

TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the September 25, 2015 Meeting

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) met at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, September 25, 2015 at the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, 8050 Paradise Rd, Classrooms A & D, Las Vegas, 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)
Gil Yanuck – Carson CAB
Mike Reese – Clark CAB
Doug Nielsen – NDOW
Martin Olson – NDOW
Kathleen Teligades - NDOW

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**
- 2. Approval of Agenda – Chairman Johnston**

Joe Crim motioned to approve the agenda.

Pete Mori seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

- 3. Approval of Minutes – Chairman Johnston**

The Committee may approve Committee minutes from the June 2015 Committee meeting.

Rex Flowers stated that under item 5 of the June 2015 minutes for - Review of new topics for possible inclusion to the Topic List, it currently reads as "one would be that we would not give any management antlerless elk tags to youth hunts" and stated he had said "we would give any management antlerless elk tags to youth hunts." He requested this be noted as a change in the minutes.

Joe Crim motioned to approve the minutes with the correction.

Pete Mori seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

- 4. 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 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 informed the committee he had received some emails. Two were from the Carson CAB with respect to a proposal regarding youth hunt's, and also the Carson CAB forwarded the Wyoming Youth regulation as an example to what they are seeking. If someone turns 12 years old during a two week tag period, they would be able hunt the remaining days once they turned 12. Chairman Johnston also stated he had received correspondence from Sean Shea with the Washoe CAB in regards to the PIW draw order. He said he had also received an email from Cory Lytle with the Lincoln CAB with the respect of the deer landowner program and the bull elk waiting period. Chairman Johnston indicated these items are already on the Topic List.

5. Review any new topics for consideration by the TAAHC – Operations Division Administrator Bob Haughian and Chairman Johnston – For Possible Action

The Committee will review any new topics received and added to the TAAHC Topic List and may evaluate each for potential action (i.e., reject or accept for further consideration).

Bob Haughian informed the committee that he had moved the closed topic items from the overall list to the closed list. So there are 2 lists now. To recap the closed list, there are 89 topics for the application hunt portion of the list and two topics that are closed for the tag allocation portion of the list. On the open TAAHC list, there are 57 items that are remaining on the list, 8 of which are new from the CABW's, and out of the 57 topics, 25 of those topics have a ranked order as "3" which is on one of the agenda items to be discussed. On the tag allocation portion of the list there are 88 topic items remaining, two of which are new. Out of the 88 topic items, 53 of those topics are ranked as a "3".

Chairman Johnston said he had received a telephone call from Humboldt CAB in regards to an apprentice hunt proposing if an adult drew a tag they could transfer the tag to a youth hunter to allow the youth hunter to fill the tag.

Bob Haughian reported when he receives new topic's he places the topic under the appropriate heading and assigns a number to the topic. For the topic received from the Humboldt CAB regarding the apprentice hunt, he said he had placed this topic under reference number A.3.12.1 and A3 heading deals with youth or novices. This topic is the apprentice license/tag opportunity – if eligible applicant draw a tag, a junior apprentice could fill my tag if he or she is with me as the appropriate youth hunter. These new items are similar to item A.3.12.

Chairman Johnston opened up discussions for the apprentice hunt and ranking of the topic.

Paul Valentine said Utah has a mentor youth program already in effect and would like to get more information from Utah about the program. He feels this topic warrants a rank of "2".

Maureen Hullinger informed the committee that Nevada already does have an apprentice hunting license for hunting upland game and waterfowl, but what we don't have is for big game because of the statutory requirement for the person's name to be on the tag and the hunter safety requirement. With the apprentice license, if they have not obtained another license in another state they could be an apprentice for one year after that, they would need to fulfill their hunter safety requirement to do any further hunting in Nevada.

Chairman Johnston stated he would be inclined to weigh this suggestion as a "2" but with the recognition noted that it would take statutory change to allow for transfer of tag under certain conditions from an adult to a youth hunter who has satisfied certain requirements such as hunter safety.

Paul Valentine asked if the committee would consider looking at Utah's mentor youth program that way the committee could investigate to see what would be involved for such a program to be implemented.

