TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the June 19, 2015 Meeting - DRAFT

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) met at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015 at the Eureka Opera House, 31 South Main Street, Eureka, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Brad Johnston
Rex Flowers
Joe Crim
Peter Mori
Paul Valentine

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Bob Haughian

OTHERS PRESENT: Maureen Hullinger – NDOW
Jack Robb – NDOW
Don Sefton – Systems Consultants (SCI)
Monty Martin – Systems Consultants (SCI)
Craig Burnside – Douglas CAB
Sean Shea – Washoe CAB
Lester Porter – Eureka CAB
Paul Dixon – Clark CAB
Gil Yanuck – Carson CAB
Fred Voltz – public

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 Johnston

Chairman Johnston called the meeting to order at 9:58 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda – Chairman Johnston

Joe Crim motioned to approve the agenda.

Peter Mori seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence - Chairman Johnston - 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

APPROVED

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 Johnston asked the committee if they had any member items, announcements or any correspondence they would like to discuss. There were none.

4. Review of TAAHC Charter and past Topic List proposals – Operations Division Administrator Bob Haughian – Informational

The Committee will be introduced to the historical background, purpose and objectives of the TAAHC as first established in August 2006, and will review the Topic List reflective of proposals assessed for possible implementation by previous members of the TAACH from 2006 – 2008, and from 2012 – April 2014.

Bob Haughian addressed the Charter with the committee and gave the back ground on when it was first established. He suggested to Chairman Johnston that the committee review the Charter and revise it if necessary. Bob Haughian then went on to address the TAAHC Topic List and provided the back ground on how past TAAHC committee members came up with the list and how the list was ranked by the committee.

The TAAHC Charter and TAAHC Topic List are included in an attachment.

Chairman Johnston suggested on moving the items that have already been implemented off of the TAAHC topic list.

NDOW Deputy Director Jack Robb suggested to the committee it should keep those items on the list but maybe move them to the back of the TAAHC topic list as “completed topics” for future reference.

Chairman Johnston asked if the committee had any more comments or questions regarding agenda item #4.

There were none.

5. Review of new topics for possible inclusion to the Topic List – Chairman Johnston – For Possible Action

The Committee will review any new proposals for the Topic List to be considered for further evaluation and possible future implementation.

Gil Yanuck reported during the last Carson CAB meeting that he received a letter from Mr. Matt Nusbaghmer stating that he has two sons who would like to be involved in the youth hunt. One son is 13 and the other is 11. When it came to the 11 year old, after he started to fill out his application, Mr. Nusbaghmer realized that his son’s unit choices would be severally limited because the son would turn 12 after the start of the archery hunt, rather than prior to the start of

APPROVED

the hunt, as required by regulation. He stated that the Carson City Advisory Board discussed this situation and passed a motion to suggest to the committee that they give consideration to allow an 11 year old to participate in the youth hunt if their 12th birthdate occurs any time during one of the particular hunts. This would enable them to apply so that upon their 12th birthday, they would be able to hunt.

Chairman Johnston informed the committee that Commissioner Mori had pointed out that the previous committee looked at this topic (A.3.13) and had ranked this topic as a 3 – doubtful, but this doesn't mean that this current committee could not revisit this topic again.

Gil Yanuck stated he thinks Mr. Nusbaghmer presents an interesting challenge; the whole purpose of the youth hunt is to get the youth interested in hunting. Do we drop the hammer because you are not quite 12 years old when the hunts start but if the hunt season is a two or three week period, can we do something to allow it? This is the challenge and but this would open the door to more youth hunters.

Sean Shea said that during the Washoe County Advisory meeting, the topic to change the draw order of the PIW from "after the regular draw" to "before the regular draw" had come up. The reason behind this is that the PIW is basically discriminating against a hunter who draws a tag in the regular draw and is unable to draw a PIW tag which is a specialty tag. On the average, it has been about $36,000 lost to the Heritage account because the PIW tag is drawn after the regular draw and not beforehand. It is all about opportunity; if the PIW draw is before the regular draw it would allow all who apply the opportunity to draw a PIW tag. As of now, they don't get that opportunity. All that would be needed is to change the draw order, put the PIW draw before the regular draw.

Regarding the youth hunt letter referenced above, Fred Voltz said he felt that deferred gratification is an important value to teach children and if they don't qualify because of age, they have to wait a year. Mr. Voltz went on to say that we are only talking about a handful of people on this case. After looking at the numbers, how many kids are going to be in this situation? Probably no more than 25 to 50, if that.

Chairman Johnston asked if the committee members had any additional topics they would like to add to the TAAHC Topic list.

