

TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the February 8, 2008 Meeting

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) was scheduled for **9:00 a.m. on Friday, February 8, 2008 at the Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada**

PRESENT: Chairman Jim Jeffress
Bevan Lister
Ron Lurie
Jack Robb
Don Cavin
Jeremy Drew

STAFF: Bob Haughian
Julie Meadows

OTHERS PRESENT: Don Sefton – SCI
Judi Caron - Public / Washoe Co. Advisory Board
Gil Yanuck – Public/ Carson City Co. Advisory Board
Tracy Hammond – Public/ Clark Co. Advisory Board
Ken Wellington – Public/ Elko Co. Advisory Board
Pete Mori – Public/ Commissioner
Clint Bentley – Public/Commissioner
Larry Gilbertson – NDOW
Doug Nielsen – NDOW
Ken Mayer - NDOW

NOTE: A tape recording of these proceedings is retained by the Department of Wildlife and is available for review upon request.

1. **Call to Order, Determination of Quorum** – Chairman Jeffress called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
2. **Introduction of Committee Members** –Chairman Jeffress
Giovanni Giordano (absent)
3. **Public Comment Period** - The public is encouraged to comment on items not presented in this agenda. Any item requiring Committee action will be scheduled on a future Committee agenda.

No public comments.

4. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes** – Chairman Jeffress – Action
The Committee will review and approve the meeting minutes from the December 17, 2007 TAAHC meeting.

Ron Lurie motioned to approve the minutes from the December 17, 2007 TAAHC meeting.

Bevan Lister seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Review and Discuss** – Chairman Jeffress – Informational
The committee will review and discuss the support material on the remaining items on the TAAHC Topic List under the Application Hunt Category. The support material addressing these remaining Application hunt topics is referred to as “Phase 2 Wrap-Up.”

Chairman Jeffress clarifies that these are informational items only and explains to the public how the TAAHC process has worked. The TAAHC was formed in November 2006 under the direction of former Commissioner Chairman McKenzie to look at all aspects of the hunt application process and the allocation of tags. The TAAHC opened up to the general public for comments and developed the TAAHC topic list from those comments. The comments were then categorized and assigned a ranking to each item. For the last year, the committee has

been addressing the application process and will be completed with the recommendations that will be addressed at this meeting today. Chairman Jeffress reported that very few items have made it to the commission level for approval or change. There has only been some fine tuning here and there but no major changes have taken place. The TAAHC meeting today will be informational on the last portion of the application process on the topic list. These items will be presented to the CWAB's to review the committee's recommendation and then will come back to the committee for finalization at the next TAAHC meeting in March. Chairman Jeffress opens the meeting up for comments or discussion from the committee and public on the topic items.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.2.1 – “Raise application fee” and asked Don Sefton from SCI to explain the PowerPoint slides regarding item A.2.1.

Don Sefton explains that the application fee of \$10 is just not for processing of the application, the fee also covers other cost associated with processing the applications. Cost includes postage fee, phone operators, programming costs, printing cost and data entry cost for keying the applications.

Tracy Hammond commented on the increase of application fees. He said when he had read some of the comments on raising fees for the application, bonus points and the PIW, a comment he has heard was that it is unfair that a family of five can apply at a relatively low cost and some people do not think this is fair because they have to pay the same fees.

Don Sefton explained the reason that raising the application fee has come up was because there was an inaccurate belief that if there was a push on making changes to the system he would be sticking his hand out asking for more money and to get past that, it was suggested to increase the application fee so there would be a pool of money available and he would be jumping up and down hoping that the committee would be making changes. He stated that there is not a resistance for change or to make changes. There is already money allotted to make changes, in fact, the annual contingency allotment from NDOW has never been spent on changes in a single year, ever. The only time he could recall that maybe the annual allotment was spent was back in 1998 when the program was moved over to Windows, but in all the other years, there has been money allotted for changes incase the commission wanted changes to be made.

Bob Haughian added that in talking with Maureen Hullinger who monitors the contract with SCI, the contingency fund that NDOW has for changes, has never been busted.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee for comments and reiterated that the decision the TAAHC makes on these items today are not the final decision and these items will go out the CWABs to review and give back their comments to the TAAHC.

