

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

March 15, 1983

The meeting of The Fish and Game Committee was called to order by Chairman Ed B. Smith on March 15, 1983 at 1:00 P.M. in Room 325, State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: Senator Tveit was excused and all other members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 342:

AN ACT REPEALING SECTION 87-3-502, MCA, WHICH REQUIRES THE
TAGGING OF MARTEN PELTS

Representative Ellison, District #73, presented this bill to the committee as sponsor. He stated this simply repeals an old section of the law that required the tagging of marten pelts. It hasn't been used for years. The Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks wants to get it off the books.

Jim Flynn, Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, gave testimony in support of this bill. A copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit 1.

Robert VanDerVere is in support of this bill.

There were no opponents.

Chairman Smith asked for questions from the committee. There were none.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 342: Senator Lee made a motion that HB 342 be concurred in. The motion passed unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 335:

AN ACT TO INCREASE LICENSE FEES FOR ACTIVITIES REGULATED
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE, AND PARKS;

Representative Nilson, District #37, presented this bill to the committee. A copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit 2.

Jim Flynn, Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, gave testimony in support of this bill. A copy of his written statement is attached as Exhibit 3.

Ken Knudson, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation, gave testimony in support of this bill. A copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit 4.

Jim Spring, Billings, Montana, Governor's Council on Management, supports HB 345 with the recommendations made by the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks in their testimony. We looked at other states surrounding Montana and most of their fishing licenses were higher than the State of Montana. For that reason we recommended an increase by the legislature which would have given the Department 3.3 million dollars in new income. That is considerably more than the bill being presented to you today. The increases are minimal. The bill, as is submitted, without the recommendations by the Department, would create a deficit funding during the period in question and we would not support the bill without the recommendations by the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks.

Gregg Pauley, Walleyes Unlimited of Montana, gave testimony in support of HB 335. A copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit 5.

Michael Chandler, Western Montana Fish and Game Association, said his club testified in 1981 before a similar committee. At that time the Fish and Game Department did not get the funding they requested and as a result they are right back here again. The Fish and Game Department is a resource oriented part of our government. Instead of getting a resource response, we are getting a political response. Fisheries are part of the Fish and Game Department and the fishing license fees produce about 1/2 of the cost of the fisheries and enforcement. The \$7.00 license fee means a person can fish for 365 days a year at 1.9 cents per day. A \$15 or \$20 fishing license would be reasonable and would support the fisheries program that the sportsmen want. The sportsmen have supported these fish hatcheries.

Dale Dombrosky, Walleyes Unlimited, is in favor of a limited license increase if it will result in better fishing in Montana through the fish hatcheries.

John Dilley, Missoula, stated most well informed sportsmen who are worried about the future of hunting in Montana welcome the expenditure to preserve quality hunting and fishing in Montana. Sportsmen must do their part to finance the necessary programs. He would recommend raising non-resident licenses from \$275 to \$300 and non-resident fishing licenses from \$7.00 for 5 days to \$7.00 for 2 days.

Sam Babich, supports this bill. He thinks Mr. Flynn is doing an excellent job and would recommend that the Department's amendments be approved.

Kevin Wagner, Missoula, has been a hunter and fisherman most of his life. If you look at the history of hunting in Montana you will see things weren't always so rosy. Management brought back the big game to the state. We have enjoyed consecutive mild winters that have been easy on the big game herds. We will see the need to acquire big game winter range with the change in the winter weather pattern. If we don't raise funds for this purpose we will wish we had. He supports HB 335 with the changes recommended by the Department. He

personally is willing to support a \$2.00 increase in fishing license fees. He is willing to do this to continue quality hunting and fishing in Montana.

Janet Ellis, Montana Audubon Council, stated we have many members who hunt and fish and all our members are concerned about the wildlife in this state. The Department supports the license fee increases for their primary source of budget. We supported HB 335 in its original form and are favorable to the amendments to this bill in the areas the Department has outlined.

Dick Turner, Missoula, gave testimony in support of this bill. A copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit 6.

Chairman Smith asked for opponents.

Robert VanDerVere, representing the Senior Citizens, is opposed to this bill. We are talking about money that will be raised from fee increases. He questions the hatchery in Miles City as the water there is no good. The last session a similar fee increase was passed by the Fish and Game Committee. He lobbied in favor of that increase. He feels this time there is no reason for a fee increase.

Jerry Strong is opposed to this bill. He stated Mr. Flynn does a fine job at the Fish and Game Department but he needs some accountants. He went through the budget and couldn't figure out where the money went. It shifted from one fund to another and couldn't figure out where it was. Mr. Flynn says they know where it is. In 1980 they had 500 employees, in 1981 424, 76 less, but they raised the salary to \$651,000 above the 1980 figure. He does not mind the Fish and Game getting money but he would like to know where it is going. The outfitters have a direct line to the Department through the Outfitters Council and he feels they should start paying their fair share. The camping fee is only \$3.00. You could raise the camping fee a little bit if you want to generate some funds. Let some of the other people pay some of the costs instead of the hunters and fishermen. The out of staters should pay the fees? They own 50% of this state as it is owned by the federal government. They have to pay higher and higher fees to hunt on their own land. He would like the committee to find out where the money is being spent. He has gone through the reports and can't figure out where it is.

Del Palmer, Charlo, gave testimony in support of this bill. A copy of his statement is attached as Exhibit 7.

Representative Nilson closed by stating reference was made to the Miles City hatcheries. There were a lot of people who wanted warm water hatcheries. It is the desire of the Department to keep the hatcheries open to determine the best course of action for the future. The question on the reserve that the Department has. I keep a reserve in my check book and feel that a reserve is only good business. He feels the increases are minimal and are reasonable.

He wanted to point out that the Department does not appropriate money or set anybody's wages, the legislature does that.

Chairman Smith asked for questions from the committee.

Senator Smith said some of the testimony has indicated that they think the Fish and Game Department can almost spend money at will. That is not so. He has served since 1967 in the House and Senate Fish and Game Committees and the last three sessions has set the budget for the Fish and Game Department. The only time that we have had a serious problem was under a previous director. He will say that Jim Flynn is the best Fish and Game Director he has had the opportunity to work with in the sessions since 1967. In our subcommittee we reviewed this budget. The director was irritated because of the modifications made in the budget. We took information from both sides. He is a proponent to the bill as it presently stands and maybe should have stepped out of the chair to give his opinion. There were things in the budget that I did not support, like the Italian built airplane. I felt that an American plane would be just as good for less money. The subcommittee voted for this. The import fees alone would be \$8,000. With this proposal the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks would have \$1.3 million in their funding balance for day to day expenses. Attached is a copy of "License Fee Revenues and Expenditures" furnished by Senator Smith for the committee's reference (Exhibit 8).

Senator Mohar asked Jim Flynn if he had had time to go over the proposed budget by the House and Senate subcommittee and was he satisfied with that.

Mr. Flynn said for the record I was not irritated by the action taken by the joint subcommittee. As was mentioned in testimony at the subcommittee, the appropriation choices to date, tentative actions that have been taken, do provide for a good Fish and Wildlife resource program for the next two years. We run into some difficulties when we go beyond that. What is going to happen to the pay plan? Are the agencies going to absorb within the budget. If the pay plan is funded for 3% or 4% or whatever, then we have got to make adjustments in those fees. The subject of the balance keeps coming up. We went through this last session. We did borrow out of the general fund February, March and April and started getting our money in and the thing took off. Two circumstances occurred since last session. Use of overhead money and the other was the double sale in one fiscal year of two different non-resident combination licenses. Those two primarily contributed to a large funding balance. We do anticipate spending that down. It would be my estimation, at this time, with the fees that have been approved by the House and with tentative approval on the long range building program, we would be in a deficit position probably at least for as many as 7 months in the next two years. That is with no pay plan. If we are going to get a way from that deficit position, as best projected at this time, we will need the requested increases to cover that potential and we may have a difference of opinion between

our Department and the Fiscal Analyst's office.

Senator Mohar said we would be in a deficit for so many months but would that average out for the whole year that there wouldn't be a deficit.

Mr. Flynn said at the end of the year there wouldn't be a deficit. We are unlike state agencies who get money from the general fund or get all their money in at once and spend it down. In the spring we receive money from the sale of fishing license and in the fall from the sale of big game licenses. We might end February, March and April in a deficit position but by the end of June we usually have got our money back so we are not in a deficit position.

Senator Smith asked what he thought the ending balance should be.

