

TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the December 6, 2013 Meeting

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) met at 6:30 p.m. on Friday, December 6, 2013 at the City of Reno Commission Chambers, 1 East First St., Reno, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Jack Robb
Rex Flowers
Michael McBeath
Brad Johnston

COMMITTEE

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joe Crim

STAFF: Bob Haughian
Maureen Hullinger

OTHERS PRESENT: Tony Wasley – NDOW Director
Mike Cox - NDOW
Paul Dixon – Clark County Advisory Board (CAB)
Cory Lytle – Lincoln CAB
Don Sefton – Systems Consultants
Greg Smith – Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Professor Ed Krumpe, University of Idaho (UI; participated by phone)

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 5:47 pm.

2. **Approval of Agenda** – Chairman Robb

Michael McBeath motioned to approve the agenda.

Rex Flowers seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. **Approval of Minutes – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action**

The Committee will review the minutes from the October 15, 2013 meeting of the TAAHC and may take action to approve the minutes.

Brad Johnston motioned to approve the minutes.

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.

Chairman Robb informed the committee that it has been a concern from sportsmen and NDOW staff for many years that the Heritage tags, PIW tags, and Dream tags have created an over-harvest in some areas. There was an attempt by a prior Commission to get away from over-harvesting in certain areas by eliminating the unit for hunting

for that year if an animal was harvested in that unit in the previous year. What is in place now isn't working and he stated he had some ideas on this and would like to make this a topic for a future agenda item. Chairman Robb said he doesn't want this over-harvesting in an area to have a biological impact on an area as it has happened in the past. He also stated he believes this is having a negative impact on the marketability of these tags and is not a good biological situation.

5. Review Status of Proposed Survey of Nevada's Big Game Tag Applicants' Attitudes and Preferences – Operations Chief Bob Haughian – For Possible Action

The committee will hear a progress report regarding the development of a survey to gain information from Nevada's big game hunters. The committee may further define the scope, content and administration of the survey.

Bob Haughian informed the committee he invited Professor Ed Krumpke from the Department of Conservation Social Sciences at the College of Natural Resources, University of Idaho (on the phone to participate in this meeting) to give the committee a status update on the survey. Bob explained that Dr. Krumpke and Dr. Sanyal (also of the UI) prepared the survey, with initial input from NDOW biologists. The survey consists of 41 questions. At the time of this meeting the construction of the survey is estimated at the 98% complete. Bob reported he would like the committee to have the chance to examine and evaluate the survey at this point.

Brad Johnston said he had a comment on question number 4 on the survey. He said he knows a lot of people who hunt do not define their trophy hunt on an objective measure but on their subjective views, and if you ask them what they are looking for when hunting, they would reply that they will know it when they see it. He stated that not everyone is looking for the Boone and Crocket deer.

Michael McBeath said it has been his observation over the past 10 or 15 years that most of the trophy hunters he has been associated with will classify a deer with the Boone and Crocket measurements. The language for a trophy hunt from the standards of a trophy hunter is now in terms of gross score class. Another way hunters use terms for scoring seems to be the 30 inch mule deer. He suggested maybe the language used in the survey for identifying a trophy hunt should be looked at.

NDOW Director Tony Wasley replied to Mike McBeath that he understood what he is saying, and can see this being an issue when it comes to the issue of "scale" of the hunter population, meaning that it is reasonable to assume the whole population of hunter's can identify a buck, and a smaller subset of the hunter population can identify the point class, and yet an even smaller subset of the hunter population can approximate the width, and an even smaller subset of the hunter population can identify the Boone and Crocket score. A trophy hunt is in the eye of the beholder, and by NDOW placing a specific survey response choice such as "24 inch" or "30 inch," NDOW might be viewed as imposing our standard on the respondents. Director Wasley felt that leaving the question more open would provide the respondent more of an opportunity to perhaps choose point class or choose antler spread or choose Boone and Crocket score, thereby letting the respondent better define what a trophy hunt means to them.

Professor Krumpke concurred with Director Tony Wasley. He informed the committee the question was written this way because it was just more of a place holder and if the Department wants to ask a question regarding trophy size, he was open to asking it in a broader sense. He also stated not to rely on the public to give a real detailed answer on this question.

