

ASSEMBLY ENVIRONMENT & PUBLIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1-6

MINUTES

Wednesday, February 19, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Bremner, Messrs Coulter, Chaney, Heaney, Jeffrey, Price, Jacobsen & Weise;

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Mr. Banner

GUESTS: See attached

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Chairman Bremner. He asked for witnesses to discuss AB 142, adjusting fees for fishing and hunting licenses. Mr. Glenn Griffith of the Nevada State Fish and Game Department stated that this bill would bring into line increases in costs to the Department caused principally by inflation. He also stated that inconsistencies in fee increases were because of the differences between sporting activities and commercial ventures. He stated that the department operates on fees collected plus funds from two Federal agencies. Funds from license fees are returned to the State from the Federal government. The State has the expenses of law enforcement and planting of fish. Mr. Heaney asked if the mountain lion was an endangered specie in Nevada. Mr. Griffith stated that it wasn't. Mr. Heaney also asked how Nevada compares with other states in its proposed fee schedule. Mr. Griffith stated that some states are higher and some lower. Fred Wright of the Fish and Game Department introduced Exhibit "A" showing fees in surrounding states and handwritten on Exhibit "A" are proposed fees in current legislatures except for California which have already been established. He also stated that the increased fees would have no adverse effect on tourists enjoying fishing and hunting in Nevada.

In response to Mr. Heaney's questions regarding a joint license usable in both Nevada and California which residents of either state could use in either state, Mr. Griffith stated that this idea is being considered, but that it could be a problem in an area such as ours with the Sierras so abundant in hunting and fishing facilities dividing California and Nevada.

Mr. Price asked for the number of hunting and fishing licenses issued in the past year. Mr. Griffith replied that 31,830 hunting licenses had been issued, 50,693 angling, and 22,313 combination licenses had been issued. These were all resident licenses.

Mr. Griffith further explained that the funds proposed in AB 142 would not be available until 1975; that they have no money now for

capital improvements and with the new fee schedule hope to generate \$350,000 for these improvements.

Mr. Griffith asked that line 45 on page two of the bill relating to a resident license for deer by bow and arrow be deleted.

Mr. Don Gruwell representing the Sportsmens Club of Mineral County read recommendations of his organization. (See Exhibit "B") Mr. Bremner asked Mr. Gruwell his opinion of abolishing non-resident licenses for hunting. Mr. Gruwell stated that his organization and hunters all over the state would wholeheartedly support this idea, but that personally he felt it could endanger residents of Nevada hunting in other states and Federal funds being jeopardized.

Mr. Jacobsen asked about the membership in Mr. Gruwell's organization. He stated that they had 120 signed up so far this year and that they had 190 last year. A majority of the membership of his organization had approved the recommendations he was making.

Mr. Martini requested to speak on AB 142 stating that he is Chairman of the Greater Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce Committee for the Aging and also represents the Chamber of Commerce of Las Vegas, Clark County Committee for the Aging. (See Exhibit "C") He recommended that the twenty year residency requirement for citizens over the age of 65 be reduced to one year, as is common in many states.

Mr. Weise asked how many senior citizens were licensed for fishing last year. Mr. Griffith stated that 4,400 were issued and felt that senior citizens should be given special privileges, but the loss of revenue to the Department would have to come from somewhere if the residency requirement is lowered. Mr. Bremner asked Mr. Griffith to please submit statistics. (See Exhibit "D")

Mr. John Sweetland, immediate past president of the Nevada Wildlife Federation stated that he had reviewed AB 142 with the Fish and Game Department and his organization and that his organization felt the increases in fees too conservative, but that most sportsmen and conservationists otherwise endorse the bill.

Tina Nappe representing the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club stated that she was "sorry the Department has to make a living on the huntable species". She also informed the Committee that petitions were being circulated to oppose the hunting of does and fawns and that she has found much support for more wildlife programs.