Mr. Flynn said a million dollar balance was probably adequate when the license revenue was running from 6 to 8 million dollars a year. License revenue is now 13 million dollars a year and one million in reserve is not enough to carry over. Expenditures and income reserves should go up. He would suppose we would be looking at a 1.5 million or 1.6 million in reserve.

Senator Lane asked Mr. Flynn to explain in detail the double license revenue in one year.

Mr. Flynn said the license year for the Department does not run concurrent with the fiscal year. The license year starts April 1 and when we put our licenses on sale April 1 for the non-resident combination license, which is a big revenue earner for the Department, the first year they didn't all sell until September 15 and every year since they have been backing up. What happened last year is the licenses went on sale April 1st and were sold out by July 15th of 1982. The licenses then went back on sale in April on the next calendar year and were sold out before July 1st. So the total for two years was in that year end balance and that came up to four million thirty thousand dollars. We know that balance is there and we are trying to spend it down in proportion.

Senator Lee asked Mr. Flynn to explain the justification for the Italian made airplane.

Mr. Flynn said the airplane that we are replacing is a single engine Cessna 180 and is 20 years old. We use the plane for planting fish in mountain lakes and for transportation of Department personnel. In addition, we use it somewhat for game counts and flying night patrol to attempt to apprehend spotlighting poachers. The Cessna does not make this type of airplane anymore so we went into the market place to look for alternatives. We looked at two

single engine airplanes, as well as the P68 airplane, which is the question of concern. In looking at the performance standards of all three airplanes the P68 comes out with advantages worthwhile. It is a twin engine, takes a shorter runway for takeoff and landing, is a high wing aircraft for better visibility and it has the option of a bubble windshield like a helicopter. This would enhance the ability of planting fish in mountain lakes and for game counting. The twin engine is an advantage for night patrol and we would not have to charter an aircraft when we go to other parts of the state. We weighed heavily on the fact the aircraft is designed and constructed in Italy. Although, 90% of the parts are made in America. This twin engine aircraft has an hourly operating cost of \$80.00 an hour, compared to \$87.00 an hour for single engine and \$92.00 an hour for a twin engine.

Senator Severson asked if they were taking into account the cost of the Cessna.

Mr. Flynn said we are not taking into account the cost of depreciation but even with depreciation it still comes out cheaper. It is hard to go with an aircraft for depreciation. Twenty years ago we paid \$20,000 for the Cessna and we will get \$30,000 regardless.

Senator Severson asked if the Cessna 180 cost \$80.00 to operate in the air.

Mr. Flynn said we took into consideration on all the planes the gas and oil use but not the pilots time. That would be a constant factor.

Senator Smith said for the committees knowledge he spoke with an individual who sells planes and he has some information on the aircraft in question. It flies at 166 knots, can be purchased for \$177,000, plus the \$8,000 import duty.

Mr. Flynn said the person that gave that information was not aware of the options on this airplane.

Senator Smith said he would get more information on it later. He requested the committee to address the question of fee increases.

Senator Jacobson asked Mr. Flynn for his reaction to the non-resident fishing license being changed from 2 days to 5 days.

Mr. Flynn said we originally requested to the House that the license be increased from \$4.00 to \$6.00 for the non-resident 2 day license. They increased it from \$4.00 to \$7.00 but changed it to a 5 day license. He has no problem with what the House did as long as it is changed back to a 2 day license. What the House did was to probably lose revenue as opposed to adding revenue.

Senator Mohar asked if the headquarters in Great Falls needed funding as it is his understanding that a state highway will be going through the building.

Mr. Flynn said we get our budget impacted by something that is going on in another part of the legislative process. Depending on what happens with highway construction funding the highway may go through the headquarters in the next two years and may not. Three headquarters were not approved but I will be talking to the long range committee to consider the Glasgow headquarters. The ones in Bozeman and Great Falls we do not plan to request funding.

Senator Mohar asked if the highway does end up going through, will the Highway Department have to build a new building.

Senator Smith said they will have to pay for the property.

Mr. Flynn said that is part of the problem. The land that the building sits on belongs to the State Land Department. It is a metal building and its condemned value would be \$20,000. If the highway goes through in the next year we have got a monumental problem on our hands.

Senator Smith asked Will Brook to present his amendment to the bill.

Will Brook, on behalf of the Montana Woolgrowers and Montana Stockgrowers Association and State Grazing Districts, would like to present to the committee an amendment to this bill which would take care of the problem of surplus cow elk in certain areas of the state. Presently the Department can issue cow permits during the regular season on a drawing basis or can have damage hunts after the season. The problem with the cow permit drawings is that in some instances the hunter retains the cow permit in hopes of finding a bull and if possible shoots the bull and does not utilize the cow elk tag. In the case of the damage hunts, land owners feel that the hunting season is too long and after that they do not have the time to put forth the effort for a special hunt. Their solution, after working it out with the legal staff and the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, is to issue a Class A-7 cow elk tag at a cost of \$8.00. He read the amendment to the committee, which is attached as Exhibit 9. The idea is to issue a permit during the regular season which would mandate the holder to use the tag for a cow elk. The commission has the authority and control over this tag holder and may freeze areas at any time. There may be some administration problems with this but he believes Jim Flynn can work these problems out.

Mons Tiegen has discussed this and would agree that they have problems with cow elk numbers in certain areas.

Jim Flynn stated he has discussed this in some detail with the stockgrowers and he has no problem with the amendment.

Fish and Game Committee
March 15, 1983
Page Eight

Representative Nilson said he has heard some discussion on this matter. Landowners are in favor of the concept but he questions whether this should be a separate bill. If this committee chooses to attached this amendment to this bill he will definitely try to get it through the House. It is not within the scope of the title of the bill.

Senator Smith said this is a serious problem and he has heard from a lot of people who say they have a large number of elk and only a few calves with those elk. There are too many cows for the number of bulls. He feels this is a problem that should be addressed and he thinks it can be done this way.

Senator Severson asked Mr. Flynn if on the elk permits if they could make the elk permits cow permits.

Mr. Flynn said that is exactly what they are.

Senator Smith questions whether there should be a statement of intent to the bill to clarify the rule making authority.

Senator Mohar asked if the bill could be amended to \$10.00 for a cow elk permit.

Mr. Brook said one of the reasons we proposed the \$8.00 fee was we wanted to give an economic incentive to the serious meat hunter.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M.


ED B. SMITH, Chairman

ROLL CALL

FISH & GAME

COMMITTEE

48th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1983

Date 3-15-83

[illegible]

MARCH 15, 1983

FISH & GAME COMMITTEE

| NAME | REPRESENTING | BILL # | Check One | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Support | Oppose |
| Del Palmer | Charles Area Farmers | HB 335 | | X |
| GREGG PAULEY | WALLEYES UNLIMITED OF | #335 | X | |
| Dale Dombraskey | MONT MONTANA WALLEYES Unlimited | #335 | X | |
| Jim Sprung | Gov. Council MONT | #335 | X | |
| Lam Babich | CONCERNED HUNTERS | 335 | X | |
| Altha Babich | " " | 335 | X | |
| JERRY E. STRONG | Self | | | X |
| Ken Knudson | MT Wildlife Fed | 335 | X | |
| Robert Vanderkoo | Self | 335 | | X |
| Jim Flynn | DEPT FWP | 335 | X | |
| Will Broofe | MT Stockraisers / MT Wildlife | 335 | X | |
| Janet Ellis | MT Audubon Council | 335 | X | |
| Michael Chandler | West. Mont. Fish & Game Assoc. | 335 | X | |
| John Dalseg | Self | 335 | X | |
| Dick Turner | 5-Valley Archery Minors | 335 | X | |
| Kevin Wagner | Self | 335 | X | |

DATE: MARCH 15, 1983

COMMITTEE ON FISH & GAME COMMITTEE

VISITORS' REGISTER

| NAME | REPRESENTING | BILL # | Check One | |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Support | Oppose |
| Mark | | 335 | | |
| Maurice Tasson | " | | | |
| Mark | " | | | |
| Mark | " | | | |
| Mark | " | | | |
| MARTY GRUND | " | | | |
| Robert | | | | |
| Clay Christensen | Polson High School | 335 | ✓ | |
| Doug Baker | Polson High School | 335 | | X |
| | " | 335 | ✓ | |
| Jeffrey | | | | ✓ |
| Todd Vandenberg | Polson High School | 335 | ✓ | |
| | | | ✓ | |
| Wanda | Polson High School | 335 | | ✓ |
| Mike | " | 335 | ✓ | |
| Todd Nicholson | Corvallis High School | 335 | ✓ | |
| Robert | " | 335 | | |
| Roder Nielsen | " | 335 | ✓ | |
| Mike Jones | Polson High School | 335 | | |