Chairman Robb agrees and said that everyone has their own interpretation of what a trophy hunt is.

Brad Johnston said under question 9 of the survey, he would like to see a survey question geared to "Introducing others to hunting" or "passing on the tradition."

Professor Krumpke informed the committee he could add another survey question to include "Introducing others to hunting."

Mike Cox stated with his own experience with developing surveys in the past, if you don't give the survey people side boards they may give you an answer that you are not sure where to connect the dots to as why they really said what they did. He offered maybe that there needs to be in the context of trophy hunting "I am an opportunity hunter and I expect a tag every x years." If you don't, then you may not know why they said what they said in the survey. Split it into a two-part question, because there is a huge dichotomy of folks that play the game as to "I don't care what I harvest; I just want a tag every year." You need to ask the question of why do they have different expectations, and a hunter who is in a waiting

period for 5 years, you need to ask why is he waiting 5 years? Is it because he is a trophy hunter? Knowing this might confirm that.

Professor Krumpe agreed and stated he could devise a survey question that would ask the respondent to classify themselves--do they primarily consider themselves a trophy hunter or an opportunity hunter? This way, depending on how they answer the question, we might get a better answer.

Chairman Robb clarified the reason behind this survey is to find out how many trophy hunters vs. opportunity hunters are out there. This survey would help the Commission on how it should interact to satisfy the broader group of hunting constituents and not just the people who show up at the meetings.

Paul Dixon stated when he gets a deer tag he would always fill his tag regardless of the size of the deer, even if he is looking for that trophy deer. He doesn't want just a bunch of mounts on his wall, but wants to have something that exceeds what he has as an expectation and if he doesn't find it, he would harvest merely for food. He stated that he felt this question needs to capture that point.

Brad Johnston identified in question 6, item D of the survey, "seeing harvestable deer" be broken down to other questions such as seeing trophy deer, seeing Boone and Crocket deer. This would identify further attributes by adding more selections to this question. He also identified item F "Being able to hunt mule deer every year" and suggested adding "being able to hunt the area I want to hunt even if it takes several draws" or some sort of time frame.

Michael McBeath commented there are numerous wilderness areas that hunters now have to deal with and would like somewhere in the survey to find out what the sportsmen's attitudes are regarding wilderness areas hunts. He informed the committee that when he talks to hunter, there seems to be a contingent of hunters that absolutely hate the wilderness areas and there are others who believe that wilderness areas provide opportunity for certain hunters. He stated he would be interested in finding out what the hunters are thinking in regards to the wilderness areas as to whether they are willing to hunt it. He felt the way tags are being issued has an impact on the wilderness areas. From his own personal experience, few hunters are willing to hunt the wilderness areas as opposed the non-wilderness area and he informed the committee he was interested in seeing a survey question to address attitudes of the hunters toward wilderness area hunts.

Paul Dixon said what he has seen in the bimodal distribution, there is an age distribution. People who are over the age of 60 – 65 don't have the athletic ability like they had in their 30's, 40's or 50's, or people who have a physical limitation resent that we have wilderness areas and they are unable to hunt it. What he would like to see on the survey is the age demographic and believes the answer would be tied to the age demographic up to 85% to 90% in the wilderness area hunt responses.

Bob Haughian informed Paul Dixon that towards the end of the survey there is a question that touches on age and physical limitations and believes it would be captured on the survey.

Director Tony Wasley wonders how this survey would change our management and when thinking of the issue of wilderness. It is a good question, but would suggest that the question be presented with potential management options in mind and perhaps asking the question if someone would favor a wilderness area hunt. This would get to the bigger questions of how we could better distribute hunters, are we leaving a lot of opportunity on the table because of wilderness area restrictions and people's inability to hunt these areas due to physical limitations? Where does the department land on management actions to better utilize the resources that are there?

Michael McBeath asked if it is possible to solve the problem by having a tag quota for a general hunt that would allow the hunter who drew that tag to go both within and outside the wilderness areas anywhere in the unit, but then have a special designation to have a wilderness-only hunt where the hunter actually applies to hunt those restricted areas. This would help distribute those tags in those units where hunters are willing to hunt the wilderness area and for those who do not want to hunt the wilderness area. He stated that he would like to know the numbers of hunters who would be willing to hunt the wilderness areas if there was a wilderness-only hunt.

