

TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
Minutes of the March 16, 2016 Meeting

The Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) met at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 16, 2016 at Nevada Department of Wildlife, 6980 Sierra Center Parkway, Reno, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Brad Johnston
Rex Flowers
Joe Crim
Peter Mori (by phone)
Paul Valentine (by phone)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Bob Haughian

OTHERS PRESENT: Maureen Hullinger – NDOW
Jack Robb –NDOW
Sean Shea
Mitch Buzzetti
Mike Cox - NDOW
Doug Martin
Darin Elmore

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 6:07 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda – Chairman Johnston

Joe Crim motioned to approve the agenda.
Rex Flowers seconded the motion.
Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes – Chairman Johnston

The Committee may approve Committee minutes from the January 29, 2016 Committee meeting.

Rex Flowers motioned to move and approve the minutes as corrected.
Joe Crim seconded the motion.
Motion carried unanimously.

4. Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence - Committee 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 stated he received an email from Ray Sawyer with the White Pine CAB, alleging that some people who put in for the party hunt, and an applicant has a spouse, or friend or someone they know who has built up their bonus points, then the party draws tags, but the person with the high points returns their tag, thereby restoring their points. They are building up bonus points without intending to use the tag, thereby attempting to assist others in the party in drawing tags. Chairman Johnston said he remembers this topic coming up once before but did not see it in the past TAAHC minutes and asked if this topic could be added on the next TAAHC agenda item.

Bob Haughian informed the committee that in a past TAAHC meeting, this topic did come up about people allegedly gaming the party application process and Don Sefton with SCI had done an analysis on this, indicating there was little to

no evidence to support such claims. Mr. Haughian said he recalls this item is on the TAAHC topic list and he would take a look and confirm it.

Maureen Hullinger stated this topic may have been a discussion via commission also and was determined it was not an issue at that time.

Jack Robb explained that the past TAAHC did discuss this topic before and Don Sefton had prepared an analysis and could not find anything supporting this claim, but that doesn't mean it doesn't occur now. Jack stated he and Brian Wakeling, Game Division Administrator, spoke with Don Sefton on this topic and Don Sefton said he would look at this again.

Chairman Johnston said another correspondence he received was for Commission Policy 24 which was delegated to the TAAHC and will be put on a future TAAHC agenda as an item.

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

5. New Items for Consideration for Inclusion on the Open or Closed TAAHC Topic Lists – Committee Chairman Johnston – For Possible Action

The Committee will review any new suggested topics received from County Advisory Boards or the public and may take action to add or rank topics on the TAAHC Open Topic List for consideration for implementation, or take action to add or move topics to the TAAHC Closed Topic List.

Chairman Johnston asked if committee members had any new items to be added to the TAAHC Open Topic list.

Pete Mori said he had a question for NDOW regarding topic item A.2.10 – Fee evaluation – under the comment section. The nonresident cow elk fee of \$500 to be lowered along with any other consideration for fee changes. The committee determined that this suggestion should be evaluated by the Commission's Finance Committee rather than by the TAAHC. Pete Mori asked NDOW has this been done and where are we on that?

Maureen Hullinger responded that the Finance Committee did not look at that and the Department itself is looking at a fee simplification process for the next legislation session so something could come out of that process in regards to this item.

Pete Mori stated the reason why he brought this up to the committee is because he feels that \$500 for a nonresident cow elk tag fee is too high and may be discouraging nonresidents from applying for cow elk.

Bob Haughian recommended leaving this TAAHC topic item on the open list even though it does not have a ranking order.

Chairman Johnston stated the other correspondence he received was from the Nevada Outfitter's and Guide Association (NOGA) regarding a topic that was recently added to the TAAHC open list. Maureen Hullinger inserted this topic item under T.11.1.4 as a new item that needs to be ranked by the committee.

Chairman Johnston asked if there is any public comment regarding the allegation that some people are gaming the party hunt application process by putting in for the party hunts with an applicant who has built up a number of bonus points, then the party draws tags, but the tag holder with numerous points then returns their tag so his/her points are restored, that person never intending to use the tag, thus benefitting the party.

