite a few people who bought multiple licenses. If you live a long ways from here you are not going to come back very often. If you happen to live on the border somewhere you may come more often. People living here drive 100miles to hunt.

Senator Triplett asked the committee is we should raise the fee to \$200?

Senator Lyson I have a hunting lodge up in Fortuna, ND. There are several people who own houses up there that are from out of state. I called one of the guys today. He said he would spend the \$125 right away. They come up here to stay because they like it here and even though they stay the whole season they do other things besides hunting.

Senator Hogue in Roger Kaseman's testimony he suggested that at one time we did have a season-long license and changed to the 14 day licenses. I was wondering if it was true and how we got to the 14 day restriction we have now. I think it would be worthwhile to find out whether that is true and why we did it.

Senator Erbele my name is on the bill because I had a constituent who wanted something like this proposed. He likes to come back, but sometimes the tenant has crop in the field or it is in the process so he won't hunt so he is for the season long hunting license. If they are already getting two for \$170 then we could raise the price and give them the season long license for the same price.

Senator Lyson I have received a lot of emails in opposition to the bill. I agree with one of the testifiers who said we are coming out of a tough winter and the numbers might be down.

Senator Schneider I think this is another ongoing battle of resident and nonresident hunters.

Senator Freborg moves a Do Not Pass on SB 2264.

Senator Schneider seconds the motion.

The bill received a Do Not Pass on a vote of 5 to 2.

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
02/16/2009

Amendment to: SB 2264

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium		2011-2013 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				(\$20,000)		(\$20,000)
Expenditures						
Appropriations						

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium			2011-2013 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill provides a season long nonresident small game hunting license costing \$170. Under current law, a small game license for two 7 day periods costs \$85. Hunters may purchase additional licenses if they want to hunt for more than 2 weeks.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

The \$170 license would be attractive to those who have purchased 3 or more of the \$85 licenses per year. In 2008 this involved a very small group of about 100-125 hunters. This small group would save money on their license purchases. Game and Fish revenue would be reduced by no more than \$10,000 per year.

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

Name:	Paul T. Schadewald	Agency:	ND Game and Fish Department
Phone Number:	328-6328	Date Prepared:	02/16/2009

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
01/20/2009

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2264

1A. State fiscal effect: *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium		2011-2013 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				(\$60,000)		(\$60,000)
Expenditures						
Appropriations						

1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect: *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium			2011-2013 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary: *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill provides a season long small game hunting license costing \$125. Under current law, a 14 day small game license costs \$85. Nonresident hunters who want to hunt for more than 2 seven day periods could purchase this new license instead of multiple \$85 licenses.

B. Fiscal impact sections: *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

3. State fiscal effect detail: *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. Revenues: *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

Last year 680 nonresidents purchased 745 additional \$85 14 day small game licenses. Most purchased only one additional license. Almost all of these customers would purchase the new season license for \$125. This would result in a revenue reduction of about \$30,000 per year.

B. Expenditures: *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

C. Appropriations: *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

Name:	Paul T. Schadewald	Agency:	ND Game and Fish Department
Phone Number:	701-328-6328	Date Prepared:	01/20/2009

Date: Jan 29, 2009

Roll Call Vote #: 2264

2009 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. "Click here to type Bill/Resolution No."

Senate Natural Resources Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Pass Do Not Pass Amended

Motion Made By Sen. Freborg Seconded By Sen. Schneider

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Senator Stanley W. Lyson, Chairman	/		Senator Jim Pomeroy		/
Senator David Hogue, Vice Chairman	/		Senator Mac Schneider	/	
Senator Robert S. Erbele		/	Senator Constance Triplett	/	
Senator Layton W. Freborg	/				

Total (Yes) 5 No 2

Absent _____

Floor Assignment Sen. Schneider

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
February 3, 2009 3:29 p.m.

Module No: SR-21-1543
Carrier: Schneider
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2264: Natural Resources Committee (Sen. Lyson, Chairman) recommends DO NOT PASS (5 YEAS, 2 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2264 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

2009 SENATE APPROPRIATIONS

SB 2264

2009 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2264

Senate Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 11, 2009

Recorder Job Number: 9205

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chairman Holmberg called the committee hearing to order at 9:00 AM in regards to SB 2264 relating to special season long nonresident small game hunting license fee.

Senator Jerry Klein, District 14: This came about from conversations that I had with out of state hunting friends. They proposed a number of solutions to the problems they had. This provides an additional license. They can still buy the \$85 license, but they can also purchase a special fees (?) non-resident hunting license which applies only to the non-resident hunting season. I would not apply to the early week. That would be for an additional \$40. It will go to the PLATTS program. There is a fiscal reduction which was determined strictly on using the amount of licenses purchased currently. I think that it would actually add dollars to the budget. This did come out of committee with Do Not Pass. We have been seeing a decline in hunting population. (Gives some figures.) This is a loss in revenue of around \$140,000. This is an attempt to stop the bleeding on the non-resident hunters.

Chairman Holmberg: Son in law grew up in ND and lives in MN and he does a lot of hunting; is he going to be happy about this if this bill passes?

Senator Klein: Elated. This is an issue with our children that liven in MN and they want to come back to North Dakota to hunt and not knowing what weekends they have off, this gives them flexibility – it would be perfect for them.

Chairman Holmberg: How about the hunter advocate; a Grand Forks resident that started his email, when I voted a couple of days ago a certain way, with "You idiot" – how does that correspond there?