Paul Dixon stated on question 18 of the survey there is a question regarding how satisfied a hunter was on their hunt, or if they didn't draw a tag they would be instructed to skip to the next question. But there are some hunters who drew a tag and returned it to the department. The current question structure does not allow for survey participants to address the turn-in of their tag.

Brad Johnston had a concern with question 18 in the survey, because he drew a tag for the early season in unit 212 and felt it would be very hard to answer some of these questions. He stated it was extraordinarily hot at the time of his hunt. During his hunt he saw deer but it was very late in the day and there was little opportunity. To answer this question on how satisfied was he on his hunt would be difficult because of the way the question is phrased.

Professor Krumpe suggested including on the survey an open ended question allowing the respondent to explain their answer or tell us more.

Brad Johnston asked if there could be a question asking what the hunter thinks resulted in their being satisfied or dissatisfied with their hunting experience. Professor Krumpe said there could be a way to pose the question so the survey taker would understand as to Brad Johnston's request.

Brad Johnston also suggested adding another question to determine the number of deer seen as to what the respondent believes was the greatest factor in their answer to the previous survey question? That could deal with hunter congestion, weather or something to that affect. We need a way to determine why the person answered each question the way they did without making it an open ended question, so hopefully we would get additional information instead of lacking responses from an open-ended question.

Bob Haughian informed the committee that he, Professor Krumpe and Professor Sanyal discussed at length question 19 on the survey as to whether it should be broken down to sub-questions (A, B and C) or combine into one response. He asked Professor Krumpe to elaborate.

Professor Krumpe explained to put down "loss of habitat" and then using parenthesis adding "drought/wildfires/development," so the general concept is how hunters perceive loss of habitat and the parenthesis would clarify that. He said it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to ask them separately and NDOW couldn't use the information separately if you can't manage for it.

Director Tony Wasley said it really depends on what you want to do with the answers to the question and if the results would be used for the department's educational processes rather than directing the department's management activity. It would make more sense to have them separated from an analytical ability to assess the numbers of our hunters who view the loss of habitat vs. predator loss vs. disease then it would make sense to have it combined. So we would need to ask ourselves what the intent of this question is, or is it that we want to have a better understanding of the public's perspective of limiting factors for mule deer, and does that mean we are going to use more educational resources or is it something else?

Professor Ed Krumpe informed the committee the more you split hairs on a question the greater the burden it is on the people to answer it.

Paul Dixon asked if the habitat loss due to development would include mining, wind, energy, oil, gas, or is it about housing development, because we have a public lands committee it might be beneficial to share that info with the committee. Including the question might tell us how many people perceive energy development or mining in this state as having an effect on wildlife. It does have an impact on mule deer migration in some circumstances and how does the public feel about it. He suggested keeping the word "development" in the question or at least define the word "development" in the question.

For question 10, Chairman Robb commented about how satisfied you were on drawing a tag for mule deer. He would like to see accompanying that question a question related to how satisfied a respondent is with the management of mule deer in the state of Nevada, and under current conditions do you see yourself continuing to hunt in the next 5 years or the next 10 years. Then we would be able to see if conditions stay the same, if hunters would drop out of hunting.

Mike Cox suggested asking how many times of not drawing a tag would it take before you to quit deer hunting and leave the activity for the rest of your life. He asked Chairman Robb if this is what he was trying to get at.

Professor Krumpe explained part of the difficulty to ask this question is it would be a hypothetical question and it is hard for people to answer what their threshold might be.

Cory Lytle recalled he had spoken with someone who was a life-long sportsman, and the sportsman stated "I don't know how this board (Wildlife Board of Commissioners) works or even what you guys do at NDOW". Cory stated that multiple times he has explained to people to go on NDOW's website, read what's there and pay attention to the issues being

discussed by the CABs and commission. Cory also said he believes people need to be educated and is surprised how many people do not know how the system works.

