MINUTES OF THE MEETING FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 50TH LEGISLATIVE SESSION

February 5, 1987

The meeting of the Fish and Game Committee was called to order by Chairman Orval Ellison on February 5, 1987, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 325 of the State Capitol.

<u>ROLL CALL</u>: All committee members were present with the exception of Rep. Peterson who was excused.

HOUSE BILL NO. 429: Rep. Ted Schye, District #18, sponsor, stated HB 429 was a rather simple bill which was an act to provide for Fish and Game approval of the awarding of prizes for the taking of protected fish in state waters. It would also provide the department with additional authority and the flexibility needed to regulate these fishing events. He explained there was a slight amendment, which he distributed to the committee (Exhibit 1). Additionally, there was a statement of intent to clarify rule making authority for the department and distributed a copy of this as well. (Exhibit 1a). With that, he stated he would let testimony be heard and reserved the right to close.

<u>PROPONENTS</u>: Jim Flynn, Director, Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) submitted testimony. (Exhibit 2). He stated HB 429 provides that the commission shall adopt rules governing fishing contests and will remove the prohibition on awarding prizes based on a bag limit for fish. With passage of this bill, harmless contest can be permitted as before, but those that will result in excessive harvest of a game fish population or damage to the environment or site can be prevented or scheduled to minimize damage. It would also provide the department or commission with both the authority and needed flexibility to regulate fishing derbies.

JIM BENDER, President, Walleyes Unlimited submitted testimony. (Exhibit 3). He stated current state law 87-3-121, MCA, states that prizes cannot be given for bag limits but can be given "for any one game bird, fish, or fur bearing animal on the basis of size, quality or rarity." Walleyes Unlimited is not opposed to fishing contests, they realize the potential increase in the sales of supplies and services that would occur in a given area. During tournaments, they have encouraged conservation of the resource by limiting below the legal limit the number of fish a participant may take and remain within the rules of the contest. They believe that changing the current statute to allow the Fish

and Game Commission to establish rules for fishing contests would allow for more flexibility in tournament fishing and would not be detrimental to the resource.

STAN BRADSHAW, representing Trout Unlimited (TU), submitted testimony. (Exhibit 4). He stated TU supported HB 429 because it provided another measure of protection for the fishery in the state that has been lacking in the past. Under existing law, the only kind of fishing derby that can be held were those which allowed for the taking of a single fish, with prizes to be awarded on the basis of size, quality, or rarity. This has given rise to some heavily attended derbies for tagged fish. The problem, under current law, is that if a person chose to hold a derby on a given water, even if the derby might have adverse consequences of that fishery, the commission and the department were powerless to stop it. HB 429 provides the commission with the authority to control those derbies which might otherwise have an adverse effect on a given fishery.

#### NO OPPONENTS

NO QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSIONS) FROM THE COMMITTEE .

Rep. Schye closed by stating he did want to point out the statement of intent and hoped the committee would look favorably and give HB 429 a DO PASS.

Hearing closed on HB 429.

HOUSE BILL NO. 535: Rep. Orval Ellison, District #81, sponsor, stated he knew the committee was limited for time, so he would let the opponents and proponents speak.

JIM FLYNN, Director, Department of Fish, **PROPONENTS:** Wildlife and Parks, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 5). He stated the department supported the concept of a block of nonresident deer A licenses to be used statewide. They support the additional block of nonresident deer licenses with the understanding the additional revenue generated by these licenses be earmarked for conservation easements, lease or fee title purchase of wildlife habitat in the State of Montana. The Department opposes the use of a resident sponsor to obtain a nonresident license. They felt the resident sponsor would do little to help the nonresident hunter. It would be costly for the department to administer, and penalties for noncompliance had not been addressed. It also sets a precedent for license brokering and could foster illegal outfitting as it did in the early 70's. The bill incorporated several aspects that had been introduced in other legislation before the committee. They suggest

that it be submitted to the subcommittee addressing all the bills concerned with the issue.

JO BRUNNER, representing the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association stated they had proponents and would hand out testimony for each. With this she introduced the first proponent.

ANDY BILLINGSLEY, a Glasgow resident, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 6). He stated most outfitters thought the 5,600 license set aside for their clients in 1985 was a magic number which would allow the outfitters to live happily ever after. This is not so. The 5,600 was no more than a survival figure. He then gave statistics reflected in his testimony, and stated in order to keep the outfitting industry in Montana afloat, he urged the committee to give a DO PASS to HB 535.

RUSS GREENWOOD, a member of MOGA from Southeast Montana, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 7 and 7a). He stated presently there were two ways for a nonresident to buy a deer "A" tag for eastern Montana. Buy a B-10 combination license for \$350, or wait until the B-10 licenses were sold and see if the Fish and Game Commission issued some nonresident deer "A" tags for the area you wanted to hunt in. You could then enter a drawing for your tag. The odds are about one in four that you would draw a tag. He stated being an outfitter. there was no way to survive on the risky luck-of-the-draw for the deer "A" tags. He must license his hunters with the expensive, but available, \$350 B-10 license. Now, with the squeeze coming on the B-10 license, his fellow outfitters in the west desperately need the elk tags his hunters were throwing away. He urged the committee to look favorably on HB 535 and give it approval so he would not lose his job.

SANDRA CAHILL, a licensed outfitter, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 8). She stated two groups HB 535 obviously favored were the guided hunter and the outfitter. She referred to her testimony on the economic study done by Montana State University and gave several facts and figures on guided and non-quided hunts. She then stated regarding increased revenue in the state going to outfitters, as the university study showed, 91% of their gross income is spent within the state of Montana. Outfitters also provide jobs. By increasing the number of clients available to outfitters, HB 535 would also increase the number of jobs they could provide. New dollars brought into Montana are spent and re-spent in Montana. She urged support and passage of HB 535.

ART WEIKUM, member of MOGA, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 9). He stated consensus has it that the magic number of 17,000 residents permitted to hunt in Montana, in any given year, was one of social compromise, rather than one with biological basis. Another social aspect of providing for a stable outfitting industry in Montana, through HB 535, is one of opportunity for less fortunate Americans and urged a DO PASS for the legislation.

RON CURTISS, member of MOGA, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 10). He stated the prior testimony had shown HB 535 to be valuable to the state. The value lies in not only its economics, but also in its social values; in the jobs it provided; in the business it would stimulate. The outfitting industry, through HB 535, has asked first that all non-resident licenses be set aside for Montanans, and secondly that their own industry be limited to half the available licenses. Why a set aside? Montana outfitters need a set aside so they can carry on like any other business in the state. He stated they were not asking for any licensing privileges they have not asked to be extended to every other resident Montanan. They were also not asking the committee to lock up half the licenses for those non-resident hunters who had reserved hunts with them. HB 535 gives all Montanans more licenses than they needed; licensed outfitters, landowner outfitters and residents, and it accomplishes it without denying even one resident his opportunity to hunt in Montana.

TERRY ENGLE, a professional guide from Helena, stated he supported HB 535 because for him, it was his way of life. The non-residents were important to him and he urged passage of HB 535.

TRAVIS BARKER, representing Ford Creek Outfitters, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 11). He stated his family operated Ford Creek Outfitters and has done so for the last 11 seasons. He stated, the reality of second generation outfitters is in question. The opportunities available to tomorrows outfitters depend on decisions made today. Considering the increasing number of outfitters operating on private land, rancher-outfitters, and established wilderness outfitters, the quota of non-resident big game licenses available to outfitter clients needs to be increased from its present number, if the industry was to remain healthy in Montana. By lending their support to HB 535, they promote tourism in Montana, sound management of Montana big game, and an enhanced image of their state by people in other states.

JOHN WILSON, Administrator, Montana Promotional Division of the Chamber of Commerce, supported HB 535 and stated it

would enhance the airline industry by bringing additional nonresidents into the state, also being an added way of promoting tourism. He urged the committee's support of HB 535.

BILL GAY, a landowner from Powder River County, submitted (Exhibit 12). He stated their ranch had been testimony. leasing hunting rights to an outfitter for four years and expected to continue to lease for the foreseeable future. The primary reason for leasing was economic. He stated they can no longer afford to give away anything. He stated the amount they make from hunting was not a large percentage of their budget, but it was significant enough to help pay the bills. Charging hunters was a possibility, but had costs in time and effort. With an outfitter on the place, they do not have to worry about trying to collect from each group of hunters, and they were also supervised so he did not worry about gates open, camps too close to water holes and four wheel drives making ruts in the meadows. The arrangements they used with their outfitter has worked very well, and he felt has been a positive way to manage hunting on their property. He encouraged the committee to provide means to the outfitters to establish stable businesses in their community.

JOE MORRIS, livestock ranch owner, stated they have also leased their land to an outfitter and have been very pleased with the results. He stated the clients also made comments on how pleased they were. He felt it was more profitable for them and others who were doing the same thing.

GEORGE ALLEN, Montana Retailers Association, stated they were in support of the bill and added he felt it would promote tourism, along with additional economy to the state that was so badly needed. He urged the committee to give HB 535 a DO PASS.

LARRY STANLEY, representing the airline industry, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 13). He stated as a representative of the airline industry, he felt qualified to verify the type of person who was most likely to use the airlines that serve Montana during a traditionally slow period, as the same one who would be inclined to use an outfitters and guides service. These people leave double the amount of money per person in the state than the out-of-stater who came on his own. If they really support the "build Montana theme", they needed to consider supporting the programs that bring the most revenue into Montana.

LOREN SEAVER, a Great Falls resident, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 14). He stated the Montana Outfitters and Guides

Association represents a statewide industry that is at a fork in the trail, and depending on decisions made by the legislature, they will either lose a valuable industry, or take a step in the right direction to promote the industry. He stated he respectfully requests the committee to direct the organization along the right fork in the trail, set aside the additional licenses for the clients of outfitters and help save a vital industry.

KELLY FLYNN, a rancher from Broadwater County, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 15). He stated their ranch is a survivor ranch, and across the years has survived by being diversified. Today, they are operating a hunting business and the previous two generations of ranchers in their family have survived some difficult times. His generation is now experiencing some of these difficult times. Their hunting operation is an important reason their third generation is surviving these difficult economic times. He urged the committees' support of HB 535.

JACK ATCHESON, representing his consultant firm, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 16). He stated he was a hunting consultant, which is similar to an airline travel agent. Instead of Hawaiian tours, he finds hunters. Contrary to what people think, the hardest part of outfitting is finding enough clients who will pay what the outfitter needs to make profit. To find clients, you must advertise one to three years in advance. The cost of advertising has nearly doubled in the last five years, but the pool of prospective clients has not. If we want to destroy a 34 million dollar industry, we can do it by making it tough on outfitters. If Montana is to be a recreational state, we must charge for what we have. There are many places to go besides Montana. Non-residents pay two thirds of our Fish and Game bill, and dump millions into our economy. Do not exchange the non-resident who is willing, with a do-it-yourselfer who spends little. He urged support for HB 535.

Due to the time limit, the rest of the proponents were asked to simply state their name and support the bill.

ROGER W. YOUNG, President, Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce submitted testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 17).

JOSEPH J. ABERLE, representing the Ag Almanac, submitted testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 18).

HAROLD AND JEAN WAHL, Great Falls residents, submitted testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 19).

ROGER F. WOLTER, a Great Falls resident, submitted testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 20).

BRIAN HOVEN, Hoven Equipment Company, submitted testimony and supported HB 535. (Exhibit 21).

JERRY KAVANAGH, a Great Falls resident, submitted testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 22).

THE HORSE CREEK OUTFITTERS, submitted testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 23).

TAG RITTEL, President of the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association, submitted testimony in full support of HB 535. (Exhibit 24).

CHUCK REIN, Anchor Land & Livestock of Melville, submitted written testimony in favor of HB 535. (Exhibit 25).

AL JOHNSON, Kalispell Area Chamber of Commerce submitted written testimony in favor of HB 535. (Exhibit 26).

GARY AND VIOLA ANDERSON, Deep Creek Outfitters, submitted written testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 27).

ANGELO PETRONI, Bert Mooney Airport Authority in Butte, submitted testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 28).

JOHN AND CAROLYN BACON, of Melrose, Montana, submitted written testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 29).

DUANE NEAL, a Pray, Montana resident, submitted written testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 30).

EUGENE LEE, Kalispell Chamber of Commerce, submitted testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 31).

The following proponents are all members, or associated with members, of the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association. They all left testimony which can be found as exhibits. The minutes will reflect their name and their support of HB 535.

CARL SOLVIE, General Manager Grantree Inn (Exhibit 32). DAVE KUMLIEN, Montana TroutFitters Orvis Shop (Exhibit 33). SULLIVAN PHOTO WEST, Bozeman, MT (Exhibit 34). CRAIG FABRICIUS, store manager, Good Year Tire Center (Exhibit 35). MARK MACLEOD, Highlander Photographics (Exhibit 37). MICHAEL S. HAMMOND, Universal Graphics (Exhibit 37). STEVE SCHNEE, Schnee's Boot Works (Exhibit 39). HARRY W. NEWLON, President, First Bank, Bozeman (Exhibit 40).

GARY AND VIOLA ANDERSON, Deep Creek Outfitters, submitted written testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 27).

ANGELO PETRONI, Bert Mooney Airport Authority in Butte, submitted testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 28).

JOHN AND CAROLYN BACON, of Melrose, Montana, submitted written testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 29).

DUANE NEAL, a Pray, Montana resident, submitted written testimony in support of HB 535. (Exhibit 30).

EUGENE LEE, Kalispell Chamber of Commerce, submitted testimony supporting HB 535. (Exhibit 31).

The following proponents are all members, or associated with members, of the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association. They all left testimony which can be found as exhibits. The minutes will reflect their name and their support of HB 535.

CARL SOLVIE, General Manager Grantree Inn (Exhibit 32). DAVE KUMLIEN, Montana TroutFitters Orvis Shop (Exhibit 33). SULLIVAN PHOTO WEST, Bozeman, MT (Exhibit 34). CRAIG FABRICIUS, store manager, Good Year Tire Center (Exhibit 35). MARK MACLEOD, Highlander Photographics (Exhibit 37). MICHAEL S. HAMMOND, Universal Graphics (Exhibit 38). STEVE SCHNEE, Schnee's Boot Works (Exhibit 39). HARRY W. NEWLON, President, First Bank, Bozeman (Exhibit 40). ERNEST FRANKE, a Thompson Falls resident (Exhibit 41). KATHLEEN PAULIC, Granny's Home Cooking (Exhibit 42). DARL CUCHIN, Doug's Towing and Auto Service (Exhibit 43). WISE RIVER SPORTSMAN'S CLUB, (Exhibit 44). RON COLLINS, Manager, Chevron Feed and Fuel (Exhibit 45). JEFFREY C. SPADY, Express Photo Lab (Exhibit 46). CLIFF RENNER, Kwik-Kopy Printing (Exhibit 47).

<u>OPPONENTS</u>: JEANNE KLOBNAK, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation, submitted an excerpt from a wildlife magazine. (Exhibit 48). She stated MWF opposed HB 535 as it was written. She stated the outfitting industry was not a survival industry. The industry has been provided \$3 million plus as a subsidy according to the studies reflected in her testimony. She stated this so called \$34 million brought into the state by the outfitters was a misleading figure and felt the committee must take a look at the proposal very carefully before they make a drastic decision like this for the State of Montana.

KATHY HADLEY, a resident from Deer Lodge, stated she represented the average sportsmen in her area. She felt HB 535,

535, in that it would put pressure on an already pressured resource. He stated the proposal would inevitably force people to hunt with an outfitter and guide, simply because it would become more difficult to obtain a license in the years to come. The felt it was not a fair balance between residents and nonresidents, and it would specifically effect the various other special interest groups throughout the state. He urged the committee to kill the bill.

LEWIS HAWKES, a concerned individual, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 50). He stated HB 535, as written, is a disservice to the average working resident in Montana. It unfairly allocates a portion of the hunting opportunities and is a move towards the privatization/commercialism of the wildlife resources in Montana. The dude rancher-outfitter-guide complex is a powerful special interest group, who put pressure on the DFWP to set special seasons or longer seasons for their own financial benefit and push for excessive trophy hunts to draw their clientele to obtain more money. They are a middleman broker group who contribute nothing to the raising of wildlife in Montana, and are helping block access to some 13,000,000 acres of public lands in Eastern Montana. He stated a random draw should be held for all non-resident licenses and urged the committee not to pass the bill.

JOE GUTKOSKI, President, Gallatin Wildlife Association, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 51). He stated the bill was a large step in privatizing a public wildlife resource. It gives favoritism to a special interest group and is unfair to non-resident hunters that do not wish to employ outfitters. He urged the committee to kill the bill.

M. E. "GENE" QUENEMOEN, a Belgrade resident, submitted testimony (Exhibit 52). He stated the wildlife resources of Montana were never intended to figure prominently in providing an economic base for the state. This resource was kept in public ownership to provide a recreational amenity for all citizens. It is wrong to now look at it as a resource to be exploited for economic development. Further privatization of this resource will, in the eyes of most Montana sportsmen, take away a valuable reason for living in this state. It is unfair to non-resident hunters, and should think, unconsitutional to require any sponsorship by Montana residents, whether outfitters or just friends, in order to obtain a non-resident license. If a quota is necessary, and the demand for non-resident licenses exceeds the quota, then the licenses should be issued on a random drawing.

TONY SCHOONEN, Skyline Sportsmen Association, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 53). He stated his organization officially opposed the establishment of 6,000 additional

deer "A" tags in Montana, based upon the increase of approximately 4,200 non-resident elk hunters into our state. They felt strongly the 4,200 non-residents would congregate on public lands in the southwestern parts of the state. This would increase the elk harvest by approximately 800 animals, and with dwindling habitat coverage due to logging and limiting the kind of elk to shoot, such as no-spikes, they felt would lead to more hunter conflicts.

EMILY SWANSON, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 54). She stated the issue at hand has been portrayed as an economic issue by the outfitters and she wished to dispute that not guaranteeing outfitters a clientele will destroy their businesses. They have heard that without a guaranteed clientele, the state will lose over a million dollars of revenue and X number of jobs. She emphasized she felt outfitting was an important and reputable industry in the state, and fully supported the fine outfitters of Montana. What she feared was it sets a precedent of preferential treatment for a privileged few, for the future of our state. Many people live in Montana to take advantage of its natural resources and, when these are taken from them by becoming too costly, which is what they fear is beginning with this precedent, will we undermine what we hold most dear? We need to draw a firm line on who controls the public's wildlife and that line begins here.

ED SHEPARD, a local resident, opposed the bill stating he felt everyone should have an equal and legal opportunity to obtain a license, and the lottery system is perhaps the best way to go.

BILL HOLWORTH, a concerned citizen, opposed the bill stating, it would be added pressure to the elk and deer out in the field, which is the last thing they need to do to the wildlife.

#### NO FURTHER OPPONENTS

REP. GIACOMETTO asked Mr. Gay regarding the fact he does lease his land to an outfitter and wondered if he had problems with keeping them in certain areas or did he leave it up to the outfitter.

MR. GAY stated they have left it strictly up to the outfitter, and so far the results have been great.

REP. ELLISON closed by stating he just wanted something that would be fair to all persons involved, to give everyone a fair chance. The game of Montana belongs to everyone, and is a renewable resource they must take seriously. With that, he closed.

HEARING ON HB 535 WAS CLOSED.

Due to the time limit, the hearing was recessed, and Rep. Asay, sponsor of HB 379, asked if they could hear the bill upon adjournment of the House stating there were many people who had waited to testify on the bill all day. Rather than reschedule, they could have it then. The committee had no objections.

The meeting was re-convened at 6:00 p.m. A quorum being present, hearing was then opened on HB 379.

HOUSE BILL NO. 379: Rep. Tom Asay, District #27, sponsor, stated he presented HB 379 with the idea that it was a relatively new concept released here in Montana. He stated he has been working on the concept for the last few years, due to the fact that no one seemed to be satisfied with the present results of wildlife management and recreation. This bill proposes a landowner or a group of landowners get together and draw up a plan for their particular lands. The plan would then be presented to the department for full approval. Any plan drawn up would be done with the help of professional biologists, to ensure exactly what was there and how it should be handled. The plan would include any of the provisions for access for the local hunters, and would cover the entire sphere being totally managed by the landowner with the approval of the department. The hope is, with such a plan, the landowner and operator would decide, and include in his economic plan, to run fewer livestock, thus enhancing his economics and his ability to survive economic crisis as well as the ability to enhance the wildlife resource, which would cause the landowner to grow as well. Rep. Asay went over the department's figures stating it was obvious they did not anticipate any great increase in availability of game for some years to come. People who hunt, must realize a vast amount of habitat that can be acquired, is on private land. We need to set our sights on what is good, we do not need to look only at elk, we have to realize there are a great deal of cattle that are not being harvested or managed to a satisfactory level. The people who own the land should be encouraged to try and live within the land. Economically, people need to diversify to survive during economically bad times. He felt HB 379 held the potential for insuring diversification to some of the landowners who would be interested in doing this.

<u>PROPONENTS</u>: Rep. Paul Rapp-Svrcek, District #51, co-sponsor of the bill, stated he is a native Montanan and lived here all his life. To him, the bill was a radical departure of the way they have done things in this state in the past. If there were any possible way to hold back the tide they see coming, he would find a way. Since they cannot hold back

that tide, they must then direct it as he sees HB 379 doing. He stated for many years, the landowners have been supporting the public resource on their private land and receiving little or no compensation. Last session they had struggles trying to directly compensate the landowner for game damage on their property plus the problems arising from it. That is why he became intrigued by the idea of management for It appears with this proposal, they take an wildlife. adversarial relationship between the landowner and the hunter and the landowner and the department, providing an incentive for the landowner to manage his land for the best of the public resource that he has been carrying for so It changes his emphasis so he now has the best long. interest of the public resource in mind. It has been found in other states, where similar proposals have been enacted, not only does it alleviate many of the game damage problems, but the game population on public lands has increased as a result of the partnership between state and private landowner. and private partnership in the management game resource. While this is a departure from the way things have been done in Montana in the past, there are benefits to be derived for the public hunter and the public at large who are interested in preserving the wildlife in the state. This is a concept which needs to be looked at and needs to be scrutinized very carefully. Finally, it is a creation of partnership between landowners and department, and is a long term proposal for the preservation of game animals and recreational game opportunity we have had in the state.

BILL MYERS, rancher/outfitter and President of the Montana Outdoors Association initiated in 1985 by a group of landowners, outfitters and business people. He distributed copies of the studies, done by the group, to the committee. (Exhibit 55). He stated HB 379 was a result of two years of research and study which found that several other states have landowner wildlife management programs. These programs have proved to be feasible not only to the landowners, but of managing of wildlife for residents and non-residents According to the research done, three major areas alike. would require attention of those interested in game managelicensing of hunters, game management laws, ment; and private land manageability. The other area needing attention is the private land manageability. The philosophy that managing game on private lands, is still a question. There has been a belief that the rancher could not benefit from Ranchers are just now learning the important value game. hunting can be to their operations. Considering the limitations put on the private landowner, by restricting his licensing and/or partnership abilities and forced access on those acres, the value of those elk is teetering dangerously toward endangerment in many cases. Through a program such as private wildlife management areas, it will not cost the

talked about here is turning what many landowners tend to look at as a liability, into an asset. The expertise that could be offered by the department under this legislation in the area of planning for wildlife and habitat management, could be invaluable for landowners across the state, not to mention for the wildlife resource itself.

KEN ARTHUN, rancher, stated on the north of the Crazy Mountains, they have about 121 head of elk. At the beginning of hunting season, they probably had 21 bulls, three or four branch antlered bulls, no mature bulls whatsoever and the rest were spikes. At the end of the season, of the 121 elk, there were 100 elk and there was not one bull left alive in the bunch. He questioned what is wrong with economic growth in Montana. HB 379 provides a new concept for the State of Montana, and what is wrong with going after He stated they have let people hunt on their land for it. the last 50 years and have finally shut their land off to hunters because they got tired of having people abusing their lands. He challenges the Montana Wildlife Federation to prove who pays the taxes on these private lands, who feeds the animals that are there, or who pays for the feed the animals take, and who fixes the fence after the animals have been run through by our "Montana hunters". He urged support for HB 379.

