

Current as of March 21, 2008

Category – Application Hunt (A)

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.1 –Bonus Points	A.1.1	Leave as is		TAAHC				8/10/07 Commission approved, with exception of A.1.4
	A.1.2	Preferential System for Deer	Preference-point system for bonus points for deer tags.	WACAB	1. Not in favor of preference for deer. 2. Several comments to support preference.	1. WPCAB 2. WACAB	2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.3	Preferential System	Preference-point system for bonus points for sheep, goat and elk.	WACAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.4	Youth points carry forward	Allow youth to carry forward bonus points once eligible to apply within the general hunt.	TAAHC	1. Endorse youth bp carry forward. 2. Favors carry forward. 3. Comment in favor 4. In favor of.	1. WPCAB 2. WACAB 3. NDOW 4. CCCAB	1	8/10/07 Commission approved
	A.1.5	Squaring of Bonus Points	Is the squaring of bonus points working?	TAAHC			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.5.1	Squaring of Bonus Points	Enhance odds of 10 points or more. Double number over 10 points and then square them.	ELCAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.6	Party Bonus Points	Leave as is	TAAHC	1. Leave as is	1. NDOW	2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.6.1	Party Bonus Points	Change the bonus points of a party to equal the bonus points of the party member with the fewest points	TAAHC			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.6.2	Party Bonus Points	The process of averaging and rounding up of bonus eliminated on party applications. The party application should receive bonus points equal to and not to exceed the party member with the least bonus points.	WACAB	1. Comment example- If you have a party application with three applicants and one member of the party has one point, one member has three points and the third member of the party has five points then the application would receive one bonus point.	1. WACAB	2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.7	Weighted bonus point draw with point cap	Set aside a percentage of quotas to those with maximum number of points and cap points.	TAAHC			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
A.1.8	Weighted bonus point draw	Top percentage of bonus point holders would have more weight in the draw. Remaining would go to the general draw without squaring.	WPCAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. **In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.**

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.1 – Bonus Points	A.1.8.1	Weighted bonus point draw	Set aside a percentage of quotas to those with higher number of points.	TAAHC	<p>1. Consider setting aside a small percentage of tags in each of the big game hunts for applicants with a certain number of bonus points or maximum bonus.</p> <p>2. Set aside a 10% of quotas to those with maximum number of bonus points per species</p> <p>3. Set aside a 25% 50% of quotas to those with maximum number of bonus points per species.</p> <p>4. Set aside a 20% of quotas to those with maximum number of bonus points per species.</p> <p>5. Similar suggestion in public email</p> <p>6. Similar suggestion in public email</p> <p>7. % of max bonus points ahead of regular draw.</p> <p>8. Hybrid Bonus Point Process (50 - 75% of unit group quota available to 2 highest bonus point categories; <u>eliminate squaring of points</u>). The 2005 % of total tags to the 2 highest bonus point categories by species is as follows: Elk – 23%, DBH – 29%, CBH – 25%, RMBH – 40%, Goat – 26%. You also need to look at what % of the 2 highest bonus point categories are drawing tags, in order to provide have a valid argument. For example in 2005 this value was only 11% for DBH, which indicates plenty of room for improvement. For deer 50% of the total tags should go to the highest bonus point categories. The injustice for deer can be seen in the 2005 bonus point data. There were a total of 9,204 tags available to resident 1331 tag holders. The top 4 highest point bonus of applicants were 8 – 5. Of these, there were 139 successful applicants along with 132 of these applicants that were unsuccessful. Even taking into account for individual units applied for that have small quotas, it is utterly ridiculous that with over 9,000 tags statewide, that the current system is unable to issue tags to the 132 applicants with the maximum bonus points (8, 7, 6, or 5) that were unsuccessful!</p>	<p>1. WACAB 2. NYCAB 3. WACAB 4. WACAB 5. Public email 6. Public email 7. CCCAB 8. NDOW-employee</p>	2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.8.2	Weighted bonus point draw	Change it like the old preference system where the higher points get first preference. Lump 0 to 3 trophy points in 1 category, 4 to 7 in another, 8 to 10 and so on. People would still not draw at the higher preference but their odds would be better.	WACAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. **In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.**

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/Commission Decision
A.1 –Bonus Points	A.1.8.3	Bonus point with preference	Augment the current bonus point system with preference status for the applicants with the max bonus points. Set aside 10 to 30% of the tags for a preference draw for the applicants with the max bonus points. Base the percentage on the tag quota for each management unit and species. The applicants that are unsuccessful in the preference draw would participate in the general draw with all other applicants on the remaining 60% of the tags.	WACAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.9.	Accumulated bonus point draw	Allow someone who has bonus points draw before someone without bonus points.	WACAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.9.1	Accumulated bonus point draw	The applicants with the most bonus points and draw for them first. If there are still tags, go to the group below them.	WACAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.10	High points/High age (maximum bonus pt holders)	Allow those who meet certain "criteria" (certain age, length of residency and high point value) to have a hunting "advantage." (separate draw?)	TAAHC	1. Not in favor. 2. Believer that if a person is 65+ years of age with 13 points or better in the elk draw that they should automatically draw an elk tag. At this age there is not many more years that this person will be able to get out and really hunt for elk. Furthermore, 3 years is ample time to wait before drawing an elk tag. Especially when they are a native Nevadan and have never drawn an elk tag. Let's give this person one chance to hunt elk in Nevada. 3. All hunters who have been applying for a trophy tag 10 or more years and reach the age of 60 yrs automatically receive a tag. The commission can pick the years and age but 10 and 60 sound about right to me	1. WPCAB 2. WACAB 3. WACAB	2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.11	Pooling bonus points	Pool maximum number of bonus points for one species. (lose points for other species.)	NYCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.1.12	Bonus point percentage by hunter choice	Suggest that you look at and count all of the applicants with max points in each hunter choice group. Then determine a percentage of max point tags that it would take to clear all max point applications from each hunter choice area within a five to ten year period (do not exceed 50%). A percentage of max point applicants should have been drawn when we started the point system.	PUBLIC			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.13	Transferring Bonus Points	Transfer adult points to youth	NYCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.1.14	Loss of Points	Do not lose points except for obtaining tag or death.	CLCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.1.14.1	Loss of Points	Change timeframe for losing points for non-application to 5 years	CLCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.1.14.2	Loss of Points	Lose points if draw tag in 1 st choice only. Do not lose if draw tag in 2 nd -5 th choice.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.1.14.3	Loss of Points	A successful draw applicant should not lose all bonus points. Reduction of points would be determined based on an average of all applicants for that season/species.	TAAHC	1. Average reduction not fair to those not drawn. Hunter who draws should lose points.	1. PUBLIC	3	TAAHC rejected

