

Public Comments

Through 6/13

Just wanted to comment on the new tag and license fees since I was unable to attend the meeting. I'm not for the premium tag fees. I would rather you guys raise prices on all tags a little bit to make the money you need rather than targeting the trophy Hunters. I would like it if you sent out surveys to all Arizona resident Hunters to get there input also as I know a lot of people are NOT for it. I like what you guys are doing with the fishing licenses and youth licenses. Just do not agree the high premium tag fees. Thanks for your time.

I received my survey on Saturday and have a few questions about it. If I add comments to the survey will they be included in the answers that are compiled at the conclusion? Also, What is the departments goal or desired outcome from this survey? Thank you for your time, Respectfully

As a nonresident I have enjoyed hunting your state three different occasions and have loved it all three times.

But health problems have plagued me with three spinal surgeries do to degenerative arthritis.

One thing that affects me and others is overall cost of a hunt as the price of gas goes up extra then many may stay home.

I think many states including my own (Utah) charge nonresidents too much for tags and license fees.

One animal that I would have liked to have on license when I have hunted whitetail deer is a cougar tag, but I wouldn't pay over \$150 dollars for a tag.

My neighboring state Nevada has lowered the cougar tag to about \$106 for nonresidents so it encourages nonresidents to add the tag when deer hunting.

So I think every state that has cougars could follow that example I believe it would actually bring added revenue to your Fish and Game department with little effect on the cougar population.

Thanks for your thoughtful consideration.

Hello there. I am a 58 year old Phoenix born native, recently retired Phoenix Fire Captain of 32 years and an Arizona hunter and fisherman who has been buying my licenses since I was 14. I have payed for lifetime hunting and fishing licenses for myself, my 2 sons and a lady friend. It really upsets me that after making these large purchases upfront and never knowing your life expectancy why the Commission doesn't include the urban fishing license in the lifetime license when it is included in the FREE Pioneer license. A person puts up a lot of money in advance, mine was over 700 dollars when I purchased mine 8 years ago, and it only seems right that in doing that along with the trout stamp you get with the lifetime hunt/fish license you shouldn't have to buy an urban fishing license each year. Please give my complaint/suggestion some consideration.

I am a native of this State and served 21 years with DPS.

I am also 66 years old. There should be a loyalty benefit for people that have bought a hunting and fishing license for most of their life. I have owned a hunting license since I was 14 (minus 4 years service during the Vietnam war).

At age 72, one gets a life time license. Many can't hunt at 72. There should be a loyalty benefit and reduced hunting license costs, or a reduction with a life time license from loyal people and natives of the state..

I would also like to see a better CHAMP hunting program.

Why dont you folks hold a webinar or at least broadcast these meetings simultaneously?

Hello,

I am a long time Arizona resident. I have entered for the Elk hunt lottery for the last three years and

have not been drawn. The lottery is a flawed system for hunt tags. Although I'm sure it's good for azgfd as I've paid for a hunt license and not been able to use it, it is simply not a fair system. In other states to purchase a hunt tag you simply buy one over the counter, first come first serve, what could be simpler? When the tags run out they run out.

Please just eliminate the lottery system. It would save time, confusion, money, energy and frustration.
Thank you for your consideration

I would agree to a one year from purchase license and extras added would be nice. I think premium should bring premium fees.

I support SB 1223 and glad to see it signed into action. Now if the action is supportive for the public as well as Arizona, and Arizona Game and Fish.

Thank you for the update

AZGFD,

I am truly disappointed that this law passed. I foresee nothing but unlimited increases in licenses, tags and additional fees. There is no oversight of AZGFD any longer when it comes to the unlimited revenue it can procure. Unlimited power to raise fees and no one to stop it. At least the legislators could slow it down. The arrogance that of those that believe this could be in the best interest of the sportsmen and sportswomen. There will preferred rates for preferred hunts and tags and then only the wealthy few will be able to hunt those with the passing of time. And everyday hunter/fisher will have the placated random chance of being able to get one of the precious tags. The special interest groups will have Raffle tickets a plenty and our wildlife will be sold to the highest bidder. I am sure that wages, pensions, benefits and equipment will cost more and more every year at an uncontrollable rate. Above the rate increases of years past, surpassing inflation .

JUST CHARGE MORE for tags, and licenses!

Our children's hunting heritage has been sold.

This is truly shameful,

PS: I doubt this will be read aloud at any of the "meetings"
and I am sure I will never be "drawn again" by voicing this opinion.

Please allow me to preface these questions with the following statement:

We all stood by and supported the department when they asked for power to control license prices and swore it was to simplify the schedules and process. That power wasn't granted for a full week before you raised the price of an elk tag by an average of 37%.

First, please explain how a fee structure such as the one proposed simplifies the license fee schedule. Three different prices for elk tags and subjective definitions of premium hunts appears to do the opposite.

Please justify why a bull elk tag should cost more than a cow elk tag, are bulls more difficult to manage than cows?

Please define a premium elk or deer tag. How do we assure that this definition is not broadened later to include more costs?

Please justify the increase to the cost of cow elk tags.

Please justify and provide backup for the increased application fee.

Please explain how you can assure the public that revenue generated by these increased and complicated fees will not be squandered in internal dispute settlements such as the one awarded to [redacted]

I think a fishing /hunting license that is good for a year from date of purchase is a great idea as for a fishing license that costs more and includes other stamps all in one price is good idea also as long as the cost isn't so high that normal people and families can't afford to purchase licenses. Because it's been difficult in recent years for myself a life long Arizona hunter /Fisher to afford hunting tags for me and my kids we have to really struggle to hunt like before I feel the cost increases several years ago were way out of line an increased way too much to fast should have been spread out over many years instead of a couple. I have many friends, family and coworkers that have been unable to afford the costs of hunting and fishing license /tags since that increase which means people can't afford it every year as they did before in years past. I'm hoping the new license structure doesn't price people out of being able to enjoy the outdoors. I think the price of new licenses are not only fair but also very reasonable I hope azgfd takes the best interest of the normal middle class sportman and families into consideration and not just changing license structure to make more money \$\$\$? Thank you. Life long Arizona sportsman.

I agree that the license period should be changed. I buy one resident license and 3 different non resident licenses in various states and AZ is the only one tied to a calender year. Most start with the beginning of the first hunting season or earlier, but continue thru the fall and winter seasons ending or to a specific spring date. Having various ending dates based upon the purchase date is confusing and unnecessary. The ending date is more important than the starting date and a single uniform ending date would simplify issuing and enforcement as well.