REP. LEO GIACOMETTO stated for the record, he was a proponent to HB 379.

OPPONENTS: Jim Flynn, Director, Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 59). He stated the intent of the bill is to encourage the propagation, conservation and utilization of wildlife resources on private lands is commendable. However, the means to accomplish this intent cause them to oppose its passage. The bill is not practical for a number of reasons, and contemplates the creation of a unique relationship among landowners, sportsmen and the department which is of concern. From a practical standpoint, it would be physically impossible for the department to meet the bill's requirements and meet their present obligations without a major addition of If only a small percent of the total eligible personnel. landowners took part in the program, the amount of time to approve and monitor the proposed plans is large. The implementation of the program in a state with limited non-resident hunters would seem to be impractical. The bill would seem to facilitate the paying of a trespass fee by the sportsman to the landowner. Such transactions would be costly and burdensome. They see no need for it, and suggest the bill should not be approved.

Fish, Wildlife and Parks anything and the landowner is responsible for coming up with the money. Fish, Wildlife and Parks would benefit financially from not only having these additional monies available, but from extra license revenues as well. Through proper allocation of licenses, whereby the landowner would also profit, the income would not only insure wildlife already in place, but would elevate the importance of wildlife which would be a real "winner" in trying to solve the problem in the state.

BASSET HOINESS, concerned rancher, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 56). He stated the intent of HB 379 was to allow the private landowner a monetary incentive for the game that is managed on his property. The incentive is a guarantee of licenses for out-of-state hunters. The Fish and Game Department is saying their main problem with the bill is the cost of biology work that is needed for each operation. What about using private biologists. They say no, they would not take the expertise of these people. In many cases, this would eliminate the problem of winter range for elk. He felt the bill is a winner because HB 379 could help keep the farmer-rancher on this ground and help eliminate the over supply of cattle on the market. They have been looking for a diversionary crop for agriculture that would not add to their bulging surplus. This bill would help.

KEITH BALES, landowner from Otter, MT, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 57). He stated he felt a landowner compensation law must contain the following things: more hunting opportunities for the residents, higher quality hunting, be expandable to take in as many landowners as want to participate, compensation must be equal to, or greater than, the loss caused by the wildlife, majority of the cost should be borne by the out-of-state sportsman, and not adversely affect landowners who do not participate. When the sportsmen and the landowners agree on some form of compensation, Montana could become the premiere place to hunt in North America.

LORENTS GROSFIELD, cattle rancher from Big Timber, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 58). He stated there are a number of bills before the legislature regarding improving the wildlife resources of the state. Some of which, like this one, regard the purchasing or leasing of habitat and recognize the a lot of critical habitat, for many if not most species, occurs on private land. An obvious question concerned whether purchasing some limited quantities of habitat the best and most effective way is to approach the problems of our wildlife resources. State wildlife agencies simply must recognize this and deal with it in a constructive manner if they are to significantly improve the public wildlife resource and maintain improvements once made. What is being

REP. JERRY DRISCOLL submitted testimony by Lee Fears, who represents the southeastern Montana Sportsmen Association, in opposition to HB 379. (Exhibit 60).

HARRY MCNEIL, member of the Gallatin Wildlife Association, stated he wanted to point out that it has been their own Fish and Game Department personnel, with verbal and financial support of sportsmen, who are responsible for the recovery of Montana game populations from near extinction in the early part of the century. HB 379, under consideration here, was simply another attempt by special interest groups to capitalize on the success of those wildlife management programs. This is a bill to legalize the privatization of our wildlife. He reminded the committee it is the sportsmen who have organized meetings and tried to work out ways to improve landowner/sportsmen relations in the state. It was, also, the sportsmen who emphasized and worked for the purchase of wildlife ranges, to help relieve some of the grazing pressure on private landowners and who foot the bill to allow the DFWP employees to help landowners protest their crops and recover from wildlife damage. He felt it would be the ultimate insult to Montana sportsmen, to grant the landowners the right to obtain and distribute permits at their own discretion. It has long been accepted, that the state is a trustee of wildlife for the use and enjoyment of the people. He interprets this to mean all the people and not just a select few.

DAVE MAJORS, representing the Ravalli County Fish and Wildlife Association, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 61). He stated the RCFWA opposed the bill which recognized the important role that the private landowner plays in providing habitat for the public game animals. The concept of compensating a landowner to encourage the enhancement and conservation of wildlife on their property was laudable. He stated the mechanics of the bill, for the most part, are unsatisfactory. The idea of including any public land in a private wildlife management area was totally unacceptable to most sportsmen and recreationists. If this committee is serious in pursuing this concept, he suggested they work with the DFWP to put together a package which is acceptable to both the landowner and the sportsman, in order to benefit the resource both groups prize, Montana's wildlife.

LEWIS E. HAWKES, Bozeman resident, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 62). He stated HB 379 is similar to legislation passed in California, allowing "private wildlife management areas," which he felt was a further attempt to privatize and commercialize the wildlife resources in Montana. He stated the legislature should reject this proposal of the private wildlife management areas now, because it would serve to

further aggravate the already intolerable conditions concerning public access to public lands in Montana.

JEANNE KLOBNAK, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation, stated they opposed such a system for Montana. She stated they are creating a law which allows for a few to handle wildlife of Montana, that which Montana believes belongs to all of them. Wildlife was once nearly diminished in the early 1900's. Gradual reintroduction of the wildlife population came to be from the public policy, public support and public dollars, reestablishing wildlife, not only to public land, but to private land as well. Between 1953 and 1955, legislation was introduced to protect the environment and further advance the healing process. The policy to protect the wildlife habitat was established. In conclusion, the cumulative effects is that we have restored wildlife to a resource of unparalleled abundance and is the envy of the entire nation. The system that holds all of this together is that this was done by all of us, for all of us, and there were no privileged categories. There has been a common effort to preserve and protect common resource endowed with common respect. HB 379 is an elitist proposal which seeks to capitalize on that which belongs to us all. MWF encouraged a DO NOT PASS on HB 379.

TONY SCHOONEN, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation and the Skyline Sportsmen Club of Butte, submitted testimony (Exhibit 63). He stated the bill would allow public lands to be locked off to the general sportsman which was strictly illegal. State school lands, BLM lands and forest service lands can only be used for those purposes that are stated on the lease. Since all of those lands are public lands, hearings would have to be held to change the descriptions of The general public cannot afford to lose the leases. anymore access due to the ever increasing demands being placed on the land and wildlife resources. Public lands are blocked off by adjoining private land and then used by a small group of individuals that can afford the trespass fee, thus allowing the public wildlife to be privatized by a select few. Only private deeded land can be managed as the landowner sees fit, be it for wildlife, livestock, or some other beneficial use, not leased land or public land.

EMILY SWANSON, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation submitted testimony. (Exhibit 64). She stated the bill puts them on the path toward hunting for a privileged few who can afford to pay the price. Rather than this form of providing for wildlife habitat, she suggested that it is considered using hunting license revenues to purchase, lease or provide for easements by the DFWP of suitable lands to be managed for the public. This legislation is modeled on similar concepts at work in other states where population

pressures have forced these measures. She did offer suggested amendments to the bill and included them in her testimony.

RON COLLINS, Deerlodge resident, stated others have testified regarding loss of public access, the loss of private and public land, and the reluctance they have with private landowners that control the sale of hunting licenses. He suggested the effect the bill could have on the youth of our state. It seemed Montana possessed the inability to hold youth here, or attract youth from other states. Most of the youth in this state grow up learning to hunt and fish, and is a big reason they do stay in the state. If their opportunities are taken away, in essence, we are taking the youth away. He pointed out a state without its youth is a state not worth living in. This bill is patterned after the California and Texas bill and is almost identical to their plans. He stated they will never see the day in Montana that our population equals that of California or Texas. We are not solving our problem by using someone else's plan, we are really creating a whole new problem for our state. It must be considered that when passing this bill, we would be, in a way, selling our birthright.

KATHY HADLEY, licensed outfitter, stated she was opposed to the bill because she felt they were taking public resources and private lands and giving them up. She stated they must also think about what the public subsidizes, and in this case, she felt they were subsidizing their resource to make up for our failing economy and she urged the committee to DO NOT PASS this legislation.

JOE GUTKOSKI, President, Gallatin Wildlife Association, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 65). He stated the bill gave favoritism to a special interest group that was unfair. It was a step toward overcommercialism and privatization of a public resource. He stated GWA realized that a free ranging wildlife resource was important to the citizens of Montana and this bill would inhibit that free ranging wildlife. He urged the committee to vote against the bill.

STAN BRADSHAW, on behalf of Trout Unlimited, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 66). He stated that no longer would the right to fish be subject only to reasonable regulation, but it would also be subject to the whim of the particular landowner, regardless of the character of the water or the needs of the fishery. For example, he stated, a landowner whose wildlife management area encompassed a reach of the Madison River, could, under the auspices of this bill, require every person fishing that reach of the Madison, to purchase a permit even if the person had floated in from upstream. One of the things which has set this state apart, was that here, fish and wildlife have not been considered

objects of property. Instead, they are considered to be held in trust by the state for the use of its people. This bill would begin the erosion of that principle by endowing landowners with attributes of ownership of the fish and game that may occur within the reaches of their land.

SCOTT ROSS, representing the Montana Bowhunters Association, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 67). He stated HB 379 holds the potential for a redistribution of hunting privileges the likes of which Montana sportsmen have not imagined. Not only would the private wildlife management area manager have the final say as to who has access to the property, he also has direct control over who may be licensed to take game on that property by having control of the permit applications as well. It seems that the non-resident hunter would be given the same opportunity as a resident in obtaining a license for a particular private wildlife management area. While sportsmen in general, support the concept of limiting landowner liability when it comes to use of private lands by recreationists, the system would be entirely another matter if the availability of hunting permit applications is controlled by any monetary consideration. The uncertainties posed by this measure prompt us to not only ask your support in defeating it, but also to ask that you voice your "no" vote so strongly that Montana's citizens have reassurance that our wildlife and recreation heritage will be protected intact for our generations and those that will follow.

L. F. THOMAS, representing the Anaconda sportsmen, stated they stand in opposition to HB 379.

JANET ELLIS, representing the Montana Audubon Legislative Fund, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 68). She stated if private wildlife management areas are to be established, they want to make sure that our wildlife resources truly benefit from the management plans, and that cost money. Without adequate funding for this program, the resource will suffer when management plans are not adequately examined and corrected. They are also concerned that inadequate plans will end up in a district court, taking additional time and money from the DFWP. MALF cannot support HB 379 until they are assured that this program will pay for itself and really does protect our wildlife resource.

Due to the time factor, the rest of the audience who wanted to testify were asked to simply state their names and position on the bill.

M. E. QUENEMOEN, Secretary/Treasurer of the Gallatin Wildlife Association, submitted testimony in opposition to HB 379. (Exhibit 69).

CURT WILSON, a Great Falls resident, submitted testimony in opposition to HB 379. (Exhibit 70).

QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSIONS) ON HOUSE BILL NO. 379: Rep. Rapp-Svrcek asked Jeanne Klobnak what she was as the role of the landowner in the interaction of the public wildlife resource in Montana.

Jeanne stated her personal thoughts were that they play the role of a caretaker, someone who has regard for the land knowing that the wildlife were there before that individual and will still be there when the individual is gone. She agreed there must be some incentive provided to landowners to manage their land, and to care for the wildlife population for the benefit of all.

Rep. Rapp-Svrcek asked Jim Flynn in regard to his testimony, he stated he had concerns involving the development of the plan and how this would tax his staff and wondered what problems he sees, if we were to have the plan developed by professional wildlife biologists and not necessarily by the Department.

Mr. Flynn stated they have no problem with a private wildlife biologist developing the plan on a contract basis, with the private landowner.

Rep. Cobb asked Mr. Flynn if the Department has been working on this type of program for some time.

Mr. Flynn stated that other than the involvement they have had with the conservation easements program, he was not aware of any work done on this type of program.

Rep. Moore asked Lorents Grosfield if he had suffered game damage on his land, and wondered if he had ever received federal compensation for this damage and if he could include those losses on his income tax.

Mr. Grosfield stated he has not received federal compensation for game damage, and he did not report it on his income tax because there is very little to receive. However, he has been federally compensated in instances where someone has driven over a fence or torn down a gate, but nothing for game damage.

Rep. Ream commented there must be room for compromise when it comes to private management areas, and wondered if a neighbor with a ranch not in this program, who had started to have problems with game damage, would be on his own when it came time to do something about this damage.

Rep. Asay stated this would most normally impact a small area, with several ranches in a specific area, in hopes a number of people would express compromise for a management plan, when they can see how well their neighbors do who are in the plan, which usually involves better hunting, and better controlled land.

Rep. Ream wanted to know who was responsible if the game moved from one area to another, perhaps from private land to federal land.

Rep. Asay stated the federal lands could not restrict the game, and the plan cannot restrict the game from moving from one area to another. However, with the plan set up the way it is, hopefully with better controlled herds and land, this type of situation would be rare.

Rep. Phillips stated he saw no reference of a fee that would be charged by the landowner and wondered if he was in fact, going to charge a fee, to let these people get on his land.

Rep. Asay stated the landowner is going to sell his services to the public. Under this plan, the landowner had the opportunity to sell his services, somewhat like trying to develop a product, an example would be similar to trying to locate his trophy elk and be able to extend this as a service they obtain from his land.

Rep. Phillips stated that was fine; however, he assumes they also sell a permit, and he wondered what the fee for this permit would be.

Rep. Asay stated they would have permission from the Fish and Game. There would be no guarantees made that a certain species may be filled.

Rep. Grady asked what this fee would be.

Rep. Asay stated at this point in time, he could not give them a definite answer.

Rep. Asay closed by stating the fiscal note on the bill was in his estimation a "joke sheet" that could not even be used in regard to the bill. He emphasized again, that this is a new idea, a new concept from the way things have been done in the past regarding hunting in Montana. He felt it was a step in the right direction for Montana, and the way things must be looked at for the future. This bill offered an experimental idea, that might be worth a trial period, then evaluated to see if, in fact, it did offer some additional help to the private landowner and the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks. It was a way that private landowners

JANET ELLIS, representing the Montana Audubon Legislative Fund, submitted testimony. (Exhibit 68). She stated if private wildlife management areas are to be established, they want to make sure that our wildlife resources truly benefit from the management plans, and that cost money. Without adequate funding for this program, the resource will suffer when management plans are not adequately examined and corrected. They are also concerned that inadequate plans will end up in a district court, taking additional time and money from the DFWP. MALF cannot support HB 379 until they are assured that this program will pay for itself and really does protect our wildlife resource.

Due to the time factor, the rest of the audience who wanted to testify were asked to simply state their names and position on the bill.

M. E. QUENEMOEN, Secretary/Treasurer of the Gallatin Wildlife Association, submitted testimony in opposition to HB 379. (Exhibit 69).

CURT WILSON, a Great Falls resident, submitted testimony in opposition to HB 379. (Exhibit 70).

QUESTIONS (OR DISCUSSIONS) ON HOUSE BILL NO. 379: Rep. Rapp-Svrcek asked Jeanne Klobnak what she saw as the role of the landowner in the interaction of the public wildlife resource in Montana.

Jeanne stated her personal thoughts were that they play the role of a caretaker, someone who has regard for the land knowing that the wildlife were there before that individual and will still be there when the individual is gone. She agreed there must be some incentive provided to landowners to manage their land, and to care for the wildlife population for the benefit of all.

Rep. Rapp-Svrcek asked Jim Flynn in regard to his testimony, he stated he had concerns involving the development of the plan and how this would tax his staff and wondered what problems he sees, if we were to have the plan developed by professional wildlife biologists and not necessarily by the Department.

Mr. Flynn stated they have no problem with a private wildlife biologist developing the plan on a contract basis, with the private landowner.

Rep. Cobb asked Mr. Flynn if the Department has been working on this type of program for some time.

Mr. Flynn stated that other than the involvement they have had with the conservation easements program, he was not aware of any work done on this type of program.

Rep. Moore asked Lorents Grosfield if he had suffered game damage on his land, and wondered if he had ever received federal compensation for this damage and if he could include those losses on his income tax.

Mr. Grosfield stated he has not received federal compensation for game damage, and he did not report it on his income tax because there is very little to receive. However, he has been federally compensated in instances where someone has driven over a fence or torn down a gate, but nothing for game damage.

Rep. Ream commented there must be room for compromise when it comes to private management areas, and wondered if a neighbor with a ranch not in this program, who had started to have problems with game damage, would be on his own when it came time to do something about this damage.

Rep. Asay stated this would most normally impact a small area, with several ranches in a specific area, in hopes a number of people would express compromise for a management plan, when they can see how well their neighbors do who are in the plan, which usually involves better hunting, and better controlled land.

Rep. Ream wanted to know who was responsible if the game moved from one area to another, perhaps from private land to federal land.

Rep. Asay stated the federal lands could not restrict the game, and the plan cannot restrict the game from moving from one area to another. However, with the plan set up the way it is, hopefully with better controlled herds and land, this type of situation would be rare.

Rep. Phillips stated he saw no reference of a fee that would be charged by the landowner and wondered if he was in fact, going to charge a fee, to let these people get on his land.

Rep. Asay stated the landowner is going to sell his services to the public. Under this plan, the landowner had the opportunity to sell his services, somewhat like trying to develop a product, an example would be similar to trying to locate his trophy elk and be able to extend this as a service they obtain from his land.

Rep. Phillips stated that was fine; however, he assumes they also sell a permit, and he wondered what the fee for this permit would be.

Rep. Asay stated they would have permission from the Fish and Game. There would be no guarantees made that a certain species may be filled.

Rep. Grady asked what this fee would be.

Rep. Asay stated at this point in time, he could not give them a definite answer.

Rep. Asay closed by stating the fiscal note on the bill was in his estimation a "joke sheet" that could not even be used in regard to the bill. He emphasized again, that this is a new idea, a new concept from the way things have been done in the past regarding hunting in Montana. He felt it was a step in the right direction for Montana, and the way things must be looked at for the future. This bill offered an experimental idea, that might be worth a trial period, then evaluated to see if, in fact, it did offer some additional help to the private landowner and the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks. It was a way that private landowners could offer compromise involving private management areas, and increase the control of their lands and their game animals. He urged the committee to look favorably on the idea of HB 379, which would in the long run, offer better relations between the landowner, the hunter and the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks.

HEARING CLOSED ON HB 379.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the committee, the hearing was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

ORVAL ELLISON, CHAIRMAN

DAILY ROLL CALL

FISH GAME COMMITTEE

50th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1987

Date Feb. 5, 1987

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
ORVAL ELLISON, CHAIRMAN	X		
MARIAN HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN	X		
RAY BRANDEWIE	×		
TOM BULGER	×		
JOHN COBB	X		
FRITZ DAILY	×		
GENE DEMARS	X		
JERRY DRISCOLL	×		
LEO GIACOMETTO	X		
ED GRADY	×		
LOREN JENKINS	×		
VERNON KELLER	×		
JANET MOORE	X		
BOB PAVLOVICH (	X		
MARY LOU PETERSON			x
JOHN PHILLIPS	X		
PAUL RAPP-SVRCEK	×		
BOB REAM	X		
STAFF: DAVE COGLEY			

<u>i</u>

EXHIBIT. 1. DATE 2.5 87 HB 529

Amendments to HB 429 (Introduced bill)

1. Page 1, line 24.
Strike: "a"

2. Page 1, line 25. Strike: "is" Insert: "are"

EXHIBIT (13)	-
DATE 2.5.87	
нв_429	-

50th Legislature

LC 397

# STATEMENT OF INTENT HB Bill No. 429

A statement of intent is required for this bill because it grants rulemaking duties to the fish and game commission with regard to the awarding of prizes for the taking of protected fish in state waters. It is the intent of the legislature that the commission adopt rules that address an approval process for the conditions or operations of fishing tournaments, derbies, or contests in order to protect and preserve the fish resources in the state from potentially harmful practices or results of such events.

It is the intent of the legislature that the commission adopt rules that are designed to prevent adverse impacts on the fish resources. To accomplish the purpose, the commission may adopt rules that include but are not limited to:

(1) the duties of the department of fish, wildlife, and parks to recommend approval or disapproval of a tournament, derby, or contest or its conditions, based on sound wildlife conservation criteria;

(2) reporting requirements for the rules and conditions of a tournament, derby, or contest that awards a prize for the taking of fish;

(3) purse or participation limits for such events;

(4) time limits for reporting such events to obtain commission approval or disapproval; and

(5) details of the approval process, including any appeal process.

Notwithstanding the general rulemaking areas listed, it is the intent of the legislature to permit the commission to adopt rules that allow the commission enough flexibility to consider the merits of each tournament, derby, or contest on a case-bycase basis.

EXHIBIT_	(2)
DATE	2.5.87
нв. 429	

#### HB 429 February 5, 1987

Testimony presented by Jim Flynn, Dept. of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

This bill provides that the commission shall adopt rules governing fishing contests and will remove the prohibition on awarding prizes based on a bag limit for fish.

At this time the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and the Fish and Game Commission's only involvement in fishing contests is: (1) authorizing introduction of tagged fish if from another water or a commercial hatchery, (2) regulating the use of department-managed recreation areas and (3) insuring that contestants are properly licensed. There is no mechanism for preventing too great a harvest of game fish populations from a single or series of derbies.

Fishing derbies with significant cash prizes tend to concentrate large numbers of fishermen and if held during times of the year when catch rates are high can result in a heavy harvest in a short period of time removing fish that would have been available to sport fishermen the rest of the year. In some cases these fish are stocked at the expense of licensed fishermen.

With passage of this bill harmless contests can be permitted as before, but those that will result in excessive harvest of a game fish population or damage to the environment or site can be prevented or scheduled to minimize damage. Passage of this bill would provide the department or commission with both the authority and needed flexibility to regulate fishing derbies. The department supports HB 429.

EXHIBIT	(5)
DATE	2.5.87
HB_429	

#### TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HE 429

Current state law 87-3-121, MCA, states that prizes cannot be given for bag limits but can be given "for any one game bird, fish, or fur bearing animal on the basis of size, quality or rarity.

Walleyes Unlimited of Montana believes that this law promotes the tagged fish "derby" where a single fish is either introduced to or removed from a body of water and tagged and released for the contest. This single tagged fish normally has a large dollar value assigned to it, \$10,000 is not uncommon, and therefore draws large numbers of fishermen to a lake or reservoir in hopes of catching this single fish.

Due to the handling of the one tagged fish, normally within 24 hours of the start of the contest, this individual is seldom harvested. The large number of fishermen on the water do, however, harvest large numbers of resident game fish during the contest. The large harvest over a short period of time may be detrimental to the management of game fishes because restrictive limits, based on increased pressure are not incorporated into contest rules. So long as the participant remains within the legal limit for the body of water, he is within the rules of the contest. This, in itself, may not appear detrimental until you consider the increased pressure placed on the lake by the large advertized prize.

DATE 2.5.87

The Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks current involvement in fishing contests is limited to selecting the times a contest may be held on an area they manage, determining additional requirements to handle the increased use of that area, and granting permission for the introduction of tagged fish. We believe they should be more involved to properly manage the resource based on biological data.

Walleyes Unlimited is not opposed to fishing contests, we realize the potential increase in the sales of supplies and services that would occur in a given area and have, in fact, sponsered three tournaments over the past two years. We have tentatively scheduled three tournaments around the state in 1987. During these tournaments we have encouraged conservation of the resource by limiting below the legal limit the number of fish a participant may take and remain within the rules of the contest. We have required the participant to decide immediately after a fish is removed from the water whether or not he will tag the fish for possible entry in the contest, or release it unharmed. A participant found with untagged fish in his possession is immediately disqualified from the contest.

We believe that changing the current statute to allow the Fish and Game Commission to establish rules for fishing contests will allow for more felxibility in tournament fishing and will not be detrimental to the resource.

FXHIBIT	(4)
DATE	2.5.87
HB_47	9

#### H.B. 429

#### TESTIMONY OF STAN BRADSHAW ON BEHALF OF THE MONTANA STATE COUNCIL OF TROUT UNLIMITED, 2/5/87

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Stan Bradshaw. I am here today on behalf of the Montana State Council of Trout Unlimited, an organization to the protection of the cold water fishery in Monntana. We appear in support of H.B. 429 because it provides another measure of proection for the fishery in the state that has been lacking in the past.