Paul Valentine motioned to the committee to accept reference number A.3.12.1 Apprentice license/tag opportunity to be included in the open list and NDOW staff to investigate to further the mentoring program that Utah has currently in place and would like to apply a "2" on the recommendation.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Bob Haughian addresses topic item A.3.13.1 – Revise youth big game application eligibility, which also falls under the header topic for youth or novice. Allow those who turn 12 years old during a hunting season tag time period to be able to hunt affective on their 12th birthday even if they are not 12 years old when the tag season may have already started. Bob Haughian stated this topic item came from the Carson CAB. Bob informed the committee that the Carson CAB had made reference to this from Wyoming which allows for this.

Rex Flowers commented he is not in favor of this and would suggest this topic be ranked as a “3” and the reason is being that right now the youth hunter has 5 years they can apply in, they can acquire 4 tags in that time period and there is no season that a youth can’t apply for. There are 5 areas in this state where the season starts after November 1st. They may not be able to hunt the areas where the adults want their children to apply for but they do have opportunity as it stands. By adding this in, we would be adding a 6th year to their eligibility to hunt as a youth.

Paul Valentine said he agrees with Rex Flowers and does not see a reason to include this topic. Joe Crim also supports this view.

Gil Yanuck agrees a lot with what Rex Flowers said about the amount of time available for the youth to hunt during the period that is allowed for youths. Gil stated that during the Carson CAB meeting, the public brought this to the CAB member’s attention and asked for their support. Responding to the community members, the Carson CAB has brought this forward to the TAAHC. Gill stated that the CAB also fully understands why the comments that were made were made. The father in question has a number of children and all had qualified as a youth except for the one child whose birthday occurred after.

Gil feels this was a reasonable request from the father to ask the CAB to bring this topic forward to the committee and help him understand why the committee made the decision that they did. He stated he appreciates the committee’s consideration and comments and will take the committees comments back to the next Carson CAB meeting.

Chairman Johnston commented he does not believe there are that many youth hunters who turn 12 during a specific period of time and the other comments made by Mr. Flowers and other members of the committee are well taken in terms of season dates. Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Rex Flowers motioned to the committee that item A.3.13.1 – Revise youth big game application eligibility, be given a TAAHC recommendation of a “3”.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Bob Haughian addresses topic item A.6.2.7 – Change to the bull elk waiting period, this topic came out of the Washoe CAB. During their meeting it was discussed that a change as described might encourage hunters to harvest a smaller bull, thus adding in the reduction of elk herd populations to meet the elk management goals. It would take the harvest waiting period from 10 year to a 5 year waiting period and from 5 years to 3 years for an unsuccessful harvest waiting period.

Chairman Johnston noted that an email from the Lincoln CAB on September 24, 2015, would also like the committee to re-examine a change from 10 years to 5 years on the bull elk waiting period as well. Regarding this item, similar to item A.6.2.6., Chairman Johnston stated that he will abstain from commenting on or voting on reducing the waiting period and how it may affect those who are in a waiting period because he is currently in a 10 year waiting period for bull elk.

Joe Crim stated he is also currently in a waiting period for his bull elk but felt that this topic was brought to the committee and felt it was the committee’s obligation to come to a decision on this topic whether or not it may or may not affect him as an outcome in regards to the waiting period he is currently in. He said if Nevada is having trouble with getting people to harvest smaller bulls then changing the waiting period is an answer, and if people know they don’t have to wait so long

before they can apply again they would harvest smaller bulls and not wait for the big one and therefore possibly not harvest. Right now they are sitting out for 10 years but if it is changed to 5 years this may encourage them to harvest the smaller bulls in the process.

Pete Mori said he would like to know how many people out there have never drawn an elk tag with 15 or more bonus points and who we would be basically penalizing if we threw in a whole new set of hunters into the mix. He said he would also like to see the harvest and not harvest both to be a 5 year waiting period. Pete Mori asked Don Sefton with SCI how many individuals are there that have 15 or more bonus points and never have drawn a tag.

Rex Flowers commented he would support this because we need to create more harvest and more opportunity.

Joe Crim asked Pete Mori if he would clarify the harvest and not harvest waiting period he is in favor of.

Pete Mori stated he would support the 5 year waiting period for both harvest and non-harvest, but also would like to know how many people have more than 15 bonus points or more and have never drawn a bull elk tag. He said he would then consider recommending keeping the waiting period to 10 years, but also 10 years for none harvest, depending on the numbers that Don Sefton provides. He felt it would not be fair to those who have never drawn a bull elk tag to have more hunters put back in the mix and who had a chance to harvest an elk to those who have not.

