

CHAIRMAN TOMMY CAVIGLIA  
COMMISSIONER TIFFANY EAST  
COMMISSIONER RON PIERNI  
CABMW REP. JOE CRIM  
CABMW REP. ARNIE PITTS  
PUBLIC REP. MEGHAN BROWN

STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE:  
KIM MUNOZ, DATS DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR  
[kim.munoz@ndow.org](mailto:kim.munoz@ndow.org), 775-688-1565  
MEGAN MANFREDI, MANAGEMENT ANALYST  
[mmanfredi@ndow.org](mailto:mmanfredi@ndow.org), 775-688-1881

**APPROVED MINUTES**  
NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS  
**TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE**

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2021 @ 2:00PM

Please click this URL to join.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82996277535?pwd=bVJTZHppODJMYjYrMkVKMUJVBhBXdz09>

Passcode: 009684

Committee Members: Chairman Tommy Caviglia, Commissioner Tiffany East, Commissioner Ron Pierini, CABMW Representative Joe Crim, Public Representative Meghan Brown.

Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance: Data and Technology Services (DATS) Division Administrator Kim Munoz, Management Analyst Megan Manfredi, Management Analyst Kailey Musso, Deputy Director Jack Robb, Game Division Administrator Mike Scott, Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox, Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne, Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody McKee, Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder, Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson, Outdoor Connection Coordinator Bobby Jones

County advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Members and public in attendance: Rex Flowers

1. Call to Order, Pledge and Roll Call – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia

Chairman Caviglia called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. Commissioner East led the pledge. Chairman Tommy Caviglia, Commissioner Tiffany East, Commissioner Ron Pierini, CABMW Representative Joe Crim, Public Representative Meghan Brown were present. CABMW Representative Arnie Pitts was absent.

2. Approval of Agenda – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action

The Committee will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Committee may remove items from the agenda, continue items for consideration or take items out of order.

**CABMW REPRESENTATIVE CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE BROWN. MOTION PASSED 5-0.**

3.\* Approval of Minutes – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action

The Committee may take action to approve Committee minutes from the August 5, 2021 meeting.

Commissioner East asked for clarification on a statement made by DATS Division Administrator Kim Munoz regarding the beneficiary piece being added to a customer's account.

**COMMISSIONER EAST MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED WITH THE NOTED CHANGES, SECONDED BY CHAIR CAVIGLIA. MOTION PASSED 5-0.**

4.\* Specialty Tags Closed Units Procedure Review – DATS Division Administrator Kimberly Munoz

The Committee will discuss the possibility changing the procedure for how units are closed to Bighorn Sheep hunts for specialty tags.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz stated that DATS had a meeting with the game division to discuss potential possibilities to clarify the process around closing units around bighorn sheep specialty tags. She presented the options discussed by the Department as:

- A. No unit closures for the Heritage tags. Harvests will be docked from the next season's quota available to the general public.
- B. Split the state into Eastern and Western regions and distribute tags evenly between the two.
- C. Send a text to sheep tag holders once a harvest limit has been reached in certain units or tag holders must call into a Department of Wildlife hotline stating what units are closed before hunting for the day. Similar to the bear hunt.
- D. Specialty tags are assigned a separate quota for each unit. Harvests are reported and units are closed to all other specialty tag holders after quota is reached.

Chairman Caviglia expressed some concerns around the idea for removing the quota from the general public and possible public confusion by splitting the state.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott elaborated on the idea of having a separate quota for the specialty tags and explained that the quota would be based on the quota to the general public. Once that quota was met, specialty tag holders would be notified of the unit closure.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox explained the reasoning behind this procedure and that the current procedure in place becomes confusing and difficult to track for both the Game and DATS division staff.

Chairman Caviglia asked if the people purchasing the specialty tags would know the quota before they purchased.

Game Division Administrator Scott explained that they would know the concept and know that every open unit would be available to all specialty tag holders on opening day of the season. Most units will not change much over the years except for those units with a low quota.

Chairman Caviglia expressed concerns around areas in units where there is not cellphone service to receive notifications and the possibility of an overharvest in those units.

Game Division Administrator Scott stated that the concern was possible on many hunts that are offered by the Department but with the conservative nature taken when setting quotas, an overharvest would not be detrimental to the species.

Commissioner East asked if the Department knew when the specialty hunts normally take place and are harvesting within the season.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cox explained that the harvest data is collected with the survey and that on average, the specialty tag holders are harvesting within the first couple of weeks of the season. Those starting dates have been changed over the past few years.

