TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the June 21, 2013 Meeting

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) met on 8:00 a.m. on Friday, June 21, 2013 at the Bristlecone Convention Center, 150 6th Street, Ely, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Jack Robb
Rex Flowers
Joe Crim
Michael McBeath
Brad Johnston

STAFF: Bob Haughian
Maureen Hullinger

OTHERS PRESENT: Tony Wasley – NDOW Director
Don Sefton – SCI
Monty Martin - SCI
Paul Dixon
Robert Pohlman
Gil Yanuck
Fred Voltz
John Reed

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 8:03 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda – Chairman Robb

Michael McBeath motioned to approve the agenda.

Brad Johnston seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action
The Committee will review the minutes from the May 9, 2013 meeting of the TAAHC and may take action to approve the minutes.

Brad Johnston motioned to approve the minutes.

Joe Crim 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.

Rex Flowers said that he received a letter from John Reed and began to read the letter to the committee. The letter addressed Mr. Reed's attendance at the Big Game draw and how this helped him understand the draw process. He also

stated in his letter that when he was active military, how hard it was to preserve bonus points when deployed and when making a “permanent change of station” move. Appling for big game tags or bonus points is not on your mind. He also believes that Nevada does not do enough for veterans compared to other states. H he suggested a military exemption for active duty military members who leave the state. If a military member is on active duty regardless of how long, once they return back to Nevada, their bonus points should be intact.

Chairman Robb felt that Nevada does have a good process in place with the deferment of a tag for military personnel when they have been deployed. He stated that maybe doing some outreach to active military personnel in regards to informing them of deferment of a tag. Chairman Robb feels that this topic should be discussed by the committee.

Michael McBeath agreed with Chairman Robb and suggested that the committee should add this to the topic list.

5. Survey Questions for TAAHC Use – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action

The Committee will review suggested survey questions received from County Advisory Boards and Committee members and may take action to use such questions in a survey to obtain feedback from Nevada’s big game tag applicants.

Chairman Robb asked the committee on how they would like to approach this agenda item.

Brad Johnston suggested that depending on the survey questions, if it relates to hunting, do a survey during the return card questionnaire period and another one during the big game application period with survey questions relating to that. Have two periods where the survey would be available, once during the draw and another during the return card deadline.

NDOW Director Tony Wasley added that the survey process is really a science, and that other state agencies have done multiple surveys throughout the year and they rely on a professional survey organizations who specialize in “human dimensions.” He suggested that the committee should look into such organizations when it comes to the survey.

Chairman Robb agreed that incorporating an outside group would come up with more non-bias questions to ask. He asked Director Wasley if there was money in the budget for doing a survey with an outside source.

Director Wasley suggested that the first step would be to get a ball-park figure on the cost. He stated that he personally felt this would be a value to NDOW and supports use of such expertise.

Chairman Robb said he would prefer to such an organization to help develop the survey questions and not coming up with the questions on our own.

Joe Crim suggested that one of the survey questions should be on raising fees for tags.

Chairman Robb suggested ranking each survey question proposed by the advisory boards the same way as the TAAHC Topic list, 1 – likely, 2 – has merit and 3 – doubtful. The committee was in full agreement on this process.

Carson County Advisory Board’s survey question:

1) If successful in drawing multiple tags, are you anticipating in returning any of the tags? The committee ranked this question as a “2”.

Clark County Advisory Board’s survey questions:

1) Gather growth data on antlered mule deer on antler points. The committee ranked this as a “3”.
2) Nonresident able to return a tag for any reason. The committee ranked this as a “3”. Under the current regulation, nonresidents are able to return a tag for any reason.

Douglas County Advisory Board’s survey question:

1) Quality of hunt and hunting pressure experience. The committee ranked this as a “1”.

Humboldt County Advisory Board’s survey questions:

1) Add a suggestion box for any hunter to add any information he or she may feel pertinent. The committee ranked this as a “3”.
2) How many animals were observed during a hunt? The committee ranked this as a “1”.
3) Inquire whether there were any observed predator issues. The committee ranked this as a “3”.

Lyon County Advisory Board’s survey question:

1) Ask whether tag applicant would like to subscribe to NDOWs electronic newsletters and other information. The committee ranked this as a “2”.

Washoe County Advisory Board's survey questions:

1) In 250 words or less, how can we better recruit new hunters? The committee ranked this as a "3".
2) Would you prefer season setting dates based on a specific date or a specific day of the week, knowing that the date may cause overlap of some seasons or shorten a season in order to accommodate all. The committee ranked this as a "1".
3) Do you prefer split seasons verses single seasons, knowing that split seasons allow for greater hunter opportunity while single season allows for more time in the field. The committee ranked this as a "1".

White Pine County Advisory Board's survey questions:

1) Do you feel that a limit of no more than 14 days should be established for hunts with the exception of depredation hunts? The committee ranked this as a "2".
2) Do you think that some areas should be designated to be managed as quality and other areas designated to be managed as quantity? The committee ranked this as a "1".
3) Would you be in favor of applying for a bull and a cow tag on the same big game application? The committee ranked this as a "3".

The committee has reviewed and ranked all of the questions that were submitted by the County Advisory Boards. Chairman Robb asked if there were any public comments.

Gil Yanuck stated that at a recent County Advisory Board meeting, a question came up regarding receiving a returned tag as an alternate. He stated that the concern was if it would be possible to know where you may fall on the alternate list. Knowing this would affect planning, such as taking time off from work to hunt if you were issued an alternate tag.

Chairman Robb explained that he agreed but had reservations on this because if a hunter knew where he was on the alternate list, and had a pocket full of money, they could be inclined to offer a cash payment to the next available alternate to turn down the tag so they could receive it.