Jeremy Drew motioned for the committee to take a stance on the recommendation not increase the application fee.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee not to make a motion on these items since they are informational items only but would like to take informal comments, or “preliminary positions,” from the committee. He said he would like to see a show of hand so that we could say that the major of the committee is giving this sense of direction to the CWABs on where the committee stands at this time.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.2.1 – Raise application fee is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.2.1 – “Raise application fee;” leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.2.2 – “PIW and Bonus point fee.” Chairman Jeffress recalled that this item came forth from Washoe Co. Advisory Board and asked Judi Caron to comment on this.

Judi Caron replied she did not remember about how this item was brought up at the Washoe Co. Advisory Board meeting because most of the comments they received where through e-mails. She said she has only heard comments on raising the Bonus point fee but not on the PIW fees.

Bevan Lister asked that looking back on the history on the PIW application fees, there was a change in the fee, what change was made in the revenue for the PIW application fees?

Don Sefton commented that one of the arguments he has heard on the bonus point fees was if you applied for a bonus point, you are not subject to pay the predator management fee of 3 dollars, in the old days you applied for

a bonus point in the area that you wanted to hunt and felt you needed build your bonus points in order to draw that tag, so the question was why is cheaper to apply for bonus points now than in the past?

Judi Caron recalled that Patty Wagner had once said it is written in the NRS that if anyone is seeking a tag then are subjected to pay the predator management fee, but if just applying for a bonus point, you were not subjected to pay the predator management fee.

Chairman Jeffress said in answering Bevan Lister's question on the PIW fee change, this is where the increase came from. In order to increase the PIW application fee, this would have to be done through the Nevada Revised Statute level.

Ron Lurie said he felt that the committee's preliminary position should be to leave as it is.

Bevan Lister said he agreed with Ron Lurie for the most part, but this deal with the bonus point application and missing out on paying the predator fee made no sense to him and if this needs to go through the legislature to make this change, the committee should at least talk about making this change and maybe it's worth looking at. He said he felt it was not fair that you could apply for a bonus point and not pay the \$3 predator fee, but if you applied for a tag and was unsuccessful and awarded a bonus point you had to pay the \$3 predator fee.

Ron Lurie commented that Bevan Lister brings up a good point and maybe the committee should send a recommendation to the legislature as a change. This is another way to open up some opportunity to get some additional revenue but still give people the opportunity to get their bonus points and invest in wildlife.

Don Cavin commented that once you open this up to the legislature, this could change all sorts of things and he doesn't want to mess with the legislature.

Gil Yanuck with Carson City Advisory Board commented the issue lies with the person who applies for the tag because he wants the opportunity to get a tag, he just didn't get drawn, where as the other person just wants a bonus point because maybe he can't hunt that year for what ever reason and just wants to accrue his bonus points. This needs to be viewed as two different perspectives.

Larry Gilbertson with NDOW commented if the legislature says one who is seeking a tag, then what is a bonus point? It is not an entity in itself, it's not anything, its just another way to seek a tag by bidding your time until you get a tag. So you are still seeking a tag.

Judi Caron with Washoe Co. Advisory Board agrees with Larry Gilbertson. She said that by buying a bonus point, this was an investment in wildlife and the predator fee should be paid whether by applying for a tag or purchasing a bonus point. She said she was in favor of seeing this go to the legislature.

Jeremy Drew said he would be inclined to pass the predator fee on bonus point and would like to make this a recommendation to go to the legislature committee.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.2.2 – PIW and Bonus point fee is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.2.2 – PIW and Bonus point fee; leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress suggested on forwarding the predator fee on the bonus point to the legislature sub-committee and ask the TAAHC members if this sounds like a reasonable approach from the committee.