Under the existing law, the only kind of fishing derbies which can be held are those which allow for the taking of a single fish, with prizes to be awarded on the basis of size, quality, or rarity. This has given rise to some heavily attended derbies for tagged fish. The problem under the current law is that if a person chooses to hold a derby on a given water, even if the derby might have adverse consequences for that fishery, the commission and department are powerless to stop it.

H.B. 429 provides the commission with the authority to control those derbies which might otherwise have an adverse effect on a given fishery. Therefore, Trout Unlimited urges a DO PASS recommendation on H.B.429.

EXHIBIT_	(5)
DATE	2.5.87
HB_53	5

#### HB 535 February 5, 1987

Testimony presented by Jim Flynn, Dept. of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

The department is on record as supporting a specific allocation of big game licenses to outfitters. How they are allocated and the number to allocate are two of the issues facing this committee.

The department supports the concept of a block of nonresident deer A licenses to be used statewide. We support this additional block of nonresident deer licenses with the understanding that the additional revenue generated by these licenses be earmarked for conservation easements, lease or fee title purchase of wildlife habitat in the State of Montana.

The department opposes the use of a resident sponsor to obtain a nonresident license. We believe the resident sponsor would do little to help the nonresident hunter, it would be costly for the department to administer and penalties for noncompliance have not been addressed. It also sets a precedent for license brokering and could foster illegal outfitting as it did in the early 70's.

We also see some problems with the proposed dates of sale for the nonresident license. The current department drawings for big game permits are June 1. The final sale date in this bill of May 15 will prohibit some nonresidents from entering this drawing because they will not know if they have obtained a nonresident license in time to enter the June 1 drawing. The nonresidents would be better served if the department could set the date of nonresident license sales that will correspond to our on-going drawing and license sales.

This bill incorporates several aspects that have been introduced in other legislation before this committee. We suggest that it be submitted to the subcommittee addressing all the bills concerned with this issue.

----

B. 535 February 5, 1987

2.5.87 DATE

## HB\_535

# TESTIMONY SHOWING NEED FOR MORE LICENSES FOR OUTFITTERS' CLIENTS

Let me demonstrate the present need for the increase in licenses for outfitters' clients reflected in HB 535. Some think that the 5,600 license set aside for our clients in 1985 was some kind of magical figure that allowed outfitters to live happily ever after. This is not so. The 5,600 was not more than a survival figure.

First let's look at how the 5,600 came about. This number was based on the average number of outfitted clients in 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985. Those years averaged out to 5,793 clients and the Director reduced that number to 5,600.

Now we have to look back at those averaged years and see what was going on in our nation at that time. Do you remember? In 1982, we were just starting to climb out of the worst recession since the Great Depression; unemployment was the highest since that same depression. That recession had adverse effects on outfitting just like every other business in the country. The recession improved slowly during all those "averaged" years (1982-1985). The guided non-resident set aside was based on some of the poorest economic years in five decades. So, as you see, the 5,600 set aside was nearly 200 licenses less than the average of four of the worst economic years in our lifetime.