DATE MARCH 15, 1983COMMITTEE ON FISH & GAME COMMITTEE

VISITORS' REGISTER

| NAME | REPRESENTING | BILL # | Check One | |
|--------------------|------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| | | | Support | Oppose |
| Victor Rice | Broadwater County H.S. | 360 | | ✓ |
| Mraig Masalo | Broadwater County H.S. | 335 | | ✓ |
| Dave Spitzer | " " | 148 | ✓ | |
| Ira Herrington | " " | 384 | ✓ | |
| Jack Pearson | " " | 141 | ✓ | |
| Connie Sauterberry | Broadwater County High | 808 | | ✓ |
| Dora Croom | " " | 808 | | ✓ |
| Dixie Shively | Broadwater Co. H.S. | 808 | | ✓ |
| Debbie Nichols | Broadwater Co. H.S. | 808 | | ✓ |
| Joe Cayer | Broadwater Co. H.S. | 808 | | ✓ |
| Stephen Cook | Broadwater Co. H.S. | 808 | | ✓ |
| Kerry Mery | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Paul R. Rausser | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Tracey James | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Indie Reed | " " | 808 | | ✓ |
| Steven Smith | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Rick Hoffman | " " | 335 | | X |
| John Tintner | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Shawn Puhl | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Dorey Shyler | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Bert Cabbon | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Nandy Olsen | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Curt Gator | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Jan Rowland | " " | 335 | | ✓ |
| Charlene Brandon | " " | 335 | ✓ | |

DATE MARCH 15, 1983

COMMITTEE ON

VISITORS' REGISTER

[illegible]

(This sheet to be used by those testify on a bill.)

NAME: Del Palmer DATE: Mar 15-83

ADDRESS: Box 55 - Charles Mont 59824

PHONE: 644-2770

REPRESENTING WHOM? Charles Area Farmers

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: H-B. 335

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? X

COMMENT: See attached written testimony

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

HB 342

Testimony presented by Jim Flynn, Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

March 15, 1983

The requirement by state law for the tagging and shipping of marten is no longer necessary as it was some 20 to 30 years ago. At the time this law was enacted the marten was an extremely valuable furbearer and this kind of attention was necessary. It should be noted that that time a number of furbearers were given specific attention in our state's statutes.

Over the past few decades, furbearer management and economics have come to determine the requirements necessary for each species involved. The requirements for tagging have been taken out of state law for most species during this time. However, the marten requirement still remains.

The Department feels that the marten can and should be managed with the same program as other furbearers and that the statutory requirement for tagging is unnecessary.

We urge your support of House Bill 342.

House Bill 335 - Testimony Submitted by Les Nilson, District #37 -
March 15, 1983

There are two equally important principles to consider as we consider fee increases. The first, I feel, is to consider the question, "What should a license be worth?" The second question is "How will these increases affect the budget and long-term affect to the resource, sportsmen and landowners and the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks ability to administer?"

Let's consider the first question, what should a license be worth? I believe I could justify the Department's requests in most cases. I received a ton of mail on this bill and at least half of it was in support of the bill as written. Let's remember we are talking about both quantity and quality of these resources.

The other question deals with the budget. The dilemma that I hope we can avoid can be characterized by the Highway problem. Suddenly, the roads are in bad condition and we have to pass a large gas tax increase to try to catch up. Even with a large increase the road program will still be behind. Let's not let our fisheries and buildings, fences and general property get in the same dilemma.

The House passed some very modest increases. I'm sure these will be addressed by Jim Flynn in his remarks.

However, there are three areas I feel we should address further. The first is the matter of the non-resident fishing license. The House changed this fee from a \$4.00, 2 day license to a \$7.00 5 day license. There has been much discussion, since that action, as to what effect, on revenue, this action will have. I hope this Senate committee can make an accurate guess and act accordingly.

Another minor concern deals with the trophy fee. The House increased mountain lion fees from \$5 to \$10 and added a trophy fee of \$50.00, if a person harvests a puma. The bill does not address Grizzly bear hunting, but that trophy fee is \$25.00. Perhaps those trophy fees should be consistent.

My last concern is much larger and that is with the non-resident B-10 license. The House did not change the price for that license at all. It seems unfair to our resident sportsmen that they should bear the cost of increases and the out-of-states have no increase. I don't feel an increase for B-10 licenses would be a problem because of the quality and quantity of our resources. Last year 17,000 were sold out by June 14th. This would be an important source of revenue for the future if we gave them a modest increase also.

Keeping these ideas in mind, I hope you "Do Concur" and if there are any amendments, I hope they are reasonable so the House can approve them too!

Thank you.

HB 335

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY JIM FLYNN, DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS
March 15, 1983

Two years ago the department presented to this committee during the 47th Legislature a license fee increase proposal. That proposal consisted of a three step process whereby license fees would have been raised in the years of 1981, 1982 and 1983.

That proposal was presented to fund a budget request that dealt with the cumulative impacts of some four years of high inflation and the anticipation that inflation rates would continue for two more years at reduced rates. I would point out that the budget request then presented dealt primarily with operations and in fact was an operations budget that included a 15 percent reduction in full time equivalent employees.

After considerable discussion, the 47th Session approved a good share of our requests for 1981 and 1982 and indicated to the department that we should address any future increases to the 48th Legislative Session.

As a result I appear before you this afternoon to once again discuss the department's need with respect to license revenues.

As HB 335 was originally introduced it was stimulated by the need to fund, for the next two years, the department's operational program as well as our capital requests.

Since the introduction of HB 335, the appropriations process has begun and some initial decisions have been made. In addition other legislative action and discussions have impacted our budget requests.

As a result the picture with respect to our income and expenses has changed considerably. The Chairman has indicated that the department will have an opportunity to present the current picture to this Committee in detail at a later time. That procedure will be followed to allow the Committee more time at this meeting to listen to the comments from the public in attendance today.

I would take a few moments now to generally review the events that have led us to today.

The recommendations originally proposed for expenditure were arrived at through a process this past two years that consisted of listening to public expressions for the service they expect from the department, determining within the

agency the needs to carry out our statutory responsibilities, and reviewing our historic revenue sources.

A portion of the fee increase proposed was to cover our increased operational requests. Some of those items included are: an additional \$350,000 in the biennium for additional law enforcement effort, an additional \$300,000 in the biennium to assume the operation of the Federal Fish Hatchery at Miles City, and an additional \$2,000,000 in the biennium to offset the projected loss of federal dollars normally used to fund our existing programs.

In addition to these operational costs we proposed a serious look at our capital program with the intent of embarking upon a program which, admittedly, should have been started long before now.

We are particularly concerned with two areas: our fish hatcheries and our regional headquarters. I have attached to my testimony a synopsis of both these areas for your review.

In addition to those two areas we proposed that the department get back into the program of big game range acquisition as well as increasing our financial effort to the development and maintenance of our present holdings.

These proposals are costly, but necessary at this time. We feel that they should be addressed because further procrastination will only serve to jeopardize the programs involved or to require a drastic sum of money to address all needs at once and likely at a time of higher costs.

In assessing these needs and developing their proposal to you we are also responsible for indicating the method for paying for those needs.

In facing the anticipated cut backs in our income from the federal tax on sporting goods and in light of a 15 percent reduction in FTE's for this biennium our attention focused on increasing the fees for hunting and fishing licenses.

The result of that attention was HB 335 as introduced to the legislature.

Subsequent to that introduction the House took action that resulted in fee increases and revenues as outlined on Appendix I attached to this testimony.

At the same time the Joint Subcommittee on Appropriations acted upon our budget requests for operations and modifications for the next two years. The Long Range Building Committee has indicated their approval of a portion of our capital request.

In addition, there is much discussion about the funding of the state's pay plan and the level at which it may be finalized.

As a result we have a tentative balance sheet which can be used as a guideline at this time. With the aforementioned circumstances the department would request that this committee support the fee increases now contained in HB 335 and add the following items:

1. An increase from \$275 to \$300 for the nonresident combination license.
2. An increase from \$8 to \$10 for the resident fishing license.
3. Adopting the nonresident fishing license increase of \$4 to \$7 instituted by the House, but return the license to a 2-day license rather than a 7-day license.

These requests would fund the level of operations approved by the Joint Subcommittee for Appropriations and requested from the House Appropriations Committee. It would also fund those requests tentatively approved and requested from the Long Range Building Committee.

The funds generated from the action by the House plus the above requests would not address any pay plan funding since that question is unresolved at this time.