To hunt quail in AZ one needs two licenses over the winter. This can discourage some non resident visitors from hunting at all. I also think a lower price for small game only (not eligible for the draws) licenses could encourage more sales of those licenses. We need more hunters and that would be a way to help get them.

Thank you for your consideration

I have the following recommendations;

- a. Use the internet to renew licenses and tags. Initial purchase should be at present dealer system to verify physical descriptions and residency via driver's license or similar ID.
- b. Contract with ServiceArizona for the online renewals and purchase of non-draw permit tags and annual license renewals.. Their system of license and vehicle registration renewals is already perfected; don't re-invent the wheel.
- c. Use ServiceArizona also for boat and OHV registrations and renewals.

To whom it may concern,

I commented previously that I perceived this new bill 1223 as nothing but a way for AZG&F to take more money from outdoorsmen - and I was right. I believe this program will do nothing for wildlife, but instead will simply leave the door wide open for unbridled and uncontrolled spending by AZG&F. With the ability to charge whatever it chooses, the AZG&F department will only need to demonstrate a need (however bloated that need may be) to justify price increases.

I have reviewed the PowerPoint presentation associated with the ongoing license structure public meetings and several things became clear:

1. The funding levels for AZG&F have remained roughly coincident with demand. There are some highs and lows but on average it is about equal. It is notable that the 'reported' cost of the department and its funding levels have increased 40% in the last 8 years. Something is terribly wrong with an organization that sees those kinds of cost and funding increases yet still believes it needs more money to operate.
2. The new license structure is intended to exact more money from people by requiring everyone to

purchase every option (stamps, 2-pole, etc are all combined) rather than providing the public options and the ability to manage its expenses individually. The way the slides are presented makes it appear to be a bargain, when in reality it will increase the overall cost to sportsmen.

3. AZG&F intends to take advantage of deer and elk hunters by dramatically raising the costs to hunt. For elk, the current fees are 2 times higher than neighboring states, and AZG&F is now proposing to raise the cost to 3 times higher. Why is Arizona so different than its neighbors?

4. I believe the new fee structure will also encourage more game theft by making the price to participate beyond that which typical folks can afford. Leaving less-ethical outdoorsmen more prone to skirt game laws.

I believe this new program to be nothing but a money grab. I have heard it politely labeled differently, but the now that the bill has passed we get to see what is really in it.

Because I, like many other senior citizens are on a fixed income, I no longer can enjoy fishing in Az. because of the expense of the licensing fees, and I only live 3 miles from the river.

I'm sure there are many more seniors such as myself that could use a "free" license to catch some fish and help to put a few more meals on the table, So here are my suggestions.

1. Issue "free" licenses to residents over 70 years of age.
2. Reduce the residency rule to 5 years.
3. Eliminate the California and Nevada stamps and include them as an "all inclusive" part of the "free" license
4. Eliminate the "trout" stamps.
5. Make the license for seniors for a "lifetime", No expiration date. (this would save the state money)

Last but not least, make the expiration date for all other licenses issued by the state renewable one year from the purchase date...

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion.

I have the following comments:

1 – One Day Fishing License: conceptual price of \$16 is way too high; please consider a \$10 fee (these are for folks who fish once or twice per year; don't force them to not purchase one and break the law or "push them towards the annual because again, they fish 1 or 2 days/year)." At \$16 dollars, officers in the white mtns tell the public that Tribal licenses are \$9 and the fishing is usually better.

2 – Youth Definition is great BUT: Please change the fishing age to 16; it is the age when most folks have some sort of ID and law enforcement officers are not going to cite someone under 16 anyway and it's consistent with many other states. Don't make a law that won't be enforced. To "sell the \$5 combo" you are using the argument that kids can hunt with it as well; 95% of kids only fish between May & August and have no interest in hunting (besides, what are they going to hunt in the summer – not much). And the rationale that having a Youth definition of 10-17 years old is not valid with anglers; officers and the public don't get confused on ages between angling & hunting (just within hunting when there are multiple definitions). Don't penalize a mom with two or three young kids and make her go purchase licenses; they are usually there to kill time and rarely catch fish; and if they do, very rarely do they take them home. From an administrative standpoint, this will be a nightmare for Walmart because they have to fill out licenses by hand (old fashioned way) and on weekends they have very long lines of folks waiting to purchase a license. Lastly, hatchery production is expected to fall by 25% which means fewer fish so now is not the time to force little kids to purchase a license. Even telling a family nicely that their little kids need licenses will get people mad at us; so counter-productive to goal of License

Simplification, blah, blah, blah.

3 – Premium Hunts: AGFD pushes the NAMWM and the idea of pricing out the “average guy” and his family with premium options probably goes against the founding principles. Deer north of the Colorado River is one thing but making all elk hunts in September and Early October is not fair to the average archer who just wants to hunt with his bow and doesn’t care if he harvests a spike or raghorn. I think you should save the Premium idea for another time for two reasons: economy is still poor, especially in rural counties & constituent trust in this agency is at low levels.

4 – Different prices for Bull and Cow: if you really want simplification then make it one price; it sounds good until you get it on paper and many people put in for bull and cow (and it will lead to high rejection rates, at least for awhile).

5- Might consider offering a two year fishing license for a discount; may keep a few more anglers in the game.

Overall great stuff in the package.

To Whom it may concern,

I’m a proud Arizona Native. God has blessed me with a loving wife and two kids who all share the same passion as me, the outdoors. We love to take our children camping, hunting, fishing, hiking, and atv riding. We’re not rich but your average middle class family. Moms a teacher and dad works construction. We’re able to provide our children with a simple, healthy, and prosperous life. My wife and I are really concerned about the new “License Simplification Bill”. Our employers implemented budget cuts and yearly raises and bonuses have been out of the picture for years. The cost of everything has inflated and now our license fees are at risk of this. If you want families to continue to purchase hunting and fishing licenses along with big game tags, it needs to be kept at an affordable cost. You could potentially price the average middle class family out of some memorable family experiences.

Below are the breakdown of cost for a family of 4 applicants for deer, elk, and antelope, not including hunting/fishing licenses. We also purchase archery deer, mountain lion, bear, and archery turkey tags. It all adds up really quick along with the cost of everything else that goes with it. I hope the people and commission decide on doing the right thing at the end of the day.

Thanks

Current \$991.00

Proposed \$1852.00

I understand that the fee structure that is posted and out there right now is “conceptual” and is only a starting point for discussions, but that is a huge leap for a starting point!

I don’t see how it in any way simplifies the fee structure, other than rounding off costs to an even dollar instead of having cents on the price.