Chairman Johnston also suggested to the committee to have the numbers of those people who are in the 10 year waiting period and 5 year waiting period.

Mike Reese, Clark CAB, told the committee he drew a bull elk tag 5 years ago and when he went out to hunt, there were a lot of people out in the field during his hunt so he chose not to harvest and did the 5 year waiting period for no harvest. He stated his 5 year waiting period is up and he will be able to apply again next year, so the waiting period did come into consideration when he chose not to harvest. However, if he had known that he would have to wait 10 years if he harvested or not, he would have given 110% in harvesting.

Doug Nielsen commented we should try to use this as a motivation to get people to take a lesser bull, doing this is a much bigger picture than the waiting period because it is a cultural thing. If you look back at the outdoor writers placed back in the 1960's, 70's, and early 80's, the focus of the outdoor writers was on the adventure of being outdoors, the experience of the hunt, the feelings and emotions that come with harvesting an animal. Then this transition came into play, instead of focusing on the hunt, the focus became on how big this animal was, how much will it score and will it get my name in a book. Right now the focus that is driving not taking the lesser animals is whether their friends back home are going to make fun of them because they shot a 5 point instead of a 6 or 7 point bull. There is a culture thing that needs to be considered when you are talking about whether they are going to take a lesser bull or bull that is a certain size. The culture aspect needs to be considered and the regulation change on a waiting period in his opinion won't change what they take.

Don Sefton reported the answer to Pete Mori's question on how many residents have 15 bull elk points. There were currently 179 residents and 577 nonresidents. Don explained there were 18,857 resident clients in the last draw and 2,227 nonresident clients. Resident percent equals .95 or under 1%. The nonresident percent equals 25.9 or 26%. Total applicants last year was 21,084 and out of that number, 756 have 15 or more bonus points for both resident and nonresidents combined with the ratio overall equaling 3.6%.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Joe Crim motioned to the committee to lessen the waiting period to 5 years for successful or unsuccessful harvest and a rank of '1' as likely.

Paul Valentine seconded the motion.

Rex Flowers said he would support the motion for further review.
Motion carried 4-0 with Chairman Johnston abstaining from voting.

Chairman Johnston addresses topic item A.9.2.2 – Changing the sequent of the PIW Draw, this topic item was proposed by the Washoe CAB who would like the PIW draw occur prior the general draw for two reasons: everyone would be eligible for the PIW tag and, per estimates made by the Washoe CAB did, there is a loss of revenue when those who apply for the PIW are taken out if they are successful in drawing a tag in the general draw.

Doug Nielsen informed the committee that he was on the committee back in the 90's when they came up with this program. The timing of the PIW draw for being after the general draw was very specific and was for a very specific purpose. It was to allow those who didn't have a chance to draw a tag in the regular draw another chance to draw a tag. This was really outside of the Heritage program; the PIW tag was the first specialty tag created to give people a chance to draw a governor-type hunt. Part of the process was to find a way to increase revenue, and the timing for this was specific so if you didn't draw, your money would stay in and you would be in the PIW drawing automatically. This was before the change and now you have to submit an application fee for PIW.

Chad Bliss stated currently how the draw is set up, the Silver State tag is drawn first, followed by the other draws. He suggested the committee keep this in mind so if you do the PIW draw first then the people who are successful in the PIW draw would then not be eligible to apply for the Silver State tag.

Paul Valentine asked if he could have clarification on how the draw process currently exists.

Maureen Hullinger explained that currently the way the NAC reads, Silver State will occur first if they apply for it and if they are unsuccessful in the Silver State draw, they would then go to any of their main draw applications that they are eligible for because with Silver State, the ineligible can't apply for those particular tags if they are in a waiting period. If they select Partnership in Wildlife (PIW) on their application and are unsuccessful in the main draw for whatever species, they would fall into the PIW draw. If they do participate in the PIW draw, we do charge them \$10 at that time as historically, when it was all paper applications, you had to submit all of your fee's up front and if you had a refund we would then deduct the PIW fee out of the refund. If the PIW draw is going to be considered and changed to first, we would have to make a change to the regulation for PIW and for Silver State also to shift the order of the draws and would also need programming for both to make sure the programming would flow properly.