Mr. Jim McKay, Division for Aging Services, stated that he supported Mr. Martini's request for consideration of reducing the residency requirement for senior citizens, but to five years instead of one, as requested by Mr. Martini. He stated that last year 1818 fishing licenses and 1916 combination fishing and hunting licenses were issued to Nevada residents 65 years or older or 6.5% of the total population.

Mr. Heaney asked Mr. McKay why he preferred five years to one. Mr. McKay said that he felt a resident of five years had contributed more to the State. Mr. Jacobsen asked Mr. McKay if he felt senior citizens supplemented their daily diets with the fish they caught. Mr. McKay answered in the affirmative and stated that many senior citizens do not have the necessary \$10 for a license, as proposed in the bill.

Mr. George Archer, representing Senior Citizens of Carson City, also supported Mr. Martini's request. He stated that he was an eight year resident and if the 20 year requirement passed, he would be 85 years old before he was entitled to a reduced license fee. He also felt that the \$10 proposed fee was too high.

Mr. Roger Teglia felt that AB 142 would not solve the fiscal problems of the Fish and Game Department; that they must have other revenue; that the cost of raising one pound of fish today is \$4.50 and that a limit is worth about \$6.00; that hunting should not be thought of as "game" because there will be none left, particularly deer. He felt that the fee to senior citizens and children should be \$10.00 but that the State general fund should subsidize the Fish and Game Department. He also pointed out that the gaming industry benefits from hunting and fishing in Nevada.

The Committee recessed for ten minutes and was called back to order at 4:25 p.m. to discuss AB 143, changing the manner of compensating fish and game license agents. Chairman Bremner announced that there was a fiscal note of \$32,000 on the bill, an increase in revenue to the Department of Fish and Game. Mr. Griffith stated that this change would benefit both the agent and the Department. The agent now retains 10% of all license fees he collects and remits the balance. Under this bill, he would add a surcharge of \$.25 to each license and \$.10 to each stamp and that most states are now doing this. Mr. Bremner noted that this measure was proposed last session and failed. Mr. Price pointed out that if this bill passes along with AB 142 previously discussed, it would generate an increase in revenue to the Fish and Game Department of a total of \$350,000 from AB 142 and \$32,000 from AB 143.

Mr. Cheney asked why the additional \$.25 and \$.10 were not included in the increased fees in AB 143. Mr. Griffith stated that it was because this surcharge would be taken off the top of the license fees.

Mr. Jacobsen asked if this surcharge would be mandatory and how many licensed agents there are in the State. Mr. Wright of Fish and Game stated that the agent could still forego this surcharge to a preferred customer and that there are 150 to 160 agents in addition to 25 boat and boat licensing agents. Mr. Jacobsen also asked if there were any problems licensing agents. Mr. Wright explained that their field agents forwarded requests for licenses for agents and each was evaluated by the Department; that it is very important to have agents even in very isolated areas and even in such places as 24-hour bars.

Mr. Don Gruwell of the Sportsmens' Club of Mineral County felt that the surcharge should be included in the cost of the licenses; that there are some inconsistencies in the bill and that some agents find the licensing procedure too complicated and that it should be simplified.

Regarding AB 141, Bill Parsons of the Fish and Game Department stated that this bill is partly clean-up plus containing an important section requiring traps to be permanently marked with the name and address of the trapper. He stated this coincides with requirements from many Western states. He requested that Section 7 on page 4 be deleted as it also appears in AB 143. Under Section 12(3), Mr. Parsons stated that 14,000 children had participated in the hunter safety gun-training program. To answer questioning by Mr. Coulter, Mr. Parsons stated that 500 trapping licenses had been issued last year, 10% of which were to non-residents; that the pelts had a value of \$250,000. Mr. Coulter also asked why the trapping fee of \$7.50 had not been increased and Mr. Parsons stated that there were many enforcement problems with trappers. Mr. Weise asked the procedure followed when violators of the trapping regulations were discovered. Mr. Parsons stated that if the trap can be identified, the Department investigates and tries to determine the length of time that has expired since the trap has been checked. Under AB 141 at least the Department would have some jurisdiction over this problem.

There was discussion as to how traps can be marked.