Rex Flowers asked the committee to give consideration to two items addressed in the mule deer survey which was completed by the department in May 2014. The first one is the ability to create a dropdown on the hunt application site for a hunt map. He didn't know if this would be feasible and would have to look at it financially, but there seems to be a situation where people would like to have the drop-down map rather than having a map from another source. Another item on the application site was for people to apply as a party but pay individually. He said he would also like to see the committee work more on the tag allocation process and he has a couple of ideas. One would be that we would give any management antlerless elk tags to youth hunts, they would only be doled out to resident any legal weapon, muzzleloader and archery. Another item is on the elk free zones, not the depredation tags, but the management antlerless tags that are in area 10. Rather than limiting those tags to antlerless, make those tags as either sex. He stated he would like to get a history on those tags and stated that this year we have allocated 900 tags and last year we allocated 600 tags. He reported there were hunters out there who did

see bulls but could not take them. If these are elk-free zones, shouldn't we be managing them towards zero and not to a lower number? Lastly, he said he would like to look at and discuss the allocation of tags and how Allowable Bull Harvests are determined. After looking at the way we determine tag allocation for elk in the past, he could understand the bull ratio when the elk population was not an issue, but now that the elk population has increased, are we now managing elk for a quality animal or are we managing elk for an opportunity for people to hunt?

Paul Valentine stated the timing of the depredation hunt has always been a consideration he has had and if you have an elk-free zone and try to eliminate the elk, wouldn't an earlier season be more logical, along with an either sex tag?

Chairman Johnston said he had receive a number of correspondences regarding the application process, bonus points, active military members and the difficulties they have run into in the process and making certain commendations for them. He expressed these items should be continued to be looked at by this committee.

Bob Haughian explained to the committee that in April he received a letter from a retired Naval officer who would like to propose a change to the big game draw program that would help our veterans who have missed out on hunting seasons due to military. The first suggestion is any Nevada resident over the age of 65 who is retired with 20 years or more of military service with an honorable discharge should be able to obtain a big game hunting tag and be exempt for the big game draw. They would pay the current license fee, the current tag fee and would automatically receive a tag. They would also have to select what season such as early or late, and for what area. The second item is if a resident veteran has less than 20 years of military honorable service they would be placed in a separate drawing and would be drawing against other Nevada veterans and not the general public.

Chairman Johnston stated he would like to get the TAAHC Topic List back out to the CABs to review and provide their feedback to this committee in advance to the next committee meeting. Then the committee could start working on cleaning up outstanding items that have not been addressed and those that have already been addressed put them on a separate sheet. He said he would also like to solicit the CABs to identify any other topic items they may have and be added to the topic list for the consideration by the committee.

Rex Flowers suggested the committee send out the TAAHC Topic List to the CABs well in advance to give them time to review and submit any new topics they may want to be addressed by the committee.

Chairman Johnston said he would also like to review the Mule Deer Survey results and review the topic list upon the results of the Mule Deer Survey provided to make sure the committee is addressing the concerns that were identified in the Mule Deer Survey.

Jack Robb indicated that the Mule Deer Survey is a very good survey but it wasn't pointed in the direction that would tell us where to change our management tactics.

Peter Mori informed the committee he would like to see the following topics on the TAAHC Topic list to be addressed: the 10 year waiting period on elk, with the possible change to that; the

APPROVED

consistency for harvest and non-harvest; and the transfer of bonus points under certain circumstances.

Jack Robb informed the committee he has had contact with the Lander CAB members and they have been talking about proposing a petition to come forward to change the waiting period for elk. The CAB members believe the bull elk ratio is high due to some people passing up harvesting an elk if they don't see anything that is worth taking. This decision making by these hunters is influenced by the current 10-year waiting period if a hunter harvests a bull, and only having to wait 5 years if they don't harvest. The previous committee had looked at the waiting period on elk, and one of the major reasons for keeping it at 10 years if harvest and not changing it to 5 years was because there were a lot of people in the 5 year waiting period and if you dumped that extra 5 year waiting period into the pool, the odds would be harder for those who have a lot of bonus points to draw an elk tag. But now with more elk tags available, he believes it is worth reviewing the waiting period on elk again.

Chairman Johnston would like to make a request to CABs to review the topic list, identify priorities, and submit it back to the committee for review.

Rex Flowers motioned to request public and CAB input for items that exist on the current TAAHC Topic List and introduce any new items for consideration, and action to be taken by the CABs and the public by the end of August so there can be a topic committee for September to review.

Paul Valentine 2nd the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. **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.

There was no public comment.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.

7. Future Committee Meetings – Chairman Johnston – Informational
The Committee will reconfirm the date and location of the next TAAHC meeting.

APPROVED