

CAB Members,

I have a few comments for your upcoming meeting that I would like to share with you at this time as I will be out of town the night of your meeting:

Agenda Item #11- Definition of Spike Elk- I fully support this amended definition as it not only helps " to reduce the likelihood of errors in harvest identification" but still maintains the integrity of what a spike is. While the objective of a spike hunt is to cull a number of younger age class bulls, many of which may be branched on either or both antlers, there is still a responsibility on the hunter's part to know and properly identify his quarry. Harvest is a very small part of any hunting experience and not a necessity to the success of that experience. To reduce a spike to any animal with a minimal branching of both horns may help to eliminate a criminal act and increase legal harvest but also negates the very definition of "spike". As ethical and responsible hunters and mentors to others I would hope you will vote to support the Department's definition.

Agenda Item #12- Big Game Quotas- I will break this into 2 separate issues, one being Black Bears and the other addressing deer quotas in Washoe County.

Black Bears- We have now had 5 seasons and have never met the harvest objective of 20, only once coming close in 2014 @ 18 animals harvested. Over the 5 years the average harvest has been 14 per year and in this most recent 3 year period the harvest averaged 15 per year. A harvest average of 15 allows for an increase in tags to 64 while a harvest of 14 would allow for an increase in tags to 60. Keep in mind that this past January the season was shortened by a month to December 1 . December accounts for an average of 1 animal per year harvested. Given this fact that would reduce the past 3 year harvest to 14 animals. While 60 is an admiral increase and correct given the manner in which tags are allocated I would ask that the CAB recommends an increase to 55- 50 resident and 5 non- resident.

Washoe Deer Quotas- I tried to evaluate success rates of Junior hunts ( Bucks Only) compared with all other hunt groups ( Resident/ Non- Resident; all classes - archery, muzzleloaders, any legal weapon) and found the following per unit ( Jr,/ All Others): 011-013 29%/ 25%; 014 53%/ 46%; 015 30%/ 24%; 021 60%/ 48%; 022 64%/ 46%; 033 45%/ 41%; 194,196 87%/ 68%. Quotas recommendations for these same units based against last year's quotas are increased/ decreased as follows with Jr, hunts identified first- 011-013 (-47%/ (-13%); 014 (-27%/ (-16%); 015 (No Change/ (+21%); 021 ( -33%/ -9%); 022 (No Change/ -12%); 033 (-25%/ -9%); 194,196 (-17%/ -6%). My concerns are with Units 011-013, 015, and 033 and I would like to recommend the following changes :

011-013: Res. ALW-88, Muz-2, Arch-15; Non ALW-7, Muz-2, Arch-2

015: Same as last year- 30,2,4,2,2,2

033: Res ALW-41, Muz-3, Arch-4; Non ALW-\$, Muz-2, Arch-2

These numbers better align themselves with the changes to Junior hunts and while it must be recognized that high success rates relate to lower quotas each of these areas have been severely impacted over the past four years and we need to give the remaining deer an opportunity to evolve again into a viable resource. I only wish beyond this is that we eliminate antlerless take specific to the Junior hunt program and eliminate that take from any unit not meeting population caps except areas where there has been a major event requiring their removal. Just my thoughts.

Thanx,  
Re Flowers