Michael McBeath asked what information we are trying to get at on question 38 on the survey in regards to residency.

Bob Haughian explained the survey question is in line with the residency question presented in the Nevada Wildlife Data System (NWDS) (NDOW's licensing system). Bob Haughian asked Don Sefton with SCI if he would explain further.

Don Sefton explained that when someone purchases a license through the website or at the counters, there are a series of questions. Most customers are residents, but there are others who may qualify as a resident by virtue of another rule. An example would be if you are a student in this state and don't hold a license in your resident state, then you would qualify for resident license even if you have not met the 6 month residency requirement. The same applies to military members that are here on official orders; they qualify for residency although they have not been here 6 months unless they have taken a license in their home state as a resident.

Brad Johnston asked that perhaps other questions should be added, such as do you put in for other species, check all that apply; if you don't draw a big game tag, and do you still hunt upland game or waterfowl. He said he would like to get a little more information regarding their habits and what are the other things they do beside hunt big game. Also he said he would like to know if a person does not draw a tag do they go hunting with someone that did.

Chairman Robb also agreed with getting more information in regards to other hunting activity besides big game.

Paul Dixon would like to also add if you did not draw a tag and you are out hunting with someone else, do you buy a mountain lion tag?

Michael McBeath noticed in addition to dealing with mule deer and other issues in the survey, what about a question on muzzleloader such as what the hunter may think in terms of a muzzleloader being a primitive weapon.

Paul Dixon voiced a concern that sportsmen may or may not understand that this sporting heritage is under attack by people who have a different value set and who would like to change how we work things. He asked how we could capture in the survey to instill the need for their participation in meetings, and to educate themselves on these changing issues.

Director Tony Wasley asked Professor Krumpe if there is a responder bias and does he see a higher level of response from those who care more on hunting issues.

Professor Krumpe informed the committee he has had some experience with that and usually the general public is pleased with knowing these surveys are being done and this allows them to have a voice to be heard. He also reported that in Idaho he has specifically explained that the survey is scientifically formulated to speak to the general population of hunters. You do the random sample; you get a feel for what people care about and get a decent response rate.

Bob Haughian reported the next step to the survey process would be the random selection of 1,200 respondents to take the survey and to pass the randomly selected data to the University of Idaho. Bob estimated by the second week of January the survey information will be sent out to those who are selected.

6. Elk Hunt Management Strategies – Program Officer Maureen Hullinger – Informational

The Department is considering new elk hunt management strategies to include: removal of depredation hunts from the bonus point program; antlerless elk management tag awarded when a deer tag is drawn within specified units; antlerless elk management tag awarded when an antlered elk tag is drawn; allow applications for both antlered elk and antlerless elk in the same draw period; and implementation of spike hunts. This report addresses those strategies and the related application process options.

Maureen Hullinger stated that in September the department big game staff biologist Mike Cox presented the 7 strategies to the commission and public. The department was then subsequently tasked with developing regulations for the implementation of the strategies, to address the application process, species application eligibility and party methodology. Two of the strategies do not require any eligibility or regulatory changes and there is intent to present those at the February 2014 Commission meeting during the season setting. These are the wilderness-only antlerless elk hunts and the "any legal weapon" for antlerless elk hunt. These would be identified as hunter choices in an established time frame and do not need any direction from the public. The remaining 5 strategies require decisions and some permanent regulation changes in order to implement and to also have adequate direction to draft the application eligibility commission regulation for the February commission meeting.

The strategies left to do are the removal of the depredation hunts from the bonus point program and antlerless elk management tag awarded when a deer tag is drawn. The new informal name would be the "Delk" tag--antlerless elk tag awarded when an antlered elk tag is drawn and allow applications for both antlered elk and antlerless elk in the same draw period and the spike hunt. Descriptions of the 5 strategies were sent out to the public to determine their views on these application eligibility issues. If any of these strategies are approved, the harvest of any additional elk would assist the department in reaching their elk management goals and when implemented, would provide additional application eligibility for antlerless tags and offer more opportunities for hunters in the field. NDOW went out with a worksheet to the CABs to complete and then send back to NDOW with their responses. Maureen Hullinger touched on the responses received from the CABs.