Jack Robb said he felt this should be brought to the legislature committee to review.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.3.4 – "Transfer tag; Adult draws a tag it can be transferred to a youth." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton explained there are 3,000 tags allotted each year to the youth draw and 500 to 700 of those tags are unissued every year. He explained that in 2007 there were 3,087 applicants who applied in the youth draw and you would have thought 87 of those youths would have been unsuccessful, but yet 454 tags were left over and 523 youths were unsuccessful in drawing a tag. The bottom line is youths, like their parents, only want to hunt certain areas that may not have a lot of tag quotas available.

Bevan Lister asked if the youth would have to be related to the tag holder or what would the level of consanguinity have to be?

Chairman Jeffress said there are scenarios to consider with the transferring a tag such as if the youth is not currently in the hunt system they would have to be added or an EBay situation with someone offering to transfer their tag for a price. Currently the youth tags are not all being issued as it is.

Jack Robb commented that we currently have a system in place now for the youth hunt and feels there is no reason to make a change.

Ron Lurie concurs with Jack Robb's comment.

Bevan Lister said if opening the ball up to transfer tags could create big problems.

Judi Caron said she would like to make a comment on this from someone who could not attend this meeting, but sent her an e-mail regarding the transfer of tag. His concern was if the adult drew a deer tag in the 1331 hunt and could transfer this to a youth, would the tag have the benefit of the youth hunt and would be able to hunt on the three allotted seasons? He also stated in his email that doing this would only be opening up a can of worms.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.3.4 –"Transfer a tag is."

The committees' preliminary position on A.3.4 – Transfer a tag; leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.3.6 – "Tag Harvest; Allowing a youth to fill a general tag holders tag." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Bevan Lister said he would like to comment on this, he felt this is not a bad idea--dad draws a tag and his son doesn't draw a tag so dad lets son go hunting on his tag. The only problem with this is if dad doesn't take his son out but instead uses it himself.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.3.6 –Tag Harvest; Allowing a youth to fill a general tag holders tag is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.3.6 – "Tag Harvest; Allow youth to fill a general tag holders tag;" leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.3.7 – Youth/Adult; Adult hunter draw the same deer tag as their youth" and topic item A.4.1 – "Youth/Adult mixed party; A youth and general hunter party deer application." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton said the basic concept of this topic item was to have the youth and the adult able to hunt in the same areas and same season. As it is now it is possible for the youth and adults to draw the same tag. In 2007, 3,300 youths applied for big game, 2,680 of those youths applied in the 1107 youth hunt and 600 of those youths applied in the general draw. Something to consider is if you keep the "all or nothing" concept, instead of 454 youth tags left over there may be 854 youth tags left over each year. Also another thing to consider is the tag quota, would it come out of the junior hunt quota, the general hunt quota or even a mixed party hunt quota? Programming cost would be associated with this.

Bevan Lister commented that it would be nice if a youth and adult could draw a tag for the same season and area and be able to hunt together. If there is a way to program the two together, great, but if not what we have now is working.

Jeremy Drew said he felt this would be a good idea and if this could be done it would alleviate any strain on families trying to hunt together. Instead of having a mixed party for the adult and youth, linking the two programs together would probably be the way to go. Having the quota for the youth come out of the youth hunt and have the youth hunt draw first before the general draw so if the youth draws a tag, then adult who is linked to that youth would draw a tag in the same area.

Jack Robb commented right now there is an opportunity for the youth and adult to hunt together, families just need to look at how they apply.

Jeremy Drew felt once the return a tag for any reason is in place this may not be such a big issue as it has been in the past.

Judi Caron recalls why this topic item was submitted. She commented that in the past there were youth tags left over and if the youth hunt was held before the general draw, the parents would then know if their youth had a tag and for what area, this way the parents could then apply in the same area as the youth in the general draw. Also, reallocated the left over tags from the youth hunt into the general draw, this would increase the opportunity for hunters to draw a tag.

Tracy Hammond said he thinks part of the problem is more of an educational issue because a lot of hunters did not know that a youth could apply in a party hunt. Is this issue a money thing, a time thing or are the adults just being selfish?

Doug Nielsen, NDOW employee, said he thinks that as parents we need to understand that we may not draw a tag but still can hunt as a family in the party hunt. As an observation from the agency perspective, we get a lot of calls when it comes to the youth hunt. Calls come in from people asking if they find a youth can they hunt also. People are always looking for different ways to take advantage of the opportunity to hunt for themselves.