Sean Shea said he talked with two people last week and they informed him that this was ok to do and they will keep doing it. Mr. Shea said he also knows a person who does this every year--he shops around for people who have the most points and then talks them into applying in the draw with him as a party. Mr. Shea feels this topic should definitely be put on the open item list.

Darin Elmore recommended the committee look at the last couple of years to see who chronically has returned their party tags to determine if this is happening. If this is happening then this is something that needs to be addressed.

Rex Flowers also stated this has been done, indicating that this has been stated directly to him. Mr. Flowers asked if there is a volume of these events or just a couple of individuals who are doing this? He would also like this on the open topic list for the committee to discuss.

Joe Crim said he doesn't know of anyone who is abusing the system, but if true, some are taking an advantage of an opportunity and it is being misused. He feels the committee should at least look at this topic item and after Don Sefton comes back with his information there might be a little more flavor for some type of action than we think.

Pete Mori suggested on waiting to see what Don Sefton comes back with and if there is something more to this. He suggested putting this topic item on the open item list at that point.

Paul Valentine said he agrees with the other committee members about putting this item on the open item topic list but would like the committee to be careful about restricting or determining if this is being misused. He also stated he would want to wait to see what Don Sefton's findings are.

Chairman Johnston suggested putting this item on the topic open item list for future once Don Sefton provides the committee with his findings. Chairman Johnston asked the committee to make a motion.

Rex Flowers motioned the committee to add to the list to determine if people are using party tag applications to further their chances of drawing a tag.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Johnston addressed topic item T.11.1.4 – Restricted Nonresident Guided Hunt – Eligibility for main draw and the PIW draw. Chairman Johnston asked if there were any public comment.

Mitch Buzzetti with Nevada Outfitter's and Guide Association (NOGA) decided as an organization to come to the TAAHC with some of their comments. In 2005 when the Commission adopted NAC 502.4237, it prohibited those applicants who were unsuccessful or rejected in the Restricted Nonresident Guide Hunt to apply in the main draw for mule deer. As a result this NAC further to excludes applicants from applying for PIW mule deer tags and for the Silver State mule deer tags as well. The original intent of this NRS was to support the guide industry and set aside a percentage of nonresident tags in a separate drawing for applicants who contracted with a guide. The intent was to make contracting with a guide more appealing. The guided draw had 1,643 applicants who applied for deer in 2005. Ten years later, because of NAC 502.4237, the guided hunt is down 600 applicants--last year there were 1,043 who applied in the 2015 guided draw. NDOW is losing money due to NAC 502.4237 and this also has an effect on the guide industry. The quotas are already set for the nonresident PIW and Silver State tags so there won't be more tags allotted for nonresidents and this would not have an effect on the resident quotas for these tags. What the NOGA is asking is to let the Restricted Nonresident applicants have an opportunity to apply for those tags. A nonresident now can apply in the main draw and is getting 3 shots at getting a deer tag. NOGA clients are only getting one shot and NOGA believes strongly that their clients are being discriminated against.

Maureen Hullinger pointed out that these are nonresident tags which these clients are applying for. They are not applying for resident tags so they are not competing against residents. They are only competing against their fellow nonresidents for the opportunity. Originally when the program was set up it was allowed but then it was changed in 2005.

Joe Crim asked how this change came about.

Rex Flower responded that the change was made because the restricted nonresident guided hunt was looked at as double dipping. They were allowed to participate in the restricted nonresident guided hunt then those who were unsuccessful were allowed to apply again in the main draw.