It is all an increase, which I’m okay with to an extent, not 75% increase for “premium” elk hunts. Premium Deer hunts, an increase of 188% is Ludacris and something not a single hunter in the state of Arizona will support. Please keep in mind who the AZGFD is serving, the wildlife and hunters in the state of Arizona. An increase in fee costs is probably due, but they should be reasonable and justified, not just to simply make more money.

Recall the survey that was done a few years back by AZGFD and how more residents in AZ preferred to have the opportunity to hunt even if it meant a lower chance of being successful on the hunt....raising

fees by the percentages in the "conceptual" rates would reduce the number of residents that would put in for hunts and therefore be in contradiction to what the spirit of AZGFD is....to manage the wildlife in a way that provides the most enjoyable opportunity for residents of Arizona to experience hunting.

I totally disagree with the proposed license and tag changes. These changes will turn hunting in Arizona into a Rich Man's hunt. Every resident hunter in Arizona should have a chance at a trophy deer or elk, not just those with large bank accounts. You talk a lot about hunter recruitment for our youth and new hunters, want to get a kid or novice interested in hunting, give him/her an opportunity during prime seasons, not just the ones his struggling parents can afford. I taught Hunter Ed for 12 years, I saw first hand the enthusiasm the kids displayed and also spoke with parents and shared how I was able to do multiple hunts each with the kids, and the fees where much cheaper then. I also realize the Department could care less about my feelings, the Public Meetings for us to provide input are a waste of time, your minds are already made up, this is just going through the process. I have attended one meeting in person and watched people attempting to provide an opinion only to be belittled and have Commissioners interrupt, reply in rude a manner and basically let us know that we are wasting their time. I will never attend another.

I am a hunter, fisherman, and trapper in Arizona. I just went through the power point on the possible fee increases, for hunting big game. I'm just going to go ahead and say, that the game and fish will set these in stone. Due to my work schedule, I am unable to attend any of the meetings for this topic. I think it is unfortunate, that the future of hunting will no longer be equal. I work hard for what paycheck I get. I have never been drawn for a early or late (preferred) hunt, even though I have applied for them. I count on the animal I do harvest to provide for my family. Given the direction I see the Arizona game and Fish is going, I may now have to go out of state to secure my table fare. You may think this is more expensive for me; but my money will be going else where other than the Arizona Game and Fish. My odds are better out of state as it stands.

why are you doing this ?? - who proposed this ??

this is wrong - you are suppose to make it equal for all to enjoy hunting here in this great State. you are turning this into a circus , like most the other states in the southwest.

the ole - the guy with the most money to spend gets the best tags and hunts during the best time of yr. this is total B.S.

why would you even consider it ,let alone propose it. you say its not a proposal but your track record shows once you get the idea and bring it before a public discussion .

you sit and don't even listen to the people who are speaking, why because your minds are made up - its a done deal !

It's obvious you've been influenced by someone to even let this ludicrous idea get this far. it smells of azsfw-

Please do not have a premium tag fee-

I'm not happy about the almost double application fee either- it means online only - your track record with credit cards is less than desirable as people lost a chance to apply thru no fault of there own! to many errors and problems - keep the paper applications !!

thanks for your time

If this actually passes - my respect for the department will have been lost! It will show you are more interested in the money - than the hunters and sportsmen of Arizona.

The license "simplification" items proposed seem to have some benefits for license holders. I do take

advantage of the family pricing for combo licenses and it does save me money. Under the proposed structure I would save more money as I would also get 2 pole stamps and urban licenses included.

As far as the 365 day license, as someone who buys at least four licenses, myself, wife, and 2 kids, every year usually in October to put in for spring hunts, I can't see how a 365 day license is any different than the current calendar year structure, other than perhaps I would only need to carry one license at a time. So I don't see a benefit, but I don't have a problem with it either.

The Elk and deer tag structure proposed is ridiculous. Two different tag prices for deer and four for elk, (including youth), is not a simplification. The comparison with some of our neighboring states shows that we would be the most expensive for residents in almost every category.

I understand that costs continue to rise and prices must go up, and I am willing to pay a little more, (than current), to help offset those costs.

Why not raise application fees, (more than proposed), and leave tag fees alone? This would mean more usable money from all applicants rather than only receiving the increase from the tags actually drawn.

If a person already has a lifetime combination hunting and fishing license with trout or a lifetime with trout will these be affected?

Seniors over 70 should be given special consideration like half priced licences or lifetime licences before age 75. Colorado treats their resident to this before age 70.

I think fines should be much higher and more enforcement. I see many fishing without licenses, adults and children. Fines should be high enough to discourage abuse \$500. Pictures of offenders on billboards.

Elk permits should be \$500-\$1000.

I'm a handicap man and i love to hunt and fish .

I don't have a left leg so I can't hunt on foot only by quad or truck .

But the forest sev. is closing roads faster then i can get to them.

Its getting harder for the handicap to hunt and fish. Theres programs for every one but the handicap. WE need more access to land /lakes

The Government is helping everyone but us.

change the elk & antelope drawing to if you fill your tag can't apply for two years

I would like to address a few points.

1. I cannot stand comparisons between states, it is a really lame and misleading tool to make a point. Each state has its own issues and they cannot be compared side by side. I am sure, if I devoted the time, I could find one or more states that would have costs lower than AZ, which I am sure will not be considered in your power point presentation.

2. Why are you driving up the costs of resident tags while at the same time driving the costs of non resident tags down? Is it because you want to bring in more non residents and make more money on the backs of residents? That is what it looks like on its face.

3. I think the proposed cost of deer tags at \$100 is way too high, especially coming from \$45.

Fine if the hunt is on private property, but Arizona should NEVER charge extra to allow someone to have exclusive hunting privileges on any game unit. This would allow wealthier individuals to have exclusive or preferential use of certain public lands, which is an elitist concept, somewhat similar to hunting in some European countries. A private landowner(game ranch, etc.) is entitled to charge as he sees fit, but there should be NO uneven price structure that gives preference to certain people who can afford to pay more. Keep all hunting on public lands the same price for everyone, ensuring that EVERYONE has

equal access to all of the game species. Don't make the system unfair just because you think it's a great way to raise more money. Not a good idea at all!