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.1 –Bonus Points	A.1.15	Remaining Tags	Do not lose bonus points for obtaining a remaining tag	CLCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.1.16	Buy bonus point toward a draw for a species.	Can not enter draw for that species until one has accrued a set number of bonus points, i.e 8 points	ELCAB	1. Don't be able to buy bonus points, earn them or go back to old system	1. ELCAB	2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
	A.1.18	Loyalty points	Bonus points for volunteer projects	CHCAB			2	8/10/07 Commission disapproved
A.2 -Fees	A.2.1	Raise Application Fee	Raise the application fee to support programming changes that would have to be implemented for any proposed changes to the tag allocation process.		1. Raising fee should be avoided due to additional changes to the system	1. NYCAB	2	
	A.2.1.1	Raise Application Fee	Charge more money for trophy species	HUCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.2	PIW and Bonus point Fee	Raise the PIW fee and Bonus Point Fee	WACAB			2	
	A.2.3	Credit Card	Eliminate the ability to pay by credit card.	WACAB	1. Reduce the number of times a person's credit card is given a change to pay for big game app fees in order to streamline the timeline of the application process and allow more time to be use in developing quotas and working the tag quota managements side of things instead of monopolizing the time to deal with tag application and draw side.	1. NDOW-employee	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.4	Nonresident personal checks	Allow personal checks to be submitted by nonresidents.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.5	Online Fee	Eliminate \$3 online convenience fee	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.5.1	Online Fee	Nonresident online fee higher is more.	WACAB	1. This is already in place residents pay \$2 and nonresidents pay \$3.50 to apply online.	1. NDOW	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.6	Fee Submission	Entire fee should be submitted	WACAB	1. A lot of people are applying their whole family for highly sought after tags. Unfortunately, many of these family members really don't care about drawing some of these special tags. 2. Go back to application and fee submission method prior to online application process. All fees upfront and refund after the draw. 3. Does not want to eliminate. Supports the online process. believe that the current online application process has been great	1. WACAB 2. WACAB 3. WACAB	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.6.1	Fee Submission	Pay a single fee up front regardless of the number of species applying for.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.7	Nonresident Cow Tag Fee	Reduce the fee to \$300.	WACAB	1. This fee is part of a BDR being submitted by the Department at the 2007 legislative session.	1. NDOW	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.2.8	Predator Management Fee	Increase to \$20 and when predator is brought to the department a bounty \$20 will be paid to the hunter.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
A.2.9	Bonus point only Fee	Establish a bonus point only fee instead of requiring the purchase on the license to earn points if unsuccessful	WACAB	1. higher price for bonus points 2. Cash up front for bonus points	1. ELCAB 2. ELCAB	3	TAAHC rejected	
A.3 –Youth	A.3.1	Leave as is	Leave as is	TAAHC			2	*See Commission decision A.3.2

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.3 -Youth	A.3.2	Youth Age Qualification	Some youth whose 12th birthday is after the opening day are disadvantaged during the duration of their youth hunt window.	TAAHC	1. Supports restricting age to 4 years 2. Supports age qualifications.	1. EUCAB 2. WPCAB	2	8/10/07 Commission approved age max 4 yrs
	A.3.2.1	Youth Age Qualification	The age should be moved up to 17 for youth hunts.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.3.2.2	Youth Age Qualification	Reduce age for junior deer hunt to maximum of 15 years of age (reduce possible 5 years of youth hunting to 4 years/person with adjustment of age criteria) Overall you would not see much if any reduction in big game junior tags but you would be able to return 400 to 500 tags back to the "adult deer hunts" (remember that hunter success is higher for juniors and equates to more tags to adults with lower hunter success rates for the same number of harvested deer)	NDOW-employee			2	*See Commission decision A.3.2
	A.3.3	Tag number limit	Limit the number of youth tags a youth could obtain. Recommend 2 totals.	WPCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.3.4	Transfer Tag	Adult draws tag it can be transferred to youth	PECAB			2	
	A.3.5	Party Hunt	Allow youth to put in as youth party	CLCAB	NDOW – This is already allowed		3	TAAHC rejected
	A.3.6	Tag Harvest	Allow youth to fill a general tag holders tag.	CLCAB			2	
	A.3.7	Youth/Adult	A way for an adult hunter to draw the same deer tag as their son/daughter. Somehow do the junior drawing first, and then the successful junior's hunt choice automatically becomes the adult hunter's first choice.	WACAB			2	
A.4 - Mixed Party App	A.4.1	Youth/adult mixed party	A youth and general hunter party deer application. The quota would be reduced from the youth hunt quota and general hunt quota if quota available to fill the party for the hunter choice.	TAAHC	1. Allow junior & adult deer applicants to apply together and if there are adults tags available, then both get tags but if not, gives the junior tag if their choice is available.	1. NDOW-employee	2	
	A.4.1.1	Mixed party for elk & antelope	Cow elk and both buck& doe antelope tags for party application. More family/recreation hunting opportunities.	NDOW-employee			2	
A.5 -Online Application	A.5.1	Online Party	Improve prompts for party applications. Online deer party process confusing.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.5.2	Online App	Cannot back out of the transaction or application process if a mistake is made. Need to change something, you should be able to cancel the whole process and start over at anytime, even if the credit card number was already given.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
A.6 -Eligibility	A.6.1	Tag Return	Leave as is	TAAHC			2	See A.6.1.3.
	A.6.1.1	Tag Return	More than one tag in one year you can turn in the extra tag or tags and not loose your bonus points.	WACAB	1. Current regulation reinstates bonus points if tag is return prior to season opening. 2. Public comment at WACAB supporting this	1. NDOW 2.WACAB	2	See A.6.1.3
	A.6.1.2	Tag Return	Hunt of a lifetime. Allow for returned tag to be donated to "Hunt of a Lifetime" program which provides a hunting opportunity for terminally ill sportsmen less than 21 years of age.	TAAHC			2	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.1.3	Tag Return	Return tag for any reason. Currently allowance for military obligation, and medical/death within a family relationship.	TAAHC	1. In favor if circumstances warranted. Tag to be returned in a timely manner, month to 6 weeks prior to season open without loss of bonus point.	1. WPCAB	2	2/8/2008 commission approved a variation of this topic.