Gil Yanuck clarified further that the request was to construct a waiting list of people or to know where you stand on the list which is far more fair than to spring the fact that you got a tag that you can't use at the last minute on them. This puts people in a real rough situation when it comes to planning time off for hunting.

Michael McBeath said that a hunter has the opportunity of opting in or opting out for an alternate tag while applying. He stated that if a hunter opts in for an alternate tag, then they must be fully aware there may be a chance they could get the tag and if they have any doubts about being able to use that tag they should not check the box to opt for an alternate tag.

Don Sefton informed the committee that SCI already compiles a list of alternates after each draw. He stated that the point is that there may be some social issues in terms of the brokering for a tag and this has always been a concern with the commission.

Maureen Hullinger, NDOW staff, does not have a problem with the client knowing where they are on the list as long as they are unable to see who else is on the list. She stated that they could ask about their own record.

Fred Voltz said there seems to be a missing element to this discussion and that this committee and the commissioners are suppose to be serving the entire public in the state, not just the hunters and other licensees at the agency. So in constructing some sort of survey, whether it is on tag allocation or anything else, it would seem incumbent on the committee to include the entire public in a scientific way and not simply by adding people who submit responses on the internet. He stated that he would like to encourage the committee to consider that in the tag allocation process. As far as the wording for someone who may not be familiar with all the terminology, that is the expertise of the survey developers to be able to put together a survey where you could ask somebody in the public at large questions that would make since and you would get good data back.

Michael McBeath explained to Fred Voltz that the committee business and the commission's business is to operate to address specific issues. The commission deals with specific issues, and for issues specific to sportsmen and the allocation of tags such a survey would be specifically targeted to that group. Information from the non-hunting public would not meet the needs of such a survey. As an alternative for general public input, the USFWS has for years put together very specific public interest questions regarding hunting verse non-hunting.

Rex Flowers also said that he agreed that the committee is here to review what the hunting community is looking for. The commission needs to address the general public.

Chairman Robb asked the committee to make a motion on agenda item #5.

Michael McBeath motioned to make agenda item #5 to direct the department to work with the chairman of the TAAHC to put together an informational item for the commission with regards to options for the survey.

Rex Flowers seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Items for Consideration for Inclusion on the TAAHC Topic List – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action
The Committee will review any new 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 consideration for implementation.

Chairman Robb asked the committee if there were any other items that they would like to add to the TAAHC topic list or change any ranking.

Michael McBeath reported that he would like to add bonus point retention for active duty military as 8.1.12 on the list. The committee ranked this as a "1".

Michael McBeath read off a memo from Kenson Lee in regards to adding items on the TAAHC topic list to add a youth turkey hunt on private lands.

Maureen Hullinger informed the committee that there is already a youth turkey hunt, but if they would like to create a private land youth hunt this could be done in the Commission Regulation. She suggested speaking with our biologists for their input on this.

Brad Johnston asked about adding to the list whether or not in there could be a deer tag developed where the tag is limited to a buck with 4 points or better.

Rex Flowers recalled that this item was on the old TAAHC topic list and was removed because the committee had ranked this as a 3.

Michael McBeath motioned to the committee to add to the TAAHC topic list under 8.1.12, Bonus point retention for active military.

Brad Johnston seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. TAAHC Topic List Items – Chairman Robb – For Possible Action
The Committee will review topic items and commence assessment of those items recommended for implementation.

Chairman Robb suggested to the committee that he would like to set agenda's for future TAAHC meetings that all of the items on the TAAHC topic list with the ranking of "1" are their own agenda items. With the knowledge that the committee will work on them in order and if the committee runs out of time during the meeting, they will table the ones they do not get to for the next TAAHC meeting.

Rex Flowers motioned to agendize all the number 1's on the current TAAHC topic list for the next committee meeting and such a list be sent to the County Advisory Board chairmen for review by the County Advisory Board members.

Brad Johnston seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. **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.

Maureen Hullinger recalled that at the last TAAHC meeting Michael McBeath asked about the deer incentive statute. She stated that she had reviewed all of the past minutes and the topic came up during all of the elk incentive discussions when they built the statute. The commission had a task to develop regulation for the deer incentive program but they never did.

Michael McBeath thought maybe that this should be an informational item to bring back to the commission. He said that he would like to see the department research this and come back to the commission on options for this.

Don Sefton with SCI informed the committee that at the last TAAHC meeting the committee had requested if he could provide some data and that he has this information for them. Item number one is in regards to how many people have bonus points in the antelope 2151 horns-longer-than-ears hunt and what the maximum points were. One resident has 18 bonus points but most have 15 bonus points. For nonresidents, the maximum points are 20. Item number 2, how many people are sitting in a waiting periods. He said he compiled a list containing year of last tag for various hunts. This is just a tool to be used to help the committee when trying to decide waiting periods for a specific hunt. Item number 3, the youth draw application results. This data is for how many were unsuccessful. The average per year is around 500 unsuccessful applicants in the main draw. The data for how many youths were successful in the 2nd draw after being unsuccessful in the main draw. This averaged out to be between 75 and 100. The data for youths who were unsuccessful in the main draw but came back to draw a tag in the First Come, First Serve draw, this averaged out to be 20. Item number 4, how many 1st year youth applicants verses 2nd year applicants. In 2013 there were 3,750 youth applications and 1,129 of those applications were 1st year applicants. 2,621 applicants have applied for 2 or more years in the youth hunt. This data is included as an attachment to these minutes.

9. **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 August 2, 2013 in Fallon, at 6:30 pm. Location is to be determined.

Meeting adjourned at 9:59 p.m.