To whom it may concern;

I am only in favor of any price increases if it is due to a direct cost increase in cost of living. I am NOT in favor of pricing increases if they are for "premium hunts" and things of that nature. It already takes years and years to get drawn for those hunts. I feel like you would be giving an additional penalty now for those hunts. If you want to increase prices on "premium hunts" do it for out of state folks, or do a complete across the board percentage raise (i.e raise all fees 1%, 2% etc.). I'm a native born and raised here and the process is already unfair. I am 31 years old, been putting in my whole life, and have yet to draw a "premium" tag. I have in fact only ever drawn 1 bull elk tag and that was last year, yet i know people that get drawn for the same hunts every year...i.e. [redacted]. He has been drawn like 20 times in the last 23 years for elk tags and we put in identical requests on separate tags. If you want to make major changes, make the process fairer. You will then get the support of the people that are putting in when you want rate increases and things of that nature. Thank you for your time.

Based on your budget it looks like you need to get ahead of the curve and CUT retirement and Insurance contributions or Game and Fish will be joining Chicago and Detroit as the most mismanaged organizations ever

Just wanted to voice my opinion on your price hike of tags & license. If I would have know you would have done this when I first put in (years ago) I would have never started putting in for Arizona tags. I really feel you are making it a rich man sport. I think it is a shame it has come to this.

If Arizona really has a price hike like this it will force me out. I am just an average person making average wages. I have been putting in for 10 years and have not been drawn. All that money I have been putting in for is a total waste. I will not be able to afford it. WOW I am just shocked. I also know my two boys will no longer be able to put in as well. Along with my wife. That is 4 people that will be taken out of your equation. In just one family. Arizona is turning it into a rich mans sport. I can see a 10% hike but look at the percentages you are purposing?????? WOW it just really blows me away.

I am out of state it would be nice if this was read at your meetings for my voice is heard.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am 60 years old and have lived in Arizona since 1977 and raised three kids, two of whom hunted and all three fish. Would like to say that despite the occasional backlash the department receives I believe that overall it is doing a good job walking the fine line of managing the resource. Briefly I would like to convey my thoughts on the proposed license and tag structure as recently put forth.

I wish to go on record as being in favor of the reduction in cost of Junior License fees. Even if this gets on child in the field once a year it has merit. The cost of getting a growing child properly outfitted each year with basic things as boots, hunting clothes, etc can be daunting for parents as I recall sometimes only getting a year out of boots before they are outgrown.

Lastly I wish to express I am vehemently opposed to tiered fees for tags earmarked as "Trophy" or "Premium" and if presented in the future the opportunity for hunters to purchase additional bonus points or earn them by doing volunteer work, i.e. water catchment construction, fence removal etc. Additionally I would like to see tag fees only increase at a rate equal to inflation every five years. Thank you for your time.

This is restructuring is basically just a huge price increase. I noticed a large increase in costs of mandated employee benefits as part of the reason for the need to increase prices. The new prices will not stop me from hunting, but I will not be applying for as many tags as I normally do each year. I think some cost cutting should implemented as part of any new restructuring.

In response to the license simplification fee changes.

First, let me say that I have been a resident and an outdoorsman in Arizona for over 50 years. During that time I have been more than happy to pay for the opportunity to hunt and fish in this state for most of those years sense I have been old enough to do so. I have just finished reviewing the Departments

Power Point presentation with the new fees structures that you suggest implementing. Let me say first, as a business owner myself that I take some offense that the Department would include rising cost of fuel, healthcare and retirement costs as reasons to increase fees to it's customers. These are fees that every business has and that every business has to make adjustments in budgets for. Be it by reducing overhead, having employees contribute more to pay for insurance or even paying into a traditional 401K plan vs. a pension plan. My taxes and everyone else's in Arizona are helping to pay for every state employees retirement plan not tag and license fees. Welcome to the 20th century. The Department and Sate of Arizona should get on with making changes so they can afford to pay bills like all businesses do.

Now that I have gotten that off my chest let me comment about the fees. I know that it will not make a difference now that you can raise them when you want to and the Departments has all those increased fuel, insurance and pension costs you have got to pay for but here it is.

The new hunting, fishing and combo license fee structure for residents is OK.

The tag fee increase for resident hunters are TOO MUCH!

In particular your request for premium deer and elk tag fees. ARE YOU KIDDING ME! These few hunts, are really the only hunts left in the state that are quality hunts! The Department over the years under the format of offering OPPORTUNITY has pretty much ruined all the other hunts by putting to many hunters or to many tags/hunts in each unit. Along with the increase in hunts offered, the department has been having more issues with access in a lot of units. This continues to push more and more hunters into smaller and smaller available areas. A couple of examples of this would be Unit 22 last year with the fire closing off a large section of that unit (look at your success for Dec. hunt) and now Coconino National Forest has it's new camping rules that hurts the hunting in all those units. So, now the Department wants it's customers to pay more for tags for hunts that are not as desirable as they would have or should be. I don't see this as good business model. In particular sense you make no mention at all about spending increased revenue on access or habit improvement. Just keeping things the way they are and charging more for it is not acceptable.

So, count my one vote as NO, for increasing tag fees. Until the Department reviews it's budget and trims fat and does more to help with access and improve the quality of the hunts it currently has I don't believe the tags are worth any more than what you are currently charging for them. I have hunted in other states and if you think AZ tags are worth more than WY, NM and MT than the people running the Department should go on a few general hunts in this state and then out of this state just to compare tag cost and hunt experience.

I would like to see a more family/youth friendly license fee structure. It is currently too expensive to buy everyone in the family hunting/fishing combo licenses. I would like to see a FLAT Family License fee based on number of people in the family at a significantly reduced price compared to buying individual licenses for each member of the family or compared to the current Family License structure. I just really feel like this would promote hunting/fishing as a FAMILY activity. Right now it is cost prohibitive for families of 4 or greater. And individual youth licenses should be very inexpensive as we really need to promote youth hunting and fishing. Right now they are still too expensive. Need to look at long term benefits of this!!

heres the simple truth

you need to follow your own rules concerning wildlife and hunting here in Az.

for a family of 4 - an increase of just for premium elk fee - its 367.00 - for premium deer its 268.00

forget all the other increases / decrease in license ----- that's 635 .00 added to all the other expenses

to take a family of 4 hunting.

sorry but a lot of family's wont be able to take their kids hunting!

one of several RULES the G&F uses for standards

Hunting and Angling Opportunity for All

Opportunity to participate in hunting, angling and wildlife conservation is guaranteed for all in good standing, not by social status or privilege, financial capacity or land ownership. This concept ensures a broad base of financial support and advocacy for research, monitoring, habitat conservation and law enforcement.

no premium hunts - no \$13 application fees shame on those who support this kind of planning for the future hunting heritage here in AZ.

Here are my issues...