Strategy 1 was to remove depredations hunts from the bonus point program. The rationale that was presented is to harvest an elk regardless of age, class or antler size was the premise for the regulatory change. For example, on the bull elk depredation hunt, applicants that are building points are more likely to trophy hunt. Once they draw the tag they would not likely shoot a bull if the antlers were not considered large enough. Of the nine counties that responded, six counties support strategy 1, two counties opposed and one county had no comment. Elko County supports the concept but had additional comments to allow the depredation tag to be sold over the counter or First Come First Serve. Lyon County opposed, stating they did not feel it would have the desired effect and they don't believe hunter behavior would be affected. In addition, bonus points should accrue so unsuccessful applicants could have a better chance to draw on the subsequent year.

Rex Flowers commented it was his understanding it was voted on to do away with bonus points. Those who do have bonus points would still be able to use them in the draw until they drew a tag for that species, but once their bonus points were gone they would not accrue anymore points.

Mike Cox stated the Game Division's intent was they really wanted management bull criteria. This is what is going to be needed but it will be messy with much discussion that will take several meetings to come up with a solution. This strategy was more of a plan "D" to somehow get the depredation hunters to harvest the first bull they see in the field, but ultimately if we had criteria we could get these hunters to harvest something other than a 380 class bull.

Paul Dixon said that at his last CAB meeting one of the things that Elko brought up was going to "over the counter" tags. Paul asked Don Sefton if you basically could accommodate an over the counter tag by just making an unlimited or a number of tags available and setting a quota on how many animals you want harvested. This would be like how we now do it for the mountain lion tags. Then once we reach the quota you are done. He also asked if a special draw could be done during the year and would it have the same impact just for depredation.

Don Sefton explained that the main draw period is roughly from the middle of March to the third Monday in April, and as for the over the counter tags you have a different time span. He stated having a special draw for the over the counter would not be economical or convenient.

Cory Lytle said one of the things he could see is not having 500 tags put over the counter in certain units. He said he would see a lot smaller quota and a lot tighter areas with more restrictions on unit groups.

Michael McBeath stated when some of the people brought up the over the counter tags, what came to light in his mind is there are two types of depredation hunts. One was in Eureka and Elko counties, where they want to eliminate elk because of the conflict with livestock. The other would be harvesting many elk from a smaller area, like the one on the Atlanta Farms. You are trying to remove a specific animal from a farm within a specific unit in the state. He could see where the over the counter tags would work in the areas where you would just want to eliminate elk from a bigger area, but he doesn't see how it would work in a small area like the Atlanta Farms.

Rex Flowers did not feel the over the counter tags would be a way to go, but maybe the department and the commission should be looking at a much larger quota number in area 10 and 14. The commission had made a commitment to not have elk in those areas.

Director Tony Wasley explained we have issues with some of the landowners who have elk on their private lands and are not allowing access to sportsmen to hunt there. We had quotas of 100 to 120 tags but the hunter's success rate was in the single digits in terms of percentages. There are a lot of frustrated hunters who tried to balance the opportunity, but when landowners on one hand claim they don't want elk on their property, but on the other hand don't want to open up access to the hunters who don't pay \$2,000 each for access, this puts the department in an awkward position and we don't feel right in selling those numbers of tags to hunters who are not

granted access. This is a delicate balance. Sometimes just having the hunters in the field, maintaining a presence in and around the irrigated fields, would keep the animals at bay. There has also been some law enforcement concerns on making the tags too readily available and having too many tags out there but too few elk. The frustration may mount and you may see an increase in illegal harvest.

Brad Johnston asked if the success rate on the depredation hunts is lower than NDOW expects.

Mike Cox replied it varies depending on the objective. The Atlanta Farms hunt has a 60% to 70% success rate; the Ruby's has about a 30% to 40% success rate.

Brad Johnston stated if the goal for the success rate is not 100% then there seems to be a need to change the bonus point system because hunters are not taking animals with depredation tags and if you are meeting goal with the bonus point system in place now, why change it. Example would be if you take 100 depredation tags, want to see a 50% harvest rate and you are meeting that now, why are we talking about changing the bonus point system?

