TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the February 1, 2013 Meeting

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) met on 6:30 p.m. on Friday, February 1, 2013 at the Nevada State Museum, 309 South Valley View Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nevada.

PRESENT:	Chairman Jack Robb Rex Flowers Jim Jenne – by phone Joe Crim Michael McBeath
STAFF:	Bob Haughian
OTHERS PRESENT:	Cory Lytle – Lincoln County Advisory Board Karen Layne Rich Haskins - NDOW Mike Cox – NDOW Tony Wasley - NDOW Maureen Hullinger – NDOW Monty Martin – Wildlife Administrative Services
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 and Roll Call of Committee Members, Determination of Quorum – Chairman Robb called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda – Chairman Robb

Joe Crim motioned the approval of the Agenda.

Michael McBeath seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action
The Committee will review the minutes from the December 6, 2012 meeting of the TAAHC and may take action to approve the minutes.

Jim Jenne pointed out a correction to the minutes under paragraph 4, to change Alan Jenne to Jim Jenne.

Joe Crim motioned the committee for approval of the December 6th minutes with the change.

Michael McBeath seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence - Chairman Robb - Informational
Committee members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Committee. Any item requiring Committee action may be scheduled on a future Committee agenda. The Committee will review and may discuss correspondence sent or received by the Committee since the last regular meeting and may provide copies for the exhibit file (Committee members may provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record). Correspondence sent or received by the department will also be discussed.

Michael McBeath stated that the Clark County Advisory Board wanted to know if the TAACH would consider answering some questions they had during the meeting. Chairman Robb state the committee would. Joe Crim stated that at the

Pershing County Advisory Board meeting, because of a quorum issue, they were unable to address questions for the TAACH and asked if they could provide their questions to the committee at a later date. Chairman Robb said they could. Rex Flowers state that the Washoe County Advisory Board has about six different ideas for the TAACH.

Chairman Robb explained to the committee that he had met with Pete Goicoechea and discussed the current law regarding applying for more than 1 sex per season for cow elk and bull elk or doe and buck deer. He said he would like to help hunters get into the field by opening up the draw for both sexes for deer and elk hunts. By doing this, this would increase the pool of applicants and would also help increase the fund to the elk damage fund. Jack Robb stated that Pete Goicoechea said that he would help insert this into the bill.

Jim Jenne said that his County Advisory Board did not get their questions together for the TAACH due to getting new members in.

5. Administrative comments regarding committee charter, TAAHC Topic List and NDOW Web Site – Bob Haughian, Chief of Operations – Informational

Bob Haughian informed the committee that verbiage update was added to the TAACH charter referencing the inclusion of "sociological principles," as requested by the committee at their previous meeting. Bob Haughian also addressed the structure of the TAAHC page of the NDOW website, stressing that the two PowerPoint presentations developed by the previous TAACH from 2006 – 2008 will remain on the website as important historic information.

6. Review NDOW Policy 24, Dated May 13, 2006, "Hunting Opportunities Among Weapons and Hunter Groups" – Chairman Robb - For Possible Action
The Committee will review the P24 and may take action to revise.

Jim Jenne explained to the committee how the review of NDOW Policy 24 has come to the TAACH for review. He said that many hunters and members of the public would like to see a change in how the department allocates the tag quotas to nonresidents. He stated that the hunter's would like to see a straight 10% on all tag quotas to go to nonresidents.

Chairman Robb asked Monty Martin of Wildlife Administrative Services if he could run some numbers as to what percent of Nevada residents get to hunt an ungulate in any given year.

Chairman Robb asked Mike Cox on how the distribution of tag quotas was developed for Policy 24. Mike Cox informed the committee that the intent of Policy 24 was to focus on the distribution of weapon types by species. Rex Flowers suggested a language change to state that only 10% of tags for all ungulates be allocated for nonresidents. Mike Cox doesn't think a 90\10 split on tag allocation would be a good idea for the sheep tags. Chairman Robb said that he would have a hard time giving nonresidents 5% more tags. Mike Cox advised the committee that the nonresidents would bring in more revenue.