1. Nowhere in the North American Wildlife model does it exclude "premium" hunts from the hunts that should be available to all hunters. These tags are an asset owned by citizens of Arizona. Since Arizona residents are the majority this concept will impact more of us than anyone else. The foundation of the Arizona system shouldn't change just because some non-residents want to cut down the time they wait in line. Also, splitting these tags from the general pool will make them more portable and prone to more future price increases and at risk of being swept into even more unreachable programs (like raffles and auctions). It will also create additional complexity as the proponents of this will almost certainly advocate for separate bonus point pools which will add additional transaction costs to all hunters. The current process is SIMPLE, one price per species and we all pay the same amount of money and pay in TIME commensurate with the quality of the tag. There are never any leftover elk tags, every single one gets sold for full price, even the cow tags. Raise the MONETARY price on all tags and let people pay the difference in TIME like they do today. Arizona is the 15th most populous state and we have a relatively small pool of quality hunt opportunities. A tiered hunting structure does not make sense for Arizona, there are simply too few tags to give preference to anyone.

2. I do not approve of the \$13.00 application fees, this is almost a 100% increase over the current application fees. The application fees more than anything else should reflect the actual cost of processing an application, if the complexity of tiered (trophy/general) programs increase the cost of processing it is yet one more argument against such a concept. The application fee should not be a revenue stream. I think hunters will be glad to pay whatever it costs the department as long as the cost reflects the cost of doing business.

3. Lumping all youth tags (resident and non-resident) into a single license will make it very difficult to change things later. This idea makes the acquisition of youth bonus points very cheap. Since youth bonus points can be shared with non-youth on group applications this could really get out of hand. If this concept is approved I would hope that the department puts some rules in place regarding point averaging on group applications. I would recommend the department consider limiting the "average" on group applications to no more than 2 points above the lowest point holder on a group application. Example: A father applies on a group application with his two 17 year old kids. Each kid has eight points (with loyalty and hunter ed), the father has 2 points. The total for the application would be 18 points, making the rounded average on the application 6 points. Since Dad only has two points, the average for the application would be four points. This would prevent abuse.

4. I also fail to see what value anyone gets from a 365 day long hunting license. I see only problems with this, including residency issues and the fact that the department would need to start tracking an

anniversary date. It would also make it very difficult to process paper application anymore. The state of Utah has 365 day licenses and they are one of the most complex and customer unfriendly states. Any change we make that mirrors Utah should be considered with caution.

5. I do not like the travel insurance option that allows hunters to turn a tag back in and retain their points. This will require additional administration and most hunters will turn the tags back in for non-emergency issues like low rainfall amounts in the unit that year. This option will once again provide better opportunities for those with the greatest financial resources which runs counter to the North American wildlife model.

6. The FAQ document carefully avoided mention of "premium" pricing, only discount pricing. I don't feel like Arizona hunters have been dealt with honestly in this matter.

Here are some things that should be done prior to implementing any of these concepts...

1. Cheaper does not mean something is a better value. I think Arizona hunters would prefer to pay a little more for all tags for a given species rather than have their access to trophy opportunities frittered away and put into a separate pool. BEFORE MAKING THIS CHANGE THE DEPARTMENT MUST PROVIDE A SURVEY ON THEIR WEBSITE TO SOLICIT INPUT FROM REGULAR HUNTERS. The leadership of the critter groups do not necessarily reflect the interests of the average Arizona hunter. I have never seen anything that suggests that hunters prefer a tiered tag structure. The only people for this are people that think this barrier to entry will somehow change the demographic of successful hunters

2. PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION THAT INCLUDES SOME CLEAR BENEFITS TO A 365 DAY LICENSE. The problems are clear but the benefits are not. "Wouldn't it be nice" does not constitute a benefit, especially if the downside results in more cost and administration to AZGFD and downstream costs to Arizona hunters.

3. The graph on the powerpoint presentation seems to show expenses and revenue coming together. This is generally a sign of operational efficiency, which is a good thing. I THINK THE DEPARTMENT NEEDS TO CLEARLY EXPLAIN THE BENEFITS OF WHAT THE ADDITIONAL REVENUES GENERATED FROM INCREASING TAG FEES WILL DO FOR ARIZONA SPORTSMAN. Most sportsman could care less if there are more 200" deer shot in 13B or how many 400" bulls come out of unit 9. If most of the additional revenue produces bigger trophies in existing trophy units the pain and lost opportunity to regular hunters isn't worth it.

Thanks for the response but I don't get the point. Are you saying that we need the same amount of resources Idaho uses to manage an elk herd that is roughly 6 times the size of ours? Wouldn't we need 1/6 the funding to manage a herd that is 1/6 the size? Even if it costs more to manage a smaller herd, our license costs are already double the cost in ID.

Sounds GREAT!! But, I forgot a very important point. I think the YOUTH age of 10 -17 is not good enough. This should be expanded to 10-21. All of the kids going to college (ages 18-21) and/or their parents cannot afford to buy hunting/fishing combos. For many families, the college years are the tightest from a budgetary standpoint. What is the justification for establishing the youth age of 10-17? Please consider increasing to Age 21. If 10-21 is not acceptable then please consider ages 14-21 instead of 10-17. Thank You!!

Will there be a response to these questions? I feel I need this information to provide the requested feedback on the fee structure.

Again, I do not see this as simplification at all, please clarify what has been simplified.

why is not the Urban fishing license offered in the lifetime (forever) licenses? It would make it a lot easier if 1 (one)fish/hunt license covered ALL AREAS in Arizona.

I will try and keep this brief and to the point.

- Regarding reduced cost for youth-Yes
- For the most part the licensing does look simpler.
- I am not completely ok with rate hikes. I feel even our game and fish fund unnecessary projects (NON_GAME)
- If you want to save money quit printing regulations and applications.
- Combine the two spring draws again. In this technology driven world it is possible to get the draw results out quicker than 60 days. If you have to wait til our WM's have their survey data in to set numbers then wait. BUT that means LISTEN TO THE BIOLOGISTS IN THE FIELD AND NOT THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- If you want to increase revenue then you have to stock the woods, the way you stock the woods is increasing buck to doe ratios, bull to cow ratios, etc..... That means cutting tags and then based on sound Biological data increase as recommended. Yes I know were in a drought and there are other factors complicating our mule deer herds but when you let out over 600 tags in unit 28 there is no way the mule deer population is going to rebound. AGAIN LISTEN TO OUR WM'S
- Leave license at calendar yr
- No to premium tag structures- Every state is making this a rich man's pastime. I understand G&F needs revenue but it should not be run like a business in the sense that it needs to grow expand and create a profit. There are a lot of non-game ventures that G&F is involved in that I question. Get back to the roots of managing wildlife. Most people do not like Making unpopular decisions within their circles but those involved need to take a hard look at what they are doing with our hard earned dollars. Remember you work for us the hunters and fisherman. Not the bird watchers or the trail walkers. This is a fact no apologies. NO TO PREMIUM STRUCTURE.