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.6 –Eligibility	A.6.1.4	Tag Return	Return tag for any reason prior to printing of the tag.	NYCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.1.5	Tag Return	Death of tag holder allow transfer to another eligible person	CLCAB	1. Current regulation allows for return of tag for death and transferring to eligible alternate.	1. NDOW	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.2	Waiting period	Leave as is	TAAHC			2	See A.6.2.2.
	A.6.2.1	Waiting period	If you draw a deer tag you must sit out the following year	WACAB	1. Does not support. 2. Supports	1. WPCAB 2. CCCAB	2	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.2.2	Waiting period	Examine the waiting periods for applying for big game after drawing a tag.	TAAHC	1. Limit sheep eligibility to lifetime. 2. Place time constraints on resident applications once drawn for a tag. 3. Do away with waiting period for antelope. 4. Make waiting periods for harvest or not consistent or suggest 5 years. 5. Make antelope wait 5 years regardless of harvest. 6. Once in a lifetime for sheep. 7. Increase waiting period requirements for high demand hunts.	1. CLCAB 2. CLCAB 3. WPCAB 4. WPCAB 5. WACAB 6. Public 7. NDOW-employee	2	2/8/2008 commission approved some changes to big game waiting period.
	A.6.2.3	Waiting period	After obtaining tag and only allow application for bonus point the following year.	CLCAB			2	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.2.4	Waiting period	After obtaining tag for premium tag only allow application for bonus point during the waiting period.	CLCAB			2	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.3	Number of Tags	Leave as is	TAAHC			2	TAAHC – leave as is.
	A.6.3.1	Number of Tags	Limit one big game tag per year	WACAB	1. Does not support. 2. Supported 3. Do not limit the number of big game tags that a hunter can draw in a year. Many older hunters have spent years building up their points and may be at an age when they only have a few years left to hunt.	1. WPCAB 2. WACAB 3. Public Email	2	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.3.2	Number of Tags	Limit number of big game tags in a life time.	TAAHC	1. Supports once-in-a-lifetime sheep hunt only if successful in harvest 2. Make Elk tags once-in-a-lifetime. 3. Once-in-a-lifetime for BHS, mt. goats & PIW only.	1. Public email 2. DCAB 3. HUCAB	2	TAAHC rejected. See A.6.2.2.
A.6.3.3	Number of Tags	Limit one big game tag & one mule deer tag per year	TAAHC	1. Supports 2. Supports 3. Split into “trophy” and “Limited Entry”. Limited entry would include cow, doe, perhaps deer. Limit draws success to 1 “trophy” and 1 “Limited Entry per year. 4. Supports	1. NYCAB 2. WACAB 3. Public Email 4. Public Email	2	TAAHC rejected	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.6 -Eligibility	A.6.3.4	Number of Tags	Limit the number of big game tag a hunter can draw by recommending that the animals be prioritized from highest to lowest. Once a hunter draws in a higher prioritized category his name then could not move on to the draw for the other tags he has put in for. I would recommend that he would be able to receive a bonus point though. A hunter that wants a tag that is lower in priority for a tag he has applied for that is higher would could then put in for a bonus point only to ensure he draws the one he wants, (or at least is in the drawing for the one he really wants)	WACAB	1. Supports ranking.	1. Public email	2	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.4	Return Card	Longer deadline period for turning in questionnaire.	EUCAB	1. Set big game hunt questionnaire deadline to a single date of January 15	1. NDOW-employee	3	Commission previously approved.
	A.6.5	Landowner Program	Establish a limit a hunter purchasing these tags could obtain.	TAAHC	1. Supports 1 per species	1. WPCAB	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.6	Remaining Tags	Prior to two years ago any remaining tags were available in the remaining tag draw process without being available to everyone. Change back to Resident remaining to Residents. Nonresident remaining to nonresidents	TAAHC	1. Does not support opening remaining up to all residents and nonresidents alike.	1. WACAB	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.6.1	Remaining Tags	Give nonresident remaining tags to residents next in line after 1 st draw	CLCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.7	Limit Big Game applications	Limit application for big game to 1 species per year.	NYCAB	1. Comment in support	1. WACAB	3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.8	Nonresident Guided/Main Draw	Nonresidents cannot apply for the Guided Draw and deer in the main draw in the same year.	WACAB	1. This eligibility restriction was approved in 2006 and implemented in 2007.	1. NDOW	3	Commission previously approved.
	A.6.9	Nonresident Elk Application	Non-residents can apply for a Nevada cow elk hunt, but cannot apply separately for a bull elk hunt. While residents can apply separately for each. Separate the non-resident cow elk hunt from the bull elk hunt, such that bonus points can be earned separately on each (as with residents).	WACAB	1. Application eligibility is the same for residents and nonresidents. Applicants can only apply for one type of hunt category per species in a draw. The applicant has to choose cow or bull elk and cannot apply for both in the same draw. If there are remaining tags the applicant can come back and apply for those in a subsequent draw.	1. NDOW	3	Eligibility currently exist.
	A.6.10	Buck and Doe App Hunter Choice	Allow to apply for both buck and doe on one application by allowing choices for both buck and doe. Ie: area 10 late buck, area 10 early buck, area 10 doe.	WACAB			3	TAAHC rejected
	A.6.11	Transfer tag	Bighorn sheep tags, resident or nonresident hunt for first couple of weeks and burn out or injured. 24 hour notice, sell tag for \$1,000/day for the remaining season and \$10,000 upon harvest.	CCCAB			3	TAAHC rejected
A.7 -Party Size	A.7.1	Deer Hunt party size	Limit hunter party size.	TAAHC	1. Did not want to increase party size 2. Did not endorse.	1. WPCAB 2. NDOW	3	TAAHC rejected