Rex Flowers informed the committee when he was at the Washoe CAB meeting, their intent was not to make the PIW draw come first, but rather, ahead of the general draw. They felt that times have changed and the PIW tag is now more of an advantageous tag to have and felt it should be drawn before the general hunt, but not necessarily before the Silver State Tag draw. Part of the reasoning was revenue. We are losing over \$30,000 a year by having the PIW draw after the general draw.

Chairman Johnston commented that most people would chose the PIW tag over the general tag and would be willing to pay for that chance. He felt that Washoe CAB had done a good job at demonstrating the amount of money lost from the PIW and have identified \$119,000 just for the deer draw alone. He feels this topic does have some merit to it and if it would work what would be the impact.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Chairman Johnston motioned the committee to move the PIW topic reference A.9.2.2 and weigh it at a "2" as having merit for further review and discussion by this committee.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Bob Haughian informed the committee there are 2 topics he would be addressing that are both similar. The first topic item A.9.18.1 – Issue a tag to resident military retiree with 20 years or more of military service. Any resident veteran over the age of 65 years old and retired with 20 years of service should be able to obtain a big game tag and be exempt from the big game drawing. The second topic item A.9.18.2 – A separate drawing for resident veterans. If a resident veteran has less than 20 years of honorable military service, they would be placed in a separate drawing and would only compete against other eligible vets and not the general public.

Rex Flowers said he was not in favor of either of these topics, and would make a recommendation to rank these topics as a "3". He felt that we do not need any more preferred individuals or set-aside programs.

Joe Crim stated that proving 20 years or service in the military would probably not be a problem but getting the paperwork back and forth to the department may create a paper nightmare and felt he also could not support this topic.

Paul Valentine informed the committee that topic item A.9.18, Special draw for military personnel, is currently ranked on the TAAHC topic list as a "2", and felt this was almost the same thing. He asked the committee if this would need to be re-addressed.

Bob Haughian informed the committee they can go back to any open item on the topic list again and review them and also re-rank them if needed.

Chairman Johnston suggested to focus just on the topics that are a "3," then at a later meeting they can go back and re-review the topics that are ranked as a "2" to get them resolved. He suggested including these two topics under A.9.18 as potential special draw for military personnel. Then when the committee is addressing the topic items that are ranked as a "2" they could address those topic items at the same time.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Chairman Johnston motioned to the committee that the proposals that were submitted from Mr. Waltrip and have been identified as A.9.18.1 and A.9.18.2 be included in A.9.18 and is weighted as a "2" to be addressed by the committee at a later meeting.

Paul Valentine seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Bob Haughian addressed topic item A.9.19, Restricted Resident Guided Hunt for mule deer, and stated this came out of the Washoe CAB where the public has inquired about why residents can't have a special drawing for deer as the nonresidents do. The concept would be as that of the existing Nonresident Guided hunt.

Maureen Hullinger provided background to the committee on how the Nonresident guided hunt works now. She informed the committee that the nonresident restricted guided hunt is established in statute, as a special draw outside the main draw. The Guide Association pushed for a special draw for their nonresident clients so they could get them in the field and have the guaranteed business. Those tags that are sold out of that guided draw are stripped off of the nonresident quota prior to the recommendations to the commission for the main draw nonresident quota for deer. The client has to be contracted with a guide at the time of application being submitted. If they apply in the nonresident guided draw, they are ineligible to apply in the main draw for deer. They can however apply for other species in the main draw but not deer.

Pete Mori asked Maureen how is it determined on how many tags can a guide obtain for clients.

Maureen Hullinger explained there are two levels of restrictions; the quotas are based off of the prior year's quota, and cannot exceed 37 ½% per each unit group and 16% overall on the previous year. Then there is a 400 successful tag cap with a 30 person cap for each guide. The guide can submit as many applications as they like, but once they have reached 30 successful clients the rest will then be unsuccessful. The clients do earn bonus points if unsuccessful for deer or they just can purchase a bonus point. The tag fee for the nonresident guide draw is \$300 versus \$240 for the general draw. The nonresident guided hunt is all based out of statute and the authority for that draw is also in statute.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Joe Crim motioned to the committee that topic item A.9.19 be weighted as a "3" and take it off of the open topic list and move it to the closed topic list.

Pete Mori seconded the motion.