Mike Cox explained it was not because of the success rate. We could have a higher success rate if hunters' expectation were lower or didn't care what type of bull they were taking. There is a theory which could be valid by having accrued bonus points. With bonus points, you have an investment and with this investment, it means you are going to have a higher expectation. But without this investment, your expectation might be lower.

Chairman Robb suggested that maybe in the next year to do away with the depredation hunts all together in Eureka County and see how the "Delk" hunt works in those areas.

Mike Cox reported he spoke with a couple of his counterparts in Utah over the past few months and one of the methods they use is an elk control permit to alleviate elk in these elk-free zones which allows the deer hunters to pick up an elk tag in addition to their deer tag.

Director Wasley explained he wanted to provide some clarification regarding the bonus point. What it really boils down to is the expectation comes with the accumulation of bonus points, and that limits the department's ability to be as effective with the intended purpose of the hunt which is depredation. He believes the accumulation of bonus points creates an expectation. When people build more bonus points they get higher expectations which then limits our ability to issue more tags. This doesn't serve its intended purpose. We do not allow a hunter to apply for an additional bull tag when they are in a waiting period. So they would then apply for an elk depredation tag and this would then change the expectation and interferes with the intended purpose which makes it difficult for the department to have realistic expectations to be used as a depredation hunt and not used as a trophy hunt.

Maureen Hullinger explained that strategy number 2 - the antlerless elk management tag is awarded if a deer tag is drawn, the newly coined "Delk" tag. The premise is to increase cow elk harvest without adding additional hunters and hunter congestion during the existing mule deer hunt seasons. This antlerless elk tag is considered a management antlerless elk tag without any bonus points associated with it. If this is approved, then there will be a regulation change to include that language to exclude it from the bonus point program. There are two sections to strategy 2, the first is to support or not to support the concept, the second is, if supported, to address the application eligibility that the public would like to see associated with other elk applications. To address the concept, there were nine counties that responded, eight of the counties supported it and one county had no comment. Clark County supports it with the additional comment to consider adding the youth hunt for the "Delk" option and consider looking into legislative action to have a separate fee for the antlerless elk management tag at a lower rate of \$60 so to entice people to apply. Douglas County supports it with additional comment that the over the counter elk tag be made available when needed to decrease the elk population. Lincoln County supports it, stressing strong consideration should be given to the individual CAB and biologist recommendations in specific units or unit groups tested on a small scale. Lyon County supports it with the additional comment they were optimistic on the desire effect. Washoe County supports it with the additional comment to include nonresident applicants.

The second part of this strategy is the eligibility which deals with an antlerless elk management tag option on a deer tag application. There is a need to know how to handle this on a deer tag party application. There are two options for this. Option one, to only have the "Delk" available to single applicants. Option two, have it available on deer party applications where each individual in a party can opt to participate in the "Delk" but not all party members are required to participate. It was pretty much a unanimous vote from the counties who were for option 2.

The eligibility on 2B of the "Delk" eligibility, does the public want hunters to be able to receive 2 or more antlerless elk tags, and depending on what eligibility option is selected, someone could randomly draw up to 3 tags but there could be other applicants that don't draw an antlerless elk tag at all? There were 4 options for them to look at. Option 1 - only in the same draw, one application for eligibility on any type of antlerless elk tag. They would have to choose either the "Delk" option or the regular antlerless elk hunt or the depredation elk if available. Option 2 - in the same draw allow all applications for all antlerless elk tags with the knowledge there could be successful applicants with 3 tags and others without any tags for cow elk. Option 3 - in the same draw allow applications for all antlerless elk tags, but once a tag is drawn, all other outstanding antlerless elk applications become unsuccessful thus earning a bonus point where applicable. Option 4 - allow applications for the regular antlerless elk and the "Delk" application, and if the depredation elk management is approved as a hunt, it would be excluded without the option to apply with the potential of an applicant drawing only 2 tags. Out of the responses from the counties, one county voted for option 1, seven counties voted for option 3, and one county had no comment.

