



IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

600 S Walnut / P.O. Box 25
Boise, Idaho 83707

Brad Little / Governor
Jim Fredericks / Director

Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group MEETING MINUTES

December 19th, 2024

Ellary TuckerWilliams, Legislative and Community Engagement Coordinator, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Members attending virtually included: Aaron Lieberman, Benn Brocksome, Brad Compton, James Petzke (present for a portion of the meeting), Mark Harris, Mike Veile, Ned Burns, Jerry Cloninger, and Tyrel Stevenson.

Michael Fuller was absent from the meeting but provided his votes via email.

IDFG staff in attendance included: Ellary TuckerWilliams, Tara Reichert, Rick Ward, and Elizabeth Page.

In compliance with open meeting law, members of the public had the opportunity to view virtually through a Zoom meeting link.

Virtual Meeting Ground Rules Reminder:

Ellary TuckerWilliams reiterated the ground rules for the meeting, as established in a prior meeting on July 29th, 2024.

Overview of Public Comments Received:

Members of the public had the opportunity to submit public comments, which were summarized and provided to the advisory members prior to the meeting. There will be continued opportunity for public comment, should these recommendations continue through the rules process.

At the closing of public feedback form there were 281 unique responses received through the Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group's feedback form on the IDFG website. The majority of responses are resident hunters from Idaho (59%), and 41% are nonresidents from other states.

In general, many hunters cited their frustration with the current system for a variety of reasons including the online application process, perceived unfairness with in-person or vendor tag accessibility vs online, the in-person ability to purchase tags for other people, and the inability to apply for tags online as a hunt party. There was also concern with increased demand on the resource leading to overhunting and lower wildlife quality/health, and perceptions that changes to tag sales were primarily to increase IDFG revenues. The bulk of responses were pro-draw

(n=135), with the majority of those individuals being residents (n=102). Non-residents are mostly split between pro-draw (n=33) and pro-OTC (n=27). Residents also have strong responses towards increasing the price of non-resident tags (n=51) and reducing the overall number of non-resident tags (n=48), many citing a goal of reducing the total number of non-resident hunters. Only one non-resident hunter suggested increasing prices or reducing the number of tags.

Comments from outfitters generally center around concern for reducing the total number of outfitter tags and ensuring that outfitters have access to non-resident tags. Some suggestions are to separate the outfitter tags from the non-resident allotment or to increase the number of outfitter tags. Outfitters often cite the added economic benefits that the outfitting industry brings to Idaho. Comments from the general public suggest frustration with outfitters accessing non-resident tags and “gaming” the system, and a wish for them to be removed or reduced from the tag sale.

December 10th Non-Resident Tag Sale Recap for 2024:

Tara Reichert, Licensing and Operations Manager for the Bureau of Administration, presented a recap of the December 10th Non-Resident Tag Sale for 2024. Tara noted that this recent sale demonstrated a significant improvement in system performance compared to previous sales, with positive feedback received from the public. While the process was lengthy, it was executed smoothly. However, some persistent issues, primarily related to human behavior, were observed. Despite these challenges, the sale was deemed a success, underscoring the need for continued efforts to address these recurring issues.

Finalization of General Season Deer and Elk Tag Draw Framework Recommendation Language (Action Item):

The group discussed the process for reviewing recommendations. It was clarified that the goal was to achieve consensus recommendations, as outlined in the Charter, while also acknowledging that a discussion document would be produced to provide additional context. Dissenting votes and their reasons would also be presented to the Commission. The group agreed to proceed in sequence, wordsmithing drafted recommendation then voting on each recommendation before moving to the next. A member raised concerns about the final product and the need for consensus, emphasizing the importance of clarity in the Commission's desired outcome. A question was asked about the ability to add recommendations such as an “opt in” option for non-resident applicants wishing to be contacted by an outfitter. The group agreed to review additional recommendations at a later point in the meeting.

The group discussed incorporating recommendations submitted via email by group members Mike Fuller and James Petzke into the decision-making process. While some members expressed reservations about receiving their recommendations before the initial vote, the group consensus was to include their preferences. The group agreed to allow the facilitator to provide feedback on their recommendations line by line to ensure accurate representation. It was clarified that the focus would be on language changes and that a motion/second and roll call vote would be conducted for each recommendation. The group acknowledged that the Charter requires a quorum of six and a super majority vote for any recommendation to move forward to the

Commission for consideration and that incorporating feedback from Fuller and Petzke would be helpful. Ultimately, the group agreed to include their votes via email without further discussion.