Senator Klein: We have some true advocates of in state hunting, and I'm just trying to look for a balance. This would be about economic development. There was an out of state hunter that saw opportunity and started company here in McClusky. There is simply a lot of opportunity.

Senator Christmann: I wonder if Paul could answer a question on the fiscal note. It looks to me like we're showing the revenue loss from people buying additional license now at \$85 for each additional license and assuming that it will be at 125 dollars. Very few additional people accounted for; do you think this will not attract any more. I think only about 25-30 additional people were accounted for.

Paul Shadwall, Chief Administrative Services Division, North Dakota Game & Fish

Department: It is a difficult situation to make an estimate. Right now with the current \$85 license system, 90% would buy one license. They only make one or two trips to ND. They still might not make 3-4 trips to ND. A small group of people we're impacting.

Senator Robinson: Did you say that the policy committee gave us a do not pass?

Chairman Holmberg: Yes, but some voted for it on the floor.

Senator Krauter: How many additional dollars are going to be going into PLATTS program?

Paul Shadwall: There won't be any additional dollars. If the licenses increase then those dollars will adjust accordingly.

Discussion: A discussion occurred between the committee members regarding the dollar impact.

Clarence Bina, United Sportsmen of North Dakota: Testified against SB 2264. (No written testimony) We are opposed to bill for the simple reason that the licensing structure as it exists is just right.

V. Chair Bowman: If you lived in SD along ND border, would you be making that same statement? You have to look at both sides of this. We have areas down where I live that are right on the border. Some of our friends just live across the border and this gives them an opportunity to come in and hunt more. I can't believe that a good sportsman wouldn't want to let your neighbor to take advantage of the hunting.

Clarence Bina: I can answer this in two ways, one I reiterate what the board said. And now with my badge off and represent myself, a long time hunter, I understand all of the dynamics of out of state hunters. They would like better buy, and I understand that.

Roger Casemen, North Dakota Wildlife Federation: Testified against SB 2264. (No written testimony) I do have friends that come up and hunt and they are willing to pay anything to get access to our pheasants. The price for those folks is not an issue. The North Dakota Wildlife federation are not opposed to changing the licensing structure, but we feel that this is not the right year to make decision like that. The pheasants are going through one of the hardest winters they have had in the last 10-15 years. We don't know what the change is going to do.

Senator Krauter: If this isn't a good year, why were you opposed in the past several sessions?

Roger Casemen: I agreed to represent the North Dakota wildlife federation because their regular representative had bypass surgery and I am not a professional lobbyist and I don't intend to become one. I had nothing to do with that personally, I advocated for the group to help them out.

Senator Christmann: If we put in a provision in here if there is a heavy winter kill, the game and fish could suspend this from going into effect for one more year. Then we could put the wildlife federation on record as being in favor of the bill?

Roger Casemen: That puts game and fish in an impossible situation. It becomes a tug of war. My personal opinion is that the law ought to be clear and to the point. I am not opposed to laws that are flexible but that would be an impossible situation.

Chairman Holmberg: Closed the hearing on SB 2264. We have to make recommendation because the body overturned the committee's recommendation, now and it goes back to Senate.

Senator Wardner: Moved Do Pass.

Senator Krauter: Seconded.

A Roll Call vote was taken. Yea: 9, Nay: 4, Absent: 1

Date: Feb 11, 2009
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2009 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2264

Senate _____ Committee _____

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Moved Do Pass

Motion Made By Sen. Wardner Seconded By Sen. Krauter

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Senator Krebsbach	✓		Senator Seymour	✓	
Senator Fischer		✓	Senator Lindaas	✓	
Senator Wardner	✓		Senator Robinson		✓
Senator Kilzer	✓		Senator Warner	✓	
V. Chair Bowman	✓		Senator Mathern		
Senator Christmann	✓		Senator Krauter	✓	
V. Chair Grindberg		✓	Senator Mathern		✓
Chairman Holmberg		✓			

Total Yes 9 No 5

Absent 1 (Grindberg)

Floor Assignment Natural Resources

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent: Schneider

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
February 11, 2009 11:03 a.m.

Module No: SR-27-2364
Carrier: Schneider
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2264: Appropriations Committee (Sen. Holmberg, Chairman) recommends DO PASS
(9 YEAS, 5 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2264 was placed on the
Eleventh order on the calendar.

2009 HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES

SB 2264

2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2264

House Natural Resources Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 3-5-09

Recorder Job Number: 10265

Committee Clerk Signature

Nancy S. Gerhardt

Minutes:

Chairman Porter – Open the hearing on SB 2264.

Senator Jerry Klein – What 2264 does is simply allowed for a nonresident to buy an entire nonresident season long hunting license. It would provide for \$170.00 they could hunt for an entire season. My intention was for the entire 2nd license, or the additional \$85.00 to go to Plots. I know there is a lot of competition for Plots acres out there, especially as commodities have gone up and prices have gone up. We need more dollars for the dept. to continue to maintain those efforts to make sure we have plenty of plots land. It's pretty simple; I know there's another bill in the senate now that would possibly help those folks. Another issue was people who have children in the cities. They're not sure when their week-ends will coordinate with coming home for the pheasant hunting. This will allow them, if they want, to buy this license and come home whenever they can. Questions?

Rep. Hanson – Do you know how much CRP is lost in your district?