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.9 –Draw Process	A.9.1	Leave as is		TAAHC	1. I like the draw system that is in place. It is nice having five choices to put in for. This allows hunters to hunt different areas if they want. The computerized draw process seems to be random and works well. Overall things are good, just making a few minor adjustments would make it that much better. 2. Leave as is 3. Leave program as is with minor changes. This is a random draw.	1. Public 2. Public Email 3. NDOW	2	
	A.9.2	PIW First	Hold the PIW draw first.	TAAHC	1. Endorsed	1. WPCAB	2	
	A.9.3	Order of the Draw	Run all 1 st choice, then all 2 nd choice, then all 3 rd choice etc by species	TAAHC			2	
	A.9.3.1	Order of the Draw	1 st & 2 nd s choices, not drawn then back into a general draw.	CCCAB			2	
	A.9.3.2	Order of the Draw	Party hunt for 1 st couple of choices, and then break back to individual draw.	CCCAB			2	
	A.9.3.3	Order of the Draw	Hold youth draw earlier	TAAHC	1. Endorsed	1. WPCAB	2	
	A.9.4	Hunter Choice	Limit hunter choice to 1 instead of 5	NYCAB			2	
	A.9.4.1	Hunter Choice	Expand hunter choices selection for mtn. goat to 3.	CLCAB			1	
	A.9.5	Draw Number	Lower the draw number use less than 1 billion	CLCAB			3	
	A.9.6	Mountain lion tag with Big Game	Make Mountain Lion Tag available when awarded big game tag.	NYCAB			2	
	A.9.10	Weapon specific hunter choice	Hunter choice to be weapon specific. Ie. All any legal weapon or all archery etc.	PECAB	1. Supports this topic. 2. 2 Similar submissions. 3. Similar submission.	1. WPCAB 2. WACAB 3. Public email	3	
	A.9.11	Draw results	Speed up the notification process to get tags out sooner	PECAB	1. Quicker results 2. Early online tag draw results, you could allow 2 weeks for successful applicants to make contact with WASO and not accept the tag. If you don't make contact, you automatically receive the tag. The tags would then be printed starting after this 2-week period which would be only 2 weeks later than we print now.	1. WACAB 2. NDOW-employee	2	
	A.9.12	Remaining tags	Draw all nonresident hunts prior to resident and remaining tags would go to resident hunts.	WPCAB			2	
	A.9.12.1	Remaining tags	Remaining cow elk tags placed into a youth cow elk hunt.	PUBLIC			2	
	A.9.12.2	Remaining tags	Move left over Non-resident Elk tags to Resident pool and hold second draw prior to mailing out tags.	LYCAB			2	
	A9.12.3	Remaining tags	Nonresident and Resident left over tags go back into a general pool.	HUCAB			2	
A.9.13	Application Process	Make the application process easier and smoother. (Find a better contractor)	WACAB	1. Hold the draw earlier	1. WACAB	3		
A.9.13.1	Application Process	Allow applicants to make copies of original applications and allow submission for draw process.	WACAB			3		
A.9.14	Application deadline and draw	Earlier application deadline and earlier draw date.	WACAB	1. Additional public comment - Deadline in Jan. (Jan 31) with results by mid March.	1. WACAB	3		

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
A.9 –Draw Process	A.9.15	Guided Draw Applications/per Unit	Outfitters should be limited in the number of applications that they can submit in any one hunt unit. I would suggest a limit in the range of 100-200 applicants in any one hunt unit per outfitter. That would be greater than most Nevada-based outfitters need in order to end up with a decent number of successful applicants.	WACAB			3	
	A.9.16	Guided Draw Later	Due to policy changes now in effect there is no longer any reason to hold this draw early. Now, holding this draw at the same time as all other draws would allow for those quotas to be aligned with the most current information available. This would help to create a greater fairness for tag distribution in the nonresident hunter group. This would require changes to NRS 502.147	WACAB			3	
	A.9.17	Senior Draw	Regardless of bonus points, give a special draw ahead of regular draw.	HUCAB	1. In favor of.	1. CCCAB	2	8/10/07 Commission Disapproved
	A.9.18	Military Draw	Special draw for military personnel	CCCAB			2	

Category- Tag Allocation (T)