Management Analyst Manfredi clarified that quotas are normally set in May. Which would be before the opener of the season but traditionally after the purchase of the Heritage tags.

Chairman Caviglia shared that he like the Game Division's proposed option over what is currently in place. He shared examples of the confusion that the public has around what units are opened or closed due to the prior year's harvests.

Game Division Administrator Scott shared confusion that happens within the Department when trying to draft the Commission Regulation.

Public Representative Brown asked if there was any consequence if there was an overharvest to a unit and if there was, asked the Department to be sure and share that information so it is common public knowledge.

Commissioner Pierini added that the proposed option of additional communication to the tag holders will make the program better. He also added that the Department communicates often with the specialty tag holders and suggested gathering feedback from them as to what is or is not working to continually better the program.

CABMW Representative Crim added that he like the proposal from game but suggested the quota of those specialty tag holders be lower than what was proposed to prevent the chance of over harvest.

Commissioner East stated that she liked the proposal from Game and the suggestion by CABMW Representative Crim.

Chairman Caviglia asked what the current procedure was for the public around the bear hotline.

Game Division Administrator Scott answered that it was up to the tag holder to call that hotline daily to receive notification if a unit or area has reached the limit of harvest and has been closed. The hotline is updated daily as needed by the Department depending on harvest.

Commissioner East asked if there has ever been an overharvest in the bear units.

Game Division Administrator Scott answered that they have closed units but never had an additional harvest out of a closed unit.

Public Comment:

Rex Flowers stated that he agreed with the option proposed and discussed by the Game Division and agreed that the specialty tag quota should be lower than what was being proposed. He expressed concern about the change not being notified to the public as an action item, potentially leaving some organizations who are very involved in the current process unaware of the change.

Chairman Caviglia asked if the Department was looking for direction with this agenda item.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz clarified that the Department is looking for direction from the Committee to expedite the process of drafting the Commission Regulation that will be heard by the Commission in January's meeting. The Commission will then have the ability to approve the changes and hear public comment on the changes in their January meeting.

Commissioner East stated that she tried to encourage members of the Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU) to participate in today's meeting, but no members are in attendance. She expressed a desire to hear from partner organizations around this topic.

Management Analyst Manfredi clarified that if it is the Committee's desire, an updated draft of the policy can be brought back to the Committee for review before adding the language to the Commission Regulation to be heard in January's Commission meeting.

**CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA MOVED TO DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT TO REVISE THE POLICY OF THE CLOSED UNITS FOR SPECIALTY TAGS BASED UPON THE OPTION PRESENTED BY THE GAME DIVISION AND TO GIVE THE DEPARTMENT THE LEEWAY TO SET THE SPECIALTY TAG QUOTAS WITH THEIR BEST JUDGEMENT, TO BE HEARD AT THE NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING FOR REVIEW.**

5.\* Commission General Regulation 499 - Bonus Point Only Application Period – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – Informational

An update will be given to the Committee on draft language amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 chapters that would decouple the hunt application periods with the 7-day bonus point only application period and create a separate period for bonus point only purchases as directed by the Committee in August's meeting. The change also defines what "awarded" means to a successful draw applicant.

Management Analyst Manfredi gave an update on CGR 499 as directed by the Committee during the last meeting. A workshop will be held later that week during September's Commission meeting to further discuss the language changes.

Commissioner East stated that there was confusion at the Washoe CABMW meeting as to why this is being presented. Concern was expressed that additional timeframes might cause the Department to lose sportsmen and deter them from applying. She asked for an explanation as to why this change would be necessary.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz answered that this change would expedite the release of the big game draw results to the public due to waiting for the 7-day bonus point only period to close before the Department can receive a completed dataset to begin the validation process.

Chairman Caviglia added that this option also gives the public additional opportunity to keep their bonus points if they happened to miss the main big game application period.

6.\* Commission General Regulation 501 - Tag Transfer Program – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – For Possible Action

The Committee will review draft language of Commission General Regulation 501 that would provide direction for allowing the transfer of game tags to non-profit organizations and determine the status of a tag if the holder is diseased. This regulation was created after the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 89 of the 81<sup>st</sup> Legislative Session.

Management Analyst Manfredi gave an update on the draft language of CGR 501 as directed by the Committee during the August meeting and shared the additional information added by the Department. The beneficiary language was shared with the Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) who stated that the proposed language conforms to the intent of AB 89.