Sen. Klein – I don't have an actual number on that. Our district is more immune from the CRP acres going away than others. As you travel through the hills of Kidder Co. most of those acres are rolling hills, pot holes, or slews. I have not seen a major move as we travel our country side for CRP acres.

Rep. Hanson – I've got a printout of the 2007 and this shows your district lost 25% of the CRP, so you want to bring in more hunters and you have less Plots or CRP to hunt on.

Sen. Klein – I didn't write in here more hunters. I'm looking to make the hunting experience easier, not create more hunters. We have 625 folks last go round that bought 2nd licenses. We have 51 that bought 3 licenses, we have 4 that bought 2, 3 people that bought 5 licenses. The attempt here isn't to create more hunting or more hunting or more hunters. It's trying to create an opportunity for them to have an easier hunt. If they're staying they might find themselves doing something else for a week or two. If we had those people stay for 90 days, tourism would be happy, my community would be happy, and we would have additional revenues.

Rep. Hunsakor – I'm sure at the time you were approached by these folks, circumstances may be a little different now with the winter kill. I don't know if that will make a difference, some areas lost a lot of pheasants. I don't know if that enters into the mix. Does that change the perspective at all?

Sen. Klein – Have we had some winter kill? Yes, absolutely, but we've also had, in visiting with Sen. Krauter who has photo's of 2 weeks ago, he would estimate a million birds on those photo's, in his area. SW has had snow, but the wheat that wasn't harvested because of the drought, continues to stick out of the snow and the birds have covered the area. He believes they're having a great year there. In areas that have had 400% of the average snow fall, yes, we may have a little more trouble. We do see them as we travel, we have to slow down because they are there in the same spot every day, or every week-end. I didn't really take this into consideration, it was an idea that we worked on last fall and that's where this came from.

Rep. Hunskor – The concern is, if there is fewer birds and those nonresidents are going to come in for longer periods of time does that put more pressure on and take away from the resident hunter?

Sen. Klein – That could mean fewer birds? Yes. Will it create more hunters? I don't know. I think that's still a matter of interpretation. I'm still thinking we could pick up some of those extra licenses. We have a few people who only come for the general 14 days may spend the extra \$85.00 and say, maybe I'll stay for an extra week. My thought is there will be a few people buying that extra license, because there are some who say the money isn't the big issue. You can go to the airport in Dickinson and see all the private planes, and they rent cars, and stay at the hotel/motel, buy food, etc. My intent certainly isn't to put more pressure on the hunt.

Rep. Pinkerton – How did you come up with the fee of \$170.00?

Sen. Klein – I started with a \$40.00 increase. As it worked its way through the senate it came out with a Do Not Pass in the Natural Resources Committee. Somehow we got that passed, and it moved on to the Appropriations Committee, where it didn't get a very warm reception, but it moved back to the floor and one of the ideas we had was to raise that. Maybe \$40 isn't enough. I really wasn't sure where that price was. At this point, I'm sticking with \$170 and I think we've made our effort for whoever is interested in what we are doing in ND. We're trying to create this season long license. The dollar figure is just something we work on some other day.

Rep. Keiser – For the nonresident who would come in and buy 3 licenses, this would be a benefit to them. **1)** Someone who wanted to buy 3, 4, or 5 licenses they would win on this deal. Anybody who just wanted to have just 1 or 2 licenses would never take advantages of this thing. Is that a large enough group that we want to change the law? **2)** Is this designed

hopefully to keep some of those people, who from your position, would be coming for the 1 or 2 licenses to actually extend their time here?

Sen. Klein – It is exactly that. The 56 folks who bought the 3, 4 & 5 licenses they're going to see that as an advantage. I think there are folks out there that are not sure about the 14 days, or the 2 – 7's or if they picked the right ones. They seem to have a lot of vacation time, and I'm glad they do. I think it's just an effort to make it a little easier. In the case of the gentleman who comes to Harvey, he spends 2 months here. He is trying to coordinate it with his kids who come and this way he can pick his days more randomly than otherwise. We will hear that we will have more folks from out of state buy more land because now they can hunt all season they'd stay on that land and hunt the entire season. Access is still the issue to me. It's all about access and whether or not we can get to where those birds are. Right now we are hitting them with a car. There was a car ahead of me Sunday coming back and he had pulled over on the side because I saw this fresh rooster on the road, and of course this big chunk of metal was sticking up on the front of his grill.

Chairman Porter – We're drawing down on Game & Fish's reserves by \$20,000 if this bill were to pass in its present form. In this biennium in the Appropriations Committee with their budget we are negatively spending that reserve fund, 6 million dollars. That does have some concerns to me that we're moving in a negative direction rather than a ????????????? Budget neutral direction.

Sen. Klein – I can't imagine the fiscal note being that. If we're looking at 50 licenses and \$85.00, that's not a lot of dollars. My thought more is we would sell those 50 additional for people who aren't sure about staying. I think this is neutral. My first bill may have had a bigger hit. The numbers I have, and I got these from the Governor's office, indicated we've had a decline in our nonresidents in a variety of areas. My thought is if we could hold that a

little bit, as we lose that we lose additional revenue, whether it's in sales, gas, food and a variety of other taxes we collect.

Chairman Porter – One of the other concerns that came up, 8 years ago when we changed this to match basically what SD does, that it become a period of days license rather than a season long license so we match our surrounding states on how they do it. One of the concerns that came up that helped us move that concept forward was the fact that a lot of nonresidents were purchasing land and then they were changing the course of what the land was intended for – the production and agriculture. We had a large influx of nonresident landowners because of our generous hunting provisions across the state. Do you have any concerns with that in your area? I know your area, more than any, has a large number of property rights and farm land should be for farmers kind of thoughts out there.