Maureen Hullinger stated this was not made clear at that time and that the quota for nonresidents is all one quota for nonresidents. The quota for the guided draw is taken off the top before you see the recommendation for the nonresident quota at the commission meeting. It's not necessarily a second chance at a tag, but because of the way the statute reads the department has to deduct those issued tags off of the nonresident quota recommendation before we set the quota for the nonresident tags in the main draw. Then we have to make sure there are enough tags for a party hunt in the main draw depending on the outcome after the guided draw. We are losing application fees by disallowing them from applying for those deer applications. The quota for the nonresident guided hunt is based off of the previous year's tags that are issued, and for the tags that go unsold, they just go away. There is a cap of 400 tags that can be issued out of the guided draw which has not hit that cap due to the lack of applicants applying in the guided draw.

Rex Flowers pointed out the clients who are unsuccessful in the guided draw do have the opportunity to apply in the second and First Come, First Serve draw for left over tags and does the NOGA let their clients know this.

Mitch Buzzetti stated that the nonresident guided hunt is a rifle hunt and most of the tags that are remaining after the main draw are for archery.

Pete Mori asked for clarification from Maureen Hullinger what she meant when she said the unissued tags after the guided draw "just go away."

Maureen Hullinger clarified that the quota for the guided draw requirement is set in statute and is based off of the quota from the previous year issued to nonresident, any legal weapon tags. There is a calculation and the quota is not to exceed 16% that is established in the prior year, and 37.5% per unit group so this sets the quota for that particular unit or unit group for the upcoming year. As an example, you could have 50 tags for area 101-108 and those tags might not all be issued through the guided draw. Whatever the balance is after the guided draw, because they are then based off of the prior year, are not added into the current year quota. As stated this is because the quota is calculated from the prior year. The way the statute reads is those tags issued out of a unit are subtracted from the nonresident deer quota for the main draw. To subtract them from the quota the Game Division utilizes the results of the guided draw when determining the nonresident deer allocation for the coming year main draw. What is presented to the Commission already has the guided quota subtracted. Essentially, the main draw is a remaining tag draw for the nonresident's any legal weapon hunt. In addition, statute stipulates that there is a cap of 400 tags for the guided draw. If the calculation to determining the guided quota provides an overall tag quota for the guided hunt over 400, statute only allows the issuance of 400 tags.. Once the cap is reached any undrawn clients become unsuccessful.

Pete Mori asked Mitch Buzzetti according to the letter the NOGA wrote to the committee on the loss of 600 applicants applying in the guided draw since 2005 due to draw opportunity, is this because applicants only want to apply in certain units? It makes no sense to him that there would be leftover tags in the nonresident guided draw and the guides would still loose clients.

Mitch Buzzetti responded that it is pretty much because it is unit specific; there are a number of people who strictly put in for quality areas with a limited quota. That is where you would lose those individuals, the ones who would be putting in for the real hard draws units and may assume their odds may be better if they put in the main draw. Also, another thing to keep in mind, a master guide is only allowed 30 successful clients and if you put in 60 clients, only 30 of them could draw, the other 30 would be unsuccessful.

Darin Elmore felt by not allowing the applicants from the guided draw to apply for PIW and Silver State, the resource suffers and the agency suffers by not having the opportunity to garner another \$10 or \$5. He said he believes it is an issue for PIW and Silver State, but he does believe it to be unfair to double-dip in the main draw.

Paul Valentine said he agrees with Mr. Elmore and would like to see these applicants be able to apply for the PIW and Silver State tags.

Pete Mori said he is looking more at the guides in the state of Nevada; they do have the information since this was changed in 2005 and it seems they have waited long enough to let this thing play out and it has impacted them. It is the committee's responsibility to rank this topic item as a 1, 2 or 3.

Rex Flowers said he has no problem with giving this consideration, and questions NOGA understanding that in order to accommodate them for Silver State and PIW, which is 4 tags total, that their draw could be delayed 2 ½ months later than where it is now? You have to put them in the same sequence in the same draw. The upside would be that the department would get more income and there would be one less draw to manage.

Joe Crim agrees this does need to be looked at to see if there is a way to work it out so we are not losing the revenue. We need to be diligent and look at this topic and give it consideration.