The details of this proposal I would present to you in our review of the situation at a later date.

Our reasons for requesting the three additions we have center primarily around the fact that the fishery program is, in the appropriations process, receiving the majority of the new program we requested.

Tentatively we are funding the requested work on our hatchery system as well as the money for the upgrading of the Eastern Montana Fishery.

As a result to feel that the fishing license for resident and nonresidents can be justifiably increased.

The nonresident combination big game license can stand a 9 percent increase over the next two years without becoming a burden.

I have attached a copy of our testimony presented to the House Fish and Game Committee regarding HB 335. That testimony speaks to Montana's fee structure compared to other states and in relation to other costs for recreationists.

We feel that the appropriations process has been responsive to date and that a meaningful fish and wildlife program is possible. We request your cooperation in reviewing these three additional requests to assure that program's enactment.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HB335

BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE, AND PARKS

On page 2, line 8, delete the words "April 30" and in their place, add "the last day of February".

On page 4, line 13, after the words "Class B-1" and before the words "Class B-7", add the words "Class B-2 " .

On page 6, line 16, after the words "Class A-6," add the words "Class A-7,".

On page 12, line 18, strike "and" and in its place put a ",", and after the numeral "10", place the numerals ", 12, 13, and 18".

On page 12, after line 25, place the following:

. "(3) Sections 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are effective on January 1, 1984."

APPENDIX I

House Approved Fee Increase

| | <u>FY84</u> | <u>FY85</u> |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Antelope | | |
| Resident (\$5 to \$6) | | 21,000 |
| Elk | | |
| Resident (\$9 to \$10) | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| Deer | | |
| Resident (\$8 to \$9) | 135,000 | 135,000 |
| Moose | | |
| Resident (\$25 to \$50) | | 13,000 |
| Nonresident (\$175 to \$300) | | 1,250 |
| Sheep | | |
| Resident (\$25 to \$50) | | 16,750 |
| Nonresident (\$175 to \$300) | | 13,750 |
| Goat | | |
| Resident (\$15 to \$50) | | 12,250 |
| Nonresident (\$175 to \$300) | | 1,875 |
| Grizzly | | |
| Resident (\$25 to \$50) | | 15,400 |
| Nonresident (\$175 to \$300) | | 13,500 |
| Mountain Lion | | |
| Resident (\$5 to \$10) | | 4,470 |
| Nonresident (\$100 to \$200) | | 13,800 |
| Trophy (\$50) | | 5,000 |
| Trapper (\$10 to \$20) | | 40,000 |
| Fishing | | |
| Resident (\$7 to \$8) | | 172,000 |
| | <u>220,000</u> | <u>564,045</u> |

The House eliminated the nonresident \$4 2-day fishing license and replaced it with a 5-day license for \$7.

HB 335

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY JIM FLYNN, DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS
January 27, 1983

Two years ago the department presented to this committee during the 47th Legislature a license fee increase proposal. That proposal consisted of a three step process whereby license fees would have been raised in the years of 1981, 1982 and 1983.

That proposal was presented to fund a budget request that dealt with the cumulative impacts of some four years of high inflation and the anticipation that inflation rates would continue for two more years at reduced rates. I would point out that the budget request then presented dealt primarily with operations and in fact was an operations budget that included a 15 percent reduction in full time equivalent employees.

After considerable discussion, the 47th Session approved a good share of our requests for 1981 and 1982 and indicated to the department that we should address any future increases to the 48th Legislative Session.

As a result I appear before you this evening to once again discuss the department's need with respect to license revenues.

The fee increase before you is presented to fund what we feel are the needs for the next two years for the department's operational program as well as our capital program.

These recommendations for expenditure were arrived at through a process this past two years that consisted of listening to public expressions of the service they expect from the department, determining within the agency the needs to carry out our statutory responsibilities, and reviewing our historic revenue sources.

This process has been over a year in developing and puts some hard questions before your committee that need to be addressed. However, we feel that these questions cannot be put off.

A portion of the fee increase is to cover our increased operational requests. Some of those items included are: an additional \$350,000 in the biennium for additional law enforcement effort, an additional \$300,000 in the biennium to assume the operation of the Federal Fish Hatchery at Miles City, and an additional \$2,000,000 in the biennium to offset the projected loss of federal dollars normally used to fund our existing programs.

There are other lesser items that you were presented a few weeks ago at our budget briefing.

In addition to these operational costs we are proposing a serious look at our capital program with the intent of embarking upon a program which, admittedly, should have been started long before now.

We are particularly concerned with two areas: our fish hatcheries and our regional headquarters. I have attached to my testimony a synopsis of both these areas for your review.

In addition to those two areas we are proposing that the department get back into the program of big game range acquisition as well as increasing our financial effort to the development and maintenance of our present holdings.

These proposals are costly, but necessary at this time. We feel that they should be addressed because further procrastination will only serve to jeopardize the programs involved or to require a drastic sum of money to address all needs at once and likely at a time of higher costs.

In assessing these needs and developing their proposal to you we are also responsible for indicating the method for paying for those needs.

In facing the anticipated cut backs in our income from the federal tax on sporting goods and in light of a 15 percent reduction in FTE's for this biennium our attention focused on increasing the fees for hunting and fishing licenses.

In arriving at the figures before you we took a number of factors into consideration. The system we used is not foolproof, but we believe has some validity.

One factor we used was to review the fees charged in other states. We not only looked at each fee, but looked at the relative value each state put on those fees. In addition, we made an effort to appraise and relate the quality and quantity of the hunting and fishing experience in those states, with that of Montana.

In addition, we looked at what could be considered as a value of the animals harvested. This past year we auctioned off 300 carcasses of deer at various locations in the state. These carcasses averaged a revenue of \$33.04. We auctioned off 124 carcasses of elk for an average of \$238 per carcass. We auctioned 13 moose carcasses for an average of \$303 per carcass. As you can see, these animals have some value as a meat source.

Another factor considered was the cost of other recreational activities in Montana. We looked at the cost of movies, the cost of skiing and other forms of recreation.

In addition we looked at the costs of the other normal aspects of a hunting or fishing trip. This included the cost of rod, reels, rifles and guns; the cost of tackle and ammunition; the cost of vehicles and fuel; as well as the cost of food and tents.

As an additional factor we referred to a report conducted by a group of citizens commissioned by the Governor to review state government and its operations. This Council on Management had its own recommendations on fees that we used as a reference point.

Another factor that we always need to consider in Montana is the amount of the nonresident license revenue. In arriving at the figures before you we took into account that in 1950 nonresident license sales accounted for 18 percent of the department's license revenue. In 1982 nonresident license sales accounted for 61 percent of the department's license revenue.

The result of this total process is the proposal before you. It does contain some large increases in some areas. These figures are a new experience for Montana's sportsmen.

However, I would emphasize that these revenue requests are based upon our expenditure program designed to serve the sportsmen and to benefit our fish and wildlife resources.

We would request your approval of HB 335.

PRIORITY LISTING OF HATCHERY
REPAIRS AND REPLACEMENT

AND

HISTORY AND PRODUCTION OF MONTANA'S
SEVEN STATE FUNDED FISH HATCHERIES

Prepared by: Arthur N. Whitney
Emmett L. Colley
Date: December 29, 1982

Priority Listing of Hatchery
Repairs and Replacement

1. Move Flathead Lake Salmon Hatchery operation to Creston flowing well site.
\$ 455,000
2. Construct new hatchery building and increase rearing capacity at Big Timber.
\$ 500,000
3. Rebuild the major portion of the raceway system at Great Falls.
\$1,900,000
4. Repair 16 raceways at Anaconda.
\$ 230,000
5. Replace four raceways at Lewistown and remodel the original hatchery building roof.
\$ 90,000
6. Replace old, energy-inefficient residences, one each at Big Timber and Anaconda.
\$75,000 each \$ 150,000

HISTORY AND PRODUCTION OF MONTANA'S
SEVEN STATE FUNDED FISH HATCHERIES

Flathead Lake Salmon Hatchery
Somers, Montana

The Flathead Lake Salmon Hatchery site was selected in 1911 and was the first state fish hatchery to be constructed with state funds. The Anaconda hatchery, which was the first state fish hatchery, was reportedly built by Marcus Daley and donated to the state.

This station has been the receiving station for many wild trout and salmon taken at different spawning stations throughout the Flathead River drainage. Up to eight rainbow, cutthroat, and grayling stations have operated during the spring months. During the fall and early winter months the Somers hatchery received as many as 10 to 12 million kokanee eggs that were taken from Flathead Lake and surrounding area. These eggs were eyed and many of them sent to other state hatcheries as well as neighboring states.