To further substantiate our present need for well over 5,600, let's look at the last year coming out of the recession when outfitted clients' licenses were not limited in numbers. In 1985, 7,694 hunters used outfitters. This is 2,094 hunters over the 5,600 limit imposed the following year (1986). Can we then say 7,694 is the magic number? NO! Let's look at those four averaged years again. Outfitted Hunters

~~~	TOTTOACC HALLAGTO	
1982 -	4,779	Additional Hunters %
1983	5,324	Up 545 or 11% increase
1984	5,747	Up 423 or 8% increase
1985	7,324	Up 1,577 or 27% increase
1986	5,600	Down 1,724 or 31% decrease

As you can see, outfitting economics were following the national economic trend except our upswing was cut off in 1985 by the 5,600 set aside. The national economy is still improving, and it hardly seems logical to hold a valuable Montana industry at recession levels; especially considering the up trend the outfitting industry was experiencing prior to the 5,600 set aside of 1986. Let us look further.

In 1985, 301 outfitters used power of attorney forms and served 7,694 hunters, which averages out to 25.5 hunters per outfitter. In 1986, 324 outfitters used outfitter certification forms to license 5,600 hunters for an average of 17 hunters per outfitter. If the same number of outfitters used certification forms this year as last, it would take a set aside of 8,262 licenses in order to just come up to the 1985 average of 25.5 hunters per outfitter and that would still be holding the industry at 1985 levels.

Now we have a new number 8,262. In order to allow current outfitters to operate at 1985 levels it would take a set aside of 8,262 licenses.

I'd like also to point out that the decrease in clients from 1985 to 1986, that is from an average of 25.5 clients to 17, cost each outfitter \$12,800 in gross income and cost the state of Montana \$3,958,000 in new money into the state. That would have had an economic effect on the economy of \$9,895,000. This is according to the study of the economic impact of outfitting done by MSU.

#### MONTANA OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES ASSOCIATION

EXHIBIT.	(7)
DATE	2.5.87
HB 53	5

#### TESTIMONY FOR 6,000 B-11 LICENSES

This bill contains a provision for 6,000 combination deer licenses for Eastern Montana. I'd like to address the concerns and rational behind these licenses.

First, let me tell you why we need these 6,000 licenses.

Presently there are two ways for a non-resident to buy a deer "A" tag for Eastern Montana. The first is to buy a B-10 combination elk, deer, Black Bear, bird and fishing license for \$350. That gives them a deer "A" tag and several other tags they could use to start fires with. The other option is to wait until the B-10 licenses are sold and see if the Fish and Game Commission might issue some non-resident deer "A" tags for the area you want to hunt. You could then enter a drawing for your tag. The odds are about one in four that you would draw a tag.

Being an outfitter, there is no way I could survive on the risky luck-of-thedraw for the deer "A" tags. I have to license my hunters with the expensive but available \$350 B-10 license. Now with the squeeze coming on the B-10 license, my fellow outfitters in the West desperately need the elk tags my hunters are throwing away. And I need an appropriate license to replace the B-10 that was never intended for Eastern Montana deer areas anyway.

The B-11 combination deer, bird and fishing license is an appropriate license for Eastern Montana, and 6,000 is an appropriate number.

Some would have you think these 6,000 licenses mean 6,000 additional hunters in Eastern Montana. This is not true. If you'll follow with me on the support information I passed out with my testimony, I'll show you why it isn't.

From information taken from outfitter reports and surveys, MDFWP estimates about 3,500 non-resident combination licenses are used each year by those hunting just deer in Eastern Montana. Each year the department has issued non-resident deer "A" tags, and even though they are issued too late to help outfitters they are utilized by non-resident hunters.

In 1982, the department issued 2,111 non-resident "A" tags; 3,136 "A" tags in 1983' 5,076 in 1984' and 2,500 in 1985.

When you combine these "A" tags with the 3500 B-10 tags used in the East, you come up with the following numbers of non-residents hunting in Eastern Montana: 5,611 in 1982; 6,636 in 1983; 8,576 in 1984; and 6,000 in 1985. This makes a yearly average of 6,930 non-resident hunters over the last four years. HB 535 asks for 6,000 of these to be issued as B-11 licenses.

As you can see, our 6,000 deer tags have not added hunters to Eastern Montana, but have simply made useable licenses available at an appropriate time and price to licensed outfitters' clients, landowner outfitters' clients and other nonresidents who plan their hunts to Eastern Montana in advance.

EXHIBIT	7 <u>a)</u>
DATE 2.	5.87
HB_535	

## SUPPORT INFORMATION FOR 6,000 DEER LICENSES

Non-resident		Non-resident		Total Deer		
	Deer "A"Tags		Deer B10 Tags		Tags Used	
1982	2,111	+	3,500	=	5,611	
1983	3,136	+	3,500	=	6,636	
1984	5,076	+	3,500	=	8,576	
1985	2,500	+	3,500	=	6,000	
	12,823 : 4	= 3,2	.00		$\overline{27,723}: 4 = 6$	,930

Last four years averaged 6,930/yr non-resident deer hunters in Eastern Montana. Last four years averaged 3,200/yr non-resident deer "A" tags for Eastern Montana.

6,000 New B-11 Licenses3,200 Average Non-resident "A" tags sold in Last 4 years.

\*\*\* 2,800 Actual Increase In Non-resident Licenses.

### TOTAL DEER LICENSES AVAILABLE

	Non-resident	Resident	Total Non-res.	Non-res. and	Total Deer
	Deer "A" & B10	Deer	and Resident	Resident "B" Tags	Tags Available
1982	19,111	154,943	174,054	21,126	<b>195,180</b>
1983	20,136	159,135	179,271	41,925	221,196
1984	22,076	168,127	190,203	92,344	282,547
1985	19,500	135,500	155,000	75,123	230,123

HB 535 would increase these total licenses by 2,800 deer tags.\*\*\*

EXHIBIT (8) DATE\_2.5.87 HB. 535

MONTANAS 50TH LEGISLATURE February 5, 1987

HOUSE FISH & GAME COMMITTEE Orval Ellison, Chairman

MONTANA OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES ASSOCIATION ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF HB 535

For the record, my name is Sandra Cahill. I grew up on a ranch and in the outfitting business in Montana. I have 35 years experience and have been a licensed outfitter for 11 years. I am a member of the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association and live near Livingston.

Two groups that HB 535 obviously favors are the guided hunter and the outfitters. Some would have us think that it is almost criminal to favor any group and not in the best interest of Montana. Using the economic impact of the outfitting industry on the Montana economy survey done by Montana State University, I'd like to show how HB 535 benefits many Montanahs--in fact all Hontanans.

Guided hunters have a greater positive effect on the Montana economy than do non-guided hunters. The university study just mentioned found that an outfitted client spends 3262 for each day he is in our state, while the non-guided hunters for that same day spends 336.40. So, the outfitted hunter spends \$175.60 more for each day he is in Montana. The average outfitted hunter spends \$2,373 per trip in our state, while the non-outfitted hunter spends \$1,391 with the difference being \$1,437 per hunter. Using this difference, we can calculate that HD 535 will bring an additional \$12,663,000 new dollars to Montana. Part of this would be paid to outfitters and part to other Montana businesses such as airlines, car rentals, gas stations, motels, resturants, taverns, sporting goods stores, gift shops, taxidermy shops, grocery stores and meat processing plants.

How about that part of the increased revenue in the state that would go to outfitters? That went into Swiss bank accounts, right? No, not quite. The university survey shows that outfitters spent 31% of their gross income within the state of Nontana. Therefore, HB 535 would increase outfitter spending in our state on such things as payroll, sporting goods, tack, grocieies, (including meat), equipment, land leases, stock, Nontana grown hay and grain, vehicles, fuel, etc by \$3,000,000 dollars a year. Outfitters would also spend an additional \$400,000 a year advertising out of state to bring tourist dollars to Nontana. This amount almost equals what the Travel and Promotion Bureau spends out of state to promote tourism.

DATE 2.5.87	EXHIBIT (8)	
	DATE 2:5.87	
HB_535	HB 535	

Page 2, February 5th, FaG hearing, MOGA economics testimony.

Outfitters also provide jobs. By increasing the number of clients available to outfitters, HB 535 would also increase the number of jobs we could provide. That increase would amount to 1,150 jobs.

As you are seeing here, new dollars brought into Montana are spent and re-spent in Montana. The university survey tells us this roll over effect amounts to 2.5 times. That is, new dollars coming into Montana have a 2.5 times effect on the economy. Therefore, the \$12,663,000 HB 535 brings into the state will have a \$31,670,000 effect on the Montana economy, and that makes this bill for every Montanan.

I urge your support and passage of HB 535. Thank you.
EXHIBIT (9) DATE 25.87 HB 535

# MONTANA OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES ASSOCIATION

TESTIMONY SUPPORTING SOCIAL ASPECTS OF HB535

For the record, my name is Art Weikum. I've been a licensed Montana outfitter for 4l years and am a member of the Montana Outfitters & Guides Association and the Professional Wilderness Outfitters Association. I live near Augusta.

Consensus has it that the magic number of 17,000 nonresidents permitted to hunt in Montana in any given year is one of <u>social compromise</u>, rather than one with biological basis. My testimony today, therefore, addresses the social aspects of nonresident hunting, specifically how by adoption of HB535 this legislative body can actually benefit the social environment of the Treasure State.

Under today's system, using information taken from the MSU study: Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana, we find 5,600 guided non-resident hunters using the class B-10 combination licenses spent an average of 11.0 days in Montana, totaling 61,500 hunter days; while 11,400 unguided hunters spend 16.1 days in the state, totaling 183,540 days.

Under the present system, there are 245,140 non-resident hunter days spent within the state.

With application of 1/2 set-aside provided in HB535, we conclude 93,500 guided hunter days (8,500 X 11.0) and 136,850 unguided hunter days (8,500 X 16.1) for a total of 230,350 non-resident hunter days spent in Montana -- a <u>decrease</u> of 14,790 days. Therefore, there would be <u>less</u> social impacts upon resident hunters by non-resident hunters if HB535 were to become law, all other things being equal.

However, all other things aren't equal. Due to the very nature of most outfitter operations, guided hunters spend their time afield away from resident hunters. As an example, I conduct my hunting trips deep within the Bob Marshall Wilderness. Most outfitters try hard to provide a quality experience for their clients. Since quality hunting is often considered synonymous with isolation, continuing conflict with other hunters is <u>not</u> usually part of guided hunter programs. Therefore, it's not at all far-fetched to conclude by allowing more guided hunters to participate there will actually be less social conflicts than just in the decrease of 14,790 user days.

Another social aspect of providing for a stable outfitting industry in Montana through HB535 is one of opportunity for less fortunate Americans. ŕ

EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_2.5.87 HB\_\_535

# MONTANA OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES ASSOCIATION TESTIMONY FOR HB 535 CONCERNING THE HALF SET ASIDE

I believe the prior testimony has shown HB 535 to be valuable to the state. The value lies in not only it's economics, but also in it's social values, in the jobs it provides, and in the business it would stimulate. Testimony has also shown that the Montana outfitting industry is a viable and valuable asset to our state. This outfitting industry through HB 535 has asked first that all non-resident licenses be set aside for Montanans, and secondly that their own industry be limited to half the available licenses. Why a half set aside for outfitters' clients? Why any set aside? Montana outfitters need a set aside so they can carry on like any other business in our state. No other business in the state is limited by the state.

Are we asking for something new, something we haven't had before, something that will guarantee our existance? NO! Until 1986, last year, outfitters had no limits on the number of clients they could serve. HB 535, although it limits outfitters' clients, does allow outfitters to operate as they have in past years. HB 535 makes no guarantees to outfitters; we must still go out and sell our hunts and provide good services and maintain our good reputations in order to take advantage of the set aside. This bill in no way forces anyone to hunt with an outfitter. Under HB 535, outfitters will still spend over \$1,000,000 a year to encourage tourism into Montana.

HB 535 asks for half the licenses to be set aside for outfitted clients. Why half? Do outfitters need half? Probably not. Actually we don't know how many we need, and neither does the Dept. of FWP; no one does. The information to arrive at a number is just not available. We don't think it's important anyway. The real question is: Do you intend to use a set aside number to stimulate the Montana economy or to hold the economy and the outfitting industry at status quo? If your intention is to hold us at that recessionary average used in 1986, the number is 5600. If you want to hold us at the last pre-restriction levels, then 8,262 is the number. But, if you would allow us to do what we can for our state within the bounds outlined in HB 535, then the half set aside is appropriate without worrying about numbers. HB 535 is a good compromise for it allows outfitters to attain the numbers of clients that they would have had if 1986 restrictions had not been imposed, while at the same time the half limit tells us that we are not going to be able to expand our services or numbers of outfitters without hurting the industry.

I ask you to remember we are not asking for any licensing privileges we have not asked to be extended to every other resident Montanan. Please also remember we are not asking you to lock up half the licenses for us, we are only asking that you allow us <u>thirty days</u> to use up to half the licenses for those non-resident hunters who have reserved hunts with us. We are not asking for a set number of licenses, only that we have thirty days to license our clients.

HB 535 gives all Montanans more licenses than they need--licensed outfitters, landowner outfitters and residents, and it accomplishes this without denying even one resident his opportunity to hunt in Montana. If it accomplishes this, then why try to further divide the licenses.

I encourage you to pass HB 535 as it is written for the good of all Montanans.

EXHIBIT (11) DATE 2.5 . 87 HB 535

Jestimony by Iravis Barker on House Bill 535 Fish and Game Committee-February 5, 1987 Room 312B. Capitol. Helena, Montana.

My name is Inavis Barker. My family operates Ford (neek Outfitters, on the Benchmark road, west of Augusta.

We bought our outfitting business in 1975 and moved to Montana from Michigan in June of 1976. Since that time we have run 11 seasons.

Outfitting, ranching, and farming businesses make it possible for each person in a family to make a contribution, both financially and personally, to the family as a whole. I know that working together in our outfitting business strengthers our family.

There are 11 outfitters who base their businesses out of Augusta Each of them runs what can be classified as an average to large-sized business, based on the number of clients they handle each year. They make it possible for several hundred non-resident and resident hunters and fishermen to enjoy the Bob Marshall Wilderness and Scapegoat Wilderness. It is were not for the outfitters with their expertise and equipment, the majority of those people would not reach the interior of those Wilderness areas.

The Lion's share of revenues which enter Augusta businesses each year come during the hunting season.

Within the next several years there are 3 outfitting operations in our area, which will be operated by a second generation and one by a third generation. These people have a real interest in continuing their family business.

As I speak today, the reality of second generation outfitters is in question. The opportunities available to tomorrows outfitters depends on decisions made today. (orsidering the increasing number of outfitters operating on private land, rancheroutfitters, and established wilderness outfitters, the quota of non-resident big-game licenses, available to outfitted clients, needs to be increased from its present number, if the industry is to remain healthy in Montana.

By Lending your support to House Bill 535 you promote tourism in Montana, sound management of Montana big game, and ar enhanced image of our state by people in other states. Jhank You

EXHIBI DATE. HR 534

Madam Chairperson and Honorable Committee Menberst

I am Bill Gay, a Landowner from Powder River County in boutheastern Montana and I rise in support of House Bill 575. Our ranch has been leasing hunting rights to an outfitter for four years and expect to continue to lease for the forseeable future.

The primary reason for leasing is economic. We can not longer afford to give away anything. Until an outlitter approached us, we did not realize what people wire willing to pay for the right to bunt. We have been raising doer and putting up with bunters of all types for a long time and we are finally getting paid for it. While the amount we make from bunting is not a large percentage of our budget, it is significant enough to help pay the bills. I am sure the committee is aware of our industry's financial condition.

Charging hunters is a possibility but has couts in time and effort. With an outfitter on the place, we don't have to worry about trying to collect from each group of hunters. I do not want to put up with all kinds of people at my dow at all hours of the day and night, arguments about what is a fair price. Or collecting bad checks. With an outfitter on the place, the hunters are supervised so I need not worry about gates open, camps too close to water holes, and tour wheel drives making rute on meadows.

Liability is a problem when we take money for honting rights and we require that the outfitter covers both himself and us. With laws, lawyers, and insurance companies the way they are now, we aren't positive that we are completely covered, but we feel safer using a litenaed cottitter.

The arrangements we use with our outfitter has worked very well and I believe has been a positive way to manage hunting on our property. I would encourage this committee to provide the means to the outfitters to establish stable businesses in our community. Thank you for your consideration of House Bill 575.

21's 83 5 Territor Bight in & Suides Bissis The da send my see is long study non protingent laseres in the well to the falls that was outfater and quite describe. I will los to or she and que froster. fing support her saying that is dividet a - angele angelette I an not qualifier la marie that delansurching the type of paraments is most likely to use the childrise that same montana luring a traditionally along period is it is in - me would be in claned to use an person in the state than the oil of date who couse since on this own . "If we really support the trulit montana Reve program that by the most rename.

Alter March 198

ckinde . همده بالمراجع DATE 2.5 87 HB\_535

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

MY NAME IS LOREN SEAVER AND I RESIDE IN GREAT FALLS. THE THOUGHTS AND OPINIONS THAT I WILL SHARE WITH YOU TODAY ARE THE RESULT OF 20 YEARS OF OBSERVING, AND PARTICIPATING IN, THE HUNTING AND FISHING SCENE IN MONTANA.

经济利 制力费性机构

IT IS NO SECRET THAT MONTANA HAS LOST MORE THAN IT'S SHARE OF BUSINESSES, INDUSTRIES AND CONSEQUENTLY JOBS DURING THE LAST FEW YEARS.

THE MONTANA OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES ASSOCIATION REPRESENTS A STATEWIDE INDUSTRY THAT RIGHT NOW IS AT A FORK IN THE TRAIL. IF YOU, AS A COMMITTEE, AND THE LEGISLATURE AS A WHOLE, DIRECT THE ORGANI-ZATION DOWN THE LEFT FORK, WHICH REPRESENTS THE STATUS QUO, THEN THE FUTURE OF THE OUTFITTING INDUSTRY WILL BE IN SERIOUS DOUBT. OUT-FITTERS WILL FIND THEIR NUMBERS OF POTENTIAL CLIENTS SO SEVERELY RESTRICTED THAT REMAINING IN BUSINESS WILL BE NEXT TO IMPOSSIBLE, IF NOT VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE. IF THE ORGANIZATION TAKES THE RIGHT FORK AND YOU ALLOCATE ADDITIONAL NON-RESIDENT LICENSES TO HUNTERS UTILIZING THE SERVICES OF OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES, YOU WILL HELP TO ASSURE THE FUTURE OF AN IMPORTANT INDUSTRY.

I USE THE WORD INDUSTRY ADVISEDLY BECAUSE THE OUTFITTING INDUSTRY GENERATES TREMENDOUS SUMS OF MONEY THAT FLOW DIRECTLY INTO MONTANA'S ECONOMY.

A UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA STUDY, BASED ON THE 1985 SEASONS, INDICATES THAT THE OUTFITTING INDUSTRY POURED 34.4 MILLION DOLLARS DIRECTLY INTO OUR STATE'S ECONOMIC PIPELINE. STUDIES HAVE SHOWN THAT DOLLARS, GENERATED BY ANY BUSINESS, TURN OVER AN AVERAGE OF 2 1/2 TIMES AS THEY ARE PASSED ON. THAT BEING THE CASE, THE OUTFITTING INDUSTRY HAD A POSITIVE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF 86 MILLION DOLLARS ON MONTANA'S ECONOMY IN 1985. EIGHTY-SIX MILLION DOLLARS IS A SIGNIFI-CANT AMOUNT OF MONEY BY ANYONES STANDARDS.

مربحاتها التواريجين

DATE 2587

I SUBMIT TO YOU THAT ALLOCATING 50%, OR 8,500 OF THE 17,000 NON-RESIDENT LICENSES FOR HUNTERS WISHING TO UTILIZE AN OUTFITTER OR GUIDE SERVICE IS NOT UNREASONABLE.

I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT YOU DIRECT THE ORGANIZATION ALONG THE RIGHT FORK IN THE TRAIL, SET ASIDE THE ADDITIONAL LICENSES FOR THE CLIENTS OF OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES AND HELP TO SAVE A VITAL INDUSTRY.

ANY INDUSTRY THAT BOLSTERS THE ECONOMY OF OUR STATE WITH 10'S OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS DESERVES THE WHOLEHEARTED SUPPORT OF ALL OF US.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR CONSIDERATION.

EXHIBIT.	(15)
DATE	2.5.87
48.535	

February 5, 1987

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee,

Please accept my following testimony of spoken and written words.

My name is Kelly Flynn. I am a third generation member of a ranching family in Broadwater County. Our ranch is a survivor ranch. Across the years we have survived by being diversified. In the recent years we have become even more diversified ----by necessity.

Currently on our family ranch we raise cattle... we grow oats, and barley and wheat... we have a few chickens... we run a summer vacation operation and dude ranch... we raise sheep... and we grow alfalfa and grass hay. Today we are operating a hunting business.

The previous two generations of ranchers in my family have survived some difficult times. My generation is now experiencing some of these difficult times. Our hunting operation ---- our hunting operation is an important reason our three generation ranch is surviving these difficult economic times. Our hunting operation is helping several other ranchers survive these times.

Mr. Chairman, members of this committee, we urge your support of House Bill 535. Please keep giving us the chance to survive these difficult times.

Thank you,

All a stranger

## Kelly Flynn

# JackAtcheson&Sons, Inc.

INTERNATIONAL HUNTING CONSULTANTS IT (16) INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AGENCY 2.5.87 TAXIDERMISTS 3210 Ottawa Street - Butte, Montana Telephone 406-782-3498 406-782-3470

I am a hunting consultant, which is similar to an airline travel agent. Instead of Hawaiian tours, I find hunters. Our business is worldwide. I own an airline travel agency, and for 25 years ran a taxidermy business. We have had over 20,000 clients.

Contrary to what people think, the hardest part of outfitting, as in most business, is finding enough clients who will pay what the outfitter needs to make a profit. There are too many other things to do or places to go. To find clients you must advertise 1 to 3 years in advance. Under 5% ever send deposits.

The cost of advertising has nearly doubled in the last 5 years, but the pool of prospective clients has not doubled. If we have more hunters in Montana this year, it is because we took them from Wyoming or Idaho or British Columbia.

In Wyoming, they have a drawing. Outfitters must double-book to hopefully draw out on enough clients. This costs twice as much in advertising. The clients are hesitant because they want to plan and you can't predict a drawing. The Wyoming outfitter must cut prices to make it appealing. The Wyoming Fish and Game Department must create feedlots for elk to keep the elk kill high. I don't handle many Wyoming hunters, it is not worth the effort.

If we want to destroy a 34 million dollar industry, we can do it by making it tough on outfitters. We'll regulate them out of business, like the Forest Service is trying to do.

Eut doing away with outfitters won't open any land. Montana would quickly be taken over by rogue outfitters from Texas or California. They'll bring their clients to hunt in Montana, but do their banking in Dallas and Los Angeles.

The licensed Montana outfitter you can reason with, or his Montana neighbor will harrass him. The rouge outfitter is just replaced by another rogue, or the private land just ends up with some individual or club. It will never be as it was.

If we are to be a recreational state, we must charge for what we have. The residents get all the elk and deer tags they want. Kill success is high. Guided non-resident hunters taken only 8% of the elk and 2% of the deer and antelope.

Believe me, there are many places to go besides Montana. Non-residents pay two-thirds of our Fish and Game bill, and dump millions into our economy. Don't exchange the non-resident who is willing with a do-it-yourselfer who spends little.

Wyoming has organized a task force to see what can be done to change or modify their license system that is considered unfair. Now Montana is contemplating doing what Wyoming has found undesirable.

Please read the attached sheep on what is fair. You'll like it.

#### AIRPORTS

The 20,000 hunters average \$125 per person in airfare or (2,500,000). 3000 licenses will add (\$375,000) in airfares.

Not all of this money is credited in Montana, but without the airport use by non-residents, we undoubtedly would have less large aircrafts flying into Montana. We cannot afford to lose any boarding in Montana. Non-residents help keep our airports open, the airport restaurant and the nearby motels. One job supports another.

#### TAXIDERMY

In 1955, there were 15 taxidermists in the State. Now there are 150. About 50 employ one or more persons.

There were about 20,000 deer, elk, bear, sheep, and antelope licenses sold. Each person left about \$41 for the taxidermist. (\$820,000). Of the 20,000 hunters, approximately 25% left items for the taxidermists (5000). Of the 5000, at least 25% (1250) will continue to ship taxidermy intermittently to the Montana taxidermists. Out of state shipments originating from Alaska or Africa usually consist of two items per shipment, which easily averages \$800. (or \$800 x1250) = \$1,000,000. This is a minimum of \$1,820,000. All out of State money. Every year this figure will continue to grow rapidly. If you give us 3000 more licenses, it will mean \$300,000 next year to the taxidermist trade alone.

Jacl	Atcheson & Sons, 3	I
	INTERNATIONAL HUNTING FISHING & PHOTOGRAPHIC CONSULTANTS	



3210 )mawa Street Bume: Montana 59701 Telex 551 o43

DEAWING

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AGENCY Telephone 40 -40

Travel Agency

	h and the
4061 782-2382	
406: 782 3498	
405: 494-2415	
	(16)
DNTE 🔔	25.87
1-135	

The opponent wants to make things <u>fair</u>. But <u>fair</u> to who? The opponent wants a drawing that will make it difficult for residents to hunt with friends or relatives who might not draw a permit. That is not fair to our relatives.

WHAT IS FAIR

Only 17,000 elk and deer licenses go to non-residents. Over 100,000 can go to residents.

That is not fair. Fair is  $\frac{1}{2}$  the licenses going to non-residents and  $\frac{1}{2}$  going to residents. After all, about  $\frac{1}{2}$  the state is Federal land. Sounds fair.

Only 10% of the special goat, sheep, and antelope go to non-residents. That is not fair. The permits should be divided equally. That is fair.

The coal tax and proposed bed tax are not fair.

But fair is not always important. We in Montana have to live on what we have. That's fair.

Afaska 🔹 Asia 🎍 Africa 🎍 Australia 🍙 British Columbia , 🍨 Idaho 🍝 Mongolia 🍨 Montana 🍨 Yukon Go while you are physically able



17)EXHIBIT.

P.O. BOX 2127 926 CENTRAL AVENUE GREAT FALLS, MONTANA 59403 (406) 761-4434

February 2, 1987

TO: House Fish & Game Committee Cascade County Legislative Delegation

FROM: Roger W. Young, President

# SUBJECT: BIG GAME LICENSE ALLOCATION

The Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce expresses its support for the importance of the outfitting industry in the Montana and the contribution which hunting and fishing plays in the state's tourism economy.

A study by two Montana State University professors showed that the outfitting industry pumped \$34.4 million directly into the state's economy in 1985. When multiplied by 2 1/2 times to reflect the dollars being passed on in the economy, Shannon Taylor and Michael Riley of the MSU business faculty, estimated the total impact of the outfitting industry on Montana in 1985 to be \$86 million. The study showed the average guided hunter spent \$2,878 in Montana including \$1,507 in guide fees while the non-guided hunter spent an average of \$1,391. According to the study, the guided hunters stayed in the state an average of 11 days and spend an average of \$86 a day. It said that guided hunters spent about \$15 million in Montana in 1985 and guided fishermen spent about \$15.3 million, or an average of \$187 a day. The survey said the total income for 513 licensed outfitters in Montana in 1985 was estimated at \$15.9 million. Of that amount about \$14.2 million went back into the state economy for such things as payroll, supplies, vehicles, fuel, use taxes, stock, leases, and insurance.

Licenses from non-residents are a substantial part (65%) of the Department of Fish Wildlife & Parks revenue. Out-of-state hunters are big contributors to the Great Falls economy. The Great Falls Area Chamber of Commerce endorses action by the state which will guarantee outfitters a proper allocation of non-resident big game licenses to insure their ability to book hunts for a growing market of out-of-state hunters. This could be done administratively we believe. Legislation is however also being introduced to establish an allocation formula and to make available an additional number of deer only licenses in Eastern Montana to take some of the pressure off the demand for the combination big game licenses for non-residents.



Joseph J. Aberle Publisher

EXHIBIT\_(B 2.5.87 DATE

January 29, 1987

Attention members of the Legislative Committee considering the bill presented by the Montana Outfitters Association.

I hope you will give favorable consideration to the bill presented by the Montana Outfitters Association which will guarantee them licenses for their out-of-state hunters.

The Montana Outfitters provide an essential service to the non-resident hunters. The money brought into our state through the Outfitters is significant and is a great benefit to the State of Montana's economy.

Many Montana businesses and families depend on and are supported directly by this out-of-state money. Please help a great Montana business to prosper, support the Montana Outfitters bill which will guarantee their hunters licenses.

Sincerely, Joseph J. aberle