Chairman Johnston said he doesn't have an issue with the double dipping. If there is a nonresident who wants to come to Nevada to hunt, and he hooks up with a guide, applies in the guided hunt and is unsuccessful, then decides to put in for the main draw, then let them. This doesn't change the number of tags that are available to the nonresidents and if he draws that tag in the main draw, he would then hire that same guide he initially went with in on the restricted guided draw. This could produce potentially more business for the guides and outfitters. This is the message they are trying to send us. He understands giving them a second chance and doesn't know how much of an impact this would have on the other nonresidents. Chairman Johnston said he feels this is worthy of review. He also believes that a nonresident who puts in for the restricted guided hunt should be eligible to put in for the PIW and Silver State tags. Chairman Johnston asked the committee to make a motion.

Pete Mori moved to rank order T.11.1.4 as a "1", weighted as "likely".

Rex Flowers seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Review for Consideration – Topic Item A.3.12 and A.3.12.1. – Junior Mentor/Apprentice Tag Hunting Opportunities – Committee Chairman Johnston - For Possible Action

These items propose that if an eligible applicant draws a tag, a junior apprentice could fill the tag if he/she was with the applicant as an apprentice youth big game hunter.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any committee comment on this. There were none. Chairman Johnston opened the discussion up to the public for comments.

Sean Shea said he believes this shouldn't be limited to juniors only, but also expand it to first time hunters.

Chairman Johnston stated the topic as presented is limited to individuals, there is the junior apprentice topic and this was not specifically identified by age, and the prior one is youth's age of 8 to 18, so this is the limitation on the TAAHC topic list right now. If we wanted to expand this to any apprentice hunter, it would be a new issue that the committee would need to put on the open topic list and not to change the current topics.

Bob Haughian stated that the committee could amend the current topic but for clarity on this, we might want to show this as a sub-element for this one.

Darin Elmore said he would follow along with Mr. Shea's comment on opening this up to any first time hunters and feels we are excluding a potential larger opportunity by limiting this to only juniors. By doing this it would have a balloon effect in recruitment and he suggested that the committee should consider making it an apprentice program opposed to just making it a junior program.

Paul Valentine asked if this would allow a transfer of a tag to any hunter.

Maureen Hullinger responded that it depends on how this discussion goes as to what would happen with that tag. At the last TAAHC meeting NDOW provided Utah's example of this where the tag was in the tag holders name but Utah issues a permit to the person who is the apprentice and they can essentially take the animal. The tag holder's eligibility is still affected, the tag holder's bonus points are gone, and they may be in a waiting period. But they have allowed an opportunity for the apprentice hunter to pull the trigger and harvest an animal. It's not necessarily a transfer of a tag. It's a document that gives privilege that is associated with that tag. Therefore it is dependent upon how you go forward on this item. In Oregon it is a similar format with their mentor and apprentice program. We would definitely have to make some laws and regulation changes depending on how the TAAHC would like to proceed. Ms. Hullinger recommended the committee determine if this is an option or whether if it is feasible or desirable.

Chairman Johnston said he likes the proposal. If a youth hunter who was initially coached wants to go along, and he could fill my tag, this action isn't taking a tag away from anyone else. It's not changing the number of tags issued, just giving someone else the opportunity to potentially get into hunting activities. Chairman Johnston believes this is something worthy of consideration and moving this on to the commission to develop some sort of plan on how to implement an apprentice hunter program.

Joe Crim said this opportunity would probably get people out of their houses and into the hills to hunt whom normally won't hunt and he would like to see this move forward.

Rex Flowers said he is in favor of a mentoring program and adding a novice part so that older, inexperienced individuals could get into this and this could be a real strong point for hunters because this could assist retaining older age individuals and by amending this to also include the novice type hunter.