In recent years the land surrounding the spring area has been sold for private development. With new homes and land use the hatchery water supply has been disrupted, siltation has increased, and the flow has been reduced to 385 gallons per minute. Livestock trampling in the spring area cause a constant silt problem and we occasionally encounter losses on the green eggs due to silt smothering them. Recent management requests are for the kokanee to be reared to 1- to 2-inch size rather than being released as newly hatched fish. Rearing the fish to a larger size requires additional rearing ponds. This cannot be accomplished at the present site with decreasing water flows. It has been recommended in the long-range building program budget that the present hatchery be closed and the operation moved to a state-owned artesian well site south of Creston, Montana. This water supply will allow us to rear greater numbers of fish to a larger size.

The annual production of the Flathead Lake Salmon Hatchery is approximately 2,500,000 kokanee salmon and cutthroat weighing 1,200 pounds.

The entire production of this station is planted in lakes in Regions 1 and 2.

Jocko River Trout Hatchery
Arlee, Montana

Funds were appropriated in 1947 to purchase the Jocko River Ranch from George Ripley. Only the earth type ponds and one residence remain of the original purchase. A new hatchery building, ten 100' by 10' raceways, two residences, and a four-stall garage were constructed. In 1963 five brood ponds and a spawning house were built. This unit was designed to protect the rainbow brood from vandalism and other problems that are encountered when brood fish are exposed to public viewing.

A new modular home was purchased in 1973 to replace the dwelling that was on the site when the state purchased the hatchery. All the buildings are in very good condition and only need routine maintenance. The furnace in the hatchery building is in need of repair. This item is budgeted for and recommended for replacement in 1985.

For many years the Arlee hatchery was the home of the westslope cutthroat and Arlee rainbow broodstocks. After completion of Corps of Engineers mitigation hatchery in Lincoln County in 1979 the westslope cutthroat brood were moved to the Murray Springs Hatchery. Only Arlee rainbow brood remain at this station. Between 6.5 and 7 million rainbow eggs are produced annually. Rainbow eggs from this stock have been shipped to state and national fish hatcheries throughout the United States and have received nationwide recognition as a quality product.

The entire production of the Arlee station is rainbow. The average annual production is about 200,000 to 250,000 fish weighing 24,000 pounds.

These trout are released in Region 1 and the northern part of Region 2.

Washoe Park Trout Hatchery
Anaconda, Montana

Funds were appropriated by the legislature in 1907 to construct a fish hatchery located at Anaconda. In 1908 one residence, an ice house, and hatchery building were erected. All the original buildings have had some repair and remodeling over the years. This original residence does need to undergo major remodeling to make it energy efficient or be replaced. The ice house has been converted to a walk in freezer that has been used for fish food products that needed refrigeration. It is also used by law enforcement during hunting season to freeze confiscated game. The hatchery building has undergone major repairs and changes over the years. In general the hatchery building is good. It should be insulated to reduce heating costs.

All the concrete raceways have been badly damaged by frost and should undergo major repairs (a current cost estimate from the A & E Division is attached). Also some minor problems exist on the warm water intake and 150 feet of the water supply line at the Warm Springs Creek crossing.

All the remaining buildings are in fair to good condition and only need day to day maintenance.

The annual production of the Anaconda hatchery is about 550,000 fish weighing approximately 22,000 pounds. Rainbow and cutthroat are the major species reared. Grayling, golden trout, and brook trout are also reared at this station. The later are only raised when requested by regional fish managers.

The majority of the fish produced at this station are released in the western half of Region 3, all of Region 2, and the southernmost part of Region 1.

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING DIVISION



TED SCHWINDEN, GOVERNOR

1500 EAST SIXTH AVENUE

STATE OF MONTANA

(406) 449-3104

HELENA, MONTANA 59620

December 20, 1982

RECEIVED

DEC 22 1982

FISHERIES DIVISION

Emmett L. Colley, Chief, Hatcheries Bureau
Fisheries Division
Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
1420 East Sixth Avenue
Helena, Montana 59620

Re: Tank Repairs
Anaconda Fish Hatchery

Dear Emmett:

This letter is in response to your December 20, 1982, request for an estimate of the cost to repair the tanks at the Anaconda Fish Hatchery.

We estimate the total cost of repairing the sixteen tanks to be \$230,000.00. This cost includes removing some deteriorated concrete around the perimeter of the tanks, and pouring new reinforced concrete tank bottoms and walls. It is assumed that no piping work would be required.

The above cost is based on our estimate of mid-1984 construction costs, and includes full architectural services.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "George T. Nolan, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

GEORGE T. NOLAN, JR., Mechanical
Engineer
Design Bureau

ld

Giant Springs Trout Hatchery
Great Falls, Montana

In 1922 Montana Power Company donated the land for a fish hatchery to the department. The Giant Springs Trout Hatchery water storage tank and residence were constructed in 1922. During the Public Works Administration six concrete circular ponds, four-stall garage, shop, residence, and pump house were constructed. In 1953 the old wooden stave water tank was replaced by a 50,000 gallon concrete water tank which was built in the city park. This property is now owned by the department. In 1971 one new residence was erected on newly acquired land east of the present hatchery site.

Monies have been requested in this biennium to replace some of the circular ponds with a system that would more efficiently utilize the area. With increased storage of water by Montana Power Company the present ponds do not have adequate drainage.

Rainbow trout is the major species reared at the Giant Springs Hatchery. Other species are also reared when requested by the regional fisheries managers.

The average annual production is 580,000 to 600,000 fish weighing 31,000 pounds.

These fish are stocked in Regions 4 and 6, in the Missouri, Sun River, Teton, and Milk river drainages.

Big Springs Trout Hatchery
Lewistown, Montana

In 1921 the Montana Fish and Game Commission was authorized to enter into a 99 year lease with the City of Lewistown to erect a fish hatchery at the big springs south of Lewistown. At that time one residence and a hatchery building were constructed. Part of the original hatchery building is still being used. The original house was sold and moved off the hatchery property. During the depression years two large earthen ponds were excavated and rock retaining walls built. This work was accomplished by the Public Works Administration. After World War II the large hatchery building was erected to house indoor raceways, also four 8' by 100' raceways were constructed. In 1960 land was purchased about one mile north of the original hatchery site and 30 concrete raceways, two residences, a shop, and feed storage building were constructed. This increased the production of the Lewistown hatchery considerably, it became the largest production station in the state and continues to hold that distinction to date. One more residence was added to the hatchery in 1973.

The four concrete raceways built in the late 1940's have had extensive repairs due to settling and poor construction. The raceways need to be replaced with new structures. The original hatchery building should be tore down and replaced.

Rainbow, Yellowstone cutthroat, and kokanee are reared at the Lewistown hatchery with an annual production of 2 million fish weighing 110,000 pounds.

The Big Springs Hatchery has the greatest distribution of any state hatchery. Fish are released from there into lakes and reservoirs in all seven regions.

Yellowstone River Trout Hatchery
Big Timber, Montana

In June of 1921 the Big Timber Rod and Gun Club raised \$1,000 and acquired the land and residence at the present site of the Big Timber Hatchery. They donated this acquisition to the department. During that year a small hatchery was erected to house troughs for rearing fish; several years later the hatchery was enlarged to house more troughs. The hatchery was then capable of rearing 1½ to 2 million small fish. In 1930 the hatchery building was enlarged to its present size. During 1939 the Public Works Administration constructed a three-stall garage, ice house and shop building, residence, and large dirt type raceways. Only one of these ponds is in use at this time. The other dirt type ponds have been converted to concrete brood ponds.

During 1930 through 1950 the Big Timber Hatchery was an egg receiving station to incubate brown trout, rainbow, and cutthroat eggs. The eggs were taken at spawning stations in Yellowstone Park, West Yellowstone, Harrison, and Georgetown lakes.

In 1960 this station was converted to the only domestic source of Yellowstone cutthroat. This was due to the lack of available eggs from Yellowstone Park. During the 1960's this strain of fish contacted a bacteria known as kidney disease. Due to the persistence of this disease the closure of this station almost became a reality. In the early part of the 1970's as a result of a continued effort by a new manager a new strain of cutthroat from McBride Lake was collected to begin a new broodstock. These fish also contacted kidney disease. With the use of medication and two new concrete raceways, the kidney disease was eradicated. This strain of cutthroat is becoming a very popular fish in areas where it can be used.

The McBride Lake cutthroat is the only strain of fish reared at Big Timber. Over 1 million eggs were produced in 1982, approximately one-half these eggs were shipped to other Montana hatcheries for rearing and release at a later date.

