

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2170

2001 SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES

SB 2170

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2170

Senate Natural Resources Committee

Conference Committee

Hearing Date 1-11-01

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1	X		37.2 -end
1		X	Start - 37.1
Jan. 12 1	X		20.4 - 39.9
Committee Clerk Signature <i>Janet Garrison</i>			

Minutes:

SENATOR THOMAS FISCHER, Committee Chairman opened the Committee meeting.

Attendance was taken with all Committee members present.

SENATOR FISCHER: opened the hearing of Bill 2170: A BILL RELATING TO HUNTING BY NONRESIDENT YOUTH.

SENATOR EVERY presented Bill 2170 as the sponsor of the bill. (See attached testimony).

SENATOR KELSH: asked how the numbers were used to calculate the economic details.

DEAN HILDEBRAND, Director of the State Game and Fish Department, explained this was only an estimate and had no idea what the numbers would be.

RANDY FROST, Executive Vice President of the Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce testified in support of Bill 2170. He wanted to point out first the economic value of the bill and the positive effect it would have not only in the Devils Lake area but the entire state. The second point would be the issue of continuing the sporting tradition in American. What better

opportunity do we have to show case North Dakota and what the state has to offer. This bill of reciprocity for out of state youth would be economically valuable for now and in the future.

SENATOR EVERY: questioned how do you use our resources to attract business for economic growth to North Dakota.

RANDY FROST: suggested using our commerce department through tourism and joint marketing effort to show case what the state has to offer.

SENATOR TOLLEFSON: questioned reciprocity of other states in regard to youth hunting and why some of these states are not interested in reciprocity.

SENATOR TOLLEFSON: questioned the individual difference of dollar amount between the resident and out of state license for 16 year old.

DEAN HILDEBRAND: passed out a nonresident application for license to hunt in North Dakota. The back side of the application has a map of states we have reciprocity for youth hunting.

SENATOR TRAYNOR: wanted to clarify that a youth under the age of 16 does not need a license to hunt in North Dakota and that if this bill passes a nonresident youth under 16 years of age would have the same privileges.

DEAN HILDEBRAND: confirmed the question and clarified that the he was neutral on the bill.

SENATOR TRAYNOR: asked how solid the fiscal note on the bill was.

DEAN HILDEBRAND: the fiscal note was not very solid but based on their best estimate and that it could be much more or much less. The fiscal note is a sort of scientific guess at best.

SENATOR TRAYNOR: asked if the economic benefits are counter balanced to the lose of revenue.

DEAN HILDEBRAND: he thought they might be.

SENATOR TRAYNOR: testified in favor of the bill expressing his personal experiences of out of state youth hunting and it's economic impact.

MIKE DONAHUE: representing the North Dakota Wildlife Federation and the United Sports of North Dakota presented testimony opposing Bill 2170. (See attached testimony).

SENATOR TRAYNOR: asked if his two organizations have been involved in negotiations with other states for hunting reciprocity

MIKE DONAHUE: not to his knowledge.

LARRY KNOBLICH: the Executive Director of the North Dakota Sportsman Alliance presented testimony opposing Bill 2170. (See attached testimony).

SENATOR KELSH: thinks reciprocity will be advantageous to the state because our state is the one with the great and abundant hunting.

SENATOR EVERY: questioned Dean Hildebrand if there is law enforcement problem with non residents coming into the state and is the amount of non residents coming into the state manageable as far as the Game & Fish Department concerned.

DEAN HILDEBRAND: all hunters are treated the same. Manageability depends on situation and conditions of hunting and the number of hunters and is manageable depending upon legislation and provisions made for his department.

PAUL CLARY, a member of the Cass county Wildlife Club testified in opposition of Bill 2170 for reasons already stated.

SENATOR FISCHER : closed the hearing on Bill 2170.

January 12, 2001

Discussion was held on Bill 2170.

SENATOR TRAYNOR: made a motion for "DO PASS" of Bill 2170.

Page 4

Senate Natural Resources Committee

Bill/Resolution Number SB 2170

Hearing Date 1-11-01

SENATOR EVERY: second the motion.

Discussion was held.

SENATOR CHRISTMANN: wished to express his opposition to the bill keep the status quo and to delay the consideration of this bill content.

SENATOR EVERY: feels we need to also be concerned about the benefit of the economic impact of the small communities.

SENATOR FISCHER: questioned whether passing of this bill will make a difference to this state.

SENATOR TOLLEFSON: was torn about the bill, feeling that hunters will come to our state. He saw no real advantage in changing the present status and feels the present law does a fine job. The discussion continued as to striking a balance of protection and rights of North Dakota residents, the state's natural resources of sufficient wildlife and economic growth.

SENATOR TOLLEFSON: called for the question.

Roll vote was taken indicating 4 YEAS, 3 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING.

SENATOR EVERY will carry Bill 2170.