Eligibility 2C, the "Delk" application eligibility with an antlered elk general application - allow for applicants to apply for the antlered elk category and allow for an application on the antlerless elk management (Delk). The antlerless elk management tag option would not affect the eligibility on the bull elk tag because they are two separate applications, one is the category for bull elk and the other is for the deer application with the antlerless elk management tag. There would be the potential of someone drawing a bull elk tag, deer tag and a cow elk tag. The response from the counties on this option was five supported it, three opposed and one had not comment. Clark County supports it with the additional comment of the support vote was split 4-1, due to the perception issue of one board member. Lyon County supports it with the additional comment to keep the bull elk eligibility so to get the sportsmen to check the box for the "Delk" tag.

Greg Smith asked the committee if these hunts would have a conflict with the regular hunt season.

Director Tony Wasley informed him that NDOW does not see a conflict and when setting the season for these hunts, they may overlap by only a few days. And because NDOW manages the deer population a little differently, with different objections than elk, we are more concerned with upsetting bull elk hunters and deer hunters than the cow elk hunters. If there is a conflict, the online process for the application would have an informative drop down box for the hunters to acknowledge there is an overlap in the season.

Mike Cox clarified the original intent of the season date for the "Delk" tag is that you could use the antlerless elk management tag during the same season and time period as your deer tag. But there could be a restriction on the cow tag regarding where you can hunt in the unit.

Brad Johnston asked if he could go back to agenda item #1 of survey and would like to have some questions on mule deer hunting to determine if you had a chance to take a cow elk during your deer hunt, would you do so and why. He stated at his last CAB meeting it was brought up that if a deer hunter is out hunting they may be really focused on harvesting a trophy deer and on day 1, day 2 or day 3 if they see a cow elk, they are not going to take the time to pack that animal out. An opportunity hunter who just wants the meat may take the animal. Then a question on if you harvested your deer, are you going to stay out in the field longer to try and get a cow elk. He thinks these are questions that need to be in the survey. He believes these are some questions that would help us understand how the hunter's behavior might be and help to see if the "Delk" concept will achieve the desire result.

Chairman Robb suggested on trying the "Delk" hunt out for a year, this would be more beneficial than to have it in the survey.

Maureen Hullinger explained strategy 3 - antlerless elk management tag awarded if a bull elk tag was drawn. A similar concept as the "Delk," but with a bull elk tag drawn with the option of the cow tag associated with it. The premise for this antlerless elk tag is to increase opportunity to harvest a cow elk without hunter congestion during the regular hunting season. This is considered an antlerless elk management tag without any bonus points. The response from the counties were five support it, three oppose and one with no comment. Lincoln County supports it with the additional comment that would allow a hunter with the opportunity to harvest a cow elk if a bull tag was obtainable without affecting eligibility. Lyon County supports it with the additional comment to combine strategy 3 and 4 for cow elk hunters not to be penalized. Like 2B option 3 which was in the same draw allow applications for all antlerless elk tags, but once a tag is drawn, all other outstanding antlerless elk applications become unsuccessful thus earning a bonus point where applicable.

Brad Johnston explained the thought process behind this comment from Lyon County was if you adopt strategy 4, where someone could apply for both the antlered and antlerless elk in the same draw period, then in addition to

getting a cow tag linked to their bull tag, the possibility of drawing a bull tag and 2 cow tags would apply. If you adopt strategies 3 and 4, someone who draws their bull tag and link the cow elk tag, then the application for the separate cow elk tag would be deemed unsuccessful and they don't lose their bonus points.

Maureen Hullinger explained strategy 3A eligibility – the applicant is already applying for two elk, the antlered bull elk and the antlerless elk management tag, should they be eligible to apply for the antlerless elk tag category also. The response from the counties were 2 supports it, 3 opposed, 4 with no comment. Washoe County supports it with additional comment of once an antlerless cow tag is drawn, then all other cow elk applications are deemed unsuccessful.

Paul Dixon believes once a bull elk hunter draws his tag, he is not going to be thinking about a cow elk at that time, and to award both a cow elk tag along with a bull tag you would not be meeting any sort of objectives for reducing cows.