1. Apprentice license should come with some better sideboards. Right now we have individuals who are taking advantage of this license and we believe that the department is losing revenue from some non-residents who are using the free license to come down and participate in "annual hunts" with family members for small game and predators either during the holidays or vacations.

2. I agree with one of the comments made about not making December whitetail tags down on the border "premium hunts". It's a great tag to have but in all reality, the border issues keep hunters on edge and just the stress hunting along the border takes away from one's ability to truly enjoy the "premium hunt". I for one don't even camp out when I am able to draw one of those tags because of the border issues. Unfortunatley there are awesome areas that I would love to hunt but I know that I must avoid them because of smuggling activity. It's down right scary in some areas!

I am opposed to the Premium tag concept.

I am opposed to giving a non-resident a cheaper price for a antlerless tag compared to an antlered tag.

I would like to voice some of my opinions about the topics being reviewed. I am an avid hunter here in AZ and worked at an archery shop for the last few years and hear a lot of public opinion there. First, I want to address the "premium" system. In my eyes this will not decrease the numbers of people applying for these tags, the people who apply for these hunts now know what they are in for for the most part. I apply for these premium hunts each year and I know I am battling years and years of waiting in order to have experiences that aren't overrun with seas of newbie hunters with high powered rifles on every single hill (southern unit early coues tags). What I believe that it will do is INCREASE the number of uneducated hunters to put in for these hunts as they will know what hunts the trophy hunters want without doing any research on the areas (I know a lot of people that do this in Utah). Furthermore, all early bull tags are far from premium, I would much rather have a late 9 or 23 archery bull tag than an early 4b tag, let alone some of the "desert" early bull tags..... Also the license system, I agree with simplifying it but for the love of god don't go with a system like utah where your license is good for 365 days there will be so many NR who put in for points every two years on one license and just buy a license for the second year if they get drawn (I do this in Ut) and this will cost the state a lot of money.

I think the 1 day license price for both resident and non resident should be half of what is being proposed. I frequently have guests come in. A 10 dollar rate would give us more flexibility in planning and we may actually spend more over the course of a week. The higher price reduces the number of times you can go out and also makes short fishing trip (hour or two) too expensive.

Hi Game and Fish,

I do not like the thought of premium hunts. I like to put in with a chance of drawing 1 of them hunts without having to break the bank. Seems like premium hunts would be more of a rich mans hunt. I have to save to put in for the hunts that I put my kids and I in for. I can see increasing the tags some 10% to 15%. Making different pay for hunts seems way more confusing to me.

The application, bonus point going from 7.50 to 13 I think is a bit much. I think something like 10 dollars.

I like the license going for a calendar year. Makes it easy to know when to buy them and know you got it for all the draws that year.

Thanks you for taking the emails

Gentlemen,

I don't know if this is the right forum to present this. If not, could you please direct to the appropriate department.

The way I understand the drawing process now is that a 75 year old has the same chance as a 20 year old. I have submitted three years in a row for elk and only continue to earn preference points. That has not worked in drawing a tag so far. We old folks are running out of time but the 20 year olds have "forever" so to speak to accumulate enough points to be successful in getting a tag. Has any consideration been given to redesign the draw so at least a percentage of the old timers have better odds in drawing before they end up at the packing house?

One of those old guys.

- What do you think an elk tag should cost?

1. I think the elk tag is currently priced right, if not slightly a little high. I wouldn't want the price of an elk tag to increase and impact our ability to recruit and maintain young future hunters by making the cost too high for their parents. That includes the adults who take them hunting.

2. Nor would I want the cost of a tag to preclude the average hunter.

- Would you prefer your hunting or fishing license to be valid for one year from the date of purchase, as opposed to just the current calendar year?

1. Either way has it's own baggage. I think it's ok like it is.

- Would you be willing to pay more for a fishing license if it included more privileges at a discount over purchasing those privileges separately?

1. No – this is similar to paying for cable TV and only being able to buy bundles.

- How do you feel about the concept of offering some premium deer hunts at a higher fee?

1. I do not favor that concept.

- Should there be a significantly discounted price for a youth license?

1. Yes, for youth hunts.

I think it is outrageous to be raising fees for hunting. This is a god given right and to have the government continue to raise fees or in other words a use tax for hunting in Arizona is just ridiculous. I oppose any fee change structure change. To change a fee amount by 150% for a deer tag is just plain stupid.

I am the current Chairman of the Arizona Bowhunters Association. I attended the meeting on May 20 and just wanted to put my comments in writing. I understand that no changes have been made to

license and tag fees since 2007. I would encourage you to gradually increase tag fees and prices. With the passing of Senate Bill 1223 you have the ability to make changes every year. I like the simplification of the license fees that are being proposed. We listened to Ty Gray speak at our meeting and simplification was the major selling point for SB1223. The creation of "Premium Hunts and Fees" does not simplify things, it makes it more confusing. I am a husband and father of two boys. The hunts we usually apply for for deer and elk cost \$595 in 2013. If your proposed changes are put into effect those same hunts next year would cost \$1050 in 2014, an increase of \$455 just for deer and elk! This increase is too much and will put a huge burden on families who apply for all species. The premium hunt structure is not something we need in Arizona. I like increasing the application fee and tag fees a little to offset increased costs but keep in mind how this affects your customers. Take a little from a lot of people, instead of a lot from a few.

Just wanted to comment on the new tag and license fees since I was unable to attend the meeting. I'm not for the premium tag fees. I would rather you guys raise prices on all tags a little bit to make the money you need rather than targeting the trophy Hunters. I would like it if you sent out surveys to all Arizona resident Hunters to get their input also as I know a lot of people are NOT for it. I like what you guys are doing with the fishing licenses and youth licenses. Just do not agree the high premium tag fees. Thanks for your time.

Good morning,
I'm writing to voice my opinion regarding the proposed change to the fee structure for deer and elk tags in AZ. I don't agree that there should be a tiered system that charges a higher price for "premium" tags over "general" tags. New Mexico already does something similar (and Utah to a lesser degree), and I strongly disagree with it. Individuals who have a higher disposable income should not be given the advantage when it comes to acquiring tags (premium or not) to enjoy a public resource. This proposal is in direct conflict with the one of the pillars of the North American model of wildlife management; the democracy of hunting and fishing (hunting and angling opportunity for all). The high price of elk hunting already excludes a large percentage of the population from participating, and all this proposal does is narrow down the number of individuals that can participate in those hunts deemed as "premium". As much as financially possible, these public resources ("premium" or not) need to be equally available to everyone.