Sen. Klein – In my area we don't have a whole lot of out of state folks hunting on the flat land that is farmed form road to road to road. However as we travel around the district what we see as we campaign in some of our small communities some of these homes where the grass is mowed around the house, but not beside it, you kind of know who lives in those homes in the fall. They want a home, but they don't know how much property they actually own. We haven't seen that movement up where I live. There always is some of that discussion, and there are folks out there doing that. Do I see this as opening this thing, I don't, but we can all look it the way we see it. If those folks still want to buy each license individually we haven't taken that away from them. If they came and bought one and decided they needed another and then another, those opportunities are still there.

Rep. Hanson – Your County has 14% owned by nonresidents. Which isn't a lot.

Sen. Klein – Thank you. I wasn't aware of that.

Chairman Porter - Any other questions? Further testimony in support of SB 2264?

Opposition to SB 2264?

Terry Steinwand – Director of the ND Game & Fish – We don't think it's going to be a resource issue, it has the potential to be an access issue. You have to be aware of some potential unintended consequences. One we thought of was the potential for season long nonresident to come in and purchase land and tie it up for their own hunting purposes. Whether it be hunting or fishing it takes 2 pieces of the puzzle to provide hunting and fishing. **1) It takes the resource. 2) It takes the access to the public resource to be able to hunt or fish in ND.** I have been contacted by a number of nonresidents, I'm not saying they disagree with the bill, they disagree with the price. They think even \$170 is too low. The lowest figure I've been given by a nonresident is \$250. Somebody brought up there was a 20% decline in nonresident water fowl hunters in 2008, about 4% decline in nonresident upland game hunters. We agree with Senator Klein's concept bringing these people in, if we could somehow make sure we don't see those unintended consequences, I would reverse Game & Fish position on this. Given the potential unintended consequences we would have to go in slight opposition.

Questions?

Chairman Porter – From a department standpoint have you received a lot of calls or any calls from nonresidents saying your treatments unfair compared to other states? That we should be able to get a season long license?

Mr. Steinwand – No, I would say it's probably the opposite. They feel ND is probably the final destination. As North Dakotans we do have to favor our residents. They do live here year round, they do pay taxes. They put up with winters like this.

Mike McEnroy – ND Chapter of the Wild Life Society – I would like to echo what Director Stienwant said. I think the big concern of this bill is the law of unintended consequences and how allowing no residences to purchase an upland game license that would be good for almost 4 ½ months. It would be incentive for nonresidents to purchase recreational land in the state. I don't think that is good for economical development for the state. I don't think it's good for ND sportsmen. We urge a Do Not Pass on this bill so we don't hasten the sale of ND.

Questions?

Vice Chairman Damschen – Do you think someone who can afford to buy land for hunting would be discouraged from buying a second license. If they can afford land wouldn't they be able to afford a second license?

Mr. McEnroy – I agree with that, but I think having the license available for 4 months is so much more of a bonus. It's like getting a little stamp at the grocery store or a sticker at the gas station. It's not much, but, now I can have a season long license for 4 months. If something happens at work I don't have to worry about that I already paid for that week-end because I've got all 18 weekends. I think it's more a philosophy, I agree the person who can afford to buy recreational land isn't going to worry about another \$85 for a license. They're also not going to worry about having to make an economic living off that land either.

Rep. Keiser – I agree with Vice Chairman Damschen that if they can buy the land they can pay the \$85 or whatever you want to charge them. Isn't the real problem their guests?

Mr. McEnroy – My concern is not that this will bring more hunters. I don't think this is a hunter numbers issue. I think it's a land access issue and an economic issue from land use. These folks that do have the money and the resources to buy land and unlimited numbers of hunting licenses, if we stay with the present 2 weeks system. Makes it unavailable for our ranchers and farmers in the state as well as to our sportsmen and women in the state.

Rep. Pinkerton - As a veterinarian I have an interaction with these folks that comes in, because they bring their hunting dogs with. I think someone who own a private jet and would buy 10 million dollars worth of land, and their guests I don't believe are much of an issue either. This is an unlimited 4 ½ month license and other than their wife and their servants, they aren't going to stay here all that time. They are just going to buy a short license. What I see as a problem is people who come into the state who are retired, or wealthy and semi-retired, and they come in their motor homes or they come and rent a house and maybe they even have a car here. They hunt every day. They bring 6 dogs with them and they hunt every day. They might have 2 buddies retired from GM and they might stay for a month, and they hunt every day. The dogs come in and their pads are worn off, and face hair's all worn off, and they probably aren't going to make that much difference in the number of dogs, but the residents in my district know about them and they hate them. I'm against this bill.

Mr. McEnroy – Was there a question there?

Foster Ray Hager – Cass County Wildlife Club – See **Attachment # 1**.

Roger Kaseman – ND Wildlife Federation – See **Attachment # 2**.

Clarence Bina – See **Attachment # 3**.

Rep. Hofstad – There is a segment of our population out there that are absentee landlords. They have land in our state for a variety of reasons. They might have grown up here and inherited land. These people now come back. They enjoy the experience of hunting. They also participate in our community, because they pay taxes, they have relatives here, so they come back often. This is a situation that addresses that segment very well.