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.1 -Youth	T.1.1	Youth Big Game Hunts	Consider a youth antelope hunt.	TAAHC	1. Does not support. 2. Support from public email 3. Because of the low hunt opportunities in the State of Nevada I suggest that youth draws be limited to cow elk, mule deer does, and antelope does. 4. Establish pronghorn junior hunt with about 300 tags to start with. These tags would be drawn 1 st before junior deer. If success in antelope draw cannot apply in junior deer hunt.	1. WPCAB 2. Public email 3. Public email 4. NDOW-employee	*3	
	T.1.1.1	Youth Big Game Hunts	Consider a youth cow elk hunt.	EUCAB	1. Clark county submitted also. 2. Public request	1. CLCAB 2. Public email	*3	
	T.1.1.2	Youth Big Game Hunts	Consider a youth bull elk hunt.	CLCAB	1. Reduce or eliminate kids from trophy hunts	1. ELCAB	3	
	T.1.2	Doe or Forked horn	Doe or forked horn only	WACAB			3	
T.2 –Harvest Restriction	T.2.1	Point qualifications	Consider 5 point or less elk hunt.	CLCAB			2	
	T.2.1.2	Point qualifications	Consider 4 point or better hunt.	CLCAB	1. Supports minimum size restriction	1. WACAB	2	
	T.2.1.3	Point qualifications	Consider 2 point or better units.	WACAB	1. Supports minimum size restriction	1. WACAB	2	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.3 -Pioneer Tag	T.3.1	Pioneer Tag	New tag for 50 year resident that has applied at least 20 seasons.	CLCAB			2	8/10/07 Commission Disapproved under the Application Hunt review process.
T.4 -Senior	T.4.1	Senior Hunt	Establish percentage of tags for seniors	CLCAB	1. Comment requesting same	1. Public email	2	8/10/07 Commission Disapproved under the Application Hunt review process.
T.5-Landowner Program	T.5.1	Leave as is	Leave as is	TAAHC	1. Leave as is	1. NDOW	2	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.
	T.5.2	Private land season	Consider reinstating private land season. Hunter could pick a 30 day period to hunt but would be restricted to the landowner's private land includes reinstating Nov 1 – Nov 30 season.	TAAHC	1. Did not support 2. Have a Nov- Dec deer hunt within the unit/units. Sell tags to highest bidder-half of money to landowner half to mule deer rehabilitation fund.	1. WPCAB 2. HUCAB	2	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.
	T.5.2.1	Private land season	Suggest that hunters must hunt on the landowner's private land. Have landowners set the thirty day period with guidelines provided by NDOW	PUBLIC	1. Tag only valid on private lands in conjunction with normal deer/antelope seasons.	1. HUCAB	2	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.5 –Landowner Program	T.5.3	Doe Hunt	Landowner to specify which property to hunt does. 1-2% doe harvest.	PECAB			2	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.
	T.5.4	Review Process	NDOW needs to really look at the process of how land owners get depredation tags for all species,	WACAB	1. NDOW needs to get better control of this process, and have more people involved in determining if a land owner is truly justified in getting a tag	1. WACAB	2	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.
	T.5.5	Drop Program	No landowner tags- Too much money involved.	WACAB			3	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.
T.6 -Hunter Congestion	T.6.1	Identify recommendations	Identify recommendations for relieving hunter congestion	TAAHC			*3	
	T.6.2	Split units or seasons	Consider further dividing hunt unit groups or season dates (specifically on the deer and elk hunts) to disperse hunters, reduce conflicts, and increase the quality of the hunts.	WACAB	See Topic T.8		*3	
T.7 - Trophy	T.7.1	Trophy vs. quantity	Does the public want trophy hunting or more opportunity to hunt?	TAAHC			2	
	T.7.1.2	Efforts to increase recreational hunters	With efforts to increase “recreational hunters”, throw bone to trophy hunters by implementing pilot project to enhance trophy quality in select units through specific harvest strategies (without point-class restrictions) that attempt to optimize age structure and animal densities with more intense evaluation of harvested animals in cooperation with Nevada Record Book Committee and herd densities in relation to limited habitats.	NDOW-employee			2	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.7 - Trophy	T.7.2	Rut Hunts	Reserve a certain portion of Elk tags as "Trophy Elk tags" and manage the herds as such. - Hold back a certain percentage of Elk tags for each geographical elk herd and allow the tag recipients to hunt during the rut.	WACAB			2	
	T.7.2.1	Rut Hunts	Creation of a trophy deer and elk hunt. Trophy hunt would be a rut hunt placed in every area. The quotas for these areas should be extremely low, giving trophy hunters a chance to hunt in the rut at low tag numbers. These hunts could be separate from other deer and elk tags and if hunters apply for these then they cannot apply for another tag of the same species. These tags could also be sold for more, thus increase total tag sales.	PUBLIC			2	
	T.7.2.2	Rut Hunts	Rut hunt in every elk unit group that is limited to less than 5% of the total bull tags available and would be a fund raiser to support management of elk on private land and expansion of opportunities to allow elk herd growth on private lands at same time providing access by public elk hunters to these private lands and adjacent locked up public land through conservation agreements. Resident tag \$1,000 & Nonresident tag \$2,500.	NDOW-employee			2	
T.8 –Season Structure	T.8.1	Split season	Percent of tags to an earlier season, and a smaller percentage of tags allocated to a later season to allow opportunity for more mature animal.	TAAHC	1. Not a bad idea but gives the same or close to the same percentage of tags for each of the split seasons if possible.		2	
	T.8.1.1	Split season	Split some seasons	NYCAB	1. Supports split seasons in some units. 2. Provide more hunting opportunity for mule deer by having 2 shorter split rifle seasons instead of single 30-day season that will reduce hunter success by 10% and allow 10% more hunters to draw tags each year (statewide average hunter days for any legal weapon hunt is less than 5 days in most unit groups) Consider setting split seasons for trophy male hunts (bull elk and buck pronghorn) as tag quotas increase to provide quality hunt and allow for increased quotas as population increase.	1. Public email 2. NDOW-employee	2	
	T.8.1.2	Split Seasons	Multiple short seasons in unit groups. May provide for more quota and opportunity for sportsmen to hunt and possibly relieve congestion.	TAAHC		1. WACAB	2	
	T.8.1.3	Split Seasons	More late season for archery deer hunt in more units	HUCAB			2	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.8 – Season Structure	T.8.2	Landowner Program	Hunter must select weapon type to hunt with.	CLCAB	1. Non stratified seasons for Landowner Compensation Tags (just archery, muzzleloader or rifle) not all three.	1. NDOW-employee	2	Topic transferred to the Elk Incentive and Landowner Compensation Committee in Nov 07.
	T.8.3	Season dependent on Unit	Season should be dependent upon unit.	WPCAB			*3	
	T.8.4	Rotational System	Rotational system by series of units. Designate unit(s) in region that would be “trophy”. Longer season fewer tags, archery only, muzzleloader only and any legal weapon only. Rotate these designations by unit(s) in the region following a designated rotation time period (i.e., rotation could occur after 1, 2 or 3 years as a designation). Units identified as any legal weapon hunt (high number tags, hunting opportunity and possible high harvest) would rotate to an archery season (lower harvest rate allowing for recovery), then rotate to muzzleloader and then “trophy”.	TAAHC	1. Leave as is. A rotational system may cause much disparity among county advisory boards, NDOW and sportsmen on how are what units should be chosen.		3	
	T.8.5	Any legal weapon	Remove the any legal weapon deer hunt out of the rut.	TAAHC	1. Allow hunting in the rut	1. NDOW	2	
	T.8.6	Close Season	Close seasons in fire devastated areas.	WACAB		1. WACAB	3	
	T.8.7	Flying surveys and Computer models	Reduce tag allocations by 25% for those areas not flown and count done on computer models.	WACAB			3	
	T.8.8	Youth hunt	Non stratified seasons for youth hunt tag holders. Youth must select a weapon class and season.	NDOW-employee			3	
T.9 -Demand Success	T.9.1	Male Female Ratio	Examine Male/female ratios	TAAHC	1. Tag allocations should reflect upon maintaining the “status quo” on good buck to doe ratios. Nevada has always been about being able to maintain the position of quality not quantity when it comes to our big game animals. 2. Eliminate bull elk ratio criteria for quota settings and establish age criteria that would be managed similar to how bighorn sheep quotas is managed; would require instituting tooth collection from bulls.	1. WACAB 2. NDOW-employee	2	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.9 -Demand Success	T.9.2	All Species	Use demand success for all species	TAAHC	1. I think there needs to be a set percentage of tags that go to nonresidents. I like 10%, but that will not fly, so why not try 12 or 15%. As it stands now no one really understands the process for the fluctuating percentage of tags going to nonresidents. There should also be a set proportion within the resident and nonresident tags for Any Legal Weapon, Archery, Muzzleloader, and Junior hunts (residents only), possibly 80, 5, 5, and 10 percent respectively	1. WACAB	3	
	T.9.3	Application Choices	Use all application choices to determine demand (by weapon class)	TAAHC	2. Go back to making people choose their weapon when applying for deer or account for all hunter choices IF the data supports the fact that demand is being screwed with by only looking at 1 st choice unsuccessful and those which draw tags for demand % by weapon class.	1. Public email 2. NDOW-employee	2	
	T.9.4	Nonresident Allocation	Remove 10% allocation for nonresidents.	CLCAB			3	
	T.9.4.1	Nonresident Allocation	Only allow up to 10% allocation for nonresidents.	WACAB			3	
	T.9.4.2	Nonresident Allocation	Do not allow nonresidents more tags than any resident hunt. 10 archery tags, 9 rifles.	CLCAB			3	
	T.9.4.3	Nonresident Allocation	More tags for residents and less tags for the non-residents.	WACAB			3	
	T.9.5	Cow Elk	10% cow elk hunt in certain units like deer and antelope.	CLCAB			3	
	T.9.6	Deer	Deer tag allocations should be made with the biologist recommendations as a minimum.	WACAB			*3	
	T.9.6.1	Deer	Eliminate demand success for deer. Bow and muzzle loader allocations are undersubscribed.	Public	1. Revise the Demand Success formula to allow for common sense to prevail when primitive weapon class for deer and cow elk archery.	1. NDOW-employee	2	
T.9.7	Junior allocation	The allocation of tags for the junior hunter group is based on prior year quotas. Suggest delaying quota recommendations until after the Department recommendations are available and then at that time allocations to each management area can be made based on current year recommendations with most current data available.	WACAB			3		