I realize that AZGFD needs to increase its income to match operational expenses, and if we need to adjust tag costs to do this, then that's something we need to do (license and tag prices should be adjusted annually to correlate with the rate of inflation). However, the price of a tag should not be based on perceived quality of AZGFD or any one else. The wildlife of Arizona is a public resource, and the ability to hunt ("premium" and general) needs to remain available to everyone. Structuring tag fees as proposed does nothing but exacerbate the problems of our current system where wealthier individuals have more access, and more and more individuals are excluded from this outdoor heritage that we are trying to attract more individuals to take part in.

I agree that it's important to treat many aspects of AZGFD as a business; however the price you charge for access to a public resource by basing it on quality is not one of them. If one wished to maximize the dollar amount gained for each tag, then each one should be put on the open market and sold to the highest bidder. As an agency responsible for the allocation of a public resource I'm sure it's easy for you to see the fault in this, and I hope that I have helped you see one of the faults in this current proposal. Instead of having the proposed tiered approach, I'd recommend increasing the current tag cost of all tags by "X dollars" to meet the operational needs of AZGFD.

Hello -
i'm for simplification /bundling of the fishing - always a pain in arse to figure which license/stamp needed to fish where. i'm sure each program will get a percentage from the fees and hopefully make the lisenche more desirable and up the sales.
the youth program is great -\$5 isn't a bad idea if they want to know who these kids are in the field.
maybe an option of a one time fee of \$25 which last the yrs from 10-17 might work as well
I'm all for a reasonable fee increase in the tags!

A \$13 fee for processing is not ok - compared to other states - an increase to say 10 might be more appropriate , though they should have quit trying vendors for the online process, after the first disaster and we wouldn't be where we are now -

different application fees for paper verses/ online is crazy!!

I'm against any premium fees !

We all deserve an equal chance to hunt the rut !

as I heard from a very wise person :

you will only be making problems between hunters!

if guy has a premium bull elk tag and there are 300 regular cow elk hunters hunting the same unit at the same time - the hunter with the bull tag will think he's got preference to a water hole / blind /trail etc.

He paid more he has first chance -- it will happen and cause major conflict between hunters - we don't even want to go there . Leave it alone - It's not worth the extra \$\$\$\$

same as late deer - a hunter will get pissed if an archer walks in front of his stand during his premium hunt

an blows his chance at a trophy---same for waterholes or mineral licks etc.

we don't need to try to model the AZG&F after other states . we are suppose to be leaders in equal and fair opportunity for all sportsmen and women!!

Couple of hunter comments re: not liking the premium hunt units – I understand their comments:

I have never hunted big game and this can be totally off base, but are these units where most of the deer and elk are and if so, are the chances significantly increased in these units?

It this is the case.. I definitely support these as premium hunt units and hunters should pay more for the opportunity to hunt in these units.

I also like the idea the opportunity to purchase insurance, like travelers insurance if something happens and you cannot use go on your hunt, but you would have to turn in your tag before the hunt begins, how would that work?

\$13.00 sounds more than reasonable.

As a family; Dad, one 15 year old, one 13 year old and a 7 year old who fish lakes and urban and dove hunt we like the new license fees proposed on the slide you made available before the presentation. However we would never be able to afford the old hunt tag fees and the proposed make it even more out of our reach and it is something we would like very much to do. You have to realize that you are making it tough for the average joe to help in you conservation efforts. We made over 40,000 last year. Own our on vechiles out right/ have no car payments, minimum insurance, use dial up internet, no "cable" bill, everything basic. but still can not afford health insurace or hunt tatgs. Which one do you think I am going to worry about first? Please lower fees!!!!

Resident Hunter/ angler and father of future hunters/ anglers

I adamantly oppose your proposed fee structure. For several years the department has been promoting the desire to increase opportunity for hunters. Now with the proposed restructuring of fees and the addition of premium hunts you are pricing the common man out of the recreational opportunity hunting and fishing represents. All this at a time when most Arizona families have been negatively impacted financially by the housing collapse and recession and are just now beginning to show weak signs of recovery.

If you truly believe in providing more opportunity to hunters and anglers, and have any compassion for the financial hardships Arizonans as a whole have and are continuing to experience this is not the way to go. This is an embarrassment and shows just how out of touch the department truly is with its constituency. Please go back to the table and come up with a better proposal than this.

I like the new license structure. It is especially beneficial for me as I buy a combo license every year. My question I have is if the Resident or Non-resident has been discussed. My parents are retired and own a house in Arizona and Michigan. They live in Arizona for 6 months but are considered to be non-residents based on Michigan being there primary residence. My father would buy a hunt and fish combo every year if he was considered a resident but the fees are pretty high for non residents. I would like to see a Resident license fee extended to those that pay property taxes and utilities in the State of Arizona.

Appreciate the response. My comments to the "age" discrimination is this. Laws are often passed out of emotion and without sufficient study. Just because there is a law doesn't make it good law. Also conditions change and mindsets change which should also result in a change in the law. There is plenty of "age" discrimination afforded senior citizens - discounts on food, lodging, entertainment tickets, durable goods, etc. So why not treat the senior with some sort of preference in the hunting draws. To repeat what I said before. We just ain't going to be around as long as the young folks so we won't have the same opportunities to draw as they will. Why not give us a break?
Hope you pass this on and thanks for reading.

What you are effectively attempting to implement is for Arizona to cost 2 times as much as any other state to hunt deer and elk for its residents.
#1- Elk and deer tags in other states you used as comparison for tag fee's also include hunting license. Not also have to buy a hunting license.
#2- AZGFD is supposed to manage Arizona's wildlife not be a business concerned with making money and that is all new proposals are about any more.
#3- You've tried to trick the public with the wording by almost making it seem as if you are saving people money when all you doing is forcing people who don't hunt birds or small game or fish in phoenix to pay for with add ons to there licenses they don't want or need.
Once again azgfd makes are state look greedy while taking advantage of residents and non residents alike. How about lowering cost of license and tags since 2007 americans on the whole make 25% less income. Just wondering if this was taken into consideration. I guess not or you would also have known rural America it is a higher rate than that.
Do The right thing for the people and not your pocket books.
Sincerely Rural Arizona resident

Ps There are no elk left in the verde other than a few migratory at certain times of the year. So please cancel your vv hunt unit this is only a money making scheme devised by you all.