Don Cavin said he wanted to comment that the whole idea of this is to benefit the majority of the sportsmen in the field and not to change it for a few.

Bevan Lister said he likes the idea Judi Caron had about holding the youth draw earlier than the general draw and thinks this is worth discussing.

Jack Robb said he had concerns regarding youths who may not be able to get into a hunter education class prior to the youth draw if it is held earlier. If this is the case, then the parents still wouldn't be able to hunt with them. He said he felt this too was more of an educational issue.

Jeremy Drew said he still would like to explore the idea of linking the draws together but not so much as a mixed party hunt for the youth and adult. Jeremy said he would be willing to volunteer his time into looking into to this.

Judi Caron wanted to comment that it's not so much the adult wanting to know where to apply with a youth, there may be a family with 2 kids and one kid is no longer eligible for the youth hunt and the other one is. It may be that the family would like both of the kids to be able to hunt together in the same area. She said she felt that there was room for discussion on this.

Clint Bentley, speaking on his own behalf, said that he agrees and thinks this is a great idea but the one draw back is that we just got the youth hunt formulated into the regular hunt system with this year's data, if we move them ahead, we would have to use last year's data again because we don't have the information early enough.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.3.7–Youth/Adult is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.3.7 – Youth/Adult; leave as is

The committees' preliminary position on A.4.1 – Youth/Adult mixed party; leave as is but from the ancillary stand point, Jeremy Drew and Don Sefton will get together and look at this and any information from this will go out to the CWABs in an ancillary fashion.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.4.1.1 – “Mixed party for elk & antelope;” Cow elk and both buck & doe antelope tags for party application. Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton reported that Utah has a party application for deer, elk and antelope and can apply as a party with residents and nonresidents for these hunts.

Jack Robb commented he could not see this would have an increase in a family activity with this. We have a system now that works and would like to see it kept as is.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.4.1.1– Mixed party for elk & antelope is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.4.1.1 – Mixed party for elk & antelope; leave as is

Bevan Lister asked the committee what would be the benefit or perceived benefit in applying as a party for cow elk and antelope.

Jeremy Drew said the benefit or perceived benefit in applying as a party would be the bonus point issue. Going into a party hunt may increase your odds with combining the party's bonus point or decrease the odds depending on how many bonus points each hunter has.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.2 – "PIW first; Hold the PIW draw first." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton explained that one of the administrative issues associated with holding the PIW draw first is that there already is a petition that has been accepted by the commission for a Silver State Tag draw. Currently the PIW fee is charged after the main draw for those who applied for the draw if they were unsuccessful in the main draw. If the PIW draw is held first, then the fees would have to be charged up front first and would not be for the unsuccessful applicants, it would be for anyone who applied for a PIW tag. Also an NAC change is required because it specifically states that the PIW draw is to be done after the main draw and, consequently, programming would have to be done. Don Sefton explains that out of the 33 PIW tags it would only push nine successful tags to different hunters. The only other benefit in having the PIW draw done first would be that this would generate more revenue for the Heritage Fund.

Doug Nielson explains to the committee and the public how the PIW draw originated. The draw was developed to try and enhance more opportunity for hunters and also increasing revenue for the agency. A raffle for this was considered but Nevada law doesn't allow for a raffle. The idea for the PIW draw was designed to give the hunters another bite of the apple if they were unsuccessful in the main draw and instead of getting a refund they could let their money ride and be put in a drawing for one of these unique tags, kind of a blue collar man's chance tag of a Governor's type tag.

Judi Caron said there had been a lot of discussion from the Washoe Co. Advisory Board about this coming up. One question that kept coming up is why do you have to be a loser to be a winner? She said there is feeling of I don't want to be a loser to be a winner and maybe this would generate more money by drawing the premier tag first.