Mr. Satterthwaite of the Nevada Wool Growers Association stated that his organization is in agreement with the bill but would request that the time requirement to check traps be changed to every five days instead of every 72 hours as this would place a great burden on his employees working a 40 hour week and checking traps for coyotes.

Mr. Griffith stated that some trappers do not check their traps but every three or four weeks; that the Department would accept checking every five days and that he understood the Wool Growers problems.

Tina Nappe of the Sierra Club stated that her organization supports the bill, but feels that non-game species are not given sufficient attention and that fish and game departments in many rural states are under criticism; that the 72 hour check period as proposed in the bill is more acceptable to her organization.

Mr. Robert McGinty, a trapper from Sparks, stated that there are no Fish and Game funds spent to propagate coyotes or muskrats and that the fees are just "bleeding the public". He felt that if identification was required on all traps, that since he has so many stolen, he would be found responsible for those in violation of the checking period; that it would be impossible for Fish and Game officers to place a constant surveillance on traps to determine by whom and when they are set.

1- 10

He feels that 72 hour checks are impractical in a large area; that the checks he makes are sometimes every three days, sometimes once a week. He stated that a weekly check would be satisfactory to him. There was general discussion between Mr. Coulter and Mr. McGinty as to controlling trappers and it was generally agreed that there is not enough personnel to do an adequate job. Mr. Cheney wondered how Fish and Game authorities could possibly know if traps were properly checked. Mr. McGinty felt that this would be practically unenforceable.

Mr. Cheney asked if the time period covered by a license to trap began when the license was purchased or set. He was told that it began when the trap was set and that if the trapper was not observed, no one would know when the time period began. Mr. Heaney asked if there was any limit to the number of traps an individual could set. He was told that there wasn't. Mr. Coulter asked if there was any practical way to check traps. Mr. Griffith stated that it was workable but not easy; that it is a necessity to have the authority and that their office has considerable complaints resulting from trapped animals not being properly checked.

Mr. Heaney asked if there was any attempt being made to use a graduating fee schedule according to the number of traps a trapper had out. Mr. Griffith stated that he knew of none.

Chairman Bremner turned the meeting over to co-Chairman Coulter so that he could attend a sub-committee meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Mr. Gruwell of the Mineral County Sportsmens' Club asked why sheriffs and constables were eliminated as enforcers of this bill as he felt they should be available to help. Mr. Griffith stated that this was redundant as it was already included in other regulations related to the same subject.

Mr. Dave Burroughf felt that the bill increasing the authority of the Fish and Game Department was good and that he supported the proposed changes. He also supported requiring identification on traps. Mr. Heaney asked the Fish and Game personnel if the primary purpose of the 72 hour checking period is to protect the animals. Mr. Griffith stated that the purpose of this time period are: 1) to eliminate pain; 2) to release the animals if trapped for an unreasonable period; and 3) to preserve the pelt.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40.

Respectfully submitted,

PHYLLIS BERKSON, Secretary

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT & PUBLIC RESOURCES

1-5

Date Wed., Feb. 19 Time 3:00 p.m. Room 214

Bills or Resolutions
to be considered

Subject

Counsel
requested*

AB 141

An act relating to fish and game; re-defining the term "wildlife"; changing certain license requirements; eliminating pheasant stamps; prescribing fees for permits to introduce or remove wildlife; requiring identification of traps and more frequent visitation of traps; removing sheriffs and constables as enforcers of fish and game laws; revising other provisions in the fish and game laws; and providing other matters properly relating thereto

AB 142

An act relating to hunting and fishing licenses, tags and permits; providing for an adjustment of fees; adding new categories requiring permits; deleting certain categories; and providing other matters properly relating thereto;

AB 143

An act relating to fish and game administration; changing the manner of compensating fish and game license agents; providing for the revoking of a license agent's authority for any breach of regulations; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT & PUBLIC RESOURCES

