

FISCAL NOTE

Bill #: SB0437

Title: Special landowner big game license
based on acreage

**Primary
Sponsor:** Mack Cole

Status: As Introduced

Sponsor signature	Date	Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	---------------------------------	------

Fiscal Summary

	<u>FY2002 Difference</u>	<u>FY2003 Difference</u>
Exenditures:		
State Special Revenue	Unknown	Unknown
Revenue:		
State Special Revenue	Unknown	Unknown
Net Impact on General Fund Balance:	(\$0)	(\$0)

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
	X	Significant Local Gov. Impact	X		Technical Concerns
	X	Included in the Executive Budget		X	Significant Long-Term Impacts
	X	Dedicated Revenue Form Attached		X	Family Impact Form Attached

Fiscal Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Each qualifying property in Section 1 will utilize the complimentary program to the full extent (2 deer/2 antelope)
2. It is unknown how many landowners will qualify and participate in the complimentary program in Section 1. Landowners who receive complimentary licenses probably would have purchased a deer license at the regular price of \$13. The second complimentary license will be given to a person who also would have purchased a deer license at the regular price of \$13. Similarly, landowners may have purchased antelope licenses at the regular price of \$11. A loss of revenue will occur as a result, but the amount is difficult to quantify because of the unknown number of potential participants.

3. It is unknown how many landowners will qualify and participate in the complimentary program in Section 2. Landowners who receive the complimentary elk permit probably would have purchased the same permit at the regular price of \$3. A minimal loss of revenue will occur as a result, but the amount is difficult to quantify because of the unknown number of potential participants.
4. The need for supplemental game damage licenses identified in Section 3 is dependent upon multiple factors that are not within the agency's control, i.e. winter weather, summer fire season, etc.
5. Section 3 may result in new revenues when supplemental game damage licenses are issued at regular prices. The amount of new revenue is difficult to quantify because of assumption #4.
6. The cost of producing complimentary licenses is insignificant; management of the contracting and game damage components of the bill can be handled within current program budgets.

FISCAL IMPACT:

	<u>FY2002</u> <u>Difference</u>	<u>FY2003</u> <u>Difference</u>
<u>Expenditures:</u>		
Operating	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Funding:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Revenues:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Expenditure):</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	Unknown	Unknown

TECHNICAL NOTES:

1. It is not clear whether a "large landowner" could split their property into small 1,200 acre pieces and get more licenses than intended.
2. It is not clear if the intent is to allow a landowner who owns property that might span multiple hunting districts to hunt in all districts on one license or permit.
3. SB437 does not allow participation in the special drawings if the applicant is participating in this program. Applications for complimentary deer and antelope licenses (Section 1) and public hunting access agreements (Section 2) must be completed by June 1 of each year to allow for identification within the special drawings.
4. Under Section 3(4)(b), will hunters unsuccessful in the drawings for a license within a hunting district be offered the opportunity for a license before going to a first-come first-served?
5. No "regular" priced elk license exists for nonresidents.
6. It is unclear if an individual can harvest an elk, then receive another elk license under the damage hunt portion of this program and potentially harvest a second elk in the same license year.