

INFORMATION PAPER

#14 D

AGENDA ITEM:

On Line Hunt Application Changes/Amendments after Application Submission

***NOTE:** This informational item was first identified as an agenda item for the May 15 & 16, 2009 commission meeting. Although listed on the agenda exclusive of support material, this paper was created days before the May meeting in an effort to “walk” the commissioners through the topic. Of course the short fall was that CAB members did not have full visibility on the issue and the proposal being made by the department.*

With this in mind, this topic is now scheduled again for discussion at the June commission meeting. This time, support material—this document—will be made available for the public. The desire for the June meeting is for the CABs to discuss this issue at their local meetings and to provide feedback to the commission. Your comments should be included in the minutes of your local meeting, and those minutes should be made available to the commission no later than the week of June 22nd. You are also encouraged to send specific comments regarding this topic to Bob Haughian, Chief, Operations Division (bhaughian@ndow.org), not later than Wednesday, June 24th.

Discussion follows:

ISSUE: Chairman Lent has been contacted by several hunters that want to be able to change or amend their application submitted on line. Chairman Lent requested this be put on the commission agenda as an item for discussion.

Although Nevada does not have a current “amendment” process in place, what are the other existing processes allowed for Nevada?”

- Prior to the draw, an applicant can withdraw an application via letter request to WAS. The applicant does not lose a bonus point, no bonus point is earned, and the applicant does not participate in the draw. Non-refundable fees are retained by the department
- Return of tag for military deployment, death or medical reason. Tag fee is refunded, and eligibility and bonus points reinstated. Non-refundable fees are retained by the department
- “Return of Tag for Any Reason.” For reasons outlined under current NAC guidance

How are we defining “amendment?”

- An amendment would be any change made to an on-line application prior to an established deadline date. Scenarios like the following:

- “I submitted my application for the wrong weapon type, can I change my application?”
- “I submitted my application with only one unit choice. Now I want to select all five choices. Can I do that?”
- “I intended to submit my daughter for a youth hunt, but I submitted her in the main draw. Can I change it?”
- “I selected cow elk and wanted to select bull elk. Can I change it?”

Can an amendment process be established for Nevada?

- Yes. We see this as a hunter-friendly initiative

How could the process work for Nevada?

- Under a possible scenario of extensive programming, this could be a nightmare to address all the possibilities. However, the simplest proposal is to allow the application to be withdrawn, and then allow the applicant to resubmit the correct application (at a cost). This represents a change to the original application without the programming and system complexity by simply substituting a new application

At what time frame would we allow an amendment of an application?

- We could allow an on-line application to be withdrawn and an amended application submitted by the application deadline date
- Additionally, we are proposing two other post-application deadline allowances. Not later than the Monday following the application deadline (i.e., one week after the close of the application deadline):
 - an applicant can withdraw an application (but not resubmit an amended application) and/or
 - an applicant can purchase bonus points
- This would allow an applicant who recognized an error after the application deadline and avoid obtaining an unwanted tag and depriving someone else of that opportunity. Suppose the hunter accidentally applied for archery when he wanted Any Legal Weapon. The hunter could withdraw the application and enter a bonus point only application
- The applicant could also purchase bonus points. This gives sportsmen who miss the deadline a second opportunity to at least maintain bonus points

What are the Pros and Cons?

- Pros
 - Hunter Friendly
 - Self funding (paid for by the non-refundable original app fee on the withdrawn application and could be supplemented by a "withdrawal fee" if desired)
 - Relatively small administrative burden (doesn't require hand entry or editing of withdrawals or new applications)
 - One time programming costs
 - Fewer tags going to hunters who can't use them (i.e., remedy for inadvertent or unintended weapon or area choices)
- Cons
 - Sportsmen who don't make mistakes tend to be unforgiving of sportsmen who make mistakes and some even feel that assisting those with mistakes unfairly increases the odds for people who don't make mistakes (i.e., by putting "more people into the competition")
 - Timing makes it an untenable solution for paper apps--i.e, withdrawals will need to be confined to the 94% of those who apply on-line

Will regulation change be required?

- Yes, initial assessment of this proposal indicates change will be required for NAC (not NRS)

What are the programming costs?

- The contractor has already done the lion share of the programming in support of Utah's amendment processes. Most of the work would be moving the Utah code into the Nevada process and customizing it to fit the differences in the Nevada process
- To program, test, document, train for the **amendment process**, the total cost estimate is **\$6,750**. This will include the web sites (session/confirmation based withdrawals, license purchase issues, ability to withdrawn individual members of groups, etc.) and back end posting/edit issues

- To program, test, document and train for the added **bonus point process**, the contractor can use whole pieces of their Utah efforts, but will still require some customization to fit Nevada's specific draw. The total cost estimate is **\$5,400**
- Total Cost for both: **\$12,150**

Does this proposal introduce the potential for additional revenue?

- Yes, by comparison to the number of Utah applications, we estimate the following potential increase in revenue for NDOW (as a percentage (52%) of Utah amounts):

	<u>UTAH</u>	<u>NEVADA</u>	<u>NEVADA REVENUE</u>
# of Applications	291,000	151,000	
# of Amendments	500	260*	\$2,600**
# of Bonus Points (post deadline)	5,000	2,594*	\$25,940
ESTIMATED ANNUAL REVENUE:			\$28,540

* estimates for Nevada
 ** \$10 applicant fee only

What is the desire of the Commission?

To be determined—however, initial feedback from the commission at the May meeting was favorable. Now the commission wants to hear from the public and CABs.