Pete Mori stated he certainly does not have a problem with moving this forward, however, looking at this Nevada mentoring program, he assumed it is a draft proposal and sees a lot of stuff on there that makes sense, but it seems like all of this is redundant because there are some people who don't want to have to buy a license or to apply and pay for the tag. These are the people that you are trying to attract. The adults are the ones who are capable of making a decision on whether they want to hunt or not. Most adults can afford to apply and buy the tag if they are successful. We currently have a program for youth ages from 12 to 17 and currently there are left over youth tag each year, so the opportunity is already there.

Paul Valentine stated he believes this has a lot of merit and should move forward to the commission. He stated, however, that he has concerns of two hunters in the field both with firearms pursuing the same deer,

Maureen Hullinger responded to Mr. Valentine's concern stating that Oregon's program limits only one firearm between the two hunters. These are the things that would need to be ironed out in the program guidelines and rules.

Chairman Johnston entertained a motion that he would like to present it to the commission an apprentice program and add in the elements that were discussed on this topic during this meeting.

Rex Flowers motioned to present topic item A.3.12.1, Apprentice License tag opportunity, to the commission, and move A.3.12, Big Game Mentor Youth Hunt, to the TAAHC closed topic list.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Chairman Johnston asked Rex Flowers for the clarification on his motion if this would be to make a recommendation from the TAAHC and make a presentation to the commission for the commission to entertain regulatory changes to implement an apprentice hunting opportunity.

Rex Flowers stated that was correct.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Review for Consideration - Topic Item A.3.13.1- Revise Youth Big Game Application Eligibility - Committee Chairman Johnston - For Possible Action

This item proposes to allow those who turn 12 years old during a hunting season/tag time period to be able to hunt effective their 12th birthday even if they are not 12 at the time the tag would otherwise start.

Chairman Johnston reported this item came from the Carson CAB and that the TAAHC had previously discussed this and weighted it as a "3," as "doubtful", and would like the committee to decide if it should be moved to the closed topic list.

Maureen Hullinger explained the background regarding the junior hunt before the committee opened it up for discussion. The junior hunt original language when it was first established was that they had to be 12 years old prior to the opening date of their season and not attain their 17th birthday by the close of the season. In 2010 this was changed to extend that period for the junior hunt to not obtaining their 18th birthday at the close of the season and not have more than 5 years of application (the original language was 4 years of application). The applications and the age have now been expanded for the juniors. The reason why the regulation was set for 12 years old is because statute states they can't have a tag if under the age of 12. When the season for the junior hunt was established, it was set for the multiple seasons--archery, muzzleloader and any legal weapon. Archery season opens in August so this excludes those first-time hunters who are not 12, but there are units that do have later seasons. Youth hunters are not excluded completely because if they turn 12 in October, they could apply in the regular 1331 deer hunt. They still have a hunting opportunity and the original NAC was written this way because NDOW's Law Enforcement had concerns with them having a big game tag in possession with seasons on it and not 12 years old, thus violating statute.

Doug Martin stated understands the committee's concern that this would expand the eligibility year for juniors but this is not a request for that and he wanted to clarify this to the committee. He stated a gentleman in Carson had approached him and said his son turns 12 in August, after the start of the archery season, but his son has no intention of archery or muzzleloader hunting, but because we combine all those hunting opportunities for the youths, his son who turns 12 in August could not go hunting that year with his father. Mr. Martin said he realizes that the statute regarding the youth hunt is clear and that a child under 12 years old shall not hunt big game. However, the statute does not exclude an 11 year old from applying for a big game tag and he believes the agenda item addresses both the statutes as well as supporting opportunity for youths. Mr. Martin also stated that Law Enforcement's concern is a valid concern but could be dealt with in the field and it is very clear that when you sign on the application processes that your child can not hunt until they are 12. There are many ways that the commission could deal with this and one of them is that if your child has not reached the age of 12 until after the start of the archery season, they can't get an archery tag. Instead of giving all of the seasons to the youth, only give the season that the youth is qualified to hunt. Mr. Martin stated that he hoped the committee would not put this topic item on the closed topic list.