Monty Martin reported that he ran the numbers that Chairman Robb had requested for big game applicants only and excluded bear and mountain lion. He came up with 40,211 resident applicants. Out of that number, 24,036 were successful in obtaining 1 or more tags which resulted in 59.77%. For the nonresidents, 17,113 applicants, out of that number, 2,156 were successful in obtaining 1 or more tags which resulted in 12.6%. These numbers do not reflect the remaining draw or the over-the-counter tags.

Cory Lytle commented that he would like see the committee review #2 in Policy 24 to add the economic benefits that hunting provides.

Tony Wasley stated that to do the 90/10 split, it would have to be done by each species, not for all ungulates. Tony explained how the department comes up with the quotas each year and stated that the department allocates a minimum of 10% tags by species to the nonresidents.

Michael McBeath asked why the committee just doesn't modify Policy 24 to reflect what the department is doing in practice. Do it just for the Main Draw that way everyone has had their chance.

Monty Martin said he had miscalculated the numbers of applicants for nonresident and the correction is 17,110 applicants, with 2,092 successful in obtaining 1 or more tags which resulted in 12.23%.

Michael McBeath feels that policy's are meant to be a general guidance and that the policy should approximate the 10%, and that the department should be given the discretion to be flexible when allocating tags for each unit and to come as close as they can to the 10% tag quotas for the nonresidents.

Chairman Robb asked Mike Cox if he could work on some wording for the policy to reflect the allocation of tags to residents and nonresidents. Mike Cox said he would come up with something before the next TAACH meeting using Michael McBeath's suggestion.
Chairman Robb said he would like for the next TAACH meeting for the committee to be able to review the changes for Policy 24, have the committee vote on them and send the changes before the Commission.

Michael McBeath suggested that it would be a challenge to initiate the new policy language change for this year but to have it in place for 2014.

Chairman Robb understands the concern of implementing the new language for the policy too early before having a complete thorough review, but if the new language for the policy is not in place this year before the quota setting in May, the Commission may stand a chance in violating their own policy without going to a 12% tag allocation to nonresidents by the numbers Monty Martin had furnished. Chairman Robb said he would almost be inclined to review the policy at least twice in the next year. He said he would like to see the first change in the policy by taking out the graph that shows the sliding scale of when the percent of tags increase, then change some verbiage in the paragraph above to state the allocation of tags for nonresident to stop at 10% and not have a sliding scale below. If the committee can do this and get the changes for the policy to the Commission before the quota setting, they would not be violating this policy.
Michael McBeath suggested the wording to read "The Commission will establish a goal of a minimum nonresident quota of approximately 10%."

Maureen Hullinger asked if this would also include black bear. Chairman Robb said it would include black bear also.

Michael McBeath motioned to the committee to amend Policy 24, Hunting Opportunities Among Weapons and Hunter Groups, with the reference to the heading of Hunting Opportunity Formula on page 4 with regards to the last sentence to read as follows "The Commission will establish a goal of a minimum nonresident quota of approximately 10%." Therefore striking 50% resident opportunity and also striking at the end of that sentence "for all ungulates as follows" and also striking the box and its contents.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Rex Flowers asked if the committee was going to take out the first two sentences in the policy.

Michael McBeath motioned to the committee to amend his motion to include striking the first two sentences.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Michael McBeath withdrew his motion to restate it.