Commissioner East suggested adding clarifying language that would prohibit the exchange of money when transferring a tag to an organization.

Discussion was had around the language that would designate a beneficiary to a tag in the event of the tag holder's death and if it followed the intent of AB 89.

Chairman Caviglia asked if qualifying the organizations would need to be written into the regulation or if it would be a newly created policy by the Department.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz answered that it would be a policy of the Department that would need to be created along with forms needed to apply.

Public Representative Brown asked if language needed to be included that would add a limiting timeframe on the decision of what is to be done with the new owner or beneficiary of the tag.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz agreed that it would be beneficial to add a timeframe to the language.

Chairman Caviglia added that a limitation to transferring a tag is needed to be included in the language.

Management Analyst Kailey Musso spoke to the potential confusion around placing the new tag transfer language into a newly adopted regulation that has yet to be codified by LCB. The two tag transfer regulations will marry up once adopted. She gave background information on the reasoning behind why this bill was brought forward during the last legislative session.

Public Comment:

Rex Flowers commented that he would like to see the tag revert to the Department to be made available in the First-Come, First-Served program. HE added that a list of qualified organizations should be available to the public by March 1 of every year so that people applying for tags can know what options are available if they are successful.

Chairman Caviglia shared concern around the language that reverts a tag back to the Department for their discretion to transfer the tag to anyone. He foresees the public having issue around that portion. He asked if it would still be possible for a person to notify the Department of a death wishing to obtain a tag when no beneficiary was designated and if the Department would still honor that request.

Management Analyst Musso stated that once this regulation is in place, it is outlining what a family member can and cannot do.

Commissioner Pierini asked if there would be a perceived possibility of family members fighting over who would receive the tag of the deceased tag holder.

Public Representative Brown suggested that the Committee direct the Department to send the discussed changes today to LCB for a more thorough review and opinion on whether or not this met the intent of AB 89 so the Committee can have better direction moving forward.

Management Analyst Manfredi confirmed the process from LCB but clarified that the language may not be received back from LCB in time to discuss at the next scheduled Committee meeting.

Discussion continued around the need to honor AB 89 without a proper process in place as approved by the Commission and if the proposed process of a beneficiary would honor the bill's intention. Examples of Department interactions were given in instances of the death of a tag holder.

**COMMISSIONER EAST MOVED TO APPROVE THE DRAFT LANGUAGE OF CGR 501 WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: UNDER 2C, THE TAG WOULD REVERT BACK TO THE DEPARTMENT. INCLUDING TIMEFRAMES FOR DETERMINING THE USE OF A TAG BY A BENEFICIARY AND AN ORGANIZATION PRE-QUALIFYING TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM AND INCLUDING LANGUAGE PROHIBITING THE SALE OF A TAG. THE DEPARTMENT IS DIRECTED TO SUBMIT THE REGULATION WITH THE CHANGES TO LCB FOR OFFICIAL DRAFTING. SECONDED BY PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE BROWN. MOTION PASSED 5-0.**

7. Mule Deer Waiting Period – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action

The Committee will discuss the possibility of creating a waiting period for those applicants who were successful in drawing a mule deer tag.

No new data or information was presented by the Department.

Chairman Caviglia stated that he was unsure about moving forward with applying a waiting period to the mule deer hunts because he has spoken to people who have no bonus points and are happy to hunt units considered unpopular but have high draw odds. Applying a waiting period would be detrimental to those individuals. For those individuals wanting to hunt in the highly popular units for potential trophy animals, it is part of the strategy of applying in areas with lower draw odds and waiting to draw is part of that game. One change in the process may not affect those hunters wanting the high popular units as they might think.

The Committee members agreed to wait for additional information before taking action.

No public comment.

**CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA CLOSED THE AGENDA ITEM WITH NO MOTION.**

Break from 3:32PM to 3:42PM.

8. Mule Deer Junior Hunt Eligibility Requirement Review – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action

The Committee will discuss the possibility limiting the number of tags a junior can be awarded and/or the junior age requirements to give more opportunities to more juniors.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz shared a presentation reviewing past data shared with the Committee around the Junior Hunts as well as the results of a survey distributed to junior hunters by the Department. The DATS Division collaborated with staff from the Game and Conservation Education Divisions to prepare potential options for the Committee to deliberate. Those options included:

- 1) Increase junior tag allocation from 25 percent per unit to 30 percent. This would render 475 more tags but decrease the resident mule deer quota by 5 percent.
- 2) Limit the program to four years applicant participation with a maximum age of 16-years-old. This would render 550 more tags.
- 3) Break out the weapon class to any legal weapon or archer and muzzleloader bundle. This would render 400-500 more archery and muzzleloader tags. These estimates are based on a conservative hunt success rate.
- 4) Create a draw order for junior applicants. If a junior draws any other tag, they become ineligible for the junior tag. This would render 220 more tags.