Mr. Bina – I can speak personally to this, so personally, I can speak of my son. I grew up in Bocket, ND. He lives and works in St. Paul, and every time he has time to do it he comes and hunts deer and upland game with me. The big expense is not the license with him. It's getting away from his job and getting time away from his family. That is the big issue.

Vice Chairman Damschen – Mr. Steinwand, could you get us some information concerning what other states might have season long nonresident licenses available?

Mr. Steinwand – Just so I'm clear – you want other states whether or not they have a season long nonresident game license?

Vice Chairman Damschen – Ones that do have a season long nonresident game license.

Mr. Steinwand – I will attempt to have that to you by this afternoon.

Rep. Keiser – I have to challenge the fiscal note a little bit at this point. It's based on the assumption that a small group of people that would have and have been purchasing 3 or more licenses would get a benefit. But all the testimony in opposition their concern was the great increase in the number of people that would be buying this. If this bill would pass you wouldn't need many people to buy this license to offset this fiscal note, in fact, let's say 1,000 of those people from MN bought this \$170 license that aren't now buying it. Wouldn't that give you a pretty strong fiscal note?

Mr. Steinwand – You are absolutely correct. Fiscal notes, to a large extent, at least for us, are guesses. We don't know how many people are going to come in. All we know are 753 or 758 people last year bought multiple licenses. If enough people do it, it would be a negative.

Rep. Nottestad – Please add Manitoba and Alberta to that list.

Rep. Hunskor – Would the decrease in CRP and less Plots land, what's the potential for increasing the number of acres?

Mr. Steinwand – When Rep. Hanson mentioned how much CRP we've lost, ND has lost about 750 thousand acres of CRP in the last 2 years. I believe I provided some testimony at the beginning of session that by 2012 we'll probably be around 1 million acres of CRP. Surprisingly we've increased our plots program acreage.

Rep. Hanson – On the funding end of it, you're looking to pick up more acres for Plots, I would assume.

Mr. Steinwand – At this point and time and into the next biennium I believe what we do have is adequate. We are revising some of those figures we are paying because we realize inflation is going up. We have around 10 to 11 million dollars in our Private Lands Initiative, which Plots is a large portion of that available.

Rep. Hanson – At one time you had a million acres of Plots, how much of that is left?

Mr. Steinwand – What's left is 1 million 42 thousand acres. As of this morning.

Rep. Hanson – Do you anticipate losing any of that with the next sign up for plots?

Mr. Steinwand – Not at this point and time. There is no continuous sign up for CRP in most areas anymore.

Vice Chairman Damschen – Any further testimony in opposition of SB 2264? Seeing none we will close the hearing on SB 2264.

Additional testimony - See **Attachments # 4, 5, & 6.**

2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2264

House Natural Resources Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 3-5-09

Recorder Job Number: 101313

Committee Clerk Signature

Nancy L. Gerhardt

Minutes:

Chairman Porter – Pull out SB 2264. Any Discussion? Motions?

Rep. Drovdal – Do Not Pass

Chairman Porter – Rep. Drovdal moves a Do Not Pass.

Rep. Keiser – 2nd.

Chairman Porter – 2nd from Rep. Keiser – any discussion?

Vice Chairman Damschen – I'm on this one. I don't have a problem with it. I have a lot of out of state hunters that come up to my country, and they are actually better and more observant than most.

Chairman Porter – Any further discussion? Hearing none the clerk will call the roll on a Do Not Pass to SB 2264.

Yes 10 No 3 Absent 0 Carrier Rep. Nottestad

Date: 3-5-09
Roll Call Vote #: _____

2009 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2264

House Natural Resources Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Pass Do Not Pass As Amended

Motion Made By Drovdal Seconded By Keiser

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Porter	✓		Rep Hanson	✓	
Vice Chairman Damschen		✓	Rep Hunskor	✓	
Rep Clark	✓		Rep Kelsh	✓	
Rep DeKrey	✓	✓	Rep Myxter	✓	
Rep Drovdal	✓		Rep Pinkerton	✓	
Rep Hofstad		✓			
Rep Keiser	✓				
Rep Nottestad	✓				

Total (Yes) 10 No 3

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Nottestad

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
March 6, 2009 2:25 p.m.

Module No: HR-40-4255
Carrier: Nottestad
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2264, as engrossed: Natural Resources Committee (Rep. Porter, Chairman)
recommends **DO NOT PASS** (10 YEAS, 3 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING).
Engrossed SB 2264 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

2009 TESTIMONY

SB 2264

North Dakota

Tourism Alliance Partnership

P.O. Box 2599
Bismarck, ND 58502
(701) 355-4458
FAX (701) 223-4645

2008-2009 MEMBERS

- Basin Electric Power Cooperative
- Bismarck-Mandan CVB
- Buffalo City Tourism
- Destination Marketing Association of North Dakota
- Devils Lake CVB
- Dickinson CVB
- Fargo-Moorhead CVB
- Abraham Lincoln Foundation
- Greater Grand Forks CVB
- International Peace Garden
- Lewis & Clark Fort Mandan Foundation
- Municipal Airport Authority of the City of Fargo
- ND Aeronautics Commission
- ND Tourism Division
- Newman Outdoor Advertising
- Norsk Hostfest Association
- Odney Communications Group
- Select Inn of Bismarck
- Spirit Lake Casino and Resort
- State Historical Society of North Dakota Foundation
- Theodore Roosevelt Medora Foundation
- Woodland Resort, Inc.