Jack Robb said if the Silver State Tag was not on the table, he would like to pursue having the PIW draw first. But if the Silver State tag draw is conducted first and the PIW draw last this would give the hunters more opportunity to draw a tag.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.2 –PIW draw first is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.2 – PIW draw first; leave as is

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.3 – "Order of the draw; Run all 1st choice, then all 2nd choice, then 3rd choice, etc by species." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton reported that Utah already does their draw this way. The argument that he has heard on this is why does the guy before me get a tag on his third choice when I could have had my first choice. The Utah draw takes over 24 hours to run because it is set up this way, and currently the Nevada draw takes a little over 4 hours to run before Wildlife Administrative Services (WAS) is ready to print the tags. One unintended consequence to do this is the length of time to run the draw would increase if done by choice order.

Jack Robb commented that the people who would like to see this concept in affect, may worsen their odds in the areas they are applying for and there are many multiple things at play here to consider. We have a system that works with ranking the hunter, not the hunter's choice, and he doesn't want to see this changed.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.3 – Order of the draw is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.3 – "Order of the draw;" leave as is

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.3.3 – "Order of the draw; Hold youth draw first." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton explained that the administrative impact on running draws separately is more costly than if the draws could be run together. Once you break up the draws, there is a fixed over head cost in running each draw separately. There is also the questionnaire card deadline issue. As it is now there are some who are confused with when to turn in their questionnaires. There also would be an impact on the quotas for tags.

Jack Robb said he appreciates the concept of this item brought forth, but we also need to consider that the youths would need to fulfill their hunter education requirements prior to applying for this hunt and he doesn't feel the committee should go forward with this recommendation.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.3.3 – Order of the draw; Hold youth draw first is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.3.3 – Order of the draw; leave as is

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.4.1 – "Hunter choice; Expand hunter choices selection for mountain goat to 3." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Jack Robb said he doesn't see any reason why we couldn't have more hunt choices for the mountain goat and he would like to see this go forward.

Jeremy Drew said he agrees and doesn't understand why we treat one goat species any different from the other and would be inclined to see this changed as well.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.4.1 – Hunter choice; Expand hunter choices selection for mountain goat to 3 is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.4.1 – Hunter choice; expand the hunter choice for mountain goat to 3 hunter choices.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.6 – "Mountain Lion tag with Big Game; Make mountain lion tag available when awarded big game tag." Chairman Jeffress explains to the public and committee that this has already been implemented and opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton commented that currently this is being implemented now. He explained that this originally came up through the legislature process and was brought up at a commission meeting.

Jack Robb informed the committee and public that he had brought this before the commission 2 years ago and it basically failed because of the \$10,000 dollar price tag associated to it, but as a result from the legislature action last year in trying to make a mountain lion an unprotected species, there has to be steps forward to show that we are taking a proactive stance to make it easier to get a mountain lion tag and harvest a mountain lion.

There was no committee's preliminary position on A.9.6 since this is already being implemented.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.11 – "Draw results; Speed up the notification process to get tags out sooner." Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton said that in recent years there has been an appetite from hunters to get the draw results earlier due to the cross over with Arizona. Arizona draw results are currently coming out about the same time as Nevada. People could not make the decision to apply in Arizona based on whether they drew in Nevada. Also people will go out and see if their credit cards have been charged to see if they drew a tag prior to the results of the draw coming out. The draw is usually run in late May/early June and there are several processes that have to happen in steps, these steps depend upon each other. We could send out the result emails prior to sending out the postage result letters. The problem that WAS faces now is that we get inundated with phone calls prior to the release date and we don't have the answers to some of these questions until the reports are run and the credit cards have cleared. Bottom line is people just want to know sooner.

Jeremy Drew asked if you could send the emails out a week sooner than the result letters go out in the mail.

Don Sefton said he thinks only several days earlier the emails could be sent out. Moving it back to the day of the draw would be problematic in the programming perspective and having enough staff to answer the phone calls would increase the cost. At least 15% of the email addresses that we have now are bad and half of the people do not include an email address.

Don Cavin recommended that there should be no change to the draw result getting out sooner.

Ron Lurie agreed with Don Cavin's recommendation for no change.

Bevan Lister asked if there was an option on posting the draw results to the website earlier.