Sean Shea said he also was contacted by a Washoe county resident about this topic who has a child that turns 12 year old on August 11, and deer archery season starts on August 10. The person was also curious as to why the child could not hunt until they turned 12.

Rex Flower stated he was not in favor of this. The child does have 5 years to apply starting after their 12th birthdate in the youth deer hunt. The child is not out of the hunt entirely unless his birthdate falls in mid or late November. There are 5 hunt units that open up in late November. It is up to the parent to determine if the child is to accompany the parent on the hunt or to get the child into the field to hunt. The tags are for archery, muzzleloader and any legal weapon and if this is amended for a few exceptions are you then going to have to come out with a new tag.

Joe Crim agreed with Rex Flowers on this and he stated he has three kids who fall into this same group that was mentioned. He stated his daughter's birthday falls in late August and she had to wait until the following year to apply. This did not affect her hunting opportunity and he believes she still has the same opportunities as other kids who have the earlier birthdates. He said he is not in favor of this.

Paul Valentine asked for clarification from Maureen Hullinger as what is the oldest age a youth hunter could get a tag.

Maureen Hullinger stated a child can hunt in the junior hunt through the age of 17 but can't turn 18 before the close of the season. The maximum years they can apply in the junior draw are 5 years.

Paul Valentine stated he agrees with Rex Flowers and Joe Crim and suggested that this item be moved to the closed topic list or leave this item weighted of "3".

Pete Mori also agreed with the other committee members stating he felt his children were more qualified hunters at the age of 16 or 17 than they would have been at 11.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments from the committee. There were none. Chairman Johnston opened up to the committee to make a motion.

Rex Flowers motioned that topic item A.3.13.1- Revise Youth Big Game Application Eligibility to remain weighted as a "3" and be moved to the TAAHC topic closed list.

Joe Crim seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Review for Consideration – Topic Items A.6.2.5 and A.6.2.7 - Related to Antelope and Elk Waiting Periods - Committee Chairman Johnston - For Possible Action

These items request that the Committee review current regulations for antelope and elk associated with waiting periods and discuss whether there is a need to change them.

Chairman Johnston informed the committee members that he would not be participating in this discussion nor would he be voting on this issue because he himself is in a waiting period for elk.

Joe Crim stated he is also in a waiting period for antelope and said he would not cast a vote regarding antelope waiting periods.

Chairman Johnston informed the committee that the antelope waiting period item was brought forth by the Lyon CAB for consideration on whether or not the waiting period is still needed.

Darin Elmore said he would be curious to know how many people are in the waiting period for both elk and antelope, how many years are they out, what has happened to the application trend after they become eligible again and also would like to take a look at the true numbers. He said looking at the 2015 hunt results for antelope, the resident applications are right around 14,000 for a total of 2,600 tags available. This works out to be just under 19% so if you look at 20% or less draw odds, 1 in 5 makes sense by just looking at it at the surface. This isn't the whole story and we would need to have the whole story in order to really understand what is or isn't happening and where the concern is.

Rex Flowers informed Mr. Elmore that for 10 years or more for the people who have bonus point, there are only three individuals so 1%. In the 5 to 9 years, there are 454 people waiting, so that's 4% of the applicants. If dropping the waiting period to three years, there would be an additional 454 applicants. These numbers are only resident applicants for antelope, all weapon types.

Chairman Johnston recalled at the last TAAHC meeting that Don Sefton had provided the numbers on waiting periods for the bull elk and stated his recollection was that it wasn't going to change the odds of the draw as much as you would think, especially with the increase in tags that are going out.

Rex Flowers also added that with the numbers he previously provided for antelope, this past season 358 people drew a tag with no bonus points, which is about 2 ½% of the applicants. If you went to a three-year waiting period, and put 354 people back in that draw this number would go up to 497 people with no bonus points. 19% of all tags would go to someone with no bonus points.

Chairman Johnston stated by changing the waiting period for antelope from 5 years to 3 years seems like a reasonable course of action according to the information provided by Mr. Flowers.

