

FISCAL NOTE
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST ESTIMATE

ESTIMATE OF FISCAL IMPACT – STATE AGENCIES (See narrative for political subdivision estimates)				
	FY 2013-14		FY 2014-15	
	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE
GENERAL FUNDS				
CASH FUNDS				
FEDERAL FUNDS				
OTHER FUNDS				
TOTAL FUNDS				

Any Fiscal Notes received from state agencies and political subdivisions are attached following the Legislative Fiscal Analyst Estimate.

LB 94 amends statutes related to big game permits to 1) specify resident preference for deer permits, 2) change the once-in-a-lifetime provision for an elk permit from “permit” to “harvest”, and 3) allow the Game and Parks Commission to require documentation in order to designate one qualifying landowner for purposes of issuing a limited permit when partnerships, corporations and trusts are involved.

These provisions will have little to no fiscal impact on revenues to the Game Cash Fund

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES-STATE BUDGET DIVISION: REVIEW OF AGENCY & POLT. SUB. RESPONSES			
LB: 94	AM:	AGENCY/POLT. SUB: Nebraska Game & Parks Commission	
REVIEWED BY: Cindy Miserez	DATE: 1/25/2013	PHONE: 402-471-4174	
COMMENTS: I have no basis to disagree with the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission’s statement.			

Please complete ALL (5) blanks in the first three lines.

2013

LB⁽¹⁾ 94 FISCAL NOTE

State Agency OR Political Subdivision Name: (2) Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (Agency 33)

Prepared by: (3) Patrick H. Cole Date Prepared: (4) 1/15/2013 Phone: (5) 402-471-5523

ESTIMATE PROVIDED BY STATE AGENCY OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION

	<u>FY 2013-14</u>		<u>FY 2014-15</u>	
	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE</u>
GENERAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
CASH FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
FEDERAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL FUNDS	=====	=====	=====	=====

Return by date specified or 72 hours prior to public hearing, whichever is earlier.

Explanation of Estimate:

The proposed legislation changes some provisions related to eligibility for certain big game permits.

Section 1 would allow the Commission to allocate at least 85% of the deer permits in specific management units to be for residents to satisfy resident preference. The remainder could be issued to nonresidents. A fiscal impact of this proposal is not readily determinable since it would depend on the number of units selected and the historic distribution of permits. Since nonresident permits are higher priced, if the application of the quota would provide for more nonresident issued permits the impact would be revenue positive. The likelihood of this being implemented in units that would have a negative effect are minimal.

Section 2 would change the current 'one in a lifetime' antlered-elk permit, to be a 'one in a lifetime antlered-elk harvest'. Individuals could only be issued one antlered-elk permit once every five years, provided they did not harvest an antlered-elk on a previously issued permit (with some exclusions). A fiscal impact of this proposal is not readily determinable since it would depend on the number of applicants that were issued an antlered-elk permit previously but did not harvest an antlered-elk, and thus reapplied after a 4-year hiatus. Presumably it would be revenue positive since each application has a nonrefundable fee of \$8.50 so any application from a previously excluded individual (had been issued a antlered-elk permit once already) would be positive revenue.

Section 3 allows the Commission to promulgate rules and regulations that would prescribe how Nebraska residents who are partners of a partnership or officers or shareholders of a corporation or beneficiaries of a trust that own or lease at least 80 acres of land would qualify for a limited landowner deer, antelope or turkey permit.

MAJOR OBJECTS OF EXPENDITURE

Personal Services:

<u>POSITION TITLE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF POSITIONS</u>		<u>2013-14</u>	<u>2014-15</u>
	<u>13-14</u>	<u>14-15</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Benefits.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Operating.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Travel.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital outlay.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aid.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital improvements.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL.....	_____	_____	_____	_____

A fiscal impact of this proposal is not readily determinable. Since landowner permits are half the price of regular permits, the impact could be revenue negative if individuals became eligible and purchased landowner permits instead of regular permits, that they may have historically purchased prior to this change. It could be revenue positive if individuals became eligible and purchased landowner permits that would or had not normally purchased permits in the past.