Don Sefton said it could be done a few days earlier. This still wouldn't stop people calling for results. As it is now, we receive approximately 500 to 1,000 phone calls from people wanting to know the results early. He said he believes some people have legitimate reasons for wanting to know such as should they apply in other states or wanting to plan their vacation around a hunt.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.11 – Draw results; Speed up the notification process to get tags out sooner.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.11 – Draw result; leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.12 – “Remaining tags; Draw all nonresident hunts prior to resident and remaining tags would go to resident hunts.” Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Don Sefton explained that last year there were 326 party applicants that had a mixed party hunt and if you draw the nonresident tags first you would have to step up to this issue because a few years back we allowed for a mixed party hunt for resident and nonresidents.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.12 – Remaining tags; Draw all nonresident hunts prior to resident and remaining tags would go to resident hunts is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.12 – Remaining tags; leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.12.1 – “Remaining tags; Remaining cow elk tags placed into a youth cow elk hunt.” Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Jack Robb said that we are encouraging the youth to hunt but doesn't feel this is the direction the committee should go. The youths can apply for a deer hunt now and the general public probably would not go for this.

Bevan Lister commented that in the past 8 years, 2 out of those 8 years his kids did not draw a cow elk tag. He said he did not feel there was a need for this hunt.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.12.1 – Remaining tags; Remaining cow elk tags placed into a youth cow elk hunt is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.12.1 – Remaining tags; Remaining cow elk tags placed into a youth cow elk hunt; leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress addressed topic item A.9.18 – “Military draw; Special draw for military personnel.” Chairman Jeffress opens up for discussion.

Bob Haughian reported this has come from a related issue last year from the subcommittee of the legislature to reduce or have a free license for military. When looking at this a lot of the issues apply, where would the tag quota come from, would it come from the existing quota and there is also an issue of proof of eligibility. You may have someone who is on active duty in the military 24/7 and others who are various degrees of guardsmen or reservist who might do 2 weeks of training a year. So where do you draw the line when it comes to proof of eligibility?

Jack Robb said he appreciates what the military does for us but doesn't think this is an avenue the committee should go down.

Chairman Jeffress commented that military personal still can apply in the general hunt and if called to active duty, they can currently defer their tag up to two years.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to state what the committee's preliminary position on A.9.18 – Military draw; Special draw for military personnel is.

The committees' preliminary position on A.9.18 – Military draw; Special draw for military personnel; leave as is.

Chairman Jeffress informed the committee and the public that on November 9th, 2007 a working group met on gathering and compiling support material for this meeting. The working group consisted of Jack Robb, Don Cavin, himself, NDOW staff and Don Sefton at the NDOW Kietzke office.

Gil Yanuck said there was a comment that came from the Washoe Co. Advisory Board meeting regarding the December 17th TAAHC meeting and out of that meeting the TAAHC made some recommendations on the

waiting periods. If the waiting periods are instituted there are people who are in limbo land right now with their waiting periods. If they are sitting out ten years to be able to apply again, and the waiting period is now changed to once-in-a-lifetime, they would not be affected by the change in the waiting period. This was never made clear in any of the support material the board or public saw.

Jeremy Drew said there was one item that the committee recommended as a 3, this was the return card having a longer deadline period. This item came through the commission to push back the deadline date and has been implemented. He asked why did his friend who submitted his questionnaire late, did not pay the penalty fee, but received in the mail his big game applications and when he went online to apply for big game was ineligible to apply. Has this issue been resolved?

Don Sefton explained when the applications are mailed and it is prior to the return card deadline. Currently changes have been made to the return card site where a person can now pay the penalty fee and submit their harvest data when applying for big game online only and for those who apply for big game on a paper application, the return card penalty fee deadline is in March.

6. Future Committee Meetings – Action

The committee will approve the TAAHC schedule for the remainder of CY2008.

Chairman Jeffress asked the committee to review the TAAHC schedule and asked for a motion.

Bevan Lister motioned to approve the TAAHC schedule for the remainder of CY2008.

Jack Robb seconded the motion.

Motioned carried unanimously.

The next TAAHC meeting will be March 21 2008 at 6:00 pm in Winnemucca.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.