Testimony of Dana Bohn
Tourism Alliance Partnership Executive Director
SB 2264
January 29, 2009

Chairman Lyson and members of the committee, my name is Dana Bohn. As executive director of the Tourism Alliance Partnership (TAP), I am here today asking for your support of SB 2264. TAP is a coalition of tourism-related industries, including CVBs, state attractions, businesses and other interested stakeholders.

Tourism is one of the largest industries in North Dakota and offers some of the best opportunities for economic development for the state. Hunting and fishing are important components of the tourism industry.

North Dakota is attractive to outdoor enthusiasts from around the country. According to North Dakota Game and Fish, more than 53 percent of all small game licenses in 2007 were issues to non-residents. Non-resident hunters spent \$7.1 million on licenses that year. The dollars that out-of-state hunters bring to North Dakota is new money.

Allowing non-residents to purchase special season-long small game licenses and increasing the time they spend in North Dakota will have a positive economic impact on the state of North Dakota, especially the rural communities that host many of these sportsmen. Local tourism-related businesses will benefit from extended hunter stays, which this bill encourages.

We urge your support of SB 2264.



Senate Natural Resources Committee
North Dakota State Capitol
600 E. Boulevard Ave.
Bismarck, ND 58505-0360

Re: SB 2264

January 27, 2009

Dear Chairman and Members of the Senate Natural Resources Committee:

I regret that I am not able to attend the hearing regarding SB 2264 and offer my written testimony.

The southwestern communities and businesses of our state would benefit greatly by the option of offering a "special season-long nonresident small game license". The area's recipients of the primary sector dollars from nonresident hunters would be enhanced by SB 2264.

Options of purchasing this license would increase not only the amount of dollars spent in North Dakota communities, but also the local and regional airports that include fixed based operators (FBO).

Numerous businesses that are connected by the hunting experiences rely on the income that is generated by all hunters. The distinction for the "special season-long nonresident small game license", SB 2264, is the additional out of state, new wealth that is brought into North Dakota.

Please support SB 2264.

Sincerely,

Terri Thiel
Executive Director

Cass County
WILDLIFE CLUB

Box 336
Casselton, ND 58012

*Same
given to
House*



**TESTIMONY OF FOSTER RAY HAGER
CASS COUNTY WILDLIFE CLUB**

PRESENTED TO THE SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

on

SB 2264

January 29, 2009

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The Cass County Wildlife Club, is opposed to this bill because we feel the Game & Fish Department has a very good nonresident small game license policy now.

First fourteen days is only \$7.14 a day. All other licenses purchased are \$6.07 a day. The club feels that the price is not too high and there is no limit on the number of licenses that may be purchased.

The licenses may be divided into ^{two} seven day periods. Seven day periods coincide with the nonresident duck and goose licenses.

Youth that are in school will be dealing with nonresidents almost every weekend.



Roger Kaseman, representing the North Dakota Wildlife Federation
701-751-0882

Testimony opposing SB 2264

Mister Chairman, members of the committee, the North Dakota Wildlife Federation opposes SB 2264. We urge the members of this committee to vote do not pass recommendation.

Unlimited non-resident hunting had a negative impact on small game populations in the 70's. That negative impact led to the 14 day restriction that is part of the license structure in place today. This legislature enacted the 14 day restriction to ease hunting pressure on our small game.

Hunting pressure is not the only pressure our game faces.

Mister Chairman, members of this committee, our game, small and large, is in the middle of one of the hardest winters on record. This is not the best time to tinker with the licensing structure we have in place. Not when Hunters are holding their breath hoping that our game survives without a catastrophic loss.

Leave the present license structure alone. The present structure is a known; this proposed change is an unknown. The law of unintended consequences is sure to apply. We will in all probability have less game when this winter ends. Making a change that will apply more hunting pressure on is our game is not the right thing to do.

The NDWF is not opposed to changing the license structure, if that change benefits game. The North Dakota Wildlife Federation understands that licensing structures, both resident and non-resident, are a tool used to manage pressure on game. Based on the hard winter our game is enduring and the probable mortality rate, the NDWF believes now is not the time to tinker with the licensing structure. We urge the members of this committee to vote a do not pass recommendation.

Thank you.

Roger Kaseman, representing the North Dakota Wildlife Federation
701-751-0882

Testimony opposing SB 2264

Mister Chairman, members of the committee, the North Dakota Wildlife Federation opposes SB 2264. We urge the members of this committee to vote do not pass recommendation.

Unlimited non-resident hunting had a negative impact on small game populations in the 70's. This legislature enacted restrictions on non-residents to ease hunting pressure on our small game.

Our game, small and large, are at the tail end of one of the hardest winters on record. Resident hunters are holding their breath hoping that our game survives without a catastrophic loss. This is not the best time to tinker with the licensing structure we have in place.

Leave the present license structure alone. The present structure is a known; this proposed change is an unknown. The law of unintended consequences is sure to apply. We will have less game when this winter ends. Making a change that will apply more hunting pressure on is our game is not the right thing to do.

Licensing structures, resident and non-resident, are a tool used to manage pressure on game. Based on the hard winter our game is enduring and the probable mortality rate, the NDWF believes now is not the time to tinker with the licensing structure. We urge the members of this committee to vote a do not pass recommendation.

Thank you.