1. Draw vs Over-the-Counter Non-Resident Tag Issuance Framework

- a. The Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group recommends to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission the following non-resident general season deer and elk tag framework:
 - i. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game is to transition from its current over-the-counter non-resident general season deer and elk tag framework to a draw system.

Member Ned Burns moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- ii. Outfitter tag allocation is to be separate from this non-resident general season deer and elk tag draw system.

Member Mark Harris moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Aaron Lieberman seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion on the First Recommendation:

The discussion began with a member emphasizing the need to explicitly exclude outfitter set-aside tags from the current recommendation, as they are not currently addressed. This led to debate on the best approach: some members proposed a separate recommendation for outfitter allocations, while others argued for including them in the current recommendation, albeit with modifications.

Concerns were raised about the potential impact on the outfitting industry and the need for a clear allocation framework before proceeding with draw system recommendations. One member stated they would abstain from voting until a clearer understanding of the allocation direction was established, emphasizing the importance of industry engagement in the decision-making process.

Ultimately, the group agreed that a separate recommendation for outfitter allocations would be more appropriate, while also acknowledging the need to address other groups with set-aside tags, such as mentored youth and disabled veterans.

2. General Season Deer and Elk Tag Draw System

- a. The Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group recommends to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission the following for a general season deer and elk non-resident tag draw system:
 - i. Non-residents can only apply for the general season deer and elk tag draws online, over the phone, at regional offices, or at approved vendors.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- ii. Idaho will be the first western state to close its draw application window, barring any extenuating circumstances.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- iii. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will charge a non-refundable draw application fee, in an amount to be determined by the Commission.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Mark Harris seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- iv. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will require non-residents to have a valid same-year Idaho big game hunting license to apply for the general season deer and elk tag draws.

Member Mark Harris moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- v. The transfer of general nonresident season deer and elk tags to save place in quota will not be allowed, except outfitter-allocated non-resident general season deer and elk tags may be transferred to another outfitted non-resident hunter at the request of the licensed outfitter.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Aaron Lieberman seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- vi. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will offer a group option on the general season deer and elk tag draw applications. Specifics to be determined by the Department.

Member Jerry Cloninger moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- vii. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will preauthorize credit/debit card transactions and charge for successful general season non-resident deer and elk tag draw applicants. Note: The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the quantity of tags in a subsequent draw or OTC sale, decrease the likelihood of less desirable tags going unsold, and provide consistency with other western states.

Member Brad Compton moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- viii. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will notify successful non-resident general season deer and elk draw applicants with failed credit card transactions that they have a short window to successfully purchase the awarded tag, otherwise the tag is returned to the Department to be resold.

Member Brad Compton moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Jerry Cloninger seconded the motion. Motion fails.

- ix. Any leftover, returned, or failed transaction non-resident general season deer or elk tags are to be sold to residents and non-residents in a subsequent draw and/or over-the-counter on a first-come first-served basis, with specifics of the later sale(s) to be determined by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Mark Harris seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion on the First Recommendation:

During the discussion, a member inquired about the definition of "approved vendors." It was clarified that this term specifically encompasses businesses that are compliant with the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS). This standard mandates that vendors have the necessary security measures in place to securely handle and process credit card information. The implication of this clarification is that requiring PCI compliance for vendors could potentially limit the pool of eligible businesses, as some may not be willing or able to meet the stringent security requirements.

Discussion on the Second Recommendation:

One member voted no because they believed this recommendation artificially inflates an excessive demand.

Discussion on the Third Recommendation:

No discussion on the third recommendation took place.

Discussion on the Fourth Recommendation:

A member noted that many other states already utilize similar dollar thresholds without detrimental effects. However, another member emphasized the need for a thorough analysis of how these thresholds function in other states and a guarantee that the proposed threshold for Idaho would not negatively impact demand, as required by the group's charter. It was revealed that approximately 90,000 individuals attempted to purchase tags during the recent non-resident tag sale, indicating a significant increase in demand compared to previous years.

Discussion on the Fifth Recommendation:

No discussion on the fifth recommendation took place.

Discussion on the Sixth Recommendation:

The origin of this specific recommendation was identified as being from the public feedback forms. A member confirmed that this recommendation aligns with the current process for controlled hunts. Another member inquired about potential departmental concerns regarding the implementation of this recommendation, to which it was confirmed that there were no identified concerns.