The hatchery building is in need of major repairs. A proposal has been submitted to construct a new hatchery building, a pipe line for additional water, and rearing ponds to meet the increased demand for this strain of cutthroat.

The average annual production of the Yellowstone River Trout Hatchery is approximately 580,000 fish weighing 6,000 pounds.

These fish are released in Regions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Bluewater Springs Trout Hatchery
Bridger, Montana

In June 1947 the Montana Fish and Game Commission bought the Bluewater hatchery site for \$3,000. In 1949 a contract for \$69,000 was let to build a residence, garage, cold storage plant, and ten 100' by 10' concrete raceways. During 1954 one more residence was added. In 1956 a larger cold storage plant, office, and feed room was constructed. This was needed to store great amounts of beef by products to meet the demand for greater numbers of fish. Nine dirt type raceways were added later, after several years of poor production in these ponds six were converted to concrete ponds. In 1973 one more residence, shop, and truck garage was added to house the large fish distribution equipment.

Rainbow trout is the major species reared at Bluewater. McBride Lake cutthroat, kokanee, and brown trout are other species reared as needed to meet regional requests.

All the buildings, pipe lines, and ponds are in excellent condition and no expenditures are needed for repairs.

The annual production of Bluewater is approximately 850,000 fish weighing 55,000 pounds.

These fish are stocked in lakes and reservoirs in southeastern, south central, and southwestern Montana.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS
BOZEMAN HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Present Facility

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Date of construction | August, 1954 |
| Employees at time | 5 |
| Size, including shop and warehouse | 50' x 80' = 4,000 sq. ft. Approximately 900 sq. ft. of this was office space. |
| Construction | Steel quonset hut |
| Insulation | None |
| Other problems | Surrounding property is commercial. |
| Other buildings | One trailer house-office; one hangar-storage |

Proposed Facility

| | |
|---|--|
| Present personnel | 42 |
| New building to include space for wildlife laboratory presently located at MSU. MSU wants space back. | |
| Proposed location | MSU |
| Existing building to be sold. | |
| Planned facilities | |
| Office space | 4,480 sq. ft. |
| Laboratory | 4,500 sq. ft. |
| Conference rooms | 600 sq. ft. |
| Reception area | 200 sq. ft. |
| Shop | 1,560 sq. ft. |
| Gas | 50 sq. ft. |
| Storage | 1,150 sq. ft. |
| Equipment shed | 1,200 sq. ft. |
| *Total | 20,601 sq. ft. plus 1,200 sq. ft. for shed. |

Costs are estimated at an average of \$78.18 per sq. ft. This includes room for mechanical, corridors, restrooms, expansion, inflation, contract administration, site work, landscaping, equipment yard, furnishings, architect fees, etc.

*Includes miscellaneous spaces.

1-19-83
SCJ:sue

DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS
GLASGOW HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Present Facility

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Date of construction | October, 1955 |
| Employees at time | 4 |
| Size, including shop and warehouse | 50' x 63' = 3,150 sq. ft. Approximately 1,200 sq. ft. of this was office space. |
| Construction | Steel quonset hut |
| Property | Department owned |
| Insulation | None |

Proposed Facility

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Present personnel | 14 |
| Proposed location | Next to existing building |
| Property | Department owned |
| Planned facilities | |
| Office space | 1,605 sq. ft. |
| Remodel existing building for storage; site work to include equipment yard, paving, etc. | |
| *Total sq. ft. | 2,500 sq. ft. |

Costs are estimated at \$88 per sq. ft. This includes restrooms, corridors, mechanical, expansion, site work, equipment yard, architect fees, remodeling, etc.

*Includes miscellaneous spaces.

1-19-83
SCJ:sue

DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS
GREAT FALLS HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Present Facility

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Date of construction | October, 1955 |
| Employees at time | 9 |
| Size | 50' x 80' = 4,000 sq. ft. Approximately 900 sq. ft. of this was office space. |
| Construction | Steel quonset hut |
| Insulation | None |
| Property | State Land Board lease -- reverts. |
| Other problems | Security is poor. I-15 off ramp is scheduled to be built near present site. |
| Other buildings | One trailer house for office space. |

Proposed Facility

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Present personnel | 41 |
| Proposed location | Giant Springs State Park. Property is owned by department. |
| Planned facilities: | |
| Office space | 3,020 sq. ft. |
| Conference rooms | 1,680 sq. ft. |
| Reception area | 250 sq. ft. |
| Autopsy room | 225 sq. ft. |
| Cooler | 200 sq. ft. |
| Storage | 270 sq. ft. |
| Shop | 780 sq. ft. |
| Gas | 50 sq. ft. |
| Equipment storage | 1,000 sq. ft. |
| *Total | 12,280 sq. ft. |

Costs are estimated at \$71.66 per sq. ft. This includes room for mechanical, corridors, restrooms, expansion, contract administration, site work, landscaping, equipment yard, furnishings, architect fees, etc.

*Includes miscellaneous spaces.

1-19-83
SCJ:sue

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 1

Date of Construction - June, 1956

Original Construction Cost - \$38,981

Total Cost to Date With Remodeling - \$109,984

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 2 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This is a steel building that is too small for present space requirements. It is not energy efficient. Two additional storage buildings have been constructed and a temporary office building (trailer house) have been added. Another temporary office building is planned for next year.

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 2

Date of Construction - January, 1955

Original Construction Cost - \$11,529

Total Cost to Date with Remodeling - \$19,026

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 2 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This headquarter building was an automatic shop purchased by the Department and converted to a regional headquarters building. It is now being replaced by a new building due for completion in late 1983 at a cost of \$786,332

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 3

Date of Construction - August, 1954

Original Construction Cost - \$27,878

Total Cost to Date with Remodeling - \$31,341

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 2 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This is a steel building that is too small for the present staff. A hangar-shed is used for additional storage and a temporary office trailer is used for additional office space. This building is not energy efficient. A new building is planned in the University complex on land donated by the University. The present building and ground would be sold.

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 4

Date of Construction - October, 1955

Original Construction Cost - \$30,255

Total Cost to Date With Remodeling - \$38,150

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 3 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This is a steel building that is too small for the present staff. It is not energy efficient. An interstate off ramp is designed to partially encircle the site in the next few years. We are leasing the ground from State Lands. We own a new site at Heritage Park and can combine a new headquarters with the design and use of Heritage Park.

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 5

Date of Construction - August, 1958

Original Construction Cost - \$29,280

Total Cost to Date With Remodeling - \$57,083

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 3 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This is a steel building being used in conjunction with the houses and out buildings left from the old "pheasant" farm. While it is not energy efficient, it will probably be adequate for five to ten more years.

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 6

Date of Construction - October, 1955

Original Construction Cost - \$28,881

Total Cost to Date With Remodeling - \$31,616

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 1.5 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This is a steel building that has serious heating and cooling problems and is very energy inefficient. A new office building is proposed. The old building would be maintained as a warehouse and shop.

REGIONAL HEADQUARTER

Region - 7

Date of Construction - August, 1957

Original Construction Cost - \$27,966

Total Cost to Date With Remodeling - \$42,283

Original FTE - 1 secretary

Present FTE - 2 secretaries, 1 supervisor

Description - This is a steel building that is not energy efficient, however, space is adequate for present staff requirements.

MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Testimony on HB 335

Senate Fish and Game Committee

March 15, 1983

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: My name is Ken Knudson, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation in support of HB 335. We would, however, suggest a few minor additions to the house version of the bill to bring the fees more closely into line with the interests of our organization.

Most of the members of the MWF are hunters, and although most of us fish as well, we feel that this legislature should pass a funding bill that is more closely tied to the actual expenditures proposed by the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks. A large portion of the capital expenditures approved by the Long-Range Building Committee have to do with fish hatchery repairs and construction. We would, therefore, prefer to see that fishing license fees be increased to levels suitable to cover these proposed expenditures. As such, we strongly support increasing the resident fishing license by an additional \$2.00. Also, to enhance the potential for additional purchases of temporary, out-of-state fishing licenses, we would endorse retaining these licenses at two-day periods rather than increasing them to cover a seven-day period.

The presently proposed big game fees are acceptable to the MWF, although we advocate an additional \$1 increase in the resident elk license, particularly if this money were earmarked for game range acquisition and maintenance and/or if the money were to go for additional management of elk populations.

