

DISCLAIMER

Electronic versions of the exhibits in these minutes may not be complete.

This information is supplied as an informational service only and should not be relied upon as an official record.

Original exhibits are on file at the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Library in Carson City.

Contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or library@lcb.state.nv.us.

Tina Nappe

615 Robinson Court, Reno, Nevada 89503 775 786 1178 201 0246F tnappe@nvcbell.net

February 19, 2003

**AB 4 - Revises provisions governing licenses to hunt, fish, or hunt and fish.
Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture and Mining**

I am requesting that action on this bill be deferred until the Committee can conduct a broader review of current licenses and fee costs.

NDOW has submitted a fee impact analysis of approximately \$7,000. I have not asked about the basis of this cost but consider the following:

- About 5,000 people a month are moving to Nevada. This increasing population impacts wildlife habitat. Wildlife management costs are going up but the sportsmen base is unlikely to increase. Can we afford an increasing percentage of that sportsmen base being subsidized?
- People who are 55 and older now comprise more than one-fifth the population. By the year 2004 they are expected to grow to one-fourth of all state residents. (Nevada State Demographics).
- You will be receiving a package of sportsmen fee increases that is partially designed to compensate for the current number of free and low cost licenses now purchased. In effect the average sportsmen and the nonresident is now subsidizing the free and low cost licenses.
- Why should someone now moving to Nevada hunt and fish for virtually free when the rest of us both sportsmen and nonsportsmen have been paying for years. By cost I am referring to investments in habitat, in administration, in hatcheries for fish, in big game transplants and guzzlers for game, and for all of us taxpayers the wildlife bonds approved by voters in 1990 and again in 2002, which purchase habitat and provide capitol improvements.
- Have any studies been done to document that the people moving here are so poor that they cannot afford the modest fees now in effect or higher fees?
- Are the people who are moving here any less well off financially than the average sportsmen of this state who is being asked to pay more for licenses, special assessments like tags or the proposed upland game assessment or property owners like me who are investing in wildlife habitat through the recently approved Q-1 which provides \$27.5 million for wildlife.

I recommend that this piece of legislation be deferred until the omnibus wildlife package can be considered in the context of all costs.

C 1 of 1

ASSEMBLY NATURAL RES., AGRICULTURE & MINING
DATE: 2/19/03 ROOM: 3161 EXHIBIT C 1 of 1
SUBMITTED BY: Tina Nappe