GUEST LIST - Wed., Feb. 19, 1975

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
1. Fred Fulstone, Jr.	ranching and livestock
2. John R. Kimball	16 county Adv. for Aging
3. James H. McKay	Division for Aging Services
4. Linda Botts	" " " "
5. Robert C. McGinty	Reno-Sparks trappers
6. Roger Teglia	Upland Bird Committee
7. Assemblyman Christensen	
8. Senator Wilson	
9. Dave Boroughf	Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
10. Don Gruwell	Sportsmens Club of Mineral County
11. Assemblyman Moody	
12. John Sweetland	Nevada Wildlife Federation
13. O G Mendetti	Nevada Attorney General's Office
14. W. G. Parsons	Nev. Fish and Game Dept.
15. F. E. Wright	" " " " "
16. W. R. "Walt" Martini	Senior Citizens - Clark County
17. George M. Archer	Senior Citizens - Carson City
18. Glen Griffith	Nev. Fish and Game Dept.
19. Brenda J. Bath	State Planning Co-ord
20. Tina Nappe	Sierra Club
21. Michael Stosic	
22. Joe Miner	
23. Deloyd Satterthwaite	Nevada Wool Growers Asso.

RESIDENT LICENSE AND TAG FEES

compiled 12/74

STATE	ANNUAL COMBINATION	ANNUAL ANGLING	SALMON-STEELHEAD TAG	TROUT STAMP	ANNUAL HUNTING	DEER TAG	ELK TAG	BEAR TAG	PHEASANT TAG
ARIZONA	12.00	4.00		2.00	7.00	4.00	20.00	2.00	
CALIFORNIA		4.00	2.00 (INCL. TROUT)	2.00 (INLAND WATER)	6.00	2.00	25.00	1.00	2.00
COLORADO	7.50	6.00			4.00	10.00	12.50	5.00	
IDAHO	10.00	6.00	2.00 (SAL) 2.00 (ST)		5.00	4.00	8.00	2.00	
MONTANA		5.00			2.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	
NEVADA	14.00	7.50			7.50	5.00	15.00		2.00
NEW MEXICO	12.00	5.50		3.00	9.00	7.50	15.00		
OREGON	10.00	6.00	1.00 (SAL & ST)		5.00	2.00	10.00	2.00	
UTAH	10.00	5.00			5.00 (BG) 4.50 (SG)	5.00	15.00	1.00	
WASHINGTON	12.00	7.50	2.00 (ST)		6.50	3.00	10.00	2.00	2.00
WYOMING	6.00	5.00			3.00 (SG) 5.00 (BIRD)	10.00 (INCL. BEAR)	15.00 (INCL. BEAR)	5.00	

EX. A
- 12

NONRESIDENT LICENSE AND TAG FEES

compiled 12/74

STATE	ANNUAL ANGLING	SHORT TERM ANGLING	TROUT STAMP	SALMON-STEELHEAD TAG	ANNUAL HUNTING	DEER TAG	ELK TAG	BEAR TAG	PHEASANT TAG
ARIZONA	12.00	2.00 1-DAY 3.00 3-DAY	8.00		30.00	30.00	75.00	25.00	
CALIFORNIA	15.00	5.00 10-DAY	1.00 (INLAND WATER)	2.00 (INC. TR)	35.00	25.00		1.00	2.00
COLORADO	10.00 ^{20⁰⁰}	5.00 10-DAY			15.00 ^{20⁰⁰}	50.00 ^{75⁰⁰}	75.00 ^{125⁰⁰}	25.00 ^{50⁰⁰}	
IDAHO	20.00	3.00 1-DAY 7.00 7-DAY		2.00 (SAL) 2.00 (ST)	50.00	35.00	100.00	15.00	
MONTANA	20.00	2.00 1-DAY 10.00 6-DAY			25.00 (BIRD)	35.00	151.00	35.00	
NEVADA	15.00	3.00 ^{5⁰⁰} 2-DAY 5.00 ^{75⁰} 5-DAY 7.50 ^{10⁰⁰} 10-DAY			35.00 ^{40⁰⁰}	50.00			
NEW MEXICO	10.00	2.00 1-DAY 5.00 5-DAY	3.00		17.00 (BIRD)	50.25	75.00		
OREGON	20.00 ^{25⁰⁰}	2.50 1-DAY 10.00 10-DAY		1.00 (SAL&ST)	50.00	15.00 ^{20⁰⁰}	35.00	25.00	
UTAH	15.00 ^{25⁰⁰}	2.50 ^{2⁰⁰} 2-DAY ^{1 day} 5.00 ^{25⁰} 5-DAY			20.00 (SG)	75.00 (BG)			
WASHINGTON	20.00	6.00 7-DAY		2.00 (ST)	50.00	3.00	35.00	2.00	2.00
WYOMING	25.00	5.00 5-DAY 12.50 30-DAY			25.00 (BIRD)	50.00	125.00	30.00	