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number “3” in the “TAAHC Recommendation” column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column “TAAHC/Commission Decision” reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the “TAAHC Recommendation” column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the “TAAHC Recommendation” changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally “2” and have been changed to “3”.

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	REF #	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful	TAAHC/ Commission Decision
T.9 -Demand Success	T.9.8	Remaining Tags	Suggest that after the second drawing held each year if there are any remaining tags, 10% of those tags remain available to that Hunter Group and the other 90% be allocated to Hunt #1331 Antlered Deer Any Legal Weapon and Hunt #1371 Antlered Deer Muzzle loader. With all of the above in place I would then suggest that any applicant who secures a tag would lose all accrued bonus points which in turn would improve draw odds for all other future applicants having bonus points.	WACAB			3	
	T.9.9	Weapon Class minimum	Minimum for deer allocations by demand success in a unit for a given weapon class. I.e. 10 tag per unit per weapon class. Allows for larger parties in muzzleloader and archery.	Public			3	
	T.9.10	Nonresident Rocky Mtn. Sheep	Remove the Non-resident Rocky Mountain sheep tag. - Make the allocation of hard to draw species more equitable for residents of our own State. Make the lower threshold of tag allocation for these species, 25 tags. Starting with tag 26 then the non-resident tag distribution formula would apply.	WACAB			*3	
	T.9.11	Cap on Tags	Cap on tags once percent success falls below a certain level to keep allocations from increasing on a depressed population through demand success formula.	HUCAB			2	
T.10 Quotas	T.10.1	Nonresident Deer	Make more general deer tags available to nonresidents by decreasing the number available to guides.	WACAB	1. Statute change as NRGH quota is based upon previous year nonresident deer quota.		3	
	T.10.2	Quota information	Make the quota information available at the time of application.	WACAB		1. NDOW	3	
	T.10.2.1	Quota information	In the Mule Deer General Draw when NDOW lowered the non-resident permits from 15% to 10% of total permits, but had already allocated Non-resident Guided Hunt permits based upon the prior year's 15% levels. As a result, the entire reduction came out of the number of permits available for the general draw. When major changes (reductions) in permits are known in advance of the Non-resident Guided draw, the permits for those units should be adjusted before that draw takes place.	WACAB			3	
	T.10.3	Quota categories	Provide a portion of tags in special category at higher fee and remainder of tags in a regular category at the normal fee. See Wyoming Tag allocation process.	WACAB			3	
	T.10.4	Rocky Mtn. Heritage tag	Establish a Rocky Mtn BH Heritage tag to increase funds for BHS restoration efforts once we see 12 tags statewide.	NDOW-employee			2	
	T.10.5	Allocation of tags	Provide Biological assessment by biologist for any proposed changes.	LYCAB			*3	
	T.10.5.1	Allocation of tags	Account for the expected harvest by deer and antelope compensation tag holders as we do for youth hunters so there are no longer any "add on" tags to the quota process.	NDOW-employee			2	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