510 1st Avenue North, Suite 110 Post Office Box 430 Great Fails, Montana 59403 Phone: (406) 727-7244

Jan 26 1997

EXHABIT (14) DATE 2+5-57 HIL 5-55

to supern it rong concerns.

my wife and I suns a, with power processing business mean 61 real falls A good share of our humanics comes from out of state humans who have the service of sulfities. Deny little comes from humans who do not use ihere. It is quite stead to me that more mong to lift in the state hig hubbes who use outgetters, built the shape this state to in it makes send to allow the sulfilles of this state more; humans, if means more money for more.

Thank your Harde & Wahl Gen MI Wahl.

Constant (20) DATE 2.5-87 In Edd

Pubruary 4, 1987

John Phillips Legislative Committee Member Capitol Building Helena, Montana 59624

Rus House Bill 535, Montana Outfitters Association

Dear Johns

I hope you will give favorable consideration to the bill presented by the Montana Outfitters Association which will provide them licenses for their out-of-state hunters.

The Montana Outfittors provide an assential service to the non-resident hunters. The money brought into our state through the Outfitters is significant and is a great benefit to the State of Montana's sconomy.

Many Montana businesses and families depend on and are supported directly by this out-of-state money. Please help a great Montana business to prosper. Support the Montana Outfitters bill which will provide their hunters licenses.

Thank you.

Simmely,

Kuyur Y. Wolter 77 Bun River Road Great Falls, Montana 59404

=XHIBIT (41) DATE 2.5.8 HR

#### JOVEN EQUIPMENT COMPANY

406/727-7153

4181 NORTH PARK TRAIL

**GREAT FALLS, MONTANA 59405** 

1/26/87 To Minders of the Lystatic Committee. Considering the bill presented by the Montana Culfitters association

I support the bill gressential by the ortfitters which will quarantee them licenses for Their huntins

Outpitters bring outside money into the state of Montana. The money outfitting pay for hunting rights to Montana ranshins is the only lingt spat in a poor aq economy. Many of our customens would not be in turness today without the income received from and of state hunters through outlitters

Sincerely Juin Edou







EXHIBIT (22) DATE 2.5.87 HB\_535

suite 112 professionel building, 510 first avenue north, great falls, montana – phone (406) 452-0202

graphic design - public relations - photography - promotions - copy writing - layouts Nor, Crypl 7311aan Gantiy, Atling Nuluna, Coutonn Log N. . Thisis : ... <u>211 57</u> 200. الا المنظم من الم والا المالية. محمد المحتاج المالية التي المالية lattin. : on hostrnight drew -lilion Collars do -u up \*1 o pritting in-. . . . . . . . . . . . . ومدعد الالال الرواسين 1.chi huba 2-159ta Militaria Neto eska Bonto incolarian ця, <u>-</u> т., . : 13 irine og mult sa utbare. . . • 1. 2. distant and that in the state గా ప్రకర్తు ఇశార్ బ్రార్ కాడ్ల్ల్ ఇగర్ బ్రార్ బాద్ కారార్లో setters toducture , Theorem - 19 آجي ا ~ ~ ~ Kavanagt



## and the second second

nen hannen han Bana Maria anderen sanden sonst hert. Inderhand - anter de 1997-463 anter

a ha ann an 1986 anns ann ann ann an thair ann ann an thair ann ann ann an thair ann ann ann ann an thair ann a Tagairtí an thairtí an t

Territoria Maniferra

- 44.8 \$4.4 \$TT \$7.4 W.

and 2111 795 the statistic decents and the second second second second second second second second second second

The set of the second of the second the second survive on a survive of the second seco

With our fights include, an economic shot in the same, i content in the company is content in the inclusion of the second attent of anything that much inclusions attent ordered attent index age.

FIRE to be specified this supply into the second provided of the condition. The date of the condition of the

Jony Tavaragh



EXHIB:1 ( 2.5.87 DATE. HB.

# CREEK OUIFIIIERS

Less than half a mile from Yellowstone National Park's isolated northern boundary, high on Tom Miner Basin's south rim, Horse Creek rises in a quiet mountain meadow seldom trespassed by man. Surrounding peaks rise into the clouds they spawn. Precipitous terrain tests the human interloper. Those who trek here must know mountain ways. Travel follows game trails - or no trails. Much of the country is too rough for horses. Here, where even latter-day mountain men rarely pass, wildlife abounds in a hidden corner of America's showcase wilderness.

We're located in the heart of the Yellowstone ecosystem. a vast area of untracked wilds, breathtaking mountain scenery, world-famous fisheries, and spectacular wildlife-including the largest elk herd in the world. Biologists, conservationists, and hunters recognize this as an unequaled wildlife paradise.

Our hunting territory on Yellowstone Park's remote north line comprises 25,000+ acres of private property and private-access National Forest land. Our clientele enjoys exclusive run of this carefully preserved remnant of North America's wilderness and representative wildlife.

#### **OUR BIG GAME INCLUDES:**

- BIGHORN SHEEP. We control the only direct access into the population center of H.D. 300, one of few areas in the world offering unlimited permits, (available up to the season opener). We hold the only permit for a hunting camp in the district.
- 2) MOOSE. We have a Boone & Crockett bull from Horse Creek. Permits are difficult to draw.
- 3) DEER. 100% of our '83 hunters had a standing shot - a typical year. Large mulie and whitetail herds; very nice bucks!
- 4) ANTELOPE. We hunt antelope on 12,000 additional private acres further down the Yellowstone drainage. Very large herd and increasing; large bucks; excellent hunter success.
- 5) ELK. The Yellowstone ecosystem has the continent's finest elk hunting, and we control a large part of the best of this. Our local population of residents and annual Park migrants includes huge bulls. Experienced, well-travelled hunters have told us they've never seen so many elk. Taking a bull is by no means automatic, but 85% of our '83 hunters had standing shots.

In addition to our excellent hunting, we have unbelievable fishing on private and world-famous public water, including the Yellowstone, Firehole, and Madison Rivers.

You are assured warm, dry accommodations cabin or tent - and superb food. We also provide: 1) all transportation, including to and from air terminals; 2) game meat and trophy handling/ transportation to local packer or taxidermist; 3) veteran professional guides; 4) all services and equipment for a first-class vacation or hunt. No hidden costs or trophy fees.

Bruce and John guide with help from three other seasoned professionals. Our combined experience in this area totals over 90 years. We retain professional cooks. Each of us will take pleasure in sharing this unforgettable Yellowstone headwaters country. No one works harder for their hunters.

EXHIBIT (23) DATE 2.5.8 HB\_53F

## To Livingston, Montana

N

1985 PHOTO Old County Road to Gallatin National Forest

Ŀ

Road to Ranch Headquarters

63 Dude Ranch on Little Mission Creek - Note how corral has been gradually extended to block public access by old county road established in 1892, dude ranch established in 1929 (27 years later), Gated corral denies access to estimated 8,000 acres of national forest, and prohibits through public travel by road then trail to West Fork of Boulder River and Suce Creek (Recently added to Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness Area)

EXHIBIT. DATE 251 HB\_53F



Blacktail Ranch Wolf Creek, MT 59648 Ph.(406) 235-4330

February 5, 1987

TAG RITTEL, President

#### Members of the House Fish and Game Comm.

Montana Outfitter and Guides Association is very much in favor of  $(\underline{H}, \underline{B}, 535)$  We feel the economy of Montana is first in the hearts and minds of Montanans and we are interested in keeping Montanas economy healthy. We are part of the second largest industry in Montana contribing over 60 million dollars to this part of tourisum.

The 5,600 non-resident license that were 'set-aside' by the Dept of Fish, Wildlife and parks for those wishing to use a outfitter was a average over four years and did not allow for growth in the outfitting industry. This was also challenged by the Mont. Wildlife Fed, but was upheld in court. Why Mont. Wildlife Fed. felt this was discriminatory, has never come to light.

Montana needs good clean industry and hunting is part of it. Montana Outfitters urge you to give **B.**B. 535 a do pass.

Sincerely, Tag Rittel

# Anchor Land & Livestock Chuck & Pam Rein

EXHIBIT (25) DATE 2.5.87

HR 535

To the members of the House Fish and Game Committee:

My name is Chuck Rein. I am a rancher and a licersed outfitter from Nelville. My family has been engaged in ranchirg in the same location since 1893.

In todays peer agricultural economy, diversification is the key to survival. A little over a year ago my wife and I decided that the outfitting and guiding industry offered more potential outside income and would fit our situation better than any other business. Of course living 35 miles from town and raising cattle on land that grows only grass and rocks tends to limit one's options. In 1986 we spent \$23,146.79 of borrowed money for setup and operation of our camp. Nine individuals and numerous businesses received compensation for services and goods rendered.

Of the thirteen non-residents who wished to hunt with us and who applied for the 3-10 license only nine were successful. It is hard to make ends meet in any business when 30% of your clients are turned away because of state regulations.

If our business is allowed to continue, and is not limited by restrictive state regulations, it will provide jobs and pump new money into the local, as well as state, economy. In my case, and I doubt it is an isolated case, two industries, agriculture and outfitting, depend on the availability of the non-resident big game license.

As a rancher and a conservationist I have always appreciated the splendor of nature, wild animals included. Since becoming an cutfitter I find myself practicing management techniques to enhance the survivability of game animals instead of

EXHIBIT (2**5**) DATE <u>2.5.8</u>7 HB 535

cussing them for the feed they eat and the hassles they bring during hunting season.

The outfitters and guides request is reasonable. We do not ask for a guaranttee to be in business, but rather the opporturity. If the licenses are available the competitively priced, high quality outfitting service will survive. As in any other business those who do not meet the competition will not survive.

Flease do not close the window of opportunity on this important Montana industry. I ask you to support H.B. 535. Thank you.

EXHIBIT (26) DATE 2.5.87 HB 536



Area Chamber of Commerce 15 Depot Loop - Kalispell, MT 59901 406-752-6166 THE VACATION CITY



Montana State Legistature Helena, MT.

Dear Legislators,

Subject: HB 535 Allocation of Non-Resident Combination Licenses

The subject bill was discussed in the Chamber of Commerce Natural Resources Committee meeting on February 2, 1987. The committee represents all facets of natural resources and related industries. Outfitters are an important segment in the business of Wildlife management and should have some way to continue to exist. We believe that HB 535 would help them survive by guaranteeing them licenses for their clients. This bill seems to allow fair treatment of both outfitters and residents.

Our committee voted unanimously to support HB 535. We are also recommending the Kalispell Area Chamber and Board take the same position.

Thank you for hearing our position.

Yours truly,

Al Johnson Chairman Natural Resource Committee

# - DEEP CREEK OUTFITTERS -

Gary and Viola Anderson

1605 - 14th Street SW

Great Falls, MT 59404

(406)	452-7365
EXHIBIT_	(27)
	2.5.87
HB. 5.	35

February 3, 1987

Representative John E. Phillips Capitol Building Helena, MT 59624

Dear Representative Phillips:

We own and operate a outfitting business, located south of Great Falls in Cascade County. We have been in the outfitting field for fifteen years, and have more than doubled our business. We employ nine guides and three cooks from the Great Falls area, and obtain all of our equipment, supplies, and services here. We feel that our business has a substantial impact on the economy of Great Falls.

Some of the hunters we served originally are still returning. Most of the hunters that we outfit arrive in Great Falls from three to five days prior to the hunt, and leave two days after the hunt. Most of them arrive to Great Falls by air and have provided additional cash flow for many local businesses in this area. We feel that it is important to give these hunters the opportunity to return.

We feel that our business could not survive under a drawing. Our success to date, is based on a good reputation and repeated customers. We respectfully ask for your support of H.B. 535.

Thank you.

Inderson "Ling Z

Gary L. Anderson Viola Anderson

dm

# BERT MOONEY AIRPORT AUTHORITY



MEMBERS: Thomas C. Brophy Dave Brown William Evans Keith P. Johnson Shag Miller

SECRETARY MANAGER Angelo Petroni

	IRPORT ATTORNEY: swrence G. Stimetz
EXHIBIT.	(28)
DATE	2.5.87
HB_53	5
	······

BUTTE, MONTANA 59701 Phone 406-494-3771

January 23, 1987

Honorable Fritz Daily House of Representatives State Capitol Helena, MT 59601

Dear Fritz:

On behalf of the Bert Mooney Airport, I ask your support for the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association's Licensing Proposal.

The majority of non-resident sportsmen who use the airport are from prearranged trips with licensed guides. Maintaining a viable airport for the community dictates that we exert every effort to maintain and increase it's use. The potential loss of business to the outfitters under a draw system would also have an adverse effect on airport use, as well as the outfitter's industry.

Airlines are very responsive to boardings, therefore, anything which will increase the use of the airport will also improve service to our community.

Yours truly,

BERT MOONEY AIRPORT AUTHORITY

etnon modelo Bv:

Angelo Petroni Airport Manager

AP/1d

To be filled out by a person testifying or a person who would not like to stand up and speak but wants their testingny entered into the record. the record. WITNESS STATEMENT DATE 2.5.8 HB NAME AN TO CARA 53 ----Burn BILL NO. ADDRESS Dec. For the all'el an art all WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT? and a second OPPOSE SUPPORT AMEND - Still and the December a let in 1. £., 2 PA. 11 1 1. 11 · , 17 1 1. 1 sugar 11/11 . • 2/ atto unt 2 .... hon it have 2 : Ì der not 11 guing place 5 Se Still. Sec. advent the will the th. 5 12 • • • Jack 1 . . . . . cc 30 1 they you this had sette 1 ... PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY. The singer at one of 120 to takent with one Revenue have 12. Form CS-34 a the set time Thank - for Rev. 1985

Apr. Bre

WITNESS STATEMENT

EXHIBIT-

NAME DUANE NEAL BILL NO. 575 NT ADDRESS PRAY \_\_\_\_ DATE <u>FIB 5, 178</u>2 WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT? <u>REGION #3. CLTFITTERS</u> OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_ SUPPORT 2-AMEND PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY. Comment 2 am Muane Mil the Rigin # 3 Outfitter Welegate to the Monitana Outfitter Council. & ripresent 248 Outfitters who are ty a large majority in support of this bill. They are also in aquement with the Restimony in support of the bill which this ben presented by representatives of The miantim Outfitter and Anides Arroniation and the Charman of the Montina On thether Council 21 Many of the Cutaties in Region II will be out cs-34 fensinere in a few-years if

Centi and and a second last hundreds of 252 in lice County a chere the had a server The Audurtion my B. N. Maranane and right man of a contrar one of the only stable mainstains alight in the Louisty many appointe mill offict to Commincialization of our Jami. Richat is curring with making a. Civing in This calcut State of Milen let 12al Alizzichnyan A wance Mark che apparent ter fied an Entitler Clotil Accurate to Anna who were unsurregull in the knowing, Ilis if we us allight and could be - checked in FTG Glerozeke

They are unable to theme schuich Anting clients. recenter law allow last hundreds of Goods in Carde. and night man She making are of alle only stable understores deft in site Security many opportente will reject to Commencialization of our diane. notest is surroug with making a Coving an Chi's estant She to of Manthanes Atranshayou Al cicanes Mice C one oppanient teatified an Culfitter sold licences to hunders who were unsurrafull in the drawing, "I his if no is allegale and remained to - checked by F75 Greade.

. Comment	> WY	INP" STATE		24.87	
NAME COL	- 10 11 1 A A	o dea.	Hass	BILL NO.	535
ADDRESS	Join	11 124	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		and the second
NHOM LU YOU		h- 1 h		1 16.	
	REPRESENT	1	asp. 1-1	of Card	(Charles )
SUPPORT		OPPOSE	<u></u>	AMEND	) 
COMMENTS					
fill i	lauth	le claire	- Thurs	<u>Aller</u>	
1 Tel Rice	Auly	16 ci	Laureling	1 cura	- international
the ch	14. 4	influer	1 1:0	Contraction of the	State in the second second
l l					
Til Come	Cau	1. acrel	of these	an day of	u đ
allen.		end the	Listian i	Cuito	Sidery.
They b				tract i	1.1.1.1
A server as a	1. 14	at oud	T. They	A six son	and the second
<u></u>		-a.y 1-064	A A COM	CARLENCE	<u>a an</u>
Merry 1	100 1				
~			****		
	أستكو الماسية بالمراجع مستعمل الماد شكال				
	alle-state - special state - state state				
	• 				
-					

٠

inn

Curl Solvie

, sain anana amin'na min' na Adria -----

Ninds B. Godi Executive Encretery

S.81

P.O. Box 631 Hot Springs, MT 60646 Ph. (406) 741-3611

#### FELLOW MONTANANSI

Nuch has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector - an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advartising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

#### No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A dotailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montans" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spont more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana Garns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over) ~ ma Mai

4. The average general outfitter has been in business 9.5 years and spends 92% of his revenue within the state.

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.



EXHIBIT (33) DATE\_\_\_\_2.5.87 HB\_535

P.O. Box 631 Hot Springs, MT 59845 Ph. (406) 741-2811

Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

#### No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over) Ortainly we 10200 , and MONTANA OUTFITTER unen we can RVIS<sup>®</sup> SHOP Wegent Dessome con in the 1 box Keenlie 1716 WEST MADE (400 587-470 BOZEMAN, MT. 59715 DAVID & LUMPE



PELLOW NONTANANS:

Nuch has recently been suid about non-resident hunting in Montane. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Pederation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262, per day, vs \$85.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana varna gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)

May Ma





017 N . 70. Seconon, Manipus 60718 Phone 560-2006

Encoutive Secretary

Graby Pateriaina Blara Mension



P.O. Bux 831 Hol Springs, MY 58845 Ph. (406) 741-2811

#### FELLOW MONTANANSI

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

#### No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana Garns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over) Cil allenable and title · 124
The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.



FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over and buides an Yana ICENSES the industr accomt 40 avs



EXHIBIT. DATE 2.5.8 HB 534

P.O. 608 63 Hot Springe, MT 6664 Ph. (406) 741-201

# PELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)

A THAT DRAW BANAS FOR OUT-OF-STATE -ONG-RELLAS PORONE APPLICATIONS WOULD IN THE DISAMEREDAS TO ONE HUNTING - ECOLOMY RE-LATES TO OWTS NOW- HURLING GUIDE AND our of the IDDUSTOR IF WE FORCE THESE PEOPLE UIOLATIONS ON THE PART OF UNMONITOPED HUNTER AND ADDIMOUNL STRAID ON OWN WILDLINE DUPACION

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.

IT IS MY OPINION THAT THE PEWATE SECTOR HOULD SHEFER BY SWRET A MERSNEE, AND I FEEL THAT PROFESSIONAL GUIDE AND ONTEITHER SITEVILES ARE NECESSARED TO MAINTAIN A MORE SELECTIVE (BALANCE OF HUNTING ACTURTES ... GUIDES TEND TO SUPPORT MORE REMOTE AREA HUNTS, AND PROV DE MORE SELECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF GAME.

Affichal Stamment avalense genetics.



### FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

#### No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over) We at Schnee's oppose a cut-of state lattery system ter bunting till X chuse

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.



FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over) <u>I don't think a lottery would be the best thing</u> for the state of Montana. I think a separate <u>license should be available for each type of</u> <u>animal & the cost should be increased for</u> out of state hunters

1

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.

EXELUT DATE



Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

### FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)



TE

Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

1

(over)

See Other side

Harry W. Newlon

4. The average general outfitt 9.5 years and spends 92% of his rev



First Bank Bozeman First National Bank in Bozeman 104 E. Main St. Bozeman, Montana 59715 (406) 587-9222

Member First Bank System

The Montana outfitting industry nee proposing legislation to utilize Mon resources for primary benefit of Mont

proposal calls for half non-resident locuses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.

Most and Mich Hu They have a Mainer ingen in 10 hund y septem till " Hut will live a me Hiller fumine icesof angedingtion Phill gund informent the present up and flelp them experi Line Menta

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish == for whatever reason == to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.

1/22/81

Mostana Nuch Hu aut fitte is. they have major impacts sur state latting septem to distribute harding lines that would have a megative impact on Helis fusines. Institut every ansideration should be quinte try and improve the present upter of allocation in a successive that will help them expend! Harry Mark

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.

I. ERNEST FRANKE DBA. FRANK MILLARYS.

Town pring

in Thompson Fille month - sepont. The act fitters + Local state - Hentenis - in All Aspects of Henting so as to Finthebe to improve there postion - As A up an comming part of our. Axional state Economy and Believe All Reles + Regelation should Brist there position as independent oppenation That can depend off - Regreat And strady - alients. Auto and in the follow.

OF OMPSON FALLS

C. 155



Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of Aove!

(over)

EXH DIA (40) DATE\_\_\_\_2.5.81



Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

#### FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

## No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)

Lach function Doing's Towning + Herte Socure



Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

#### FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)

The Montana outfitting industry needs your support. We are proposing legislation to utilize Montana's surplus wildlife resources for primary benefit of Montana and Montanans. Our proposal calls for half non-resident licenses to be issued to outfitter clients, the other half to be issued to out-of-state hunters Montana residents wish -- for whatever reason -- to have hunting with them.

Will you help? We hope you'll endorse a copy of this letter, with a brief sentence of support. Then mail it to the appropriate legislator in Helena.

Wise River Sportsman club

Pres. Ship Matheman U. Pres. Scott Schoraburg Sey-TREAS. Dole Schowler as Replentatives of the Wise Liver Spatsmen's Clieb, wie as a grang, support the Mortona Outfettes & Guelo arroc. in the above mentioned cause.



EXHIBIT DATE 2.5.87 ---- 535

Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)

1

DAT



Rhoda G. Cook Executive Secretary

#### FELLOW MONTANANS:

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts -- and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over) Fromess Bhoto Liab 321 E. Mein - "The Bozeman" Hozemen, Montana 58715 (406) 688-7222



Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such lottery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

# No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A detailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much within Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts - and did it in less time: \$262. per day, vs \$86.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 -- a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious lapor of love!

(over) mich kinans thuse Marite 10 fillow Norse



### PELLOW MONTANANSI

Much has recently been said about non-resident hunting in Montana. It seems clear the present Legislative Assembly will address the issue. The Montana Wildlife Federation is proposing legislation designed to distribute non-resident hunting licenses via a lottery. The Montana Outfitters & Guides Association believes such luttery distribution would sound the death-knell for the Treasure State's outfitting and guiding sector -- an important component of Montana's vital tourism industry. We must have assurance those people we schedule via solid business service and private advertising/promotion investment can obtain their license.

#### No other business could survive under a similar handicap.

A dotailed study of the "Economic Impact of the Outfitting Industry On the State of Montana" has recently been completed by two Montana State University professors. Some interesting facts were disclosed:

1. The outfitting and guiding industry contributed over \$34 million direct dollars to Montana's economy in 1985, with a total impact of more than \$86 million.

2. Guided non-resident hunters spent more than twice as much with in Montana during 1985 than their non-guided counterparts - and did it in less time: 5262. per day, vs 586.40 per day.

3. The average general outfitter in Montana earns gross revenue of \$40,244.69 in 1985, while his expenses totaled \$32,910.07 ~~ a revenue net of \$7,334.62 -- an obvious labor of love!

(over)

mvery Impro APTRIX ERNU her new the System water he sane Mance Minkingh

Magazine Mov./Dec EXHIBIT (48) DATE 2.5.87 As hunting pressure grows, so does the politics of "packing in."

weat & Mary Jane Mishi

by Dan Vichorek ommercial outfitting for big-game hunts looks like one of those operations that should be naturally inviting to Montana. The way it's supposed to work, locally based outfitters, our friends and neighbors who live here and pay taxes, sign up a handful of well-heeled dudes, keep then) in the state a few days, give them a quality hunting experience, charge them a quality price and send them home happy,

Even the Big Sky country is not the unlimited sky country.



The money gets spread around to supermarkets, gas stations, motels, horseshoe salesmen; all the people that the outfitters buy anything from, and of course, the tax collectors. So everybody is happy, right? Not quite. Even the Big Sky Country is not the unlimited sky country, and the outfitting business has run smack dab into what appears to be the age of limits. Or the limits of the age.

What this means and where we go from here we heard about in talking with many people in Montana who are either outfitters themselves or interested bystanders. The bad news is, it doesn't look' as though the controversies surrounding the outfitting business can be solved without going to the courts and legislature. As this is written, cases are pending, diametrically opposing legislative bills are being drafted, and change clearly is coming.

Before we get too deeply into the bad news, let's consider the good news. Consider the money for example: recreation, of which biggame outfitting surely is a major segment, brings more money into Montana than any other activity except mining and agriculture.

The amount of money obtained through big-game outfitting is substan-

tial. Records at the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks indicate there were 342 licensed biggame outfitters in Montana in 1985 Most of these outfitters have "general" outfitting licenses, which allow them to outfit trips of more than one day duration. Preliminary data from a study performed by the Coucge of Business at Montana State University indicates that holders of the general license last year grossed an average of \$44,350, with expenses of \$38,436 If these figures are accurate for all the Montana outfitters who served hunters last year, it would mean the outfitters alone took in about \$15.5 million. Actually it will be somewhat less than that, because a few (probably about 10 percent) of the outfitters had a Special Class I outfitting license that allows them to take hunters only on day trips. These outfitters had gross income of \$32,718 each and expenses of \$25,776, according to preliminary survey results. Dr. Shannon Taylor, who performed the study along with Dr. Michael Reilly, said the payments to outlitters may represent only about 25 percent of the total outlay of outfitter clients, much of which is spent in Montana.

"In a given year, about half the outfitters make a profit and half lose money," he said. "The reason so many outfitters hold on to a business with such a small profit margin, if any, is to gain equity so they can sell it for a good price. On the average, the out ~ fitters surveyed had five employees other than family members. Sixteen & percent of them had no employees outside their family."

On the average the outlitters , surveyed that five employees other than family members. Sisteen percent of them, had no employees outside their family.

Given the way we sometimes feel about outsiders, it is worth noting that virtually all the guides and outfitters are residents. During the preparation of this article we found that almost all Montana outfitters and guides are natives of the state, often with a ranching background, lovers of the outdoors, independent types, people who like people. Most have been in business for years and are not fly-bynight or fast-buck artists. Although we might classify some of them as the loyal opposition on some political or resource issues, for the most part, compared to the rest of the world, "They is us and we is them."

Anyone meeting the above criteria and wishing to become an outfitter must pass a written examination and pay a fee to the Montana Department of Fish. Wildlife and Parks (FWP). The annual license fee for outfitters is \$100, and for guides, \$25, FWP also has a four-page list of rules, regulations and restrictions the outfitter has to follow. For example, outfitters are required to carry at least \$300,000 in Itability insurance.

Continuing with the good news, we learned that Montana is generally considered the primo big-game hunting state in the union. Jack Atcheson, who runs a thriving international hunting and fishing consulting business in Butte, said, "I've hunted all over the world and the average man can do more [good hunting] in Montana than anywhere else in the world, given time and money available. Atcheson's son Keith seconds the motion: "Compared to other states, Montana can't be beat. We've got 10 huntable species here. We've got more record-book elk than the other states combined. The biggest mountain sheep in the UShave been coming from Montana for the last four or five years. White-tailed deer are a definite standout. We've got everything here. Open plains, mountain wilderness, non-wilderness."

Or take it from C.B. Rich. longtime outfitter from Seeley Lake: "Montana has the most beautiful collection of mountains and wilderness in the U.S. right now, [and for hunters] the best selection, best volume, best success in the U.S." Given such praise, some of us financially depressed residents might wonder what we're missing by not being rich dudes coming here to hunt. To find this out, we talked with a cross-section of outfitters in various areas of Montana, who offer various types of hunts. Some of these are quite different from what we normally think of as typical Montana hunting.