Comments Concerning Attached Bill AB-142

Page 1

~~Page 1~~
1. Line 17/- Yes. Recommend increase in fishing licenses because of increased costs in all aspects of the fish program which is a put and take program. It is presently also supported by a large percentage of hunting license fees.

~~Page 1~~
2. Lines 18 and 19/- Increasing these fees and keeping the fees the same as would apply for non-residents, lines 16 and 17 of page 2, we feel is unreasonable.

~~Page 1~~
3. Line 20/- A large percentage of fees collected by sale of hunting licenses, deer tags, etc., go towards support of the fish programs. The fish program is a put and take situation and open for year round fishing in most waters. We don't believe the hunter who does not fish should have to support the fish program. The hunter pays additional fees for game he hunts, such as deer tags (\$5.00), duck and pheasant stamps (\$5.00 and \$2.00) and application fee(s) of \$2.00 (ridiculous) for applying for a tag (in which he is very lucky if he gets one) for big game, except for deer. Possibly by increasing the resident fishing license fee, without raising the hunting license fee, it would put the programs closer in line with costs.

~~Page 1~~
4. Line 21/- Recommended to keep in line with recommendation not to increase hunting license fee.

~~Page 1~~
5. Line 22/- Because of commercial aspects and higher returns for furs on the market, trapping license fees could be raised a little.

Page 2

~~Page 2~~
6. Lines 11 through 15/- Why should a resident fishing license fee have to be increased and not a non-resident fee? If a resident fee is increased by about a third, we feel that a non-resident fee should be increased at least by the same percentage. Note: Presently it costs a non-resident \$18.00 for a fishing license and stamps to fish for fresh water fish in California and we understand that this might be increased by California legislative action this year.

~~Page 2~~
7. Lines 16 and 17/- We feel it is only right that a non-resident should have to pay more than a resident. At present, these fees are the same for a resident as a non-resident. See lines 18 and 19 of page 1.

~~Page 2~~
8. Lines 21 through 25, 44, 45, 46/and lines 2 and 3 on Page 3 - The members of the Sportsman's Club of Mineral County feel very strongly that there should be no out of state hunters allowed. In fact, practically all hunters we have talked to throughout the state have this same feeling. They feel the only reason for allowing out of state hunters is because of the commercial aspects, not only to the Fish and Game Department, but to private commercial enterprises. This feeling is getting stronger because of the present decline in our wildlife resources within the state. The

Fish and Game Department/Commissioners explain that they would be subject to the loss of federal support money if they didn't allow out of state hunters.

The Sportsmen's club members, along with the Game Management Board, feel that if they can't eliminate out of state hunters, the increased fees should be at least raised for the licenses and tags, as shown, on the attached marked up Bill AB-142.

9. Lines 28 and 29/^{PAGE 2}- Because of the commercial aspects we feel that the cost should be raised at least to the amounts as shown on the marked up Bill AB-142. Note: There was a lot of comment that the increases recommended were not high enough, especially for private hunting preserves in which migratory game birds are hunted. Birds not stocked at the private preserve expense. In fact, the feeling was that such private preserves where migratory game is involved, should be eliminated/outlawed.