Paul Valentine said by changing the antelope waiting period to 3 years, he could support this.

Pete Mori said he also agrees with changing the waiting period for antelope to 3 years.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments and if not to make a motion. There were none.

Paul Valentine motioned to move topic item A.6.2.5 antelope waiting period forward to the commission for consideration to change the antelope waiting period from 5 year waiting period to a 3 year waiting period.

Pete Mori seconded the motion.

Motion carried 4 to 0 with Joe Crim abstaining from the vote.

Chairman Johnston asked Rex Flowers to take over the discussion on topic item A.6.2.7 since he is in a waiting period for bull elk.

Rex Flowers opened the discussion for public comments regarding this topic item.

Sean Shea informed the committee that Washoe CAB brought up this topic. If you have to wait 10 years before you can apply again, your tendency is not to shoot a small bull, and since the numbers of elk are going through the roof, Washoe CAB's idea was to bring the waiting period down to a 5 year waiting period. This would help with harvesting a smaller bull if their hunt was coming to a close as opposed to if they had to wait 10 years before applying again. He stated the reason Washoe CAB brought up this topic item was to help with harvesting more bull elk and right now it seems there are not enough bulls being harvested according to the ratios.

Mitch Buzzetti said he is very familiar with the elk population problem in Elko County and also agrees with Mr. Shea. He suggested either changing the waiting period to 5 years if didn't harvest, and 5 years if did harvest, and have it even across the board.

Darin Elmore hopes that the department would address the spike elk definition to broaden it and to provide more opportunity there for people who just want to shoot an elk. He stated he reviewed the elk bonus point data from last year and it appears that there are a handful of units that are trophy units and the guys with the bonus points who apply for them are also applying for other opportunities and are drawing the tags. There is a significant trend in the data to show that is the case. He suggested that if this is to go into effect, the committee should look at waiting one year to put this into effect.

Pete Mori said he agreed with all of the public comments and has spent 10 years in a waiting period and this is a long time to sit out. With the increase of numbers of elk, he recalls the data that Don Sefton with SCI provided, and there were about 3% of the applicants who had over 15 bonus points for bull elk and never have drawn a tag in Nevada. He stated he was in support of moving the waiting period for harvest or no harvest to 5 years.

Paul Valentine recalled this topic was discussed at the last TAAHC meeting and Mr. Mori was the one to bring up the 5 and 5 year waiting period, and he said he also agrees with Mr. Elmore's idea about giving a year that this will go into effect for those hunters who do have 13, 14 or more bonus points to be able to make a decision to apply sooner before we have any kind of change in the total number of applicants.

Rex Flowers asked if there were any more comments. There were none, He then asked the committee to make a motion.

Pete Mori motioned to move topic item A.6.2.7 change bull elk waiting period and move forward to the commission at the TAAHC recommendation of 5 years successful tag holders and 5 years for unsuccessful tag holders, and to also include a start year if possible in the regulations.

Paul Valentine seconded the motion.

Motion carried 3 to 0 with Joe Crim and Chairman Johnston abstaining from the vote.

9. Review for Consideration – Topic Item - A.9.2.2 - Change the Partnership in Wildlife (PIW) Draw Sequence - Committee Chairman Johnston - For Possible Action

The Washoe County CAB proposes moving the PIW drawing sequence to precede the main drawing. Applicants should have the opportunity to draw PIW tags over unit-specific tags. Currently the PIW draw occurs after the draw.

Chairman Johnston informed the committee that Washoe CAB provided the TAAHC with information regarding loss of revenue due to the current order of the main draw. The total potential loss of revenue is \$119,640 by people not being able to put in for the PIW draw over a 5 year period from 2010 to 2014 because they drew a tag in the main draw and therefore ineligible to apply for PIW.

Sean Shea said he had run the numbers for 2015 and came up with a loss of revenue of almost \$34,000; this would be an average revenue loss of \$34,000 a year due to the sequence of the PIW draw. He felt that everyone would prefer to draw a PIW tag versus a state unit-specific tag.