Rex Flower commented that he felt they were not looking for this to mirror what is in statute like the nonresident guided hunt or even looking for the same percentage in tags, which would be more like a 2% or 3% of tags and they would also expect an increase in the tag fee for this. He stated that Sean Shea is a guide and he was the one who brought this to the table. He said Sean Shea told him that his clients have asked him on a yearly basis why isn't there a resident guided hunt. Rex stated he would like this topic not to disappear but if it could be reviewed and to see if the Guide Association could weigh in on this to see if there is enough interest to really go through with it.

Chairman Johnston commented if the committee follows this motion, moves this topic item to the close topic item list, and the outfitters or guides find this problematic and brings it back to this committee or to the commission or to the CABs, it could be brought back to the open topic list.

Joe Crim amended the motion that topic item A.9.19 be weighted as a "3" and remain on the open topic list.

Pete Mori seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Johnston addressed topic item A.11 Media tag, this came from the Clark CAB and is to create a media tag to promote hunting in Nevada and his understanding was that the committee had previously evaluated this topic item request and had rejected it.

Mike Reese from the Clark CAB reported that the idea behind this topic item was that currently we received \$105,000 for our heritage tag mule deer. Mr. Findlay from Las Vegas historically gets a Heritage mule deer tag. He asked what would happen to this tag if something happened to him? He stated that not too many people around the country know about these tags. He stated that he knows a media host of an outdoor show called TNT Outdoor Exposure on the Pursuit Channel and does this in other states. What they would do is have the tag issued to the host; they would pay for the total production of the show and make copies to go to the Chambers of Commerce, they use them as publicity and this costs the state nothing. He asked how many people across the United States that have a lot of money really understand that Nevada has prime mule deer habitat throughout the state. He said he was looking at an avenue to keep some of the Heritage tags that go up for auction at these banquets.

Paul Valentine indicated he is not fully supportive.

Rex Flowers said currently Nevada does have some outdoor program channels and we do have some media coverage out there and doesn't feel that giving a tag to a media outlet will bring in anything extra.

Chairman Johnston also agrees that giving a tag to a media outlet is not the answer and he does not support this.

Joe Crim agreed and said he does not support this because our return will not be worth the investment.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Rex Flowers motioned to the committee that topic item A.11 be ranked as a "3".

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Johnston addressed topic item T.5.2.2 Landowner Program – Allow hunting on private property, if someone purchases a landowner tag the landowner cannot deny that tag holder permission to hunt on that private property that the tag was issued for. If this is not changed then the landowners are double dipping. Meaning if you can't harvest an animal from the private property that the tag is issued then what is the point of giving the tag.

Maureen Hullinger addressed the history regarding the landowner program to the committee. Back in the '90s when the landowner program was developed, there was authority at that time where the hunter could chose certain seasons, and a 30 day season on private land. Over time, NAC changed it to the stratified hunt and dropped the 30 day season period off as an option for the hunter. At one point they were able to choose to hunt on private land and the landowner would hand out the applications to the hunters, but now so many of those landowner applications were purchased by guides and they would opt to do the regular hunt as opposed to hunt on private land. So over the years it has morphed and dropped off the private land option to hunters.

Pete Mori asked Maureen Hullinger for clarification on the way the NAC is right now and what does the landowner need to provide if he gets the tag, and does he have to allow access through the property or not?

Maureen Hullinger said there is a stipulation that the landowner is to provide access through their property to public land for anyone who holds a tag and if they do not want people hunting on their private property, that is a private property issue. Historically, when it was first developed there was an option for those hunters with an agreement by the landowner and signing the application they could chose the 30-day hunt on private land. That eventually went away.

Rex Flowers gave an explanation to the committee that this topic item came out of the Washoe CAB. There are a few individuals up there who are getting landowner tags every year. The landowner's are not allowing anyone to hunt on their property but they can hunt all of the surrounding area of the property. In essence, they are farming for wildlife and making money for it every year. They have a hundred head of deer sitting on their property yet they won't let anyone in to shoot them, so next year they will get the same number of tags and the year after that. By setting it up to where the landowner must allow them to hunt on private property, this will help push those deer back out. This is what the Washoe CAB intent was on this topic item.

As a land owner, Pete Mori said he has never participated in the program. As such, he can speak freely about this issue. That the fact remains that the animals are there and the landowners happen to be providing forage for those animals. It is also his right to allow who he wants or does not want on his property. He felt that he could not support this topic item.