FISCAL NOTE
 Requested by Legislative Council
 12/27/2000

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2170

Amendment to:

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.*

	1999-2001 Biennium		2001-2003 Biennium		2003-2005 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues				(\$100,000)		(\$100,000)
Expenditures						
Appropriations						

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

1999-2001 Biennium			2001-2003 Biennium			2003-2005 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2. Narrative: *Identify the aspects of the measure which cause fiscal impact and include any comments relevant to your analysis.*

It is estimated that with this bill, 750 nonresident hunters would become eligible each year to purchase cheaper resident hunting licenses. This would reduce North Dakota hunting license revenue by about \$50,000 per year.

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.*

Revenue would be reduced by \$100,000 per biennium.

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.*

None

C. Appropriations: *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, of the effect on the biennial appropriation for each agency and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget. Indicate the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations.*

None

Name:	Paul Schadewald	Agency:	ND Game and Fish Department
Phone Number:	328-0325	Date Prepared:	01/02/2001

Date: 1-12-01
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2001 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2170

Senate NATURAL RESOURCES Committee

Subcommittee on _____
or
 Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Pass

Motion Made By Senator Traynor Seconded By Senator Every

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Sen. Thomas Fischer, Chairman		✓	Sen. Michael A. Every	✓	
Sen. Ben Tollefson, Vice Chair.		✓	Sen. Jerome Kelsh	✓	
Sen. Randel Christmann		✓			
Sen. Layton Freborg	✓				
Sen. John T. Traynor	✓				

Total (Yes) 4 No 3

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Senator Every

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

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
January 12, 2001 10:46 a.m.

Module No: SR-04-0928
Carrier: Every
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2170: Natural Resources Committee (Sen. Fischer, Chairman) recommends DO PASS
(4 YEAS, 3 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2170 was placed on the
Eleventh order on the calendar.

2001 TESTIMONY

SB 2170

January 11, 2001

Mr. Chairman, fellow legislators, and those concerned. I am here today as the sponsor of Senate Bill 2170.

Over the last several days as part of the 57th legislative assembly and throughout the last year or so of our campaigns, we in North Dakota have talked a lot about economic development and the need within our state to enhance economic development. We have also heard much discussion on out-migration and youth and how we might attract and keep them in our state.

Senate Bill 2170 is a bill that will amend and reenact the North Dakota Century Code relating to hunting by non-resident youths. The current legislation says that a non-resident youth can purchase a resident small game hunting license and may hunt small game and waterfowl provided that the non-resident youth's state of residence provides a reciprocal licensing agreement for North Dakota Residents who are less than sixteen years of age.

It is our belief that by eliminating the requirement of reciprocity, we will enhance our tourism and economic development capability and will have an opportunity to showcase our state, to out of state youth, as a great place to hunt, fish, go to school etc...

Perhaps it is a kid who is considering a college and remembers the great outdoor activity that North Dakota had to offer. Maybe it's a youth from a family that has roots in North Dakota, has left, and returns only to realize the way of life he has left behind. Hunting, fishing, and the outdoors are honorable and ethical types of activities that we should be encouraging and teaching to our youth.

The cost of this bill to the ND Game and Fish Department is estimated to be \$100,000 per biennium. This number is based on an additional 750 non-resident hunters eligible to purchase cheaper resident hunting licenses. This would reduce North Dakota hunting license revenue by about \$50,000 each year. It is my belief that this number is insignificant compared to the economic impact of the additional traffic entering our state. It is also my

understanding that the North Dakota Game and Fish Department, at this time, is in excellent financial condition.

I will use the example of a close friend of mine, a father from Wisconsin that has two boys and would have liked to bring both to North Dakota for waterfowl hunting, but was reluctant to bring both based on financial ability. He compromises and brings only one this year, and the other next year. With this legislation, it would be possible to bring both this year and both next year.

Let's assume that the average out of state hunter conservatively spends only \$75 each day, and will stay in the state for 3 days. He will buy gas, food, lodging, ammunition, etc...

Lets assume that SB 2170 doubled the # of kids (750)

750 kids
<u>\$150 per day</u>
\$112,500
<u>X 3 Days</u>
\$337,500 Annually

Typically, according to the North Dakota Tax Department, the economic impact of that money turns over with a multiplier of 3. This circulates \$1,012,500 into the state economy.

Opponents of this amendment will argue that it is not fair that our kids will not have the same special treatment when they go to South Dakota, Montana or Minnesota. The chances that our kids would need to go there to hunt when they have some the best waterfowl hunting in the world right at home would be slim. This same argument could also apply for pheasants and upland game. I would have to wonder if this is not arguing a moot point, while at the same time, shooting ourselves in the foot, by not taking advantage of the opportunity to showcase our great state to youth.

Others will say that availability of hunting land is scarce and that we need to protect it for our own. This in part could be true in some areas of the state, however, by bringing in youth, with their parents, they would be hunting together on land that has already been secured. It is unlikely that the father and his children would hunt in different areas.

Then there is the question of wildlife management. The North Dakota