Page 3

10. Line 7 - What! Possibly \$10.00 for a pheasant stamp or tag. The feeling was that even for a turkey tag, \$3.00 would be sufficient.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF DON GRUWELL

Ex BCD

1-16

~~MINERAL~~

A. B. 142

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 142—COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT
AND PUBLIC RESOURCES

SPORTSMEN'S

JANUARY 30, 1975

CLUB OF MINERAL CO.

Referred to Committee on Environment and Public Resources

SUMMARY—Adjusts fees for hunting and fishing licenses, tags and permits. Fiscal Note: No. (BDR 45-256)

EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to hunting and fishing licenses, tags and permits; providing for an adjustment of fees; adding new categories requiring permits; deleting certain categories; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. NRS 502.240 is hereby amended to read as follows:
2 502.240 Annual licenses for the term of 1 year from July 1 to June
3 30 and limited permits shall be issued at the following prices:
4 1. To any citizen of the United States who has attained his 12th
5 birthday but who has not attained his 16th birthday and who has been
6 a bona fide resident of the State of Nevada for 6 months, upon the pay-
7 ment of \$1 for an annual fishing or hunting license.
8 2. To any citizen of the United States who has attained his 65th
9 birthday and who has been a bona fide resident of the State of Nevada
10 for 20 years, upon the payment of \$1 for an annual hunting or fishing
11 license. Any such person shall be exempt from the payment of the fee
12 for a resident deer tag for a regular season as required by the provisions
13 of NRS 502.250.
14 3. Except as provided in subsection 2, to any citizen of the United
15 States who has attained his 16th birthday and who has been a resident
16 of the State of Nevada for 6 months, upon the payment of:
17 For a fishing license..... [\$7.50] \$10.00
18 For a ~~5-day~~ 10-day permit to fish..... [5.00] 7.50 NO
19 For a 2-day permit to fish..... [3.00] 5.00 NO
20 For a hunting license..... [7.50] 8.50 NO
21 For a combination hunting and fishing license..... [14.00] 17.00 16.00
22 For a trapping license..... [5.00] 7.50 6.00
23 For a fur dealer's license..... [1.00] 5.00
24 For an annual master guide's license..... [50.00] 100.00
25 For an annual subguide's license..... [10.00] 50.00

To any alien or to any citizen of the United States who has attained his 12th birthday but who has not attained his 16th birthday, a bona fide resident of the State of Nevada, upon the payment of \$5 an annual fishing license (except for a fishing license to fish in the reciprocal waters of the Colorado River and Lake Mead, which annual license shall cost a sum agreed upon by the commission and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, but not to exceed \$10).

Except as provided in subsection 4, to any alien or to any citizen of the United States, not a bona fide resident of the State of Nevada, upon the payment of:

For a fishing license (except for a fishing license to fish in the reciprocal waters of the Colorado River and Lake Mead, which license shall cost a sum agreed upon by the commission and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, but not to exceed \$10).....	[\$15.00]	20.00
For a 5-day permit to fish.....	[\$5.00]	7.50
For a 2-day permit to fish.....	[\$3.00]	5.00
For a special hunting license to hunt deer by bow and arrow (and no other license shall be required).....	10.00	
For a hunting license.....	35.00	40.00 50.00
For an annual trapper's license.....	10.00	35.00
For a fur dealer's license.....	25.00	35.00 50.00
For an annual master guide's license.....	100.00	200.00
For an annual subguide's license.....	20.00	100.00

To any person, without regard to residence, upon the payment of:

For a noncommercial breeding ground.....	[\$2.00]	55.00
For a commercial or private shooting preserve.....	25.00	35.00 50.00
For a commercial breeding ground.....	25.00	35.00 50.00
For a commercial fish hatchery.....	10.00	35.00
For a private noncommercial fish hatchery.....		5.00
For a trained animal act license.....		10.00
For a fur dealer's agent's license.....		10.00
For a live bait dealer's permit.....	25.00	50.00
For a competitive field trials permit.....	1.00	5.00
For a falconry license.....	10.00	15.00
For an importation permit.....		2.00
For an import eligibility permit.....		25.00
For a tropical fish dealer's permit.....		25.00
For a live-bait seining and transporting permit.....		2.00

c. 2. NRS 502.250 is hereby amended to read as follows:

1. The following fees shall be in effect:

Resident deer tag for regular season.....	\$5.00
Nonresident and alien deer tag for regular season.....	50.00 60.00
Resident deer tag for hunting deer by bow and arrow.....	5.00
Nonresident and alien deer tag for hunting deer by bow and arrow.....	30.00 10.00 NO
Resident antelope tag.....	15.00 25.00
Resident elk tag.....	15.00 25.00
Resident bighorn tag.....	25.00 50.00

*SPORTSMEN'S CLUB
WANT NAME WITH
THIS

1	Resident mountain lion tag.....	[\$5.00]	\$10.00
2	Nonresident bighorn tag.....	[\$125.00]	250.00
3	Nonresident mountain lion tag.....	[\$50.00]	100.00

4 2. Other resident big game tags for special seasons shall not exceed
5 ~~[\$25.]~~ \$50. Other nonresident big game tags for special seasons shall not
6 exceed ~~[\$125.]~~ \$250.

7 3. Tags determined to be necessary by the commission for other
8 species under NRS 502.130, shall not exceed ~~[\$2.]~~ ~~\$10.~~ ~~3.00~~

9 4. A fee not to exceed \$2 may be charged for processing an appli-
10 cation for tags for special seasons.

11 SEC. 3. NRS 505.020 is hereby repealed.

STATEMENT OF W. R. "WALT" MARTINI

1- 19

I have been a resident for 15 years. The population of Nevada has better than doubled since I hit Nevada in 1960. Many senior citizens who have come here as we did or since we did came here to make their homes and Nevada is home to us.

We have added much to the economy and well-being of Nevada and we have been active in many things. I am an ardent fisherman, but I have not had a fishing license for nearly four years because of illness. But I have been hoping I could capitalize on my advanced age through a \$1.00 license this year.

It was just called to my attention an hour ago that qualification for resident University rates is only one year and that means a saving to the individual of a neighborhood figure of \$1800. Fortunately I can pay \$10 for a license if I have to; many senior citizens cannot.

Why penalize us who are among the aging. Leave this at one year. Most of us who are over 65 are going to stay here as long as the Lord will let us and we will continue to be good Nevadans and we will appreciate this consideration.

FISCAL NOTE

AMENDMENTS:

Assembly: First Reading A 20
 Second Reading _____
 Third Reading _____
 Senate: First Reading _____
 Second Reading _____
 Third Reading _____

Date transmitted August 1, 1974

Agency submitting Division for Aging Services, DHR Date prepared July 30, 1974

Summary	Fiscal Year 1974-75	Fiscal Year 1975-76	Fiscal Year 1976-77	Continuing
Loss in Revenue to Nevada Fish and Game Commission	\$3700.00	\$3700.00	\$3700.00	\$3700.00
Total.....	\$3700.00	\$3700.00	\$3700.00	\$3700.00

EXPLANATION (use continuation sheets if required):

The 1970 National Survey of hunting and fishing indicate 4.8% of persons who fish are 65 years of age or older. Nevada Fish and Game total fishing license sales for FY73 were 85,985 with revenue of \$520,654. FY73 figures indicate 1818 fishing licenses and 1916 combination fishing and hunting (total 3734) were issued to Nevada residents 65 or older qualifying for the reduced fee of \$1.00 or \$2.00. Using the 1970 Survey figure and 1970 census date there is a potential of 4127 individuals 65 or older who could fish & hunt. Not all of these individuals would meet the new requirements of a five year residency. the assumption they would and based on FY73 sales it is assumed half of the remaining eligible of 400 (4127-3734 buying reduced fee license in FY73= 393 or approx. 400) would buy fishing licenses at \$7.50 and combinations at \$14.00. If this new total (400) qualified for the reduced fee under the proposed revision it could result in a loss of revenue of approx. \$3700.00 annual

(Continued)

Signature _____
 Title ADMINISTRATOR FOR AGING SERVICES

Reviewed by Department of Administration _____
 Comments by Department of Administration: _____