Darin Elmore stated he agrees with Mr. Shea, with the caveat that last year in 2015 the draw odds for PIW were 1,075 to 1. He questioned whether we would lose potential applicants if the PIW draw goes first would those odds change drastically, because then it is going to mirror the Silver State Tag. This should be something to consider in the discussion.

Maureen Hullinger informed the committee of the history of the PIW drawing and that the PIW drawing was considered as a second-chance drawing. If you were unsuccessful in the main draw, you had an opportunity to draw a statewide tag. This was the first program for the sportsman to draw a statewide tag. Then the Silver State and Dream Tag drawing came later. The PIW was first implemented in 1996 and at that time if you wanted to opt in, all of the applications were on paper, so you had to pay all fees up front. Depending on the species, half of your tag fee was held on the big game and for deer, your entire tag fee was held back and you didn't get it back as a refund. The odds at that time was lower, due to the cost to participate, and in some cases better than the main draw. In 2001 the fee to participate was changed to \$10 to improve revenue for that program.

Rex Flowers stated he was in favor of moving the PIW draw. He also suggested to the committee if this goes forward, to also lump in the Restricted Nonresident Guide hunt to be included.

Pete Mori stated the intent of the PIW was your last attempt to get a tag but after looking at the numbers, he supports going forward with this.

Paul Valentine said he is in favor of supporting this based of the comments provided.

Joe Crim supports moving this forward to allow more opportunity if the need and desire is there.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more comments, there were none. He then asked the committee to make a motion.

Joe Crim motioned to move forward to the commission with topic item A.9.2.2 to change the PIW draw sequence.

Rex Flowers seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Johnston requested to the committee to re-open agenda item 5 and to remove the redundant items to the closed topic list. He suggested moving topic item A.3.12 to the closed topic item list, as well as moving A.3.4, A.3.6 and A.3.10 to the closed topic list, due to their redundancy. These items relate to adult drawing a tag and transferring to a youth to use, allowing a youth to fill a general tag and a novice hunter eligibility species. Also, move A.6.2.6, the bull elk waiting period, to the closed list, as it is a redundant item that was weighted as a "3." Topic item A.9.2 and A.9.2.1, the PIW draw sequence, is also identified as redundant and these items should also be moved to the closed topic item list.

Rex Flowers recalled the TAAHC discussing earlier on item A.2.10, fee evaluation, and has a rating of "NA", and that it is the department's place to set fees or ask the legislature to make fee changes. There are 3 different items under that topic--A.2.1, A.2.2 and A.2.10--which should all be moved to the closed list since the TAAHC has no authority over fee changes.

Chairman Johnston made a motion to the committee to move the following topic items from the open topic list to the closed topic list: A.2.1, A.2.2, A.2.10, A.3.4, A.3.6, A.3.10, A.6.2.6, A.9.2 and A.9.2.1.

Paul Valentine seconded the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

10. Public Comment Period

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

Sean Shea said he had talked to a friend who lives in Elko, and has been building up bonus points for Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep and stated that his bonus points outweigh all of the nonresident points, and should he move to Wyoming he could get a Rocky Mountain BHS tag because he has more points than other nonresidents. Mr. Shea then asked the question to other hunters if they could purchase a bonus point for a hunt that wasn't offered in Nevada so you could keep up with the residents, would they continue to buy bonus points and if so would they move out of state, and possibly could have double the points? All of them stated they had no problem with buying a bonus point for a hunt that wasn't currently offered. He stated this could potentially be additional revenue for the department.

Chairman Johnston asked Mr. Shea if he would send him an email on this topic so that way it could be put on the agenda for a future meeting.

Chairman Johnston asked if there were any more public comments, there were none.

11. Future Committee Meetings – Committee Chairman Johnston – Informational

The Committee may confirm the date and location of the next TAAHC meeting.

Next TAAHC will be scheduled in May in Reno. Time and Location to be determined.

Meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.