The nonresident combination license, we feel, is presently a bargain when you consider the wildlife populations that we have to offer compared to other western states. To be fair to Montana sportsmen, we would suggest that this fee be increased proportionately to the increase being applied to resident big game licenses. This amounts to a 10-15% increase when you consider raising deer tags from \$5.00 to \$6.00 and elk tags from \$8.00 to \$9.00. With the nonresident combination licenses presently at \$275.00, this means that an increase of \$25.00 to \$40.00 should be considered.

The MWF would request that with the above additions, this committee favorably pass HB 335. We would also like to enter into the record the testimony that we presented to the House Fish and Game Committee concerning this bill.

(This sheet to be used by those testifyi on a bill.)

NAME: GREGG PAULEY Exhibit 5
DATE: 3/15/83
ADDRESS: Box 123 Font Peck Montana 59223
PHONE: 526-3552 or 526-3513
REPRESENTING WHOM? WALLEYES UNLIMITED OF MONTANA
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: ~~A~~ HB 335
DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? _____

TESTIMONY FOR HB 335
SENATE FISH & GAME COMMITTEE
MARCH 15 1983

MIR CHAIRMAN & MEMBERS OF THE
COMMITTEE:

I AM REPRESENTING 1700
PEOPLE THAT HAVE UNITED TO FORM
WALLEYES UNLIMITED OF MONTANA.
ALL INDICATIONS TELL WALLEYES
UNLIMITED OF MONTANA THAT
THIS MEMBERSHIP WILL SWELL TO
5000 IN THE NEXT COUPLE OF MONTHS

WALLEYES UNLIMITED HAS
SEEN THE RESULTS OF THE COMBINATION
OF MONEY AND MANAGEMENT IN
NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA CREATING
A MULTI-MILLION DOLLAR FISHING
INDUSTRY. THIS INDUSTRY WAS
BASED ON ~~TWO~~ TWO FOUNDATIONS,
A HATCHERY PROGRAM THAT IS CAPABLE
OF TURNING OUT MILLIONS OF FISH
AND A FORAGE FISH PROGRAM THAT
IS CAPABLE OF GROWING LARGE FISH
THAT ATTRACTS THOUSANDS OF
FISHERMAN. IN 1982 200 MILLION

DOLLARS WERE SPENT ON FISHING RELATED ACTIVITIES IN NORTH DAKOTA ALONE.

QUALITY TAKES MONEY AND PROPER MANAGEMENT OF THAT MONEY TO PRODUCE RESULTS. BASED ON WHAT WE HAVE IN MONTANA AT PRESENT, QUALITY BIG GAME HUNTING AND BLUE RIBBON ~~TROUT~~ TROUT FISHING, REVENUE WILL BE NEEDED TO INSURE THESE STANDARDS. AND IF WE ARE TO DEVELOP THE TREMENDOUS POTENTIAL OF OUR RESERVOIRS IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN MONTANA IN RESPECT TO WALLEYE FISHING, WE NEED REVENUE AND PROPER MANAGEMENT OF THIS REVENUE.

CONSEQUENTLY WALLEYES UNLIMITED OF MONTANA SUGGESTS THAT THE LICENSE FEE INCREASE BE GRANTED AS RECOMMENDED BY THE MODIFIED F.W.P. PROPOSAL WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE 5 DAY NON-RESIDENT FISHING PROPOSAL. WE FEEL THIS SHOULD REMAIN A 2 DAY LICENSE

BUT SHOULD COST ¹⁸3 INSTEAD OF
THE PRESENT 2⁰.

IN CONCLUSION, WALLEYES UNLIMITED,
AS FISHERMAN AND SPORTSMAN, SUPPORT
THE LICENCE INCREASE. OUR RAPIDLY
GROWING MEMBERSHIP IS PROOF
THAT SPORTSMAN ARE WILLING TO
PAY FOR ~~THESE~~ MAINTAINING AND
DEVELOPING ~~THE~~ QUALITY OUTDOOR
EXPERIENCE THAT ONLY MONTANA
~~THE~~ CAN GIVE TO THE SPORTSMAN,

March 15, 1983

To: Senate Appropriations Committee for
the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks

From: Dick Turner, 1316 Phillips Street; Missoula, Montana 59802;
Professional Taxidermist, Sportsman, Member of the Board of
Directors, Five Valley Archery Club, Missoula; Member of the
Montana Bowhunters Association.

Subject: License Fee Increases

Gentlemen, I am here today at this very important hearing of your committee as a concerned sportsman and representative of my bowhunting constituents of the Missoula-Area. I will speak in their behalf. I am not here to condemn the actions of the House Appropriations Committee or that of the Fish, Wildlife and Parks Commission of the Great State of Montana. My only concern is that of the future of the fish and wildlife of the State of Montana. I feel that certain proposed programs and projects set forth by the Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department are essential to maintain the ecological balance of our fish and game resources and that they should not be subject to destruction because of lack of funds to support these programs.

Granted, I too, was appalled at the 122% increase in the resident elk tag, from \$9.00 to \$20.00, that was proposed by the Fish and Game Commission. Especially since the proposals were presented and passed by the Commission without any public comment by concerned sportsmen. Why this happened is beyond my comprehension and I hope that in the future it will not happen again. Thus, the results of the Commission Meeting were taken to the House Appropriations Committee and shot down. Its a good feeling to know that the House, did listen and consider the public comment that was generated by the approved proposals. I hope that the Senate Committee here today will also listen to us, the people and consider the dilemma that faces our fish and wildlife resources as a result of the actions of the Fish and Game Commission. I am sure that the Fish and Game Commission, has learned a valued lesson from these untactful proceedings, but at the expense of essential fish and wildlife management programs that are needed to maintain our fish and game resources.

One of the programs that was excluded by the House, that I feel is vitally important to our fish and game resources is the Game Range Acquisition Program. This program will be terminated because of lack of funds. I feel this program is essential in conserving and managing our big game herds. The herds need winter ranges and where progress is applying pressure to habitat, this program will provide protected areas. This program needs a capital outlay of \$300,000. The \$300,000 for acquisition of game ranges could be matched 3:1 with P-R money and would result in \$1.2 million for big game range purchases. Thus, it would be advantageous to invest in this program all the way around.

Another program, which will be terminated if funding goals are not reached is Core Staff Financing for ecological surveys. This program is desperately needed in this State to determine the increase or decrease in fish and game populations in order to regulate permit numbers for specific species drawings and carrying capacities of certain areas. A multitude of specific data recorded from these studies will determine our fish and game populations of the present and the future.

Last, a program that will also be terminated as a result of lack of funds, is a Bioeconomic Study, to determine the values of wildlife, so we could get a more equitable evaluation of the importance of our fish and wildlife on our State and local economy. In other words the net value of hunting and fishing, including the resource itself in helping us determine its importance when evaluating proposed subdivisions, natural gas and oil development, etc., in a particular area. I feel that these programs are essential to our present fish and wildlife resources and should not be terminated by the stroke of a pen and lack of funding.

In order for the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, to initiate these forementioned programs, it will need an additional one million dollars over the now existing House proposals and the only way that I can see in obtaining this increased revenue is by increasing some of the existing license fees. Granted, the proposals that the Fish and Game Commission brought to the House were outrageous, but I feel that we owe it to the resource itself and its future to reconsider and take the responsibility of determining what alternatives that we have in order to keep the Great State of Montana's fish and game resources the best in the nation.

I sincerely and the people I represent would not be opposed to some moderate license fee increases in order to maintain our existing resources for the present and into the future. I do not think that a resident fishing license increase of an additional \$2.00 would be objectionable, thus raising the license fee to \$10.00 for the privilege that we have here in the State of Montana of fishing the best trout waters in the nation.

I also feel that an increase in the resident Game Bird license from \$4.00 to \$6.00 is still a bargain since we have so many fine game birds to hunt. An increase of \$ 50.00 in the non-resident Big Game Combination license from \$275.00 to \$325.00 is still a bargain when compared with other western big game hunting States. I'm sure that the non-residents that hunt our State can afford it since most can also afford the expense of travel fees and acquisition of a good Outfitter and guide. For example to purchase all the non-resident licenses from Utah that are equal to our non-resident Big Game Combination license, it would cost \$400.00. Thus, our's is a bargain and I am sure that our success ratio's are quite high, as compared with other states. I think we could also raise our non-resident Bear license from \$100.00 to \$125.00, since many non-residents enjoy our spring bear hunting, which would still be more reasonable than other surrounding states. I am sure that since we sold out our non-resident Big Game licenses last year by mid June it is reasonable to assume that Montana is a popular big game hunting state and that a modest increase in non-resident licenses would not delete our success in selling them in the future.