United Sportsmen of North Dakota

Attachment #3

Post Office Box 272
Bismarck, ND 58502

www.unitedsportsmen-nd.org

E-mail: info@unitedsportsmen-nd.org

Board of Directors

Chairman
Sheldon Cieslak
Hazen, ND
(701) 748-6248

Area 1 Director
Cory Paryzek
Williston, ND
(701) 774-3744

Area 2 Director
Chad Schweitzer
Berthold, ND
(701) 453-3522

Area 3 Director
Mike Liane
Devils Lake, ND
(701) 393-4349

Area 6 Director
Sheldon Cieslak
Hazen, ND
(701) 748-6248

Area 7 Director
Dennis Kraft
Jamestown, ND
(701) 952-4993

Area 9 Director
John Askew
Fargo, ND
(701) 297-7676

**Landowner/
Sportsmen
Council**
Larry Kukla
Jamestown, ND
(701) 252-2811

Lobbyist
Clarence Bina
Bismarck, ND
(701) 527-1608

Secretary
Nancy Buechler
Bismarck, ND
(701) 222-3499

TESTIMONY OF CLARENCE A. BINA UNITED SPORTSMEN OF NORTH DAKOTA PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MARCH 5, 2009

SENATE BILL 2264

Chairman Porter and members of the Committee:

I am Clarence A. Bina, and I am speaking on behalf of the United Sportsmen of North Dakota. The United Sportsmen of North Dakota has a membership of 655 individuals and its Purposes, Objectives, and Activities are described in the USND Brochure before you.

The United Sportsmen of North Dakota opposes SB 2264 for the following reasons:

First, the United Sportsmen of North Dakota thinks that the current nonresident licensing structure is appropriate as it stands in both duration and fee level. Given the winter game-killing weather we are experiencing with estimates of pheasant die-off of 50% across the State, now is not the time to experiment with adding more nonresident hunters to the anticipated reduced numbers of pheasants with a "special season-long nonresident small game license." Currently, nonresident hunters can hunt four (4) weeks with the purchase of two (2) \$85 nonresident upland game licenses which should provide for enough daily limits for these hunters as is currently available to them.

Second, while \$40 of the \$170 license is going to support the private lands open to sportsmen (PLOTS) program and the \$40 may seem to be a benefit to North Dakota hunters, the PLOTS program does not appear to be threatened as it is currently supported. The variables of market for agricultural products are too dynamic at this time to assume that farmers/operators will continue to move significant PLOTS acres into production, thus reducing hunting access and opportunity.

Third, as indicated in the Fiscal Note to this bill, the North Dakota Game and Fish Department stands to lose as much as \$10,000 per year. This loss is at the expense of North Dakota sportsmen who will have to subsidize this loss. Our experience tells us that nonresident hunters find the current expense for nonresident licenses is not a burden relative to their other costs for lodging, meals/lodging, and significant transportation expenses.

Last, the United Sportsmen of North Dakota has learned to expect the unexpected when it comes of bills of this nature which can be amended after testimony is taken to alter the original intent of the bill, e.g., what the Senate did in amending HB1216.

The United Sportsmen of North Dakota encourages the Committee a Do Not Pass on SB 2264 as written.

United Sportsmen of North Dakota (USND)

The United Sportsmen of North Dakota (USND) was organized in 1975 to provide representation at the legislature for sportsmen. Today, the fate of all outdoor activity, particularly hunting and trapping, lies in the hands of the political process. Legislative sessions continue to have a flood of bills, good and bad, dealing with outdoor issues. To have any impact on these bills, sportsmen have to be politically active.

USND provides two annual scholarships to deserving students majoring in the Wildlife or Biology field.

USND will continue to support all efforts, public and private, to improve and expand good wildlife habitat.

Who are the members of USND?

- We are businessmen, farmers, ranchers, government employees, salesmen, trappers, fishermen, conservationists and others.
- We are men and women who share a deep concern for wildlife and its future in North Dakota; who pursue field sports, especially hunting and fishing and who abide by the code of fair play.

Purposes & Objectives:

- To provide a state-wide organization that will encompass all individuals interested in environment, habitat, conservation, hunting, ranching, farming, fishing, trapping, hiking, or any other outdoor activity.
- To promote the welfare and conservation of all game animals and birds, and the preservation of their existing habitat and improvement thereof.
- To promote and encourage better landowner/sportsmen relationships.
- To promote a healthy and satisfying outdoor and recreational potential for everyone in North Dakota.
- To protect and preserve an individuals constitutional right to keep and bear arms.
- To encourage, above all, good sportsmanship; respect for all game animals, birds and fish; respect for game laws; respect for private as well as public property; and a deep and sincere regard for the natural beauties of our state.

What does USND offer you...

- USND is one of the few sportsmen organizations in the state that hires a full time lobbyist to track bills and testify on the sportsmen's behalf during the legislative sessions.
- USND has up-to-date information on outdoor related bills and furnishes its members with a legislative report outlining the outcome of legislation affecting sportsmen.
- USND participates in Game & Fish Advisory meetings and maintains a liaison with the Game & Fish Department.
- USND has a centralized State Office with local Area Chapters to provide statewide communications.
- USND provides a strong, unified voice in outdoor issues affecting North Dakota sportsmen.
- USND is recognized as one of the leading sportsmen's organizations in the state.