Michael McBeath moved to amend Policy 24 under the heading of Hunting Opportunity Formula on page 4, by striking the first two sentences, and with regard to the third sentence, it shall read "The Commission will establish a goal of" then striking "50 percent resident opportunity and" continuing "a minimum" add the word "nonresident"" quota of approximately 10%." The final language will read "The Commission will establish a goal of a minimum nonresident quota of approximately 10%." Striking "50% resident opportunity and" striking "for all ungulates as follows" striking the entire box and its contents.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Items for Consideration for Inclusion on the TAAHC Topic List – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action
The Committee will review suggested Tag Allocation and Application Hunt topics received from County Advisory Boards and may take action to add topics to the TAAHC Topic List for future consideration for implementation.

Chairman Robb suggested that since not all of the County Advisory Boards have sent in their topic items, he said that he was inclined to table the topic list agenda item #7.

Joe Crim motioned to table agenda item #7 items for consideration for inclusion and TAACH topic list to allow the committee to get the full input from the County Advisory Boards as to their suggested topic items.

Michael McBeath seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Online Survey Process - Bob Haughian, Chief of Operations – Informational
The online customer survey process used during the 2012 big game tag application process will be explained.

Bob Haughian provided information to the committee on how the online survey process was developed and the results that came from the online survey.

Chairman Robb recalled that when he attended a Washoe County Advisory Board meeting, he had heard comments from the public that they did not see the online survey. Bob Haughian explained that at the end of the online application screen there is a question box asking if you would like to participate in the survey.

Rex Flowers suggested that maybe the next survey questions should be at the beginning of the online application screen. Chairman Robb said he was trying to figure of the best time to have the survey. Do the survey 3 days after the release of the draw results and then send out emails to those who applied online and who furnished an email address. But he also had concerns if done this way; the survey may not be accurate due to if someone was unsuccessful in drawing a tag. He also thought maybe doing the survey 3 days after the close of the application period and asked the committee for their suggestions on this.

Joe Crim thought that doing the survey after applying for tags online was the best way. People would be more inclined to fill out the survey then as opposed to a later date.

Michael McBeath agreed and thought the problem was that it was not prominent enough. He suggested putting the survey in the beginning of the application not at the end.

Bob Haughian explained the reason for the survey at the end of the session of the application was that NDOW and Wildlife Admininstrative Servies were concerned that applicants could lose their application session by going from the application hunt system over to Constant Contact website that hosts the survey. Bob suggested that having something up front of the application session to make it clear that the applicant will have an opportunity to participate in a survey at the end of the application session. And at the confirmation page, have something that will stand out more for the survey. Chairman Robb suggested putting the survey on the draw results site. There, when a hunter checks to see if they were successful in drawing a tag, a question could pop up asking if they would like to participate in a quick survey.
Bob Haughian said that NDOW could explore this option with Constant Contact for the survey.

Maureen Hullinger asked Chairman Robb what the time line would be for the survey. Chairman Robb replied that he would like to see it in place for this year, but in order to do this the committee would need to come up with some fair and accurate survey questions first. He feels that it may not be realistic for this year. Bob Haughian said that to have it in place for this year could be done. If it is to be tied to the draw results, it could be in place by then. Chairman Robb said that he wasn't comfortable with rushing this, but if the committee could get some questions from the CAB's by then it could be a possibility.

9. Possible Survey Questions for TAAHC Use – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action
The Committee will review suggested survey questions received from County Advisory Boards and may take action to use such questions in a survey in 2013 to obtain feedback from Nevada's big game hunters.

(Although this agenda item was not specifically addressed by the committee during this meeting, it was not addressed for the same reason that topics where not addressed in #7 above. Responses from County Advisory boards for survey questions and new items for the TAAHC topic list will be addressed at a future meeting, possibly May.)

10. Public Comment Period - Persons wishing to speak may do so at this time. Public comment will be limited to three minutes. No action can be taken by the Committee at this time; any item requiring Committee action may be scheduled on a future Committee agenda.

No public comment.

11. Future Committee Meetings – Chairman Robb – Informational

The Committee will reconfirm the date and location of the next TAAHC meeting.

Next TAAHC will be scheduled for March 14, 2013 in Reno, time and location will be TBA.

Meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.