For example, just downstream from\_\_\_\_ Glendive, Roy Gentry and his wife and sons guide hunters after trophy whitetail in the dense cottonwood stands they own along the Yellowstone River. Hunters interested in taking a crack at the Gentrys' trophy whitetails are offered their choice of two basic hunting packages. The first of these includes board, lodging in one of their two hunting cabins, and guide. This is the option usually taken by hunters who have not been there before. With the second option, the hunters do their own cooking and supply their own food, but get the same service otherwise. The second option is usually taken by repeat hunters.

"We're mainly ranchers," Ethel Gentry told us. "We had to fool with hunters anyway, so we decided to get in the business," she said, adding "we had to get paid for the damage the deer do to us." The large population of deer was causing serious crop depradation.

The Gentrys limit their hunters to approximately 20 per year because they believe that is the most trophy bucks that can be bagged without over-killing the population. Hunters come from all over the U.S. to try for the Gentrys trophy bucks. "They can't find better white-tail hunting than here," she said. Asked about her hunt"Some bunters get overly excited and sboot bucks that are not up to tropby standards."



er success, she said, "Nobody ever hunted five days without getting a chance to shoot a big buck."

Mrs. Gentry said some hunters tend to get overly excited and shoot bucks that are not up to trophy standards. "We're not too happy if somebody shoots a mediocre buck," she said. "I hound 'em quite a bit: 'Don't shoot one you're not satisfied with,' but sometimes they do anyway."

Mrs. Gentry said one hunter who shot a substandard buck told Mrs. Gentry's son, who was the guide, "Well, I'm satisfied with it, but I don't know if your mom will be."

Moving west on the plains, we come to the more traditional eastern Montana hunting of deer and antelope. Outfitter Claude Saylor of Brusett may be typical of the plains outfitters. He owns a ranch, and "had too many hunters plaguing me to hunt," so he decided to become an outfitter. He built three cabins, and hunts on his own land and on his neighbors'. His neighbors don't lease him the hunting rights, but do keep out other hunters, and he pays them at the end of the season. He says resident hunters should not resent his access to private land where they are excluded, because he's not the reason they can't get in. The neighbors weren't letting any hunters in before they let him in, he said, so if he weren't hunting there, nobody would be. He also hunts extensively on the Charles M. Russell Wildlife Refuge.

Saylor's hunts normally last five days, which he says about matches the attention span of the average hunter. "After that, they get bored," he said. Everything except personal gear, rifle, ammo and sleeping bag is provided on Saylor's hunts. He said the antelope hunting available to his clients is about the best there is anywhere. "We can guarantee 14-inch horns if the hunter does his part," he said. For the hunter, "doing his part" includes shooting straight, which a lot of guys don't. They sometimes shoot up six boxes of shells [20 shots each] before they hit something," he said, adding that his guides don't carry guns and won't help the clients shoot. "We don't chase 'em (antelope) with the rigs either," he said, "This is strictly a fairchase hunt."

"Fair-chase" usually means scouting the vast plains in four-wheel drive vehicles until the antelope are spotted in the distance, then planning a stalk on foot. "We really walk 'em," Saylor said. The first day, a lot of hunters tell Saylor they don't eat breakfast, "but after that first day's walking, they're ready for breakfast the next day," Saylor said, chuckling.

Saylor employs up to six guides, including himself, and each guide normally has two hunters at a time. The total number of hunters in a given year is 25 to 30. "If you take fewer people and charge a higher price, it's better for everybody," he said. The theory is that fewer hunters at a higher price result in better hunting with the same amount of money taken in. Saylor's clients are mostly doctors, dentists and other professional people. He charges \$300 a day per hunter. "Cheap hunters want everything done for 'em," he said, noting that well-to-do clients tend to be much easier to get along with. He said when he first went into outfitting (he's been at it since 1968) he charged a low price and hunted with

<u>cood</u> ol' boy meat hunters
<u>idn't</u> care if you chased the
<u>idn't</u> care if you chased the
<u>ind't</u> to do a little flock shooting,
<u>ind to do a little flock shooting</u>,
<u>ind and may kill or cripple</u>
<u>ind and may kill or cripple</u>
<u>ind and may kill or cripple</u>
<u>ind and may a higher price</u>
<u>ind hunt tend to be less interested</u>
<u>ling and more interested in</u>
<u>y days, he said</u>

Solor also guides hunters for deer, acclaims 100 percent success for oth deer and antelope.

Fin Greslin of Broadus runs an plation much like Saylor's on a onnewhat larger scale. He also guides leer and antelope hunters, but rates on 400,000 acres of private and, some of which he owns, leasing the rest. He operates three camps, two with cabins and one with a tent, and n everything furnished. Each camp manally has a cook and can accommodate eight or nine clients at a time. About 100 hunters are taken

ach year. Greslin says his clients mostly working men from the East. He operates a booth at the rrisburg Sports Show in Harrisburg, nosylvania, and says that is where many of his clients come from. Greslin also claims 100 percent suciss on deer and antelope in the 18 dars he's been in business.

For a five-day hunt with two hunters per guide. Greslin charges 1.250. For the hunter who wants a guide all to himself, the price is \$1,650 for five days. During the hunting eason, Greslin employs eight guides ull-time, some part-timers and three cooks.

Farther west, Michael Parsons of Toston offers mule deer, antelope and elk hunting on two private ranches where he leases hunting rights. The leases include 15,000 acres in the Judith Mountains and 28,000 near Martinsdale at the north end of the Crazy Mountains.

Parsons also has cabins and furnishes everything for his clients, who represent a wide range of vocations, including doctors, lawyers, truck company operators, carpenters and Canadian hog farmers. Parsons is a Professional people who pay a higher price for their hunt tend to be less interested in killing than in staying away from telephones.



carpenter in the off season. Most of his clients are from the Midwest, and they learn about him largely by word of mouth. He does no advertising. About 50 to 65 percent of his clients are repeat customers. Hunting success runs 100 percent on antelope and mule deer, which are hunted primarily on the Judith Mountain ranch, and 85 to 90 percent on elk on the Crazy Mountain ranch.

The two ranches normally accommodate a total of 40 hunters per season. Fees run \$1,500 for a five-day deer and antelope hunt, or \$2,250 for a seven-day elk hunt.

In the old traditional outfitting area along the Rocky Mountain Front, <u>Art</u>. <u>Weikum of Augusta has been in business for 41 years. He offers 10-day</u> hunts in the Bob Marshall Wilderness, primarily for elk, but also for mule deer. He offers two levels of service. The most economical of these is the "drop camp" arrangement wherein hunters are carried horseback with their gear into the Bob Marshall and dropped off and left for eight days. Weikum furnishes the tent, cooking gear and the ride in and out, and the hunters provide everything else. No guides are furnished. The drop camps can accommodate up to six hunters and are sold for a flat fee of \$3,600, regardless of the number of hunters. At the end of the eight hunting days, the hunters and their gear are packed out, along with any game they have bagged.

The second level of service is associated with the main tent, which normally accommodates eight hunters at a fee of \$2,500 each for a 10-day trip, including the one-day ride in and another day riding out. Everything is furnished to hunters in the main tent. Weikum said he doesn't like to talk about hunting success ratios. "Success is for the hunters to define for themselves," he said, adding, "It's their vacation." For most of his clients, any game they get is a bonus.

The drop tents normally attract working-class people, while the main tent is favored by people with more money, he said. He provided services to 82 hunters last year.

Around the other side of the Bob Marshall, C.B. Rich opines that he may be the dean of Montana outfitters. "I'm 67 years old and I've been in this business for 51 years," he said. He said he runs a full-service hunting camp in the Bob Marshall, with "full-service" including carpets on the floor of the tent. He also doesn't like to talk about hunter success, because of the contribution the hunter has to make. Shooting straight, for example. "Last year we had 14 hunters fire 40 shots at 30 elk and got two," he said, adding, "one of the ones they missed was only 75 yards away." He explained, "Most people who can afford to hunt don't

# Homestead Stories Wanted

for a Montana Geographic Series book about Montana's homesteading era. We would like to talk to Montana homesteaders and also hear of surviving structures.We are interested in family pictures and letters, which would be returned safely after copying. Please contact the book editor if you can help. Write Mark Thompson, Montana Magazine, P.O. Box 5630, Helena, MT 59604. shoot much. They sit all day in a padded chair ordering a secretary around."

Rich said he tries to get clients to target their rifles before they go out hunting, but they tend to fire four or five shots and say, " 'That hurts a little bit. I think it's close enough.' And you wouldn't believe what they mean when they say 'close enough'."

A 10-day hunt from Rich's carpeted tent costs each hunter \$2,100 if he shares a guide with another hunter, or \$2,600 if he wants a private guide. For the first three 10-day hunts, beginning in early September, Rich takes up to eight hunters at a time. He takes no more than six for the last hunt in the Bob Marshall. Because of the possibility of bad weather in the high country, Rich always pulls out of the Bob Marshall by October 28. He then moves the hunting to his own place near Seeley Lake for the remainder of the regular season. Hunters at the home place are put up at a lodge and have all services provided. They are charged \$200 a day for a minimum of five days if two hunters share a guide, or \$250 for individual guiding. They can stay all season if they want to.

Rich's clients come from all over the world; every state, Europe, Mexico and Asia.

These are only a few of the firstclass outfitters in Montana—there are many fine hunting areas in the state where we didn't talk to outfitters, such as the Bitterroot, Big Hole. Beaverhead, Madison, Gallatin and Yellowstone—but those familiar with the general outfitting picture in the state agree that the services and prices listed above are reasonably representative.

We also should note that although most Montana outfitters specialize in deer and elk, they also are willing to take hunters after other species such as sheep, goat or bear in the spring.

Obviously, hunting big game with an outfitter in Montana can be a highly desirable experience, and one that many people are willing to pay a lot of money for. Although this may seem like good news in a state with a longterm economic headache, it also is the source of a new set of problems. Chief Long before daylight, outfitters lined up with powers of attorney from their clients.



among these may be over-popularity. Too many non-residents want to hunt in Montana. The reason for this frenzy, according to Bill Maloit, Supervisor of Outfitting for FWP, is that nonresidents "want our quality of hunting." They also want a bargain of license fee. Montana's combination license, good for elk. deer, bear, birds and fish, costs \$350 and is valid throughout the general big-game season that lasts approximately five weeks. Most states have shorter seasons and more costly licenses. Other states commonly split licenses so hunters can buy a separate license for each species. Elk licenses are the most desired by far.

In Idaho, the current fee for a nonresident elk license is \$235.50, added to an \$85.50 prerequisite license. Separate Idaho non-resident licenses encompassing the same species included in Montana's combination license total nearly \$600. Non-resident elk hunter success in Idaho is about the same as for Montana; 30 percent for guided hunters, 20 percent for unguided hunters, Non-resident hunters are not allowed to enter drawings for sheep, moose or goat in Idaho, unlike Montana. In Wyoming, an elk license will set a non-resident back \$225, but the guided hunter is "just about guaranteed an elk," according to Maloit.

Colorado charges \$210 for a nonresident elk license, on top of a \$75 conservation license. Success among non-resident elk hunters in Colorado is so embarassingly low that the wildlife agency there won't talk about it. "Less than 10 percent" is all they'll say. Elk hunting in Colorado may be poor, but it's popular. There is no limit on how many non-residents may hold licenses, and they have been selling about 56,000, good for bulls only.

In Montana in 1976, the legislature drew the line, saying that only 17,000 \ non-residents could be licensed. The legislators also raised the price from \$151 to \$225, which probably was the reason that non-resident license sales declined from 25,584 in 1975 to 12,689 in 1976. It was not until 1979 that license sales crept back up to-17,000. In 1979, the license went on sale in May and didn't sell out until October 19. The time required to sell all the tickets was about one month less each year through 1984 (the year when the licenses went on sale April 2 and were gone by April 26), until this year when all the non-resident licenses went in one day, except for those that were reserved for clients of outfitters\_\_\_\_

Bill Maloit briefly recounted the history of how long it has taken to sell all the non-resident licenses in recent years. "First it was months, then weeks, then days, and now hours." The reservation this year of a block of licenses for outfitter clients v.as a new " thing in Montana, and not popularwith anyone but outfitters and their supporters. It was a sort of unhappy compromise that came about as a result of the increasing demand for licenses. By 1985, it became apparent 7 that some outfitter clients probably would not get licenses because they would be in competition with a large number of other non-residents who could be counted on to get their applications in as fast as Federal Express could deliver them. Consequently outfitters that year were allowed to ob-

Smoke Elser's New Product.



"You've never seen anything like it."" Not only is it a sleeping bag cover - but it converts to a one-man pup tent. Unzip the front flap, lift it up and it becomes a lean-to tent. With two bedrolls just put them face to face, zip them together, pop them up and they become a full 2-person tent - with fly! The Cowboy Bedroll/Tent keeps you and your sleeping bag dry, warm and comfortable.

The Six-Way Cowboy Bedroll tent -\$149.00 regular.

INTRODUCTORY OFFER - S119. Unconditional money-back guarantee

if you're not completely satisfied. To order one of your favorite Cowboy Bedrolls call 406-728-1738 or write Blue Star Canvas, 300 W. Main, Missoula, MT 55802.





power of attorney from their s that allowed them to come to icha and personally buy licenses on half of their clients. Long before , asked, "Fairness to who?" s ght outfitters lined up with ers of attorney from each of their jents. Naturally, hopeful nonsidents who did not have anyone in 📝 a with their power of attorney 🚔 at a disadvantage. Seeking a more uitable solution. FWP did away with power of attorney provision for and instead set aside 5.600theses for outfitted hunters. This was the average of the number 4

unters that had hired outfitters in previous three years. This of tirse left 11,400 licenses for nonsi lents who did not hire outfitters. ose 11,400 tickets went the first day were available, February 10, and applications had to be rejected nt day because the quota was eady filled A total of 4,343 plications was received after all the moutfitted licenses were taken.= Outfitted hunters had a better deal.the 5,600 licenses available to em, 4.380 were sold the first day, at the last of them weren't sold until thruary 26. The Montana Wildlife

deration was not happy with the mit set-aside, and filed suit on the tounds that FWP had acted imtoperly in setting aside licenses for te clients of outfitters. This contenon was rejected in district court and » been appealed.

Emily Swanson, executive director Ithe Federation, said in an interview th Montana Magazine. "The heart: I the issue is fairness. All the people the want to come to Montana to unt should have a fair shake She said the Federation is preparing bill for the legislature that would quire equal treatment of all nonsident hunting license applicants bough a computerized drawing. On he other side, the Montana Outfitters nd Guides Association (MOGA) has hawn up a bill, which in its present is of September 1) draft form, would berve half the 17,000 non-resident censes for outfitted clients, with the ther half to go to non-residents Dending to hunt with residents who In their license applications.

Henry Barron of Townsend, Executive Director of MOGA, said he also is concerned with fairness, but

"We need to be fair to our own people," he said, pointing out the substantial economic benefits that outfitting brings to the state, and suggesting that fairness to Montana residents consists of getting top dollar for the game taken by non-residents.

In Townsend, he said, there are eight outfitters who together contribute as much to the local economy as the sawmill, hospital and county payroll, which are the other major contributors to income in the community.

Further, he said, it is not fair to force an elk license on non-resident hunters who want to hunt only deer or antelope in eastern Montana. He said 3,000 Montana combination licenses each year are bought by hunters who want to hunt only deer. If 3,000 to 5.000 deer "A" rags were made available to non-residents, he said, then perhaps 5,600 combinations licenses would be enough to satisfy the demand from outfitted clients, providing at the same time a better deal for non-resident deer and antelope hunters. The decision on whether to make more "A" tags available is political and not biological. he said, noting that the number of resident "A" tags is unlimited.

Under the MOGA proposal, nonresident licenses would go on sale April 1, and any licenses not sold by May 1 would be sold on a first-come. first-served basis. The MOGA bill also would raise the price of non-resident combination licenses (elk, deer, bear, birds, fish) to \$450. The same ticket for residents would rise to \$45. It also would establish a new license, good for deer, fish, and birds, for \$275 to non-residents, or \$31 to residents. The explanation that accompanies the draft of the MOGA proposal says the bill would establish that Montana residents have first priority for licensing nonresident friends or family members. Further, the bill would set aside nearly \$3 million annually to compensate landowners for the value of forage consumed by game animals on private

land. The bill also would provide financial incentives for agricultural landowners who open their land to some public hunting.

Clearly, MOGA and the Wildlife Federation do not agree. Bill Maloit noted that FWP had urged the two groups to get together to work out their differences and come up with a compromise that FWP could support at the legislature. "But so far, they're a country mile apart."

The lottery idea is anathema to the 'outfitters. They point out that more than half their business comes from repeat clients, and without some way of ensuring that the repeaters can continue to repeat, business is likely to suffer. Many insist they cannot stay in business if a lottery is enacted into law.

Roland Cheek, who operates what he calls a "mom and pop" outfitting business in the Bob Marshall from his headquarters near Columbia Falls, told Montana Magazine, "Outfitter survival is at stake." He said he has seen "no issue this immediate" in the 17 years he has been outfitting. He pointed out the transparently thin profit margin of some outfitters, noting that he has made a profit in only four of the 17 years he has been outfitting. "Without my repeat business, I'm dead in the water," he said.

Wyoming, one of Montana's main competitors for non-resident hunter dollars, has had a lottery since 1971. "They had the same problem we had," Bill Maloit told Montana Magazine. 'After the lottery began, some outfit- fters went out of business, but the established ones are still there, and there are more outfitters than there were before. I think outfitters in Montana could prosper with a lottery," he said. He said the chance of applicants getting a non-resident license in Wyoming last year was about 50/50. "The outfitters don't like the lottery because they have to overbook" to compensate for the prospective clients who lose out in the lottery, Maloit said.

On the other hand, Roland Cheek said Wyoming can make the lottery work because it has a higher hunter success ratio, partly because the game managers artificially inflate the elk population by feeding and other The lottery idea is anathema to outfitters.



means. Maloit pointed out that Montana's success ratio also slips substantially if the late season elk hunts in the Yellowstone vicinity are excluded. Idaho is the only hunting state comparable to Montana that has set aside licenses for outfitting clients. This year it set aside 10,500. Responding to the outfitters' fears, the Wildlife Federation has suggested that the computerized drawing it recommends be modified to partially accommodate outfitters. Under this proposal, non-residents applying for a license would indicate on their application whether they intend to hire an outfitter, and a percentage of the non-resident licenses equal to ' the percentage of non-residents = intending to go with outfitters would be set aside for outfitted clients to draw for. So far, the outfitters have not ; shown enthusiasm for this idea. The only thing clear in this controversy is that the legislature will have its work cut out.

Next to the licensing problem, outfitters say one of their biggest headaches is the U.S. Forest Service, at least for the outfitters who hunt on the national forests, which is most of the forests in western Montana. The Forest Service restricts each outfitter to a certain number of client days, a client day being one client on the national forest for one day.

Jim Dolen, Special Areas Forester for Region One, explained that client days are allotted partly on the basis of how many clients a given outfitter has had in the past, and partly on the professional judgment of the foresters in charge of the area. The main idea is to avoid overcrowding, he said. Until three years ago, fees paid by the outfitters for use of the forest were 25 cents per client day, Dolen told us. Now they pay about three percent of their adjusted gross outfitting income. Initially, he said, "there was a flap" over the increased fees, "but they're living with it now." The Forest Service also charges outfitters for reservation of a base camp site (\$100 per season) and a grazing fee for pack stock of about \$1.30 per animal per month. Generally, Dolen said, there is a good relationship between the Forest Service and the outfitters. "We look at outfitting as one of the legitimate ways the public can enjoy the public land. We're in partnership with 'em (outfitters], just like with the ski hills on the forest," he said.

Roland Cheek, whose partnership with the Forest Service is not as happy as it might be, said he was "bewildered" by the way the Forest Service treats outfitters. He said the Forest Service is engaged in "relentless persecution." He said he could understand the Forest Service limiting outfitter use in the Bob Marshall if the area were saturated with people, "but it's not. There are no restrictions on the number of other people that can use it, so why us?"

Besides government regulation, Montana outfitters have some other worries they'd like addressed. Management of game and habitat, for instance. Art Weikum said elk hunting should be managed more for quality than quantity. He suggested that the season on bull elk should not open until a given quota of cow elk is bagged. Otherwise, hunters concentrate on shooting bulls and "pretty soon you've got nothin' but scrubs" because all the mature bulls have been killed. Too many back-country roads also are a problem in his vicinity, Weikum said, noting that he has seen the major elk migration routes near his ranch change four times over the years because of hunter pressure made possible by roads. "If they're gonna build roads, they should close 'em when they're done," he said.

Excessive fire suppression also got part of the rap for habitat deterioration. Roland Cheek said the Bob Marshall needs a "Let it burn" policy to restore openings in the forest for game habitat. He suggested that Smokey's helpers might even have to start some fires to make up for past excesses in wildfire suppression.

C.B. Rich said roads are a major problem in his neighborhood, too. "We've got such a network of roads that they are totally eliminating migration routes," he said. "Game is getting the short end of the stick. We need to maintain wilderness values because it seems like we've either got wilderness or we've got roads."

Also, he said a uniform policy is needed in regard to hunting branchantlered bull elk. In some areas, bull elk too young to have grown branch antlers are not hunted, the theory being that breeding is done mostly by the older bulls, and also improving chances for a bull to live to full trophy size. "You ask four biologists about branch-antlered bulls and you get four opinions," he said. "Each one wants to prove his own theories."

Ken Greslin suggested the deer season should open two weeks earlier and close two weeks earlier, to prevent "road hunters" from killing too many rutting bucks, which lose their alertness during the breeding season.

Claude Saylor said the liberal deerkill limits in the last couple of years have seniously depressed deer populations in his country. "I used to have 300 deer and now I don't have 30," he said. Many of the deer killed were wasted, he said, recalling tales of dumpsters full of carcasses. "It could just make you cry," he said. "People ask me 'Where's all the deer?' and I 'tell 'em, 'you shot 'em all last year'." The liability insurance headache also You ask four biologists about branch-antlered bulls and you get four opinions. Each wants to prove his own theories.



has affected the outfitting business. Henry Barron said one insurance company in Montana handles 95 percent of the insurance for outlitters. The rates are based on gross income, and the minimum premium just went from \$900 to \$1,300. Some insurance is provided by the Farm Bureau for outfitters who are also farmers or ranchers. Barron said there were approximately 20 companies offering insurance for outfitters until the last couple of years.

Jack Atcheson said outfitted biggame hunting is going to have an increasingly important role in Montana's economy, and the legislature and public agencies involved should recognize this and take steps to improve hunting for everybody. He suggested the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service should set aside winter range for game use, possibly by restricting domestic livestock grazing. Ranchers could be given a tax break if their grazing rights were reduced to accommodate game, or if they improved habitat on their private land.

Besides helping hunters, Atcheson

said, giving private landowners a piece of the action associated with hunting could help keep them in business. Keeping the "legitimate resident rancher" in business is one way to counter non-residents who come to buy residential property or take advantage of farm subsidies without contributing much to the state economy, he said. One obvious source of money to provide wildlife incentives to private landowners is through the license fee increase proposed by the Outfitters and Guides Association in their legislative bill.

Looking back at all we have discussed in this article perhaps we can sympathize with legislators and economic planners who have to make tough decisions affecting the outfitting business and non-resident hunting.

Those of us with less grim duties, perhaps given to whimsical reflection, might.ask of non-residents: Why are they willing to come to Montana and pay a stout fee to hunt big game? Why don't they go to Bermuda and hunt periwinkles on the beach? Roland Cheek gets quite lyrical in his explanation. He says there is "something spiritual in men banding together." No girls allowed. "It's a base instinct we're dealing with." Cheek said people who come to Montana to hunt sometimes like it so much they come back as tourists with their families. "These people have an affinity, a love affair with Montana."

Jack Atcheson has a slightly different view. "People sit in their offices with the phones ringing and things going on all around and they think, 'If only I could get some peace and quiet.' But once they get here, a week or 10 days is about all they can take. That's fine. We don't want to encourage any more people to live here."

Dan Vichorek, a technical writer in Helena, writes Montana Magazine's humor column. He is currently preparing a book on Montana's homesteading era, to be published in the Montana Geographic Series.

"MONTANA"

LETTERS

JAN/FEB 87

#### Musselshell

I have just finished the article "Along the Upper Musselshell" in vour November-December '86 issue. Having been born and reared in Big Timber, I was fascinated. I've known the Reins, Tronruds, Hereims, and all those wonderful Norwegians all my life. And once Col. Stevens nearly ruined a Switzerland vacation for my wife, our threevear-old daughter and me, when I was in the Army at Heidelberg. Germany. He came there on some visit and I, as a very junior medical officer, had to sit around the airport in case any of his entourage got sick. He apologized to me a couple of years ago here in Livingston (about 30 years later) for disrupting our trip.

However, I must complain about one thing. Sweet Grass in this part of Montana is two words, not one as is the town of Sweetgrass near the Canadian border.

How many times I remember as a child, the Brannins you mention in your story, calling my dad to make a housecall to their ranch (on Sweet Grass Creek). The instructions were to bring a deer tag, just in case. Of course, the deer was always skinned, cleaned and hanging in the barn by the time my dad got there. Some patient!

#### L.M. Baskett, M.D. Livingston

I used to live on a ranch near Melville, so it was like a visit home to read "Along the Upper Musselshell." Our place was near the Cavuse Buttes. The names in the article-Rein, Brannin, Van Cleve, Tronrud-I remember Tronruds had their own family orchestra, and they supplied the music for all the dances. When we lived out there, Van Cleves had a dude ranch in Big Timber Canyon, and Brannins were starting one in the other canvon. One year the whole community celebrated the 4th of July at Brannins.

I recall when a neighbor, T. C. "Tench" Hanson was shot in a fight at the old Melville Hotel, and the search in the mountains for the party responsible. He was captured and got 10 years.

Arthur Glaesman Waseca, Minnesota Outfitting

I thought your article on biggame outfitting in the November-December issue was well done. However, if the proposed changes take place, this is one non-resident who will not be back in the summer or fall. The limit has been reached! The outfitters and the state of Montana have forgotten that most of the huntable land is not theirs, but belongs to all the people. With the growing difference between resident and non-resident license fees. I wonder if Montana should be responsible for this administration. As I told my outfitter of 10 years, you will be pumping a dry hole soon.