Chairman Johnston stated he had received a lot of comments on the landowner program such as how it is or is not working, landowners getting tags but not allowing hunters to hunt on their property. He said he didn't know if this was the right committee to take on the task of reviewing the landowner program or was is there a committee for that.

Maureen Hullinger stated it wasn't clear if there was a committee tasked to review the program.

Rex Flowers explained back in November 2007, the past TAAHC had three different topic items sent to them on the landowner program and the status was that they were never reviewed or taken forward. Maybe the TAAHC needs to make suggestion to the commission about having the appropriate committee to review the program?

Pete Mori noted that in 2007 a previous TAAHC ranked this issue as "3," so they must have analyzed those topics and made a decision not to pursue them any further. He stated he has the tendency to follow along that same pattern. He understands the concept that the landowner's are farming for wildlife, but so what? If you drive landowners away from these programs they won't allow hunters to have access through their property. What would the sportsman have to gain by taking something away from the landowners?

Chairman Johnston said he would like to keep these topics on the open topic list and at some point this committee will have to deal with these issues that are coming from the landowners and CABs, or, the commission itself will have to deal with them or have some other committee tasked to deal with them. He suggested to keep these on the open topic list and rank them as the committee can agree upon, then evaluate this issue along with the other issues for landowners that are on the topic list in future meetings.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Pete Mori motioned that topic item T.5.2.2 be ranked as a "3"
Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Paul Valentine stated he would support this if the rank was a "2" with further discussion either from this committee or another.

Bob Haughian explained that this topic may fall under the tag allocation piece and this may require participation from NDOW's Game Division to help the committee to address this.

Rex Flowers suggested that perhaps Chairman Johnston could ask the Commission Chairman if this is really the TAAHC's purview or should this be associated with a different committee.

Chairman Johnston said in his report to the commission he would be noting the landowner tag topics that are on the open topic list and whether this committee or another committee or the even the commission should be addressing these.

Motion carried 4-1 with Paul Valentine voting no.

Bob Haughian addressed topic item T.22.1 Premium Tag for Black Bear, which came from the Douglas CAB and would like black bear tags to be available for Heritage, PIW, Silver State and Dream tag.

Rex Flowers reported he had attended the Douglas CAB meeting and they were really pushing for an increase in quota for black bear and CAB members feel there should be bear quota for Silver State, PIW, Heritage and Dream tag. As he had told the Douglas CAB, the Dream tag would come automatic, as it is set in statute, and once we reach a 50-animal quota a tag would be set aside for the Dream Tag program. The PIW, Silver State and Heritage would all have to go through statute to increase those quotas through the commission regulations on an annual basis.

Maureen Hullinger stated that, for PIW there would need to be a change to the NAC because currently bear is not listed as part of the quotas that are established in NAC for Partnership in Wildlife. For Heritage and Silver State tags programs, both allows for a quota of 15 big game tags. Heritage tag quotas go through the Heritage Committee and the Silver State tag quotas would go through the Commission Regulation (CR) process and you would need to keep in mind not to exceed the 15 tag cap for both.

Chairman Johnston asked Don Sefton on how many applicants for the bear hunt versus tags.

Don Sefton reported there were 3,521 total applicants this year for the black bear hunt, and out of that 3,054 were resident applicants and 467 nonresident applicants. 41 tags were issued to residents and 4 were issued to nonresident with a total of 45 tags issued for black bear.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not, he would entertain for a motion.

There were none.

Pete Mori motioned to the committee to rank topic item T.22.1 as a "3".
Paul Valentine seconded the motion.
Motion carried unanimously.

6. Review TAAHC Topic List and determine actions for select topics – Chairman Johnston – For Possible Action

The Committee will review the Topic List, specifically those topics designated as "3" (i.e., those item's previously considered by the TAAHC as "doubtful" for implementation), and make determination to remove the items from the Topic List or retain for future evaluation.

Chairman Johnston asked if, due to time, the committee would be willing to move this agenda item to the next committee meeting in January 2016.

Joe Crim motioned to the committee to move agenda item 6 to the next meeting in January 2016.

Paul Valentine seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

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.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any public comments.

There were none.

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

Next TAAHC will be scheduled for January 2016 in Las Vegas. Time and location is to be determined.

Meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m.

APPROVED