Maureen Hullinger explained strategy 4 – allow both antlered and antlerless elk applications in the same draw period. This strategy is already directed at our established general hunts which would allow an applicant to apply for both an antlerless elk and a bull elk in the main draw application process with the premise that a hunter is able to harvest a cow elk and don't want to miss out on accumulating bull elk bonus points. This would allow bull elk hunters to harvest a cow elk while they are waiting for their bull elk tag to be drawn. The response from the counties were 8 supports it, 1 oppose it.

The application eligibility option 1 for strategy 4 – allow a random draw on both but restrict the success to one tag. Option 2 – allow random draw on both with an un-restricted success that would allow both applications to go through the draw and the potential of drawing both tags. Option 3 – determine the results for the antlered bull elk application first, if unsuccessful, the cow elk application would go through or if the bull elk application was successful then the cow elk application would be deemed unsuccessful. This option would be a dramatic change to the current draw process that would require significant programming changes. Option 4 – is the opposite of option 3 with the cow elk application results first which would determine if the bull elk application would go through or be deemed unsuccessful. Again, this would require significant programming changes. Option 5 – leave it alone and keep it the way it currently is.

Maureen Hullinger explained strategy 5 – initiate spike bull elk hunts and select unit groups where there are over population objectives, start with small quotas and increase once hunters success rate is estimated for a given unit group. Utah's spike hunt success rate is typically around 15%. The response from the counties were 4 supports it, 4 oppose it, 1 was no comment.

The eligibility for 5A – would an applicant be able to apply for other elk hunts in the same draw period? Option 1 – ineligible to apply for any other bull elk when applied for a spike elk. They would have to choice between genders on the bull elk hunt. Option 2 – allow both the cow elk and spike elk application in the same draw and with the possibility of drawing both tags. Option 3 – allow a bull elk application and a spike elk application in the same draw and with the possibility of drawing both tags. Option 4 – allow all elk applications for bull, cow and spike in the same draw and with the possibility of drawing all three tags. Option 5 – allow all elk applications but once one is drawn the other applications would deem unsuccessful.

Rex Flowers stated he opposed the spike hunt because you may have a hunter who may shoot a larger than spike bull unintentionally or claim they could not tell if it had other points attached to it. This would be hard on our Law Enforcement and would be opening ourselves up for people to be doing the wrong thing.

Cory Lytle stated Lincoln County supported the concept for a spike elk hunt. He said they would like to have a discussion on a management bull hunt and get a description of what a management bull is and what a spike is, then put that out there to the hunters.

Brad Johnston said during a commission meeting, the public was asking what the definition of a spike hunt is, and after discussion, the public's reaction was that they are going to start killing babies.

Mike Cox reported when the spike hunt regulation was passed he did not support it at the time because all of the other western states have spike hunts. The reason they have them is to save yearling from being killed, they are saving the 2 point yearlings because they harvest so hard and their bull ratio's are in the teens. NDOW wants spikes harvested because there are not enough bulls being harvested because people have high expectations. If they do not see a 380 bull, they won't take a bull. We need the bulls harvested but at the same time an antlered

restricted hunt does have its baggage. The positive side of a spike hunt that we know from science is that a lot of spikes disperse and leave as 2 year olds. You can cull a fair number of spikes and not see an impact down the road of losing a cohort.

Michael McBeath stated he had a problem with a hunt based on point class, and would rather see more points than a spike hunt. We could take a 3 or 4 bull point bull without a problem if we have too many bulls.

Brad Johnston commented that we should be more aware of the counties who are being affected by the elk numbers, and the ranchers are the people whose livelihood is most affected. He believes their input is perhaps more worthy for consideration than everyone else.

7. **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.

Paul Dixon stated that the vice chairman of Clark CAB wanted him to bring up to the TAAHC the concept of a media tag from a landowner that would push for the wounded warrior or the youths with disabilities. He believes this would get more positive hunter public interaction than pushing for a trophy media tag. At a time where we are being asked about our values and ethics on hunting, it might be nice to have on the mass media to show a very positive side of what we do.

8. **Future Committee Meetings – Chairman Robb – Informational**
The Committee will reconfirm the date and location of the next TAAHC meeting.

Next TAAHC meeting is to be determined at a later date.

Meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

DRAFT - Pending Committee Approval