C.E. Allgeier Lawton, Oklahoma

# Hunting License Lottery

Re: Your big-game outfitting article, a great feature story. I visit Montana as a tourist as often as possible. My last trip was in May 1986 to Billings, Lewistown, Great Falls and Miles City to visit family and friends. Each trip averages \$2.200-\$2,500 (\$600-\$700 motels and hotels, \$400-\$500 rental cars, \$1,000-\$2.000 meals and miscellaneous) and airfare is on top of that.

In addition to visiting, I would like to hunt antelope, mule deer and birds in Montana, but the outfitters do not want to take their chances with a lottery, so my opportunities are limited. Hunting without an outfitter for a week would cost me approximately \$1,000 to \$2,000 for hotel, rental car, food, hunting license and airfare.

I believe that Montana benefits more from tourism and independent hunters than it does from the outfitters and their clients. The clients have no costs for accompanying family members, hotels, entertainment, etc.

Residents are, and should be, number one, and all non-residents should take their chances in a lottery. GO FOR IT!

> Robert K. Wickham Rowayton, Connecticut

I would like to compliment you and your entire staff on the wonderful articles and fantastic artwork presented in each of your magazines. As a displaced Montanan, I eagerly await each issue to read more about my home state. One of my favorite columns is "Humor." My favorite feature is "In Search of Small-Town Montana" probably because I come from Livingstonsmall by East Coast standards. As I read about each town. I look it up on my wall map to see if I have ever been in that vicinity.

Turned around

This brings me to one problem. The author, Mr. Devitt, needs a new compass to find his bearings. I am sure the good citizens of Paradise were surprised to know that their town had been moved to some point south of St. Regis when all the maps show it northeast.

Aside from one turned-around writer, again let me compliment you on a fine magazine. Wish I were home again!

James R. Foster Pennsauken, New Jersey

### Chagrined

In reading "Missoula's Masterpiece Theaters" by Bruce Weide in your September-October '86 issue, I was a little more than chagrined to read [in the discussion about theater owner Ed Sharp] that he was "stationed on Treasure Island, an amusement facility for military personnel near San Francisco..." I was stationed on Treasure Island during World War II and found very little amusement and a lot of hard work and war time activity. There were two theaters on base which, as the saying goes, was a drop in the bucket for the numbers of Navy and Marine personnel permanently attached to the base, much less the thousands of men passing through. So to call it an "amusement facility" is a misnomer.

As a native Montanan, I have thoroughly enjoyed your series, "In Search of Small-Town Montana" and hope to see you cover all the rest of the small towns in Montana.

> Margaret D. Swartz Apache Junction, Arizona

EXHIGIT 151) DATE 2.561 H0\_5% WITNESS CTATEMENT Ellison NAME Use GutLoski BILL NO. 535 ADDRESS 304 U. 1911 A. Poreman MT 59715 DATE 2-5-81 WHON DO YOU REPRESENTS Pras. Gallatin Willing Association. OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_AUEND SUPPORT PLEASE"LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY. Comments This bill is a large step in privationy a public wildlif resource. It pives Favoritisminto a special interert group and is unfave to non- resident hunters the du rint wish to employ outsitters. All non resident licensus should be on a luttury basisberasse Have are more than 17,000 applications annually for non-res. hunses: 1. A. A. A. Joe Hutkoki Rec. Gailuth Willing Arrow. C8-34

EXHIBIT (52) DATE 2.5.87 HB 535

# OPPOSITION TO HB 535

I have reviewed HB 535 and the documents submitted by the Montana Outfitters and Guides Association (MOGA) in support of the bill. I am <u>opposed</u> to the bill for the following reasons:

1. The wildlife resource of Montana was never intended to figure prominently in providing an economic base for the state. This resource was kept in public ownership to provide a recreational amenity for all citizens. It is wrong to now look at it as a resource to be exploited for economic development. Further privatization of this resource will, in the eyes of most Montana sportsmen, take away a valuable reason for living in this state.

2. The study commissioned by MOGA concludes that outfitted non-resident hunters spend more money in the state than those who are not outfitted. This should surprise no one. If the study had gathered data on income and wealth of nonresident hunters it would have surely shown that outfitted hunters have more income and/or wealth than non-outfitted hunters. The question is, "Why should less well-to-do nonresidents be required to pay outfitting fees in order to enjoy a hunt in Montana?" To those who do not need or want the services of an outfitter this is simply a form of extortion and many non-residents, including sons and daughters of Montana citizens, cannot afford to pay it.

3. The study shows that non-guided hunters spend more for gasoline, restaurant food, motels, and non-restaurant food than guided hunters. This is apparently because they stay in the state longer and part of these expenses would otherwise be included in the outfitter fees for guided hunters. I contend it is not fair for the state to set quotas and restrictions which arbitrarily shift business away from one group of businesses in favor of another group.

4. It is unfair to non-resident hunters, and I should think, unconstitutional, to require any sponsorship by Montana residents, whether outfitters or just friends, in order to obtain a non-resident license. If a quota is necessary, and the demand for non-resident licenses exceeds the quota, then the licenses should be issued on a random drawing. Anything else is unfair to our fellow American citizens.

Prepared and presented by:

M. J. Durnwork M. E. "Gene" Quenemoen 606 Frank Road Belgrade, MT 59714

Phone: 388-6982

EXHIBIT (53) DATE 2.5.87 HB 535

Dear LegisLitons - FORNAN, 4, 1987 (Fred "Fritz" Drizy) (Robert J. Bos" Paulovich) of others -

The Skylin's Spontsm Association of Butte And Southunstein Montana Otticially opposes the establishmint of 6,000 Additional Deer "A" taks in Montana.

The Reason is DASID ON the increase of APPROXIMITELY 4,200 NON-Resident elh hunten into our state. We feel Strongly the 4,200 Non-Resident elh hunters would primarly congrigate on Public Lands in Southwestery mentane such as the Ruby, Madison, Alachtere + Dibhole. This would increase the elh harvest By APPORTMINELS Soo Animits. With davindling habitit Courable due to Logging & Limiting the hind of elh to Shoot such as No -Spikes etc thise would be more hunter Contlicts.

lan Schomm Tom ruicit Lale Jogonth June Fischer

The LearsLadice commettee Tom August first Mante. the folight Bill Holdort ab Luebeck Les (astim



EDUCATION - CONSERVATION

Montana Wildlife Federation

AFFILIATE OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Testimony on HB 535

EXHIBIT (54) DATE 2.5.87 HB 53

P.O. Box 3526 Bozeman, MT 59715 (406) 587-1713

House Fish and Game Committee

February 5, 1987

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Emily Swanson and I am from Bozeman. I wish to enter my testimony in opposition to HB535.

The issue at hand here has been portrayed as an economic issue by the outfitters and I wish to dispute that not guaranteeing outfitters a clientele will destroy their businesses. We have heard that without a guaranteed clientele, the state will lose over a million dollars of revenue and X number of jobs. We have heard that repeat clients will not return unless they are guaranteed a license.

I ask you to look more closely at the basis for these claims. Granted, the easiest way for an outfitter to confirm a client is to guarantee him a license. BUT, what is to prevent an outfitter from expanding his client base so as to ensure a full clientele after a drawing? What is to prevent an outfitter from marketing his services so as to attract hunters to his business? What is to prevent a return client from coming back every few years when he does get a license in a drawing?

I want to emphasize that I do think outfitting is an important and reputable industry in this state and that I fully support the fine outfitters of Montana, exemplified by some of the people here today. What I fear is the precedent that preferential treatment for a privileged few sets for the future of our state. Many many people live in Montana to take advantage of its natural resources, its fine hunting and fishing. When these are taken from them by becoming too costly, which is what I fear we are beginning with this precedent, will we not undermine what we hold most dear? We need to draw a firm line on who controls the public's wildlife and that line begins here. I ask you to oppose HB535.

EXHIBIT	(55)
DATE	2.5.87
HB_379	

# Wildlife, Range, and Water Management, Inc.

Ronnie DeMasters President

Michael Bodenchuk Biologist P.O. Box 472 Chama, New Mexico 87520 (505) 756-2942

MONTANA WILDLIFE MANAGMENT SUMMARY 1985 REVISED JANUARY 1987

# RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY WILDLIFE, RANGE AND WATER MANAGEMENT, INC. P.O. BOX 472 CHAMA, NEW MEXICO 87520

RONNIE DEMASTERS PRESIDENT

# MICHAEL BODENCHUK WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST
the intent of HB 379 is to allow the grivate landowner a monetary incentive for the game that is managed on his property The incentive is a quarantee of licenses for out-of-state hunters These hunters only pay to hunt trophy-type animals. With the agriculture business being as it is and was two years ago, I listed my hunting rights for lease in the Walk Atreet Gournal. I leaced my ranch to a group of people from Texas . after the first years hunt, we negotiated a five year contract on the hunting right this contract for hunting was profitable enough that I cut my cou numbers by 3070 to encourage more game on the ranch The only thing I have to sell is grass. Whatever animal eats this grass has to show me a monetary incentive for me to stay in business. Then along came the charge in purchasing of out of state licenses and the people leasing my ranch received no licenses. Game management consists of managing habitat and hunters, running less cattle and plant grasses that are inductive to

DATE 2.5.87 HB 379

2.5.87 HB\_379 game and saving for the wildlife. Vistory proves that anything that aquiculture can show a profit at well be overproduced. Why would it be any different for wildlife The limiting factor for wildlife is habitat and the amount of forage available to survive the winter and produce young. The male of the species, seen and ell, is not a homebody. They will range widely, giving everyone a better chance at a trophy. Mature buck deer are known to range 17 miles and ell 100 miles. I am hoping on my ranch I will be able to keep 257. of these trophys at home. While managing for the trophy the female population will flourish. It is not possible to charge a trespass fee to hunt females In other states that have gone to private game management, the operators of such have not been able to find hunters to kell enough of the female population (deer). I see no problem with the cowell, but d see no one paring to hunt them. The Tish and Game Dept, is

2.5.87 Lai HB 379 saying their main problem with this bill is the cost of biolog work that is needed for each operation. What about using private biologists? They say no. They won't take the expertise of these people. (The operator would pay for their use). In many cases this would eliminate the problem of winter sange for ell. This would save the department money by not thaving to purchase this range. Isn't it better having private operators on this land paying takes and burying goods than having it owned by the tish and Game? the department would have no improvements on the land, no machinery, n takes, no people, no money spen? in town, What is so bad about private enterprise? I have merer seen anything run by the government that couldn't be don. much better by the private sector. I feel this bill is a winner for all these reasons; O This bill could help leep the farmer-rancher on this ground and help eliminate to over supply of cattle on the market. We have been looking

HB 379 for a diversionary crop for agriculture that won't sade to our bulging surplus. In a small way this bill will help. @ The sportsman will have more game to hunt! 3 The outfitter will have more trophys to hunt on public or private ground! Their complaint well be that operators of management areas well be taking their clients, but will we? There were 28,000 applications for the available 17,000 permits. "Under this bill perhaps some of the other 11,000 applicants could come into our state! 4) Businesses will welcome more -people who will spend money creating more jobs! 3 Who will lose?

(56)

UNI \_\_\_\_\_ 2.5.87

Ð

# STANTON COMPANY

(1) Post Ook Booleanth, Song 220, Proceeding 17

7.5.87

DATE

August 21, 1986

Mr. Bassett Hoiness P.O. Box 1018 Livingston, Mont 59047

Re: Hunting lease for 1986 season

Dear Mr. Hoiness,

Please be advised that the 10 individuals including the undersigned who leased your Greeley Creek Ranch during the 1985 hunting season will not be able to do so for the 1986 hunting season. The reason stems solely from difficulties obtaining licenses from the State of Montana. The State changed the method for purchasing out-ofstate licenses as you are aware, and our group was simply unable to obtain licenses prior to sellout.

I speak for our entire group in saying we throughly enjoyed your ranch last year and we look forward to returning. Needless to say, we cannot afford to mobilize the trips without the licenses.

I am sure this will cause economic hardship on yourself and your family as you had counted on the lease revenue continuing. I hpoe you recognize that our group of hunters made the effort. If we can document our troubles to the State of Montana in an effort to improve their out-of-state licensing proceedures please advise.

Again, we enjoyed hunting Montana and your Greeley Creek Ranch.

Best Regard ies E. Carrol

rlc/JC

cc: all hunters on Greeley Creek Ranch, 1985 season

EAHIE (57) \_\_\_\_ DATE 2.5.87 HB 379

#### LANDOWNER COMPENSATION

I operate a 1000 animal unit cattle ranch in southeastern Montana. Over the past years, I have approached the hunting situation from various aspects. I have allowed free access to all, charged a trespass fee, allowed no hunting, leased to a licensed outfitter and finally gotten an outfitter license I have Mule Deer and Pronghorn Antelope on the ranch. myself. deer population on my ranch has varied from a low of The approximately 50 head to a high of 500. I feel with habitat enhancement, proper management, and neighbor participation that the high number could be increased to 1000 head. If we use the high number as 100% you can see that the population on the ranch has varied from 5% to 50% of potential. The antelope numbers on my ranch have roughly paralleled the deer numbers. - Currently I am at a 45% level on deer and a 40% level on antelope.

The argument is made that landowners are legally required to support game on their land. That being the case, I feel that the 5% level is the amount I must run. There are two reason I say First, that is the approximate amount of game that was that. here when the land was homesteaded. Second, that is the level to which the game drops after the Department of Fish, Wildlife and has issued doe permits to reduce the populations. When Parks you start increasing the numbers above that level, it starts having a detrimental economic impact upon my ranching operation. The higher the percentage goes the less profit I make, or larger loss I have from my ranch. In the past when the numbers have started to go past the 25-30% level, the ranchers have started to ask the Department to issue more doe permits to reduce the Depending on how fast the Department acts numbers. the populations may go to the 50% level. However, the doe permits are issued and the numbers are decreased to that 5% level. We have just gone through a time in which the department was issuing up to 6 doe tags per hunter. At the present time I am at the 40-45% range as I stated earlier, because I did not allow an excessive amount of doe hunting on my ranch the last couple of years. I have maintained my game population with the thought I could supplement ranching income by guiding hunters. I currently have better hunting on my place than my neighbors because. I have managed for the game. At the present time, I am facing a decision whether to continue outfitting or not due to the increase costs and the adverse political and administrative climate. If I cannot figure out some form of reimbursement, I will not continue to maintain the deer and antelope population that I am now maintaining.

1. - 3 (57) DATE 2.5.87

The Elk and White Tailed Deer populations in the state also vary. The White Tail cycles closely match the Mule Deer cycles. The Elk numbers do not increase as fast as the deer numbers, therefore the cycles are not as dramatic. They will become more pronounced as the number of Elk increase. Because of the slow increase in the Elk population, it is even more important to have landowner compensation so that there is no large population reduction.

I think the game management in this state can be compared to the agricultural management between the United States and Russia. Russia, the management of their agriculture is done from a In central location with no form of compensation to the man on the land. In this country, the management is done by the individual land with a corresponding compensation to him for on the his management ability. As I am sure all of you know, this nation has had bumper agricultural crops through the years where Russia has not met their basic quotas. Hunting could be improved by giving more of the management of wildlife to the individual landowners and compensating them for their abilities. The Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks could act in an advisory capacity much like the extension service has. BУ working as a team we could improve the hunting in this state beyond imagination.

I feel that a landowner compensation law must contain the following things:

1.It must provide more hunting opportunity for the residents of the state.

2.It should provide higher quality hunting. (trophy animals) 3.It must be expandable to take in as many landowners as want to participate.

4. The compensation must be equal to or greater than the loss caused by the wildlife.

5.The majority of the cost should be borne by the out of state sportsman.

6.Should not adversely affect landowners who do not participate.

How can all of this be accomplished?

1.One idea is to have the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks set up designated areas similar to their block management areas. In these areas the landowners would improve the habitat and increase numbers of game. In exchange, the Department would issue to the landowners a percentage (minimum of 50%), of the licenses in that area which they could sell as they wished. - The remainder of the licenses would be sold to the residents of Montana by the Department.

2.The next method of compensation would be a landowner coupon. A coupon would be attached to each license and given to the landowner where the game was harvested. The landowner would then present it to the Department for payment. The coupons should be worth at least \$25 for deer and antelope and \$75 for elk.

3.The Department could enter into agreements with landowners to improve habitat on the land. The Department would make a payment based on the number of acres involved.

EAMIDIN 2.5.8 HB. 379

These are only three possible solutions. I am certain that there are several other plans or modifications of these ideas which might work. I feel that the first or second plan would work the best. They give an incentive for the landowner to increase the amount of game on his property, because the payment is based on the amount of game taken from his property. Whatever plan for landowner compensation is passed, it should adhere to the six guidelines I have listed above. When the sportsmen and the landowners can agree on some form of compensation, Montana could become the premiere place to hunt in North America.

> Respectfully submitted by Keith Bales Box 33 RR.1 Otter, Mt. 59062

Keith Balas

EXHIBIT (58) DATE 2.5.87 HB\_379

#### TESTIMONY on HB 379

before the House Fish and Game Committee, February 5, 1987, by Lorents Grosfield, cattle rancher from Big Timber, Montana.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

There are a number of bills before this legislature regarding improving the wildlife resources of this state. Some of them, such as this bill and one you'll be seeing soon regarding the purchasing or leasing of habitat, recognize the essential bottom line that a lot of critical habitat for many if not most species occurs on private land. An obvious question concerns whether purchasing some limited quantities of habitat the best and most effective way to approach the problems of our wildlife resources? Again, the bottom line that must be remembered is that much of the critical habitat for many species occurs on private land. State wildlife agencies simply must recognize this and deal with it in a constructive manner if they are to significantly improve the public wildlife resource, not to mention maintaining improvements once made. And obviously these improvements can lead to a significant expansion of recreational opportunities. There is a tremendous opportunity here for state wildlife agencies across the West with an imaginative eye to the future. HB 379 presents such an opportunity for Montana.

Today there is no doubt that compensation for recreational uses of private lands is legal, it's a property right, and it's on a dramatic increase across the West. In Montana there's a perceived tradition of "free hunting". And I'm sure you've all heard the counter arguments concerning the \$15,000 four wheel drive, the expensive gun, the amount of invested time, gas and so on. Actually, the <u>willingness</u> to provide direct incentives to landowners may be more significant than the <u>ability</u> to do so. This is a perception problem, and it illustrates the political nature of this issue. The point is that <u>NOTHING is free</u>.

I am a landowner, a cattle rancher. I'd like to take you back in time a few years and try to explain to you why providing landowner incentives is an appealing and logical step to most landowners who care about their lifestyles, their ranches, and their environment, and why it should also be a step that's logical to agencies and to recreational users.

In 1984 during the hunting season, we hosted 863 hunters on our ranch. This is about the average annual number of hunters we had hosted on our ranch over the previous ten years. In addition, we'd hosted well over one hundred days annually for other recreational uses such as fishing, hiking, picnicking, and camping, not to mention several hundred days of horseback riding. In other words, over ten years, we had hosted well over 10,000 total recreation days on our ranch, NONE of which were charged for. On the contrary, if anything, we donated a tremendous amount of time and energy (not to mention money) toward the recreating public--- consider that if each recreation day demanded only 5 minutes of our time, we donated over 50,000 minutes or one-half of an average working year to the recreating public. And I'm sure you can appreciate that we rarely got off with only 5 minutes by the time we'd coplained where to go, where not to go, where the deer are, course the other hunters are, where the "big ones" are, where the cattle are, and so on.) In fact when you think about it, what we and must ranchers have done, is to subsidize the recreation public to the extent of the time and expense it has taken us to accompdate that public. In other words, <u>NOTHING is free</u>. The recreational user might perceive that it's free to him, but it's sure not free to me.

Governor Ted Schwinden (at the International Right-of-Way Annual Meeting last November) recently said, "It's no longer reasonable to expect private landowners or public auencies to subsidize the recreating public." As the general public gets more leisure time and the income to use it away from home, increased prossure on the public lands will continue to lead to overcrowding and either regulation or deterioration of the resource. Thu reality is that the time of open door policies by landowners to recreationists is waning. The time has come when the costs that the landowner bears in terms of providing forage and habitat for the animals, and, aspecially, recreational opportunities for the public, simply must be somehow reimbursed. The private sector simply cannot stand much more pressure than it is already subjected to without some incentives, incentives that will not only keep these lands open, but will lead to enhancoment of the outdoor recreational resource itself as well. This is not a new concept. Aldo Leopold, the famous conservationist, said it in 1930: "We need to recognize the landowner as the custodian of public game on all private land, protect him from the irrespon**sible shooter, and compensate him for** putting his land in productive condition. Compensate him wither publicly or privately, with wither each, service or protection, for the use of his land and for his labor, on the condition that he preserves the game wood and otherwise safeguards the public interest. In short, make game management a partnership enterprise to which the landholder, the sportsman, and the public each contribute appropriate services, and from which each derive appropriate rewards."

Frankly, what we are talking about here is turning what many landowners tend to look at as a liability into an asset. In my view, the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks should really be encouraging legislation such as this, because their mandate, the wildlife and recreational resources can be the real winners. The expertise that could be offered by the department under this legislation in the area of planning for wildlife and habitat management, could be invaluable for landowners across the state, not to mention for the wildlife resource itself.

٢.

I unge your favorable consideration of HB 379. I think it would be a giant step in the right direction. THANK YOU.

EXHIB T	(59)
DATE	2.5.87
HB 379	

#### HB 379 February 5, 1987

Testimony presented by Jim Flynn, Dept. of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

The intent of this bill to encourage the propagation, conservation and utilization of wildlife resources on private lands is commendable. However, the means to accomplish this intent cause us to oppose its passage. The bill is not practical for a number of reasons, and contemplates the creation of a unique relationship among landowners, sportsmen and the department which is of concern.

From a practical standpoint it would be physically impossible for the department to meet the bill's requirements and meet our present obligations without a major addition of personnel. If only a small percent of the total eligible landowners took part in the program, the amount of time to approve and monitor the proposed plans is large. The meeting of such a commitment would require an infusion of additional FTE's to the department which would run counter to the present trend of cutting government.

In addition, it is highly questionable that the original \$300 fee and the subsequent annual fee of \$100 would cover the cost of approving a plan and then monitoring its implementation.

The area plan, as outlined in Section 4 on Pages 2 and 3, provides concern of itself. The development of Section 2(b) with any conclusive accuracy would be most difficult, time consuming and costly.

Questions also arise in Section 7 on Pages 5 and 6. With the limits on nonresident licenses, it is difficult to say how many individuals who have completed an application with the landowner will, in fact, get a nonresident license. Should too many be unsuccessful, the harvest in the plan will not be achieved. If the landowner allows for some nonresidents to be unsuccessful by taking more applications than the harvest allows, and all are successful, then an overharvest could occur which would be contrary to the plan.

The implementation of this program in a state with limited nonresident hunters would seem to be impractical.

This bill would seem to facilitate the paying of a trespass fee by the sportsman to the landowner. Such transactions are now taking place, and the department has no problem with them. The insertion of the state bureaucracy into these transactions will be costly and burdensome. We see no need for it, and suggest that this bill should not be approved.

= - = (le0) DATE 2.5.87 HB\_ 379

Testimony on H.B. 379

Mr. Chairman;

My name is Lee Fears. I represent the 3,000 members of the Southeastern Montana sportsmen Association.

We are strongly opposed to H.B. 379 because we do not feel that the private landowner has any right or business regulating the use of public land.

We sportsmen need more public access to public lands, not toll gates open only to he or she with the most money. Over commercialization of our wildlife is not in the best interest of the average sportsman.

Lee Fears,

Southeastern Montana Sportsmen Association Box 401 Red Lodge, MT 59068



## HOUSE BILL 379

The officers and directors of the RCFWA are in opposition to HB 379. This bill can be likened to a 'good news - bad news' type of narrative. This bill recognizes the important role that the private landowner plays in providing habitat for the public game animals. The concept of compensating a landowner to encourage the enhancement and conservation of wildlife on his/her property is laudable.

Unfortunately the mechanics of the bill for the most part are unsatisfactory. The idea of including any public land in a private Wildlife Management Area is totally unacceptable to most sportsmen and recreationists.

An applicant should have the right to appeal a denial of his/her application to the Fish and Game Commission, however an appeal to district court should not be spelled out in this type of bill. If an individual chooses to seek a legal remedy, this should be done thru existing Montana State statutes.

In the area of the amount of compensation to the landowner for the game taken, this bill would be opening a Pandora's box. The sky is the limit on what amount may be charged.

If this committee is really serious in pursuing this concept, I would urge you to work with the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks to put together a package which is acceptable to both the landowner and sportsman , in order to benefit the resource both groups prize - Montana's Wildlife.

EXHIBIT (62)
NAME: LEWIS E HALLIYES HE 379 DATE: 379 3/5/8
ADDRESS: 16 CLONINGER LANE BOZEMAN MA 57715
PHONE: 587-2734
REPRESENTING WHOM? PUBLIC LANDS ACCESS ASSN. INCORPOSATO
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 11 13 # 379
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? X COPPOSE? X
COMMENTS: 1-106112 BILL 379 15 SIMILAL +0 LUDINIATION
SIMIKARIZ PASSAL in Catar CALIFORNIA and Coheral CHLIEGANIN TO ALLOW "PRIVATE WILD LIFE MIZMIT.
ABEAS. This is a suptoin attempt to PRIVITIZE
Commenciplize the will Life RESSERCES IN Montana, the wyoming Fish and GAME DEPARTMA
bas Reviewed SIMILAR PROPASALS IN TEXAL
CALIFORNIA COLORADO NEW MEXICO and 4tah. Wyoming has similar PRIVATE - PUBLIC Lond
CONDITIONS and that gove on Record mounth
<u>A RESOLTION (CORY attiched) against the</u> <u>PRIVITIZATION / COMMERCIALIZETION OF WILDR</u> ITE
in aunominon. Luc believe montAnn should do
THE SAME AND REJECT THIS PROPOSEd LEGISLATION, PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY. "PRIVATE WITH LUIISLIFE MANAGEMANT AREAS WOULD NOW
SURTHER GETRAVATE THE alREADY INTONOURDIC.