Chairman Caviglia asked if splitting the weapon classes would make the additional tags available for both any legal weapon and the primitive weapon bundle classes.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder answered that the equation does shift some demand from the any legal weapon category which would provide a lower quota but add additional opportunities to be offered in the archery and muzzleloader classes because they have a lower success rate.

Commissioner East asked why the age rang of the junior hunters drops dramatically after the applicants reach the age of 16.

The Committee speculated why there might be a drop in participation for youth ages 17 and 18 years old.

Chairman Caviglia asked why the age range of participation was amended to 18 years old from the original creation with the age range from 12 to 16 years old.

No Committee or Department staff members could answer that question.

Commissioner East stated that options two and three were, in her opinion, the best choices to increase interest and recruitment. She expressed her opposition of limiting the number of tags an individual should receive in a draw.

Game Division Administrator Scott explained that the option came from data around some junior hunters holding up to four tags while other juniors draw none. The option to break out the weapon classes came from the thought that it would allow for more people to participate in the field. Limitations come from an applicant wanting to hunt close to their home in a season that is convenient, and it could present challenges to some parents.

Chairman Caviglia agreed with Commission East that options two and three sounded like the best choice in direction.

Public Comment:

Rex Flowers stated that the history of the program's creation provided approximately 2,800 tags to the junior program with an established age range from 12 to 16 years old. Those youth could draw three successful tags before becoming ineligible. The Commission extended the age range from 12 to 18 years old around 2010 and increased the successfully drawn tag limit to five. The program was intended to give the youth a taste of hunting but not overwhelm them. He requested a review of the NAC for a tag limit as the program was not intended to provide more than four tags out of the program for a single applicant. He expressed to the Committee his desire that they do not take action until Commission Policy 24 is reviewed as he would like to see some changes made to the policy that would create a better program, including the numbers of tags awarded to juniors based off an actual demand and success formula instead of a set number as it was with the creation of the program. He shared that he would like the program to be limited to buck harvests only as that would allow for a lower success rate.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz clarified that NAC does not provide a tag limit to an applicant but does state the number of years an application can participate in the program.

Chairman Caviglia added that he has heard a lot of public concern around the junior hunters being allowed to harvest does.

Commissioner East heard a lot of frustration with the general public and the junior hunt program around the number of tags each junior receives.

The Committee discussed Commission Policy 24 and it's affects on the junior hunt program.

**COMMISSIONER EAST MOVED TO DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT TO BEGIN DRAFTING LANGUAGE TO AMEND NAC AND OTHER DEPARTMENTAL DOCUMENTS OR PROCEDURES THAT WOULD INCORPORATE LIMITING THE YEARS OF PARTICIPATION TO FOUR, DROPPING THE MAXIMUM AGE OF PARTICIPATION TO 16, AND BREAKING OUT THE WEAPON CLASSES TO AN ANY LEGAL WEAPON CATEGORY AND AN ARCHERY, MUZZLELOADER BUNDLE CATEGORY. CHANGES ARE TO BE PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW PRIOR TO BEING PRESENTED TO THE COMMISSION. SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA. MOTION PASSED 5-0.**

9. Future Committee Meeting – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action  
The committee will discuss possible future agenda topics set a date and time for the next committee meeting.

Chairman Caviglia stated that the next Committee meeting will correspond with the November Commission meeting. Included in the meeting will be agenda items for the specialty tag unit closures, mule deer waiting period, and possibly the junior hunt regulation changes and tag transfer regulation changes depending on their return from LCB.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz stated for the record that the next Commission meeting is scheduled to be held on November 5 and 6, 2021.

Public Comment:

Rex flowers stated that he would like the Committee to review for potential adoption a novice hunter program for inexperienced hunters who are 18-years or older.

10. Public Comment Period

This period is for general comment on anything not on the agenda. No committee action will be taken but may be scheduled on a future committee agenda. The 3- and 6-minute time limits still apply.

No public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:31PM.