United
Sportsmen
Of
North Dakota



PO Box 272
Bismarck, ND 58502
(701) 222-3499
www.unitedsportsmen-nd.org

United Sportsmen
Of North Dakota
PO Box 272
Bismarck, ND 58502

Membership Application

United Sportsmen of North Dakota - P.O. Box 272, Bismarck, ND 58502
Your lifeline to continued hunting and fishing in North Dakota

Be a part of this great organization -- Your \$10 membership provides representation for you at the legislative session.
Together we can make a difference for the future of sportsmen.

Name: _____

Address _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone: _____ E-Mail: _____

_____	Yearly Membership	\$10.00
_____	Life Membership	\$150.00
_____	Scholarship Fund Contribution	
_____	Legislative Fund Contribution	
_____	Total Enclosed	

ATTACHMENT # 4

North Dakota

Tourism Alliance Partnership

P.O. Box 2599
Bismarck, ND 58502
(701) 355-4458
FAX (701) 223-4645

2008-2009 MEMBERS

Basin Electric
Power Cooperative

Bismarck-Mandan CVB

Buffalo City Tourism

Destination Marketing
Association of North Dakota

Devils Lake CVB

Dickinson CVB

Fargo-Moorhead CVB

Abraham
Lincoln Foundation

Greater Grand Forks CVB

International Peace Garden

Lewis & Clark Fort
Mandan Foundation

Municipal Airport Authority
of the City of Fargo

ND Aeronautics Commission

ND Tourism Division

Newman Outdoor Advertising

Norsk Hostfest Association

Odney Communications Group

Select Inn of Bismarck

Spirit Lake Casino and Resort

State Historical Society of
North Dakota Foundation

Theodore Roosevelt
Medora Foundation

Woodland Resort, Inc.

Testimony of Dana Bohn Tourism Alliance Partnership Executive Director SB 2264 March 5, 2009

Chairman Porter and members of the committee, my name is Dana Bohn. As executive director of the Tourism Alliance Partnership (TAP), I am here today asking for your support of SB 2264. TAP is a coalition of tourism-related industries, including CVBs, state attractions, businesses and other interested stakeholders.

Tourism is one of the largest industries in North Dakota and offers some of the best opportunities for economic growth for the state. As you know, hunting and fishing are important components of our industry. Tourism businesses want visitors to come to North Dakota as often as possible. These are trying times for the tourism industry nationwide because people have less discretionary dollars. We believe that providing more flexibility by allowing non-residents to purchase special season-long small game licenses will help attract additional visitors to North Dakota.

This bill is consistent with our hunting legislative policy, which states that we support hunting legislation that promotes free enterprise, encourages additional public access and has a positive economic impact on North Dakota.

North Dakota is attractive to outdoor enthusiasts from around the country. According to North Dakota Game and Fish, more than 53 percent of all small game licenses in 2007 were issued to non-residents. Non-resident hunters spent \$7.1 million on licenses that year.

Creating more flexibility by allowing non-residents to purchase special season-long small game licenses and increasing the time they spend in North Dakota will have a positive economic impact on the state of North Dakota, especially the rural communities that host many of these sportsmen. Local tourism-related businesses will benefit from extended hunter stays, which this bill encourages.

We urge your support of SB 2264.

Porter, Todd K.

From: kmonson@daktel.com
Sent: Thursday, March 05, 2009 10:40 AM
To: Porter, Todd K.
Subject: 2264

Dear Chairman Porter,

I am asking to enter this note as written testimony for a do not pass committee vote on 2264.

A season long NR upland license is unwarranted. We are under the effects of a brutal winter for wildlife and a major loss of CRP habitat to the tune of 600,000 plus acres with more acres coming out each year. More hunting pressure-less habitat.

In addition the cost of this license is a rummage sale price of our pheasants compared to what SD charges. Why should ND be the Walmart of wildlife to other states when they have destroyed their natural resources?

If CVBs and commercializers of wildlife need more tourism they could have easily have drawn that business with the Community PLOTS program. Didn't happen. They could have used the CAP (Community Access Program) drawn up by the ND Landowner-Sportsman Council. Didn't happen. The Council mailed this outline of CAP to 20 communities in the highest hunting use areas. There was not one reply.

As a member of the Council, I presented the CAP plan to the ND Department of Tourism, thinking the ones asking for a tourism increase should be part of the solution. Part of Ms. [redacted] comments to me were that her family had to post their own property because of the number of hunters. What's wrong with that picture?

These commercializers of wildlife would sooner change the law that address the access problems in their own back yard. We need to address access and habitat, not cheap license fees for NRs.

Thank you, Dick Monson, Barnes County Wildlife Federation memeber



Senate Natural Resources Committee
North Dakota State Capitol
600 E. Boulevard Ave.
Bismarck, ND 58505-0360

Re: SB 2264

March 4, 2009

Dear Chairman and Members of the House Natural Resources Committee:

I regret that I am not able to attend the hearing regarding SB 2264 due to the weather and offer my written testimony.

The southwestern communities and businesses of our state would benefit greatly by the option of offering a "special season-long nonresident small game license". The area's recipients of the primary sector dollars from nonresident hunters would be enhanced by SB 2264.

Options of purchasing this license would increase not only the amount of dollars spent in North Dakota communities, but also the local and regional airports that include fixed based operators (FBO).

Numerous businesses that are connected by the hunting experiences rely on the income that is generated by all hunters. The distinction for the "special season-long nonresident small game license", SB 2264, is the additional out of state, new wealth that is brought into North Dakota.

Please support SB 2264.

Sincerely,

Terri Thiel
Executive Director