Discussion on the Seventh Recommendation:

During the discussion, one member expressed their objection to the phrase "to the extent that is legal." Another member clarified that the purpose of this language was to acknowledge the constraints imposed by federal law, specifically regarding credit card processing. The first member then argued that this phrase was unnecessary as compliance with federal law is already an inherent requirement. The second member agreed with this assessment.

Discussion on the Eighth Recommendation:

The feasibility of a recommendation requiring the Department to obtain a secondary payment method from hunters was discussed. Concerns were raised about the potential administrative burden, with one member noting that another state had discontinued a similar policy due to these challenges. Additionally, there were concerns about the potential for misuse, with individuals potentially exploiting the policy to prevent other hunters from obtaining tags. While an alternative approach of requiring hunters to provide a secondary payment option upfront was suggested, it was acknowledged that this would still require significant time, effort, and resources for the Department to implement. Despite these concerns, the group decided to maintain the original language of the recommendation and proceed with a vote.

Discussion on the Ninth Recommendation:

No discussion on the ninth recommendation took place.

3. Non-Resident Disabled American Veterans Tags

- a. The Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group recommends to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission the following for non-resident Disabled American Veteran (DAV) tags under a general season deer and elk tag draw framework:
 - i. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game is to have a separate non-resident general season deer and elk tag draw for DAV (preceding the non-DAV tag draw), in which the number of DAV tags allowed is limited per unit/zone, either by percentage or otherwise as set by the Department.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Brad Compton seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- ii. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will require DAV to have an Idaho hunting license valid for big game to apply for the DAV general season deer and elk draws.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Mark Harris seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- iii. The application for the DAV draw will allow (but not require) applicants to also complete (at the same time) a draw application for the regular non-resident general season deer and elk draw as a non-DAV applicant, which will be submitted in the event they are not successful in the DAV draw. DAV applicants will only be charged a single application fee for the DAV and contingent non-DAV draw.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Jerry Cloninger seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- iv. DAV applicants may submit a group application, but DAV and non-DAV applicants cannot be combined on the same application.

Member Ned Burns moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- v. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will not count non-resident DAV tags against the statewide non-resident limits.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion on the First Recommendation:

The group discussed the specific limitations on deer and elk tags within this particular recommendation. One member proposed differentiating between the two, suggesting that while elk tags are typically limited by zone, deer tags might be unnecessarily limited by the broader "area" designation. Another member questioned whether this differentiation was already addressed by the phrase "otherwise as set by the Dept.," implying that the Department would have the flexibility to determine appropriate limitations for each species. A third member expressed agreement with the current language, stating that it clearly indicates that both deer and elk tags would be subject to limitations. Ultimately, there were no suggested changes to the recommendation based on this discussion.

Discussion on the Second Recommendation:

No discussion on the second recommendation took place.

Discussion on the Third Recommendation:

One member clarified that the intention of this recommendation is to provide DAV with a second opportunity.

Discussion on the Fourth Recommendation:

The discussion centered on the eligibility criteria for group hunts to be considered as DAV group hunts. It was clarified that to qualify as a DAV group hunt, all members of the hunting party must be DAV individuals. Mixed groups, consisting of both DAV and non-DAV members, would not be eligible for the benefits associated with DAV group hunts.

Discussion on the Fifth Recommendation:

No discussion on the fifth recommendation took place.

4. Mentored Youth Tags

- a. The Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group recommends to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission the following for non-resident mentored youth tags under a draw framework:
 - i. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game is to maintain the current mentored youth program in the new draw framework.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- ii. Idaho Department of Fish and Game will not count mentored youth against the statewide non-resident limit.

Member Mark Harris moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion on the First Recommendation:

No discussion on the first recommendation took place.

Discussion on the Second Recommendation:

No discussion on the second recommendation took place.

5. Non-Resident Lifetime License Holders

- a. The Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group recommends to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission the following for non-resident lifetime license holders under a draw framework:
 - i. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game is to maintain the current Lifetime License program in the new draw framework.

Member Brad Compton moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- ii. Non-resident tags bought by lifetime license holders will not count against statewide non-resident limit.

Member Brad Compton moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion on the First Recommendation:

The discussion explored how the Department currently handles lifetime licenses, particularly in the context of nonresident hunters who may have obtained resident licenses before moving out of state. It was clarified that these individuals retain the benefits of a resident license at non-resident prices, despite their current residency status, which does not impact the nonresident quota.

The group discussed whether the current recommendation aligns with Idaho Code Title 36 and the relevant Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA) rules. It was noted that while Title 36 may not explicitly use the term "may," IDAPA provides further clarification regarding nonresident privileges for lifetime license holders.