T.10 Quotas	T.10.5.2	Allocation of tags	Change the Heritage Tag program for every Big Games species with more than one Heritage Tag available. Allow one tag to remain as an auction tag and make the other tag available by draw to all applicants, including those on the 5 to 10 year waiting period for that particular species. This tag would carry all the rights of the auction tag at a non-refundable application fee of \$20. No bonus points would be awarded for this particular hunt. Ex. – Provided the general sportsman with the same opportunity as the sportsman able to obtain an auction tag. This system would also provide additional funding for the Heritage Account. EX. - If there are 5000 applicants for the tag at \$20. each that would equal \$100,000. as opposed to amount that the auction tags have generated in the past.	EUCAB	Recommend placing on "Hold" due to "Silver State Tag" petition currently being reviewed by NDOW.		*3	
T.11 – Nonresident Guided Hunt	T.11.1	Allocation of tags	With respect to tag allocation, the current system gives guides a special allocation of tags not subject to the draw system. This allocation should be eliminated. All tags for all hunts should be included in the general draw giving all applicants equal chance for a tag.	WACAB	1. NRGH tag allocation is subject to NRS and is based on the previous year quota. There is a draw process.		3	
	T.11.1.2	Allocation of tags	Change the way guides get deer tags, why should they be guaranteed anything?	WACAB		1. NDOW	3	
	T.11.1.3	Allocation of tags	Provide emergency language to be able to alter NRGH quota in case of fires destroying habitat (Area 6) to be able to reduce tag numbers.	PUBLIC			3	
T.12 -Archery Tags	T.12.1	Convert tag	If no harvest in the archery season be allowed to convert the tag to any legal weapon tag.	WACAB			3	
	T.12.2	Quota Allocation	Unlimited Archery tags in most units	TAAHC	1. I disagree with this leave as is. This may cause crowding, more wounding loss on animals and no control on harvest. 2. Encourage primitive weapon hunts by increasing archery tags (modified Demand/Success that approaches unlimited archery tags in many unit groups due to the fact demand could be met without having an appreciable increase in harvest) and possibly primitive muzzleloader hunt that have limited hunter success	2.. NDOW-employee	2	
	T.12.2.1	Quota Allocation	Decrease the amounts of deer tags for archery, split archery seasons, or raise tag fees.	WACAB		1. NDOW	3	
	T.12.2.2	Quota Allocation	Increase the number of archery tags for deer and antelope.	WACAB			3	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

T.12 -Archery Tags	T.12.2.3	Quota Allocation	Go back to statewide on archery tags or two or three larger units groups.	WACAB	1. Archery only in bighorn area.	1. CHCAB	3	
T.13 – Muzzleloader	T.13.1	Bull elk	Muzzleloader season in September to take advantage of the rut.	WACAB			3	
	T.13.2	Deer	Consider taking the muzzleloader deer hunt and moving it from September to November. Make this particular hunt a "High Quality" hunt. It is a primitive weapons hunt but the hunt would truly be a hunt of a lifetime, during the "rut" of course. Nevada opens the hunting season with Archery in August, then right into muzzleloader in September, then right into rifle in October and in some unit's right into a late rifle hunt in November. That is almost 4 straight months of hunting pressure on the deer. By opting for a "Rut" muzzleloader hunt, and relieve pressure on mule deer for the month of September and therefore make the rifle season one of better quality as well. The success rate is much lower with a muzzleloader than that of a rifle and therefore the herd would sustain little damage. You could also put a 5 year waiting period on the tag enabling more hunters to obtain such a hunt.	Public			*3	
	T.13.2.1	Deer	More muzzleloader tags in unit 111	WACAB			*3	
	T.13.3	Primitive vs. Inline	Primitive vs. in line muzzle loader primitive/more tags	NYCAB			*3	
	T.13.3.1	Primitive vs. Inline	Get rid of inline muzzleloader, primitive side lock only.	PECAB			*3	
T.14 - Archery/ Muzzleloader	T.14.1	Sheep and goat	Allocation and season for sheep and goat	WACAB			3	
T.15 -Unit Size/#Units	T.15.1	Unit size	How does the size affect the number of tags allocated for that unit?	TAAHC			*3	
T.16 -Doe Hunt	T.16.1	Deer and antelope doe hunts	1 to 2 % doe harvest in most units. Provides additional hunting opportunity and relief to landowners that may not qualify for the Landowner Damage compensation program.	TAAHC	1. 1-2% doe harvest in certain units		*3	
	T.16.2	Units Groups and Seasons	Cut the state into 3 parts west, east, south. You could apply first, second, third or just one. Tag good all three seasons (bow, black power, and gun). Then when numbers are in, NDOW could pull tags for set unit groups. Like 3 does out of 012-014. Party of 3 or 3 groups of 1 could hunt or one doe out of 194/196.	WACAB		1. PECAB	3	
T.17 -PIW	T.17.1	Units	PIW for unit/units	NYCAB			3	
T.18 - PIW/Heritage Units	T.18.1	Open Units	If a hunting unit has only one tag. Restrict PIW and Heritage from those units. i.e. One California Bighorn Sheep tag in Pershing County. Don't kill four sheep out of that unit by letting the Governor's tag holder and the P.I.W. tag holders harvest sheep out of that unit on top of the one tag quota.	WACAB			2	
T.19 -Volunteer Incentive	T.19.1	Award Bonus points or Tags	Reward volunteers with bonus points or tags after so much volunteer work.	CLCAB			3	
T.20 -Community Service	T.20.1	Dedicated Hunter Tags	Provide tags every year for 3 years as long as they do mandatory community service. There is a flat fee to be a dedicated hunter.	WACAB			3	

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List

T.21 -Report Poacher Incentive	T.21.1	Award Tags	Award tags to persons reporting the crime.	CLCAB			3	
--------------------------------	--------	------------	--	-------	--	--	---	--

Category-Other

Topic	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By	Date Rec'd	TAAHC Recommendation 1. Likely, 2. Has Merit, 3 Doubtful
Mountain Lion	Unit Harvest Objectives	Move away from regional harvest objectives and have unit harvest objectives.	TAAHC				3
	Number of tags	One tag per year/per hunter	HUCAB				3
		Limited number of female lions in the harvest by unit. Go back to unit harvest.	ELCAB				3
Enhance Data Gathering		CWAB make recommendations on how average sportsmen can enhance NDOW's survey efforts	TAAHC				3
Improved Communication		Need better communications at the County Level.	TAAHC	1. Better Support Materials for Season Settings (Arrays)	1. LYCAB		3
Stamps		Access to stamps user friendly to those without Internet access	EUCAB				3
License or Permit	Shed license	Create a new license for antler or horn shed hunters.	CLCAB				3
License or Permit	Nonresident hunters	Charge nonresident hunters a license to hunt coyotes and rabbits in Nevada	ELCAB	Per the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, this item has been elevated from "3" to "2". Request was made by WACAB			*3
Hunting Hours		Change extend hunting hours	WACAB	Nevada's "shooting time ends at sunset" rule precludes one of the two best times of the day for harvesting animals. There is no biological reason for not extending this to 1/2 hour after sunset. Most modern hunting optics work perfectly well at 1/2 hour after sunset. ALL states which border Nevada have the "1/2 hour-after-sunset" regulation, without problems This regulation can only cause confusion (and possible fines) for non-resident hunters.			3