In conclusion Gentlemen, I hope you will consider some of the information that I have brought forth to you in your evaluation of license fee increases and monies needed to operate our Fish, Wildlife and Parks Department. I thank you for giving me some of your valuable time and consideration. I appreciate your concerns and the opportunity to express the views of my fellow sportsmen. Thank you.

1/1 While the F.W.P. (Fish & Game) is actively pursuing increases in the license fees, by attending meeting around the state and lengthy reports through the press, there remains visible waste and poor management within the department.

Their request for more than a 100% increase in fees with out regard for respect for those who can least afford it is wrong.

Wild life belongs to each and everyone equally and for some it will result in increased poaching by

2 necessity rather than by will.

Why should Montana resident fees be compared to other states which support big game feeding programs. Pheasant farms of which Montana has none?

In western Montana the Big game and Pheasant populations ~~are~~ down from those of perhaps 20 yrs ago.

The dollars paid for illegal Confiscated game by individuals at game auctions have been used to justify the proposed increase, Actually the license ~~fee~~ is a worthless piece of paper

3
and provides only the right to carry a gun. Only 12% of the license

The Department has included in the budget funds for 3 regional headquarters. Money spent for these items contribute more to the comfort and pride of the personnel than to improving the conditions for game reproduction.

Also included are substantial investments in fish hatcheries about the state. There exists other alternatives. These include very efficient private hatcheries who are now under contract to supply other states. Their cost would be about 20¢ per

Catchable or Legal size fish about
 $\frac{1}{5}$ the cost of State operated plants
Translated another way the
montana Anglers could have
5 times the the numbers of
fish planted for the same bucks
if private taxpaying hatcheries
were utilized. —

The department wishes to
purchase a turbine engine station
made air craft for radio tracking
and personell use. (no comment)

\$67,000 of the proposed budget
is to go for the Ninepipe management
Area. This would fund the
operation, maintenance and
replacement of farming equipment

And for personell which stands at a one manager to one man operation.

These lands were at one time private farms sold to the fish and game and later successfully operated by private farmers for the fish and game on a share bases with little other costs to the department.

The real need for State owned and operated farm equipment as well as a managers position for one man should be a subject of concern.

Our final concern is the rather ridiculous way the

5
department has handled the drawing system for permits.

Many applicants forfeited their application funds all or in part while others were granted two antelope and double permits for deer. If these game animals belong to all citizens, how then can there be second permits until all applications have been satisfied?

If there were more permits available than applicants there should have been no drawing and likewise no drawing expense.

There are questions before

this hearing the need to be seriously addressed.

1. If the increase is granted in order to fund construction etc will those increases revert back when these one time obligations are met?

2. Does the department really need a twin engine plane?

3. Will these increased fees result in less license sales and increased poaching?

4. Why does the department hold on to and support positions when the need for those positions no longer exist?

we urge ~~the~~ this committee
now to seriously examine
the facts consider that we
are not paid professional lobbyists
that we have ^{not} been accorded
extensive coverage at the
press as has the department
and above all remember the
the many hunters whose
very right to hunt ~~is~~ ^{may} now
be in your hands

Statement of
Del Palmer

Exhibit 8
Submitted by Senator Smith
March 15, 1983

SSm

LICENSE FEE REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES - 1985 BIENNIUM

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Fund Balance FYE 1983 | \$ 5,329,475 ¹ |
| <u>Add:</u> | |
| Projected Income: | |
| FY 1984 | 11,420,000 |
| FY 1985 | 11,420,000 ² |
| New Fees | <u>955,011</u> |
| Total Revenue Available | \$29,124,486 ===== |
| <u>Deduct:</u> | |
| Base Operations Fiscal 1984 | \$12,083,210 |
| Base Operations Fiscal 1985 | 12,252,706 |
| Modified Requests Fiscal 1984 | 591,760 |
| Modified Requests Fiscal 1985 | 486,733 |
| CASH - Building Projects - 1985 Biennium | 705,000 ³ |
| BOND - Building Projects - 1985 Biennium | 869,000 ³ |
| Wardens Back Pay - 1985 Biennium | <u>809,000</u> |
| Total Expenditures | \$27,797,409 ===== |
| Ending Fiscal 1985 Balance | \$ 1,327,077 |

¹ Appendix Page 2 Fiscal 1983 Balance

² Appendix Page 3 Fee Increase Additional Revenue

³ Appendix Page 4 Long Range Building Program

APPENDIX 1
FISCAL YEAR-END 1983 BALANCE

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| FUND BALANCE 7/1/1982 | \$ 5,179,528 |
| Continuing Appropriation | <u>995,053</u> |
| Unrestricted Balance | 4,184,475 |
| Projected Revenue | <u>11,000,000</u> |
| Total Available | \$15,184,475 ===== |
| Base Operations | <u>9,855,000</u> |
| FISCAL YEAR-END 1983 BALANCE | \$ 5,329,475 ===== |

APPENDIX 2

Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks License Fees Approved by Subcommittee

| <u>License</u> | <u>Fee Increase</u> | <u>Additional Revenue 1985 Biennium</u> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Fishing | | |
| Residential | \$ 1.00 | \$343,664 |
| Nonresidential (2-day) | 3.00 | -0- |
| Elk | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 170,992 |
| Deer | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 269,398 |
| Moose | | |
| Residential | 25.00 | 13,000 |
| Nonresidential | 175.00 | 1,250 |
| Big Horn | | |
| Residential | 25.00 | 16,750 |
| Nonresidential | 175.00 | 13,750 |
| Goat | | |
| Residential | 35.00 | 12,250 |
| Nonresidential | 125.00 | 1,875 |
| Grizzly | | |
| Residential | 25.00 | 15,400 |
| Nonresidential | 125.00 | 13,500 |
| Antelope | | |
| Residential | 1.00 | 21,312 |
| Trapper | 10.00 | 40,000 |
| Mountain Lion | | |
| Residential | 5.00 | 4,470 |
| Nonresidential | 200.00 | 12,400 |
| Trophy | 50.00 | 5,000 |
| Total Additional Revenue | | <u>\$955,011</u> ===== |

APPENDIX 3
FISH, WILDLIFE, AND PARKS LICENSE REVENUE
LONG RANGE BUILDING COMMITTEE-APPROVED PROJECTS

| <u>Cash</u> | 1985 <u>Biennium Cost</u> |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. Fishing Access Site Development | \$ 250,000 |
| 2. Headquarters Renovation and Repair | 25,000 |
| 3. Headquarters Storage Building, Region 1 | 30,000 |
| 4. Wildlife Management Area Maintenance | 50,000 |
| 5. Lake and Stream Improvements | 50,000 |
| 6. Game Range Acquisitions | <u>300,000</u> |
| Total Cash Projects | \$ 705,000 ===== |
| <u>Bonded</u> | |
| 1. Construct Fish Hatchery, Creston Springs | \$ 455,000 |
| 2. Renovate Fish Hatchery, Great Falls | 1,900,000 |
| 3. Renovate Fish Hatchery, Big Timber | <u>500,000</u> |
| Total Bonded Projects | \$2,855,000 ===== |
| Bond Service Required in 1985 Biennium | \$ 869,000 ===== |
| License Revenue Required to Support LRB Projects | |
| 1. Cash Projects | \$ 705,000 |
| 2. Bond Service | <u>869,000</u> |
| Total LRB Projects | \$1,574,000 ===== |

Exhibit 9
Submitted by Will Brook
March 15, 1983
AMENDMENTS TO HB 335 - Third reading copy

1. Title, line 7.

Following: "PARKS;"

Insert: "TO ESTABLISH A CLASS A-7 COW ELK LICENSE;"

2. Page 3, line 14.

Following: "A-6"

Insert: ", A-7"

3. Page 3, line 15.

Following: "licenses."

Insert: "(1)"

4. Page 3, line 24.

Strike: "(1)"

Insert: "(a)"

Renumber: subsequent subsections accordingly

5. Page 4, line 2.

Following: "\$8"

Insert: ";

(e) Class A-7, cow elk tag, \$8.

(2) The holder of a Class A-7 cow elk license is entitled to take surplus cow elk in areas designated by the commission and at such times during the regular big game season as set forth by the commission"

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 15,

83

19.....

MR. **PRESIDENT**.....

We, your committee on **FISH AND GAME**.....

having had under consideration **HOUSE** Bill No. **342**.....

ELLISON(SMITH)

Respectfully report as follows: That **HOUSE** Bill No. **342**.....

BE CONCURRED IN

~~XXXXXX~~

Ed B. Smith
.....
ED B. SMITH,

Chairman.

46