One member expressed support for excluding nonresident lifetime license holders from the draw, emphasizing that this approach upholds the commitment to lifetime license holders while allowing the Department to recoup the costs associated with their licenses. This member acknowledged that the distinction between statute and rule may not be entirely clear but considered this approach to be beneficial.

Discussion on the Second Recommendation:

No discussion on the second recommendation took place.

6. Reduction of Non-resident general season deer and elk hunter participation to 10%

- a. Should there be any future recommendation or directive to reduce non-resident general season deer and elk hunter participation to 10%, the subsequent loss in IDFG revenue will be recouped among resident, non-resident, and outfitter allocated tag prices as determined by the Commission.

Member Mike Viele moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Mark Harris seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- b. The Commission is encouraged to survey resident hunters to gauge willingness of residents to pay higher resident fees to reduce non-resident participation and offset revenue loss to the Department.

Member Tyrel Stevenson moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Brad Compton seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion on the First Recommendation:

The group discussed the first recommendation, specifically the term "evenly." Some members argued that removing "evenly" would provide the Commission and the Department with greater flexibility in determining appropriate costs. It was suggested that the price of allocated tags could be increased, reflecting their higher value. This aligns with previous discussions regarding the potential for higher prices for certain tag types. However, another member expressed concern

that this might be mixing different concepts and abstained from voting due to a lack of prior consultation with the outfitting industry. Ultimately, the group decided to remove the term "evenly" from the recommendation.

Finalization of Outfitter Allocation Recommendations Language Under a General Season Deer and Elk Tag Draw Framework (Action Item):

Notes

7. Outfitter Tag Allocation – Capped Elk Zones

- a. The Non-Resident Tag Issuance Advisory Group recommends to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission the following for capped elk zone outfitter allocation within a general season deer and elk non-resident draw system:
 - i. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game will recalculate the historical use for establishing capped elk zone outfitter allocation at a frequency to be determined by the Fish and Game Commission.

Member Mark Harris moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- ii. Use of an outfitter by Idaho residents with non-allocated tags will not count towards historical use for establishing outfitter tag allocation for capped elk zones.

Member Mike Viele moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion fails.

- iii. Commission is to work with IOGLB to review historic use (such as resident hunters building historic outfitter use) including private and public land outfitting.

Member Brad Compton moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- iv. Tags allocated for outfitter use in addition to current allocation would come from the nonresident portion under the cap for each zone.

Member Tyrel Stevenson moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Benn Brocksome seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- v. Total outfitter tag allocation cannot exceed a percentage as determined by the Commission of any given non-resident quota capped elk zone.

Member Mike Viele moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Brad Compton seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- vi. Backcountry capped elk zones are to be considered separately. The Commission is to consider redistributing returned allocated tags to resident quota.

Member Mark Harris moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Brad Compton seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- vii. The Commission and Legislature is to consider allowing licensed outfitting businesses to market their services directly to non-resident draw applicants.

Member Jerry Cloninger moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Ned Burns seconded the motion. Motion carries.

- viii. The Commission is to consider formulating an outfitter tag allocation working group.

Member Benn Brocksome moved that the advisory group adopt the recommendation as written. Member Brad Compton seconded the motion. Motion carries.

Discussion:

The discussion began with the group clarifying the process for reviewing and voting on the presented options.

A key point of discussion involved the potential for significantly increasing the cost of allocated tags for outfitters. One member argued that nonresident hunters utilizing guided hunts and receiving guaranteed tags should bear a substantially higher financial burden, potentially exceeding a \$100 increase. Drawing a comparison to the Idaho liquor licensing system, the member emphasized that outfitters have become overly reliant on the current allocation system and that this shift in financial responsibility would be necessary for a more equitable system. While acknowledging the need for change, some members expressed concerns about potentially penalizing outfitters. This led to the introduction of a "nuclear option" – eliminating all allocated tags and designated operating areas, forcing outfitters to compete solely in the open market. This drastic measure, while potentially simplifying the system for the Department of Fish and Game, raised concerns about its potential impact to the outfitting industry, given their long-standing reliance on the current allocation system.

The discussion then explored the potential implications of this "nuclear option" on the Department itself. Members acknowledged that eliminating allocated tags would significantly impact the Department's operations, reducing administrative burden but also requiring substantial system changes. Concerns were raised about the potential disruption to established businesses and the importance of considering the Department's overall needs and responsibilities. The group emphasized the need for a high-level review of the options and a collaborative approach that involves all stakeholders, including the outfitting industry.