CONDITIONS CHARTER CONCERNING PUBLIC ACCESS to pyBLic LANDS in MONTHERA, MAYOL Sheuld Authorize on A trial basis for Dust & Few JENL Authorize on A trial basis for Dust & Few JENL
14thorize on A triah basis for Dust a First.

Wire leases. State for a second of the seco

Mace Kers / Jeda

This bill is also finded because is does not list a minimum number of eares whereby a landsomer can be perered under this legislation. A minimum number of deside eares, any 5000 apres, which could include more than one remain, should be appaidered before attempting to pape this bill.

In IL closing, I would like to leave you with a pupter- "No new is an inland, and shroughtout most of this state, one cannot expect to build a fence around bissolf, leave the gales, sharp treasace fees, and live happily aver afters. When this is attempted, too many people and jurisdictions are involved. The interests and "lights of others are impaired with resulting hard feilings and megative restions.

Please give a DO Not Pase to HB 579. Thankyous

Testimony of Tony Schoonen

Hr. Obsirian and esabers of the domittees

I stand before you today representing the Montana Wildlife Federation, the Skyline Sportamen Club of Batte and the Coelition for Andene on State School lands and a concerned epertamen.epposing (N.B. 579.)

EXHIBIT CEST

DATE 2.5.12

bines this bill can blocified as a privatization bill after all the legal terms are removed along with the rest of the rouge and makeup, leaving the stark reality of a public resource, that is assayed by a public agamey, for the public good being turned over in part or in whole to be assayed by the private sector.

Printization, as I have just explained it, would appli the beginning of the and to the unsurpassed wildlife resources and associated representional opportunities we presently enjoy in Montana. This bill us it is proposed is the very system which the Amorican colonies revolted against ellowing only those persons with money and property to bunt and fish.

evelow whereby ownership of wildlife was transferred the state, and subwquently wildlife becase public property. That break in historical tradition of into motion the formation of the most successful wildlife conservation system in the world and thanks to governing bodies like you, we have to keep it that way. A good example of this is the setounding number of concervation organizations statewide and nationalds working toward the best representions) opurtunities which are found nowhere else.

This is not Texes, which is merty all private land. In that even, privatizing of wildlife and exotic species caters to the affluent wildle and upper classes and not the common ordinery sporteens. We do not want to see this happen in Montons.

This bill would allow public lands to be looked off to the general sportmans which is stricktly illight. State subcol lands, BiM lends and forest worvice lands can only by used for those pirposes that are stated on the loave, primarily graping or raising crops. Since all of these lands are public lands, imarings would have to be hald to change the personiptions of wildlife wildlife

EDUCATION - CONSERVATION

Montana Wildlife Federatio

AFFILIATE OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Testimony on HB 379

EXHIBIT (64)	
DATE 2.5.87	ļ
LID 379	

P.O. Box 3526 Nozenian, M.C. 3 (114) 587-1713

House Mish and Came Coundities HB

#### February 5, 1987

Mr. Chairman, members of the condittee, my name is Emily Swamen and I am from Bozenan. I wish to enter my testimony in opposition to HB 379. Hough in what is manage for substantiating permit house pref

This billfflies directly in the face of Montana's tradition of functing for the public. (It puts us on the path toward hunting for a privileged few who can afford to pay the price. It takes eway the concept that wildlife is owned by everyone in the state to be managed for the benefit of our citizens,)

(This legislation is modeled on similar concepts at work in other states where population pressures have forced these measures. Comparing H0379 with the programs in other states, it is lacking in measures which even attempt to be even handed with public hunting./ I would unge you to essent this bill to provide more evenly for the public even while I hope it will never leave this room.

(1) Two suggested anendments: 1) A stipulated parcentage of the pandts on a private wildlife management area should be reserved for the public with no fee attached, say 10-20% of all antiered paralts and 100% of all antierless permits,2) Put a cap on the second of money a landowner can charge for access to hunt.

I fear a Montana where only the privileged few may take advantage of our fine natural resources. I also fear a Montana where the private londs are hunting reserves for the elite of the world and we find ourselves in what smounts to a feudal society. [Bole Astronomics.] White the tester with two prost-residuation of when population where the tester with two prost-residuation of many population where the tester of a long to oppose HB379, and know provide

Detter than the form of provident wetdays ladetet. They's Offer consider pupes using hunting accure revenues to purchase, leave or provide for ravements of suitable hunto be managed for the public by the April of the



EXMIST (65) DATE ASSIST SS STATEMENT HUL TI HAME JOG OLTKOSKI BILL NO. ADDRESS 304 N. 1816. Boroman MI Sylis DATE 2-3-8 NHON DO YOU REPRESENT? Pres. Gullatin Wildlie Association OPPOSE AREND BUPPORT PLEASE LEAVE PRESARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY. Comments: This bill gives favorition to a special interest group that is unfair. It is a stop toward overcommerciality : and privatication of a public valoured The public allocation from this will is mothing. Conveys public rights to private user. Gives private control over a public versurce. the Gallatin Wildlife Association vanilises that a free strying wildlife reserves is important to the citiens of Mortuguand this bill would inhibit this face varying of wildlife. The bill is also unconstitutional in that it inhibits the statutury a of the FA.G commission:

Joe Hathat: Pres. Gallatin Willing Assoc

EXHIBIT (66) DATE 2.5.87 HB 379

#### H.B. 379

#### TESTIMONY OF STAN BRADSHAW ON SPHALE OF THE MONTANA STATE COUNCIL, TROUT UNLIMITED, 2/5/87

Mr. chairman, members of the committee, my name is Stan Bradshaw, I am here today on behalf of the Montana State Council of Trout Unlimited, an organization dedicated to the protection of the cold water fishery in the state of Montana. We are here to oppose the passage of H.M. 379 because it represents a threat to the public right of access to state waters which support the fishery which we seek to enhance.

While the main focus of the bill is wildlife, language in the bill suggests that it also includes use the state's fishery, First, Section 4 of the bill provides specifically for the issuance of fishing permits by the licensee. Second, section 8(2) prohibits the commission from permitting fishing except in accordance with a management plan for the private wildlife management area.

This bill bestows the landowner not only with attributes of ownership not only over the fish, but also the water. No longer would the right to fish be subject only to reasonable regulation, but it would also be subject to the whim of the particular landowner, regardless of the character of the water or the needs of the fishery. For example, a landowner whose wildlife management area encompassed a reach of the Madison River could, under the auspices of this bill, require every person fishing that reach of the Madison to purchase a permit even if the person had floated in from upstream.

No doubt some landowners would relish such a result. Nonetheless, the Montana Supreme Court has spoken three times now on the public's right to make regreational use of the state's surface waters. In all three cases, the court has said that the public has a constitutional right of the state's waters. This bill attempts impermissably to repudiate that constitutional right.

Finally, I would like to make one more point about this bill. In foundal times, and even today in many countries around the world, fish and game were considered to be the property of the rich. One of the things which has set this country apart from those which so viewed wildlife is that, here, fish and wildlife have not been considered object of property. Instead, they are considered to be held in trust by the state for the use of its people. A hallmark of that tradition is that in this country, you don,t have to be wealthy to be able to hunt and fish. This bill would begin the erosiion of that principle by endowing landowners with attributes of ownership of the fish and game that may occur within the reaches of their land.

Por the formyoing reasons, Trout Unlimited opposes the passage of H.B. 379.

s the House Fish + Came Committee Scott Ross

EXHIBIT (67) DATE 2.5.87 HB 371



Keep Montana bowhunters off the endangered species list – JOIN the Montana Bowhunters Association

The Montana Bowhunters Association opposes HB379.

In our estimation, this bill is designed to benefit certain classes of individuals...perhaps some other than the landowners for whom the bill has been touted as a relief measure for wildlife and sportsman related problems.

HB379 holds the potential for a redistribution of hunting privileges the likes of which Montana sportsmen have not imagined. Until today. Not only would the private wildlife management area manager have the final say as to who has access to the property, he also has direct control over who may be licensed to take game on that property by having control of the permit applications as well.

It is very interesting to note that there seem to be no provisions in HB379 to differentiate between resident and nonresident hunters. It seems that the nonresident hunter would be given the same opportunity as a resident in obtaining a license for a particular private wildlife management area.

Many other implications of HB379 should, and have, raised deep concerns among resident sportsmen.

Provisions on page 2 of the bill, lines 11 through 14, suggest that access to public land way be controlled in some instances by private enterprise. This language also suggests that the public wildlife resource on those public lands may also be managed by private enterprise. This is unacceptable to us.

EXHIBIT (67) DATE 2.5.87 HB\_379

Other serious questions raised by the bill include the feasibility of managing wildlife populations which may or  $p_{RAY}$  not respect the legal boundaries of such a private management area. Trying to closely manage a game herd which way roam out of the area onto lands accessible by the general hunting public may be difficult at best.

Landowner liability is another issue that must be addressed by a bill such as this. While sportsmen in general support the concept of limiting landowner liability when it comes to use of private lands by recreationists, this system would be entirely another matter if the availability of hunting permit applications is controlled by any monetary consideration.

Another question is raised regarding the DFWP's role in 'administering' the program. Sportsmen wish their license fees to be used toward the management of the public resource, not for assisting the managers of private wildlife management areas where access **member** may not be an equal opportunity for the general hunting public.

It seems reasonable to assume that the bill in its' present form holds great potential for those who are interested in the privatization and commercialization of Montana's wildlife resources, even though the suggested intent of the bill is to provide relief for problems that face landowners.

A large percentage of Montana's sportsmen are responsible individuals for whom improved landowner-sportsmen relations are a genuine concern. We are willing to address problems that may exist in a cooperative manner. That cooperation also extends to finding solutions for wildlife depredation problems.

The Montana Bowhunters Association believes that HB379 unnecessarily circumvents honest efforts by landowners and sportsmen to resolve proble s in a satisfactory manner. In its' present form, we suspect that the issue presented by HB379 is not sportsmen-landowner relations at all. We must protest that anyone who tries to cast this issue as such does a disservice to landowners and sportsmen alike.

(2)

EXHIBIT (61) DATE 2.5.87 HB 379

Sportsmen, resource managers, landowners, and legislators have all expressed concerns about the fee hunting issue. Whether or not it is the intent of HB379 to further expand on the fee hunting concept, it has done so admirably well. Unless the bill is substantially changed, it will create the potential for the 'cadillac' of fee hunting systems.

(3)

If we must accept that HB379 is necessary or desirable, then we must also accept that we have reached a turning point in the long standing tradition of hunting and fishing in Montana. The uncertainties posed by this measure prompt us to not only ask your support in defeating it, but to also ask that you voice your 'no' vote so strongly that Montana's citizens have reassurance that our wildlife and recreation heritage will be protected intact for our generations and those that will follow.

To be filled out by a like to stand up and the record.	person testi speak but wan	ts their EXHIBIT	testimany en	would not stered into
	TNESS STATEM		And the second distance of the second distanc	
	TNESS STATEME	HB_37		
NAME Junet Ellis			BILL NO.	B 379
ADDRESS Helena				
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT	? MT Andul	oen Legis	Linve Fun	
SUPPORT	OPPOSE	<u> </u>	AMEND	<u> </u>
COMMENTS:				
<u> </u>			<u>, 1997 - 1</u>	. <b>Г</b>
i la set sta		/i	un la companya	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	- And		<u>i-</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A state of the sta		Van 1	that or the	(0.7.2.1)
	phi /	The	the proper	in the
For it will A	A. /	during.	in april	Plans 112
not add protection	- P	6 <u>  )</u>	in anter	1 We also
man in the t	Mi AMi	·····		
			e ne dite	mail the
				- <del>  , , , ,</del> ;
111 - 1 ( ) + 1! · /		<u> </u>	ti tale	
I all the state	,		the 14 .	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
<u></u>	······································			
	·····		i'm sk	·
/				
				···· •

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Form CS-34 Rev. 1985

the reco	stand up and st lak but wants their textingny entered into EXHIBIT
	Janet Ellis HB 379 BILL NO. 118 379
,	
	Helena
WHOM DO	YOU REPRESENT? MT Audulion Legislative Tund
Support	OPPOSE AMEND
COMMENT	
	The Montana Audulton Trind apports 118
	If private wildlife annugeration areas are
10 10	· established, we want to make that a
	a recovered truly honefur from the
	amount plans and that could money
	and adaptate funding for the program, the
- <del>h M A L à stà</del>	ce will cuffer when any you out plans an
	idequately entropical a l'advertabilité als
	mand "that made plane will rad
1	a district court - datury additional time
	money from the Privit We cannot supp
1112 01 1	12 until we are assured that the program
LIL P.	in for itself and really parts of the
101121	Te recoulte
	Thank yer.
, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1	
- 	
•	
yyntau a llanaith ann an amharta ailteath Gagarta	

.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Form CS-34

· DAT	E 25.87
NAME: M.E. QUET. CMOEN HB.	379 DATE: 2-5-87
ADDRESS: 606 Frank Rd.	
PHONE: 388-6982	
REPRESENTING WHOM? Sec Treas. G.	ullatin Wildlife Assoc.
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB	379
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND?	OPPOSE? X
COMMENTS: I feel this bill	would contribute to
greater commercializati	on of the wildlife
resources of Montana.	This is contrary to
the montana heritage	of public enjoyment
of the wildlife resourc	es for people in
all walks of life.	
	M. E. Quenemoci
	NG

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

.

EXHIBIT (10)
NAME: CIRT Wilson HB 379 DATE: 2/5/87
ADDRESS: RR.S 214 WA. Get. Fields, 1111. 59401
PHONE: (406) 965-3032
REPRESENTING WHOM? Myself
APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 379
DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?
COMMENTS: <u>I have paid my fair share of</u> wildliff maniferment fors for the past 23 yrs. I do not care to pay more
wild life MANITERMENT Fors for the past
23 YRSO L de NOT CARE TO PAY MORE
each years We pay enough to hunt on public land is it is It A landowner wants to close on reculator his land, fines -
public land it is bt A landownon
wants to close on reculator his land, fines -
But I AMNOT GOING to pty for it.
(1 ) RI I WA
Cuthen

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

.

[71] D. 2.5.87 HB 535

#### LEASING OF HUNTING RIGHTS IS NEGLIGIBLE !!!

#### Survey Of Stockgrowers Shows:

Only 8% of stock growers leased hunting rights on their land

Just 4% of the land owned by stockgrowers was leased--and 35% of that 4% was leased to outfitters

This means that only 1.4% of stockgrowers land was leased to outfitters

HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH FOR RESIDENT HUNTERS ?

Survey Of Stockgrowers Shows:

92% of stockgrowers did not lease hunting rights

Of the land ownded by stockgrowers, 96% was <u>not</u> closed to hunting because of leases

98.6% of land owned by stockgrowers was not leased to outfitters

SOURCE: 1985 Study done by Montana State University in cooperation with Montana Stockgrowers Association; funded largely by the Renewable Resource Extension Act

Compiled by: John Lacey, Co-op Extension Service, Public Agency, MSU, Bozeman, Montana

## Dear Representatives and Senators,

We the residents, landowners and business people of Eastern Montana are concerned with the progress of HB 535. This bill contains 6,000 non-resident B-11 licenses which combine a deer A tag, birds and fishing license. This is a license we have needed for many years. It is a realistic license for Eastern Montana, and yet the Western voter-sportsmen are attempting to keep Eastern Montana from having a license we can use. This bill was written to benefit both the outfitting industry and the resident, landowners and merchants of Eastern Montana.

......

- (71)

535

25.87

-----

We the undersigned urge you to support HB 535.

We the undersigned	lurge you to support HB 5	
Name	Address	Landowner/Merchant
- 700 yourica	Al. G. Broadyy	land ower
Pite minim	Tagay Rin Stage, M.C.	landowne 1
_ Ching Kurrill	Calie	la la comerce
- Jonen D. Rice , 8	BUP SII BODARUS	Justice of the Porce
- The Ustra	130- 67 03 roadu	cH.J.Principel
( ata the aller	Bak 152 Brakes MT	Phy dower,
Copie Steschen	Box 136 Brondy Mt.	Menchant
Jugan Kubarh	Brochen, mt.	Actualie borlinela
Santle muneau	Binder Mt	laudsimes .
- Anne Frankle	Olive, Mt.	landowner ;
_ Aux M. Cox	Dox 215 Broadin M+	Home Pronomist .
_ Que Minner	Conque Rine, mile City	tendenna
- Laura Fer Ullerik	Box 152 Buandus Mt	Honumakee -
Pine N, Currenter	BOT 191 BROADES NENT	mensionet
had Auden	bax 468 Hondus MT.	MERCHANT
Billion	Box 388 BDS MI	MERCHANT
Chaine Rolles	Box 388 Breaker 1tt.	Merchant
Anlere Shart	Bod 214 Broadus Int.	Home info
- la Mul Bruces	Buchus	Langune.
LEV w Barrow	mondes no	Timber
Bh A Melai	10 1.	Milla', IGA
Dave Proles	Broadus Mit.	landowner
Colles les Older Gran,		landa weers
Phanth	Oline mt	Pendermen
Dik allerman	Brandus Mt.	merchant
Thike Conn	Brooky mt.	Corps true Value
Stevend, Dail	Broaders, mt	1215me-Devner-
Lahard Uplace 1	Bendue Mt.	Ruder Rise Beak
At on hater.	Lecondus md.	K.Co. Alente
Flic Lefaidon	Breedus Mt	Lond owner Y
Daniel the por	Brouse MT	Ameguna
Donaly UK Swall	becadus nt	Co Sust - Home owne
Donie D. Aurnhaugh	Breadus. Mt.	Sandowner / Dispetcher

FISH AND GAM	E COMMITTEE	COMMITTEE			
HOUSE BILL BILL NO. <u>SXXX535</u>	DATEFEBRUA	ARY 5, 198	7		
SPONSORELLISON					
NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE		
Kent JAKE GIRIAM	Pex 191 Gauga Et Francis	4.535			
Alle F. HICALAN	Boy 157 Matala	$\searrow$			
Laver Brand	11) Smalle	$\checkmark$			
Mina Man Lugark R. D. t. or	Seeloy Lake	X			
MAX & Ann Barton	Augusta MIT	×			
Chucky Stown Filing	Edition MT				
Survin Fingel	Tikel APAK	X			
Laid Managel	West Brack	$\lambda$			
Mand Latta	F. M. Lan				
Jahn Princhart	Led Jake	S			

( Jaller / para It	Com Jack		
Kame n. Larget	1. Juin Mit	$\times$	
Not Mance	Bein Funcher unt	X	
ling & Alcients	BIPTIMESA MET	$\times$	
Sanda Polain	Kart I seen that	$\sim$	
Center ( is in the	Grant FACE ANT	$\mathbf{X}$	
Carner a Mulin	Contraction of the	T.X	
Juld 1. Suile	Constate interests		
F. 14	the later of the second se		
Alania Less	Helena, M-	$\mathbf{X} \rightarrow$	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

#### FISH AND GAME

## SUBCOMMITTEE

AGENCY(S) HB 535

DATE Feb., 5, 1987

DEPARTMENT ELLISON

NAME	REPRESENTING 200 Complete Audress	SUP- PORT	
CAloin Fitch ett	BROEKLREEK RO HERON MT SAKUY	535	
BILLY HILL	BX 1471 TROUT Creeking 59878	535	
hving m. Fine	Sout of Rocke Bred Ranch Rt. 1 Box 680 Ency 100 Mel. ST.	535	
An ald A. Gigur	Box 630 Ate 1 EnjorANT. Mt.		
Dance Cudney	BOX 680 RTI Emigrant	535	
Le G. Zellen	Kinsey At-miles City	535	
Ray Shores	Box 1135 Matte, MASESSE	535	
Rich Vetech	Kelly Flynn Hidden Hollin away	535	
Sandy Parsons	Rt. Poorts-Juston, nl.	535	
Jack Semon	84 mullan Schel Red St Rege	535	ł 
Emma Simons	84 Mullon Kulch Rd. St Regis MT	535	
Bab montanya	Lensaceve Helence	535	· ·
Ken Wall	235 E SUSSEX, Missoulan	<u>+</u>	. 
Eugene R Kright	Blue l'agget Out Fittens	535	+
cloie A. Knight	Blue nugget ctuttere Utica MT. 59452	535	†
Sherry Cargill	Cargel & infiles Bar Borney whitehall 592		
Meredith Laylor	BR450TT MT 59318	535	<u> </u>
the Carlton	Sun Conyon Locke. Avgusta the fiscural outrit	535	•
John (" Cargell	RTIBOY 164- Might	535	ļ
Mayourticeware	542 Narway Howerthund	535	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT IF YOU HAVE WRITTEN COMMENTS, PLEASE GIVE A COPY TO THE SECRETARY.

FORM CS-33A Rev. 1985

THE THE THE THE THE	VI	S1	TOT]	RS'	REGISTER
---------------------	----	----	------	-----	----------

VISITOR	S' REGISTER		
FISH AND GA	ME COMMITTEE		
HOUSE BILL BILL NO. XXX 535	DATE FEBRUARY	5, 1987	
SPONSOR ELLISON			
NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Dauge + under	10/50	535	
1 Lon An Hum		535	
Orvall Knestor	Plains	535	
Erender Tueston	Flanks	-535	
Van Woster	Place	535	
Rot Menzekin.	Spaley Lakp	535	
Non WRIGHT	LININGSTON	535	
Red America	Lunster	.555	
Ben Stul	Utico Mint.	535	
-Jarial Hollate	litica no	535	
Al Bassut	MelaTone M.T.	535	
Kathing Mil Fotimore	And Chardener 721		
Cano P Musca of	1. A SX - M+	535	
net hours	White The Primet	535	
Atri muli	augine ta	532-	
Killing Vachser/	Car Black	535	
Dann 5 Smith	Bizeman	· 535	
DAUTE WERELOSON	BE CALE	535	
Katie Haley Gumm	Gellatin Huran	535	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM. PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE BILL NO. <u>379</u>,53 DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1987 SPONSOR ELLISON NAME (please print) RESIDENCE SUPPORT OPPOSE Remarc 341,2 W 114 Lylynal ament East Helena L. Finstad LIAC3C 2/12535 ・ちすら minitalus -LARRY STANLEY EAST HELENA HB 5351 NT Audubon Legis Fund ana tiel 379. orents Grosfield Sweet Grass Resenation Assu. 379 manson Gorenan 37 Alstnin-Dig Trinby 791 seleng. loh all TREM con 3793 min reculture Mesuration assoc 06 Correa 2719 IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM. PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY. MARK O'KeeFe West Glacier 535 SKYLINE SPORTSMAN -BUT CS-33 BRL HOLDORF

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 379;429; 535

DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1937

SPONSOR ASAY; SCHYE; ELLISON

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
(Ray Kieps	acyde Perk	535	
Mute Dave	LIVINGSTON	535	
Jul W. P. Dani	Livingstow	535	
Cynthia Jean Sampson	R+1Bix 1806 Whitchall	535	
Spordon Sampsen	PTIBOX 1806 Whitehak	535	
Steve Rainey	Wise River	535	
Russell Greenwood	Broadus	535	
Billy Stockton	Wise River	535-	
Stru bipenthaun	(ivando	535	
How we alle youhau	Qvando	535	
Don Therright	Helena	535	·
i cuque ta	Kichak	535	
Danny Egel	Coxenda	535	-
- Cochenbaca	Willia	535	
David Kord	Stevensville	535	
HARAY A. LAFRINIERE	FLORENCE	535	
T.B. BRAACH	d'and lit		5735
Time Clawson	<i>x</i>	5-5-	535
Lee Teau	Red Lodge	535	535
IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENT	Red Lodge Deeley Jake MT S, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNE	SS STATEM	IENT FOR

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

۰.

-

# FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 535

1

DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1987

SPONSOR ELLISON

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Matthew Henke	RedLodge		535
Lewis F HAWKIS	BOZEMAN (PLAAT)		535
CRAIG K FLENTIE	LEW ISTOUN		535
LEON E. CARPENTER	Lewistand		535
M.E. Quenemoen	Pelanade	-	535
Dane Illigned Restor	S. P. S. M.	- -	535
A Der Ways REFERRY	Steren in 1/0		379
M.E. Quenemocn	Belande.		379
Dr. S.V. Taylor	Bozeman		
Ars. Delores Lea	Hungry Horse		
CLIFTON PAGE	WISE RIVER	535	
CHARLES PAGE	WISE RIVER	535	
Sandra Cahill	Liuingston	535	
Caroly- Hahn	Condon	535	
C. B. Kill	Seeley hele	535	
Leg il ittel	WOLF CREEK	535	
Sleep Lahr	Conton 11th	535	
JACK WEMPLE	Victor, MT	535-	
Shirley Wemple	Victor, MT	535	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM. PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 535 DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1987

SPONSOR ELLISON

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Glan SM. H	Trout creek MT	535	
Rolt. Flancoc		575	
Liz Barling)	A wings in	535	
Paraira Thehe	Standard	JZI	
Schward F. Aunut	Allica	535	
Kelly 1. Flynn	1 Sanne d	53.5	
Mike Paums	Zuton not	525	
art Werkum	auguste Mt	535	
Edith Weikum	augusta Mt	535	
JACK Rich	Seeley LAKE	535	
DUHNE WEAL	PRIFY PUT	535	
Maude Saylor	Brusettmt	535	
Kath, Hodley	Deer Lodere MT		535-
Konald Collins	12 eer Lodge Unt.		535
Sharon Bridges	Shompson Jalls, MT	535	
Non Whieles	Valier ant	53.5	
Nonna Wheeler	Valie Det	535	•
Vida and erson	Dreas Faces	535	
Man anderson	Sheat Fell	535	
IF YOU CARE TO WATTE COMMENTS	, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNE	555	ENT FOR

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

# FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 535

.

DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1987

SPONSOR \_\_\_\_ELLISON

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
R. Scott Ross MBH	Helenin		379
Esther Stendery	N.W. lalite Fed.		379
Carol Greenwood	Broadus mt	535	
P. BENDER WALLED ES	GT FALLS	429	314
Vinimine B Cloutene	Livingston-Mt	533	
William Ercis	BroudusMt	5.35	
Rath Bales	Otter Mt	5.35	·
Reith Bales	Pitter MA.	379	
Joe Gutkoski	Bozaman Mt.	535	
Joe Gutkuski	Bozaman 11t	379	
Loken Seaver	Great Falls	535	
Train Borker	augusta	535	ľ
Juirea Lisingles	flasgice	5.35	
VI Totalan	Sutto	535	
Arthur Haslon	Man hattan not	535	
Soe morse	two Rot mt.		
Barry W. Carloon	Blao. mt.		
Bar montanco	Coronaund not		
Ree Sudges	Thomason Tall: M	A 53T	- 379

I LOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM. PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

## FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 535 DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1987

SPONSOR ELLISON

NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING and Complete Addiese Sweetgross Rurol Schor	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
David then	Sweetgross Rurol Schor	ĸ	
Jan & Woratly	840 SarAMP CKRO PLAW	535	
Orvall Kuester	840 SarAMP CKRD PLAIM 837 Swamp Creek Rd. Plaime Mt 837 Swamp CK Rd	535	·
Brendo Luester	Plains MA	535	
Edward L. Finstad	EastHelma MT.	535	
			-
		4	
			-

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITOR	S' REGISTER COMMITTEE		
BILL NO. <u>HB 535</u>	DATE FEBRUARY 5	. 1987	<u> </u>
SPONSOR ELLISON			
NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING 7	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
DiEli KLIEK	18 Baul Burgh	1	
Bob M = Neill	Film MOHA	X	
BOB (RICK	HIGH COUNTRYOUT	ER X	-
Barbara Sourbrine	Rh. Southrine Cutt. Hers	X	
Retland L. Sourcours	RE Soubrine CUTFillers	×	
TRACE White	Ww Cut fitters	X	
Bullichite	Wwent Filters	X	
Jun Musc	Bighten Culters	X	
ANN NARTIX			
Bary faith faith ne	1 - ay they March	1	
Anneth Soupper	K Ja- Mu Cinda		
Horn Joydon	hAZY 14 Outfittes		
A dup 212 The	L'SREwnent Chinten Mit	$X_{-}$	_
Por A	- The manufacture in the		
x / homes	anaconda sportame	*	+A
	  ,		
		<u></u>	
	L		

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

1

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 535

\_\_\_\_

DATE FEBRUARY 5, 1987

SPONSOR ELLISON

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Frong Color	Mr. Reteel Oun	48535	
ma mis Kush	out fitter	TB 535	[
BRUCS 14/4 take Ap	Emigrant Corce in Spri	418535	
Charles X2+4	- Roy 863 MT 5902	/ HB533	+
Franke De com	11.5 Hered Montale MT	HB535 Acter	
Dome Half	Balling Mont	- obserier	1
Gay Ginger	397-360 WSS ML	535	
Rou Canton	No hite Sik Spys MT	.535	
KON CLATISS	KALMD-7	535	
·			
	· · ·	:	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

مدينهم فالرابي والمراجع

·	FISH AND GAME <b>SUB</b> COMMIT		
AGENCY (S)	НВ 535	DATE SEA FOR	
DEPARTMENT	ELLISON		

NAME	REPRESENTING	SUP- PORT	OP- Pose
Jock Schilla	SCHILLA ON +Fitters - Helena Myself + 9 Employoes	535	
Mary Schilla	11 1	535	
Erlith Weikum	Hidden Valley Kench Cinquesta mont	535	•
Carol Boncroft	14 Congrista mont	535	
Inform anderen	Corvalles m- 59878	535	
Larcare Mousley		- ي تي ک	
ZON MARCOUX	Dept Fish Wildlife PAR.Ks.		
	·		
		1	
			· .
,			

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT IF YOU HAVE WRITTEN COMMENTS, PLEASE GIVE A COPY TO THE SECRETARY.

FORM CS-33A Rev. 1985

VISITORS	5' REGISTER		
FISH AND GAM	E COMMITTEE		
BILL NO. XXX 535 SPONSOR ELLISON	DATE FEBRUARY 5	, 1987	
NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Vick Sego	Helena MIT	535 × 9	
fages of the	MT Desender 54	M	
Mining Manna	Commond Ar 3/	2	
GORDONI CON	Anterson 5.	535 L	
- Contract - Frank	Stry Rinch		
Sin Whatigh hi	the sinty		

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

KISITORS' REGISTER COMMITTEE 6 5, 19.87 HB 379 DATE BILL NO. SPONSOR ASAY OPPOSE NAME (please print) REPRESENTING SUPPORT 1/11 REFURE WA. Boreman BERG 1200 KANCHES HIST TON 514150 areculture presention asac ったべべん PUBLIC Land ACCUSS auky De muse 1), Id I Fef Issoc 00000 iQ. ň in a de X -BUTTE men IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

٩

BILL NO. DATE PEBRUARY 5, 1987				
SFORSON <u>ELLISON</u>	REPRESENTING	BUPPORT	орров	
· 사고 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	7.5.1	-	
Vicky Segg	Melena MIT			
and a start	MS Wayers Sin	The true	+	
The Walter	Provide the second			
In Sint 14 Enin				
GORDONY L. TANK	a Vilore Sugar	1/2 535		
/ mlue / h	Almer in int.	11 (		
Preder Stary	5 Miry Sand	19. augusta ang		
Den Antought	the such	/ 		
	f	-		
	analista vitin edalanda andresa para a vite a vitera vitera andra a sua			
	nga mila unita finita angana ngala di kangka unita ni di mini di gang, nangan dan yang nani-aki un			
	n an eine an	analaan di mananan di kunangkangkan kananan kanan di		
	<mark>a an an</mark>	**************************************		
	an fail an an Anna an Anna ann an Anna Anna An	z szágh vilebbiggeresz		
	anna an an an an an ann an an an an an a	an fan stinning gegener en sen sen sen sen sen sen sen sen sen		

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH BECKETARY. Cë-13

VISITORS' REGISTER COMMITTEE 1987 379 DATE BILL NO. HBSPONSOR ASA NAME (please print) REPRESENTING SUPPORT OPPOSE - 12 B. T. Boreman CR(-ANCHES perenstin laso feeting ) PHBLIC LAND ACCUSS uky musel Wildlife Assoc 011 X BUTT Ж ner J. IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FOR PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER			
FISH 7	GHUIE COMMITTEE		
BILL NO. <u>46</u> 379 SPONSOR ASAY	DATE Feb	5 1987	
SPONSOR <u>HSAY</u>			+
NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Doug LAnders	Londowna	·X	
Stan Bradshaw Smily Swanson	MWF	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Dana Field	MT. Audubou Legis Fund.		×
Kenny Nemt	Fantowner Fant Owner	$\times$	
Pillian Nemitz	parte Ourner	<u> </u>	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	······································	· ·	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		<b>I</b>	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.