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

OTHER COMMENTS

Topic	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By
				1. Most of the tag allocation ideas I saw on the Committee's brainstorming list are items that I think need to be determined by biologists and others familiar with herd size, herd health, and Department goals for individual herds or hunt units. Public opinion ought not matter in most of these potential changes (i.e. unlimited archery tags, pre-season scouting pressure, rotation of weapon type, etc)	1. WACAB
			CHCAB	Information about TAAHC in with tags to review in depth on the website for general suggestions.	
			WACAB	1. If there is a better more fair way to do it I would like to hear what it is. I feel that NDOW is more than fair to the non-residents and should even reduce the percentage in some areas. The tag allocations have been changed to make it easier for non-residents to apply even with residents. It doesn't need to be changed unless you have a better solution.	1. WACAB
			WACAB	Several times in past years, I and other sportsmen and women that I am acquainted with have sent e-mail questions to the "Contact Us" address on the NDOW Website. To date, virtually NONE of our e-mails have ever been answered in any way, or even referrals given. Each of us that attempt to contact NDOW now feels that NDOW wants anything to do with non-resident customers. I can remember growing up as a boy, my father and uncles were able to teach me respect for wildlife and to love the outdoors. This also translated to me as the proper way to treat and respect all living things. One of the major ways we did this was to go deer hunting in NEVADA year after year, in the same (favorite) area... Well, since 1977 I have gotten drawn for deer tags exactly TWICE, even though I have applied almost every year. NEVADA, what has happened to our recreational (hunting) opportunities, and the opportunities for me to "pass it on" in Nevada????	WACAB
		Landowner	WACAB	I believe the current land owner tag system will be a highly debated topic with Nevada sportsman in the near future. The topic discussed amongst most hunters that I have been associated with, is the fact that most land owner permit holders can hunt from the archery, muzzleloader, thru the general rifle seasons. These hunters have an unfair opportunity to harvest trophy quality animals versus the regular hunter	1. WACAB
		Primitive Weapon Qualification	Public	From my experience hunters want to hunt with primitive weapons because it is easier to draw, but do not realize the difficulties and practice required to hunt with these primitive weapons. If this process continues, then there needs to be a qualification test, especially for archery hunters, because there are a lot of hunters that draw archery tags and have never even touched a bow. This is not right, if you are going to hunt with a weapon you should know how to use it before applying for tags. I think this may result in larger numbers of animals being wounded, which negatively affects populations and hunters.	1. Public
		Application process	Public	The tag application process is also very good, just making a few adjustments to make it better. The internet applications are very easy and quick to apply with. The use of credit cards is also very nice and only having to pay the application fee is good so that hunters can apply for all species. I also believe the bonus points being squared helps to increase draw odd.	Public

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".

**Board of Wildlife Commission
Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Topic List**

Topic	Subtopic	Description	Origin	Comments	Comments Submitted By
		Table Mountain Elk Hunt		<p>1. Rumor has it that there is talk of doing away with the early elk hunt on Table Mountain. This would be a bad idea. The quality of elk herd is excellent and will not be jeopardized by eliminating the early hunt. The gene pool will stay intact. I encourage you to stop reducing tags during the early hunt on Table Mountain.</p>	1. Public Email
		General Comments Received	WACAB	<p>What aspects of the process would you like to see remain the same? Tag Application</p> <p>1. Maintain the internet application process and the opportunity to purchase a bonus point. 2. I am a Nevada resident that applies for big game tags throughout the western US and I feel Nevada's application process is the best of the lot. 3. All except, Quicker results 4. The option of entering the big game draws via internet registration is first rate! Some years ago (before the internet registration option) my party was rejected because the applications did not arrive before the cutoff date. This happened even though the applications were mailed more than 2 weeks before the cutoff. The applications had gotten lost by the U.S. Post Office. Entering the drawings online allows hunters to receive an immediate confirmation number which is on record and is proof the hunter has applied on time. 5. The <u>totally random</u> draw process. 6. Continue to allow residents and non-residents to apply together. 7. Continue the NEW policy for non-residents who apply for the guide tags of not being allowed to apply again for the Main Drawing. 8. I feel that how you have done the tag application has been working well in the past and really see no need to change it. Except for what I stated above with the youths.(17 years of age) 9. Let us continue to let us use credit cards. 10. I BELIEVE THE CURRENT APPLICATION PROCESS WORKS WELL. I AM VERY HAPPY WITH THE INTERNET APPLICATION PROCESS 11. Internet Application (Tags are good) 12. Keep using the Fallon Company 13. Do <u>not</u> limit the number of trophy tags a person can draw in a lifetime. In the event that a person is lucky enough to draw trophy tags early in life, that person would then be forced outside Nevada to fulfill his/her passion of hunting. That person may even give up the sport altogether at an early age, rather than passing on the sport to another generation. Also, poaching could increase due to an absolute lack of opportunity and a sense of entitlement by some who would otherwise at least have <u>hope</u> of someday drawing another trophy tag.</p>	WACAB

This document addresses all submitted topics. Those with the number "3" in the "TAAHC Recommendation" column are topics that the TAAHC, as determined during the July 19, 2007 TAAHC meeting, determined it would not be recommended for Commission approval. The comments addressed in the column "TAAHC/Commission Decision" reflect decisions made by the TAAHC or by the Commission. **In the "TAAHC Recommendation" column beginning on page 9 the * denotes the "TAAHC Recommendation" changes made from the March 21, 2008 meeting. These topic items were originally "2" and have been changed to "3".**