Discussion on the First and Second (Created) Recommendations:

The group discussed the potential implications of disallowing outfitters to utilize residents with unallocated tags to build their allocation. Concerns were raised that this could create a system where residents, particularly those with disabilities or elderly residents, would be disadvantaged in accessing guided hunting opportunities.

The group recognized the limitations of their expertise in addressing these complex issues and acknowledged the need for further discussion and input from the outfitting industry.

Discussion on the Third Recommendation:

The discussion was expanded beyond the initial scope. One member pointed out that the Commission previously collaborated with the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Licensing Board (IOGLB) on youth and private land hunting initiatives. Concerns were raised about the potential for private land outfitters to utilize historical use to "soak up" all available tags, effectively limiting hunting opportunities on private land.

This concern was acknowledged as a valid point by other members, but it was also recognized that this issue is complex and requires further analysis. It was ultimately concluded that the group did not have sufficient time to adequately discuss this complex issue and its potential implications.

Discussion on the Fourth Recommendation:

One member initially proposed language that would adjust the overall nonresident tag allocation in cases where tags were over-allocated for outfitter use. However, this member subsequently rescinded their recommendation for this specific item.

At 1:53 p.m. member James Petzke joined the virtual meeting and left at 2:24 p.m.

Discussion on the Fifth Recommendation:

The discussion centered around a recommendation to limit the number of nonresident elk tags allocated to outfitters in capped zones. Concerns were raised that without this recommendation, it could negatively impact unguided non-resident hunters and rural communities, potentially creating a situation where outfitters have priority access to limited hunting opportunities.

While there was general agreement on the need to apply a limit to the number of outfitter allocated tags in a given zone, there was disagreement on the specific percentage. Some members argued that the initially proposed 30% cap was arbitrary and might not be appropriate for all zones, particularly those with high demand, others found it appropriate.

Ultimately, the group decided to leave the specific percentage to the Commission for further consideration and analysis, acknowledging the need for a more nuanced approach that addresses the concerns of residents and the potential impacts on rural communities.

Discussion on the Fifth-A Recommendation:

The discussion centered around a recommendation related to the allocation of hunting tags in specific zones, particularly the Lolo, Selway, and Middle Fork areas. One key point was the proposal that any returned tags should be reallocated to the resident quota instead of the

nonresident quota. Concerns were raised about the potential financial implications of this approach, prompting a discussion on the broader economic impacts of such a change. Recognizing the unique characteristics of backcountry zones and the high levels of nonresident hunting pressure in these areas, the group agreed on the need to address backcountry zones separately. This included a specific recommendation to consider backcountry zones separately from other zones in the state when determining tag allocations. Data provided by IDFG staff highlighted the high percentage of nonresident use in these zones.

First Recommendation:

The group briefly discussed “punting” the outfitter allocation discussion back to the Commission, however, the group ultimately decided to skip this option.

The discussion then shifted to the outfitter marketing "opt-in" option, specifically regarding its limitations. Questions were raised about the criteria for determining eligibility, such as whether it should be based on successful or unsuccessful hunts. Concerns were also expressed about potential time constraints and the feasibility of implementing an "opt-out" system, given potential legislative restrictions.

The group recommended that the Commission should have the authority to decide between an "opt-in" or "opt-out" system.

Suggested Recommendation Not Previously Discussed:

A group member proposed a recommendation that the Commission establish a discretionary pool of tags outside of the existing outfitter set-aside. This pool would allow outfitters, particularly those with limited allocations, to access additional tags for specific hunts, potentially compensating for the lack of opportunity to purchase tags in-person.

The proposal clarified that these tags would come from the outfitter set-aside and would be available for hunts where the allocated tags had already been used. Concerns were raised about the potential impact of this proposal on other hunting opportunities and the potential for it to exceed existing allocation limits.

Despite the initial proposal, several members expressed reservations and discomfort with this recommendation, citing concerns about its potential impact and a perceived lack of support for this concept in previous meetings. Due to lack of support from the other members, no language was developed for formal voting.

8. Outfitter Tag Allocation – Newly Limited Units and Zones

Due to the extensive amount of time spent on discussing the non-resident general season deer and elk tag draw framework and outfitter allocation in capped elk zones, the group was unable to discuss newly limited (also known as uncapped units and zones) before recommendations were due to the Commission. Therefore, there are no recommendations specific to newly limited units and zones (also known as uncapped units and zones) to advance to the Commission for consideration.

Adjourn: 3:30 p.m.