I Listened to the webcast last night. My two cents below..

I like the combo license including the urban fish, and the simplification for family members.

Why is dove a migratory bird? It's not... and never was until recent.

I also like the idea of hunt tag insurance. It's happened to me a few times over the years where I've been drawn and end up not going.

Nothing was mentioned about transferring a big game tag to family. I wish it had been that way when I was a youth. Keep it...

Prices of fishing licenses have become so high that there are people being left out of the joy and fun fishing brings

Dislike premium pricing structure or concept

Dislike premium units

Set aside puts at risk premium opportunities for for future

Slippery slope. What's next?

| |
|--|
| Shouldn't we see larger increase to fish fees or are you shifting burden to hunting tag fees? |
| Prefer no premium, but if so premium, keep in the same draw (1 draw) process |
| Appreciate adding community fish to regular fish license |
| Premium tags will be a barrier. Bad for hunting in general, even though I will continue to apply for best hunts |
| Hunt draw insurance is great idea |
| Turning in tag is great idea |
| Discount for multiple tag applications would be a benefit |
| ABA disappointed premium structure not discussed. |
| 455 to 1050 difference in my cost for hunts I applied for this year |
| I oppose premium pricing structure. It will lose customers |
| Premium pricing doesn't simplify structures. It is the opposite of simplification theme |
| Application fee shouldn't jump so high all at once |
| What is the dollar amount you are trying to achieve in your budget? |
| If you don't go premium, will you see other tag fees increase to make up for loss? |
| regarding sb 1200 2012, sportsman group bill, that group would be instrumental in discussing things like this. why doesn't gfd go to them? |
| I don't understand what the cap on the gfd fund is. (fy 2013 50% app) |
| did you guys consider the cpi when discussing your budget challenges? it gives a distorted picture showing all of your budget increases because not everything will have increased that greatly. |
| do more people buy fishing licenses rather than hunting? because fishing license fees are being lowered while hunting fees are increasing. |
| likes 365 day structure |
| where does the 32 million in the fund come from? what is the break down for fishing vs hunting? |
| what are your projections for 2014 if all of the conceptual fees were adopted? |
| I applaud what you are trying to do by simplifying this structure. |
| conceptual non resident fish license is too low. charge more to nonresidents and don't raise fees for residents. |
| utah charges much higher for nonresidents than these conceptual fees for nonresidents. we should raise those. |
| likes the idea of getting rid of colorado river only license. |
| scared that colorado and nevada would charge more for stamps |
| how is the 365 day license going to work with the draws? |
| nonresident hunt license is too low. |
| charge 225.75 to non residents for hunting if you are going to include fishing in the combo. |
| nonresidents won't stop hunting and fishing here if you don't lower their fees. |
| resident costs are going up and nonresidents are not. |
| the current system needs to be simplified significantly. |
| I don't see how the conceptual structure is simplifying anything. |
| feels fees for youth licenses, r/nr should be different. |
| loves the fact that we are charging the youth only \$5 because they are our future and we need to get them out there to learn. |
| 1 day resident combo is too high considering the conceptual price for a year. possibly 10/20 for r/nr |
| urban fishing license is too high. 18.50 or less sounds more reasonable. maybe 15? |
| reduce age requirement for pioneer license. |
| create a reduced license structure for seniors just as we do for youth to help retain older customers |

| |
|--|
| charge more to nonresidents for tags because some of these tags are so high in demand. |
| the bighorn sheep tag in particular is so high in demand and nonresidents should have to pay more to get them. |
| we should be charging 1000 for nr deer vs 500. |
| have different application fee for r/nr. nr application to \$30 and leave r at \$7.50 |
| turkey tag from \$18 to \$25 is too much. |
| javalina fee too high. |
| turkey r fee should be about \$20 to \$25 including application fee. |
| wants to know how much the cost of actually processing an application is to gfd because the application fee should match that cost. |
| nr deer needs to be higher than conceptual, about \$550 |
| oppose premium hunt structure. |
| premium deer fees for residents are tripling and only doubling for nonresidents. this is backwards. |
| feels all fees should be raised by a fixed percentage for residents vs nonresidents. |
| supports premium structure because it is a business driving system but there needs to be a bigger difference in fees for r/nr |
| support concept of premium structure |
| wouldnt mind paying 100 bucks for deer tag on 12b but suggests waiting period for people who tag out for premium hunts |
| doesnt like the idea of all archery hunters paying for premium because all kids will be forced to do youth hunt, which will cause there to be too many kids, forcing some kids out of the sport. |
| we should keep all elk hunts the same as they are now. |
| opposes premium structure because we are making hunting a rich man's sport. |
| thinks the fees for elk hunt are reasonable |
| doesn't think anyone having to pay another \$80 to \$100 bucks for a premium elk hunt is a big deal. it is very reasonable. |
| the department is trying to run a business and these increases must be done |
| you should get a bonus point for a paper application. |
| frequent hunter and multiple genus application fee discounts are too complicated. |
| in draw, only lose bonus points if drawn for choices 1 or 2 and not choices 3,4, or 5. |
| appreciates that we are trying to provide a service by going around the state and doing these meetings. |
| Make a standard of these fees(via timeline) on if these fees would stay for two, three years, etc. If not a december rifle hunt could there be a possible later desert deer hunt (rifle) and longer? Do not reduce resident permits and increase nonresident hunt tags. |
| Set new caps or year terms on new permit price. Do not like the premium deer/elk structure permits. Nonresident general elk "cow" permit fee needs to be higher. Does not need to match bull permit but should be within \$100. Do not agree with \$13 application fee for residents (maybe \$10?). Paper and online application fee should be the same. |
| No premium hunts tags. Application fees \$10-Res, \$15 Nonresident |
| Resident fish conceptual license and fees at \$37 would be good. Big improvement. Same with urban fishing for residents at \$24. Like the resident hunt license valid 365 days. Valid 365 days is good all around. Resident combo is very good at \$57. Really like the \$5 fee for youth. That'll get more kids out taking part. Family Packages would be a good improvement. Migratory bird stamp-r is great at \$5. Resident general deer a bit high. youth also high. Don't like the idea of premium hunts. Special licenses are still good. Any chance of doing something for a disabled person who is NOT a veteran? This is a person who worked his tail off in plumbing until he was hurt on the job- has a set disability income and unable to work. Still hunts but has to go slow and easy. Realizing that Game and Fish has expenses that have increased, prices for all of us have increased as well. Those of us who are fighting the budget with a "fixed" income, in particular, cannot afford fees and permits to go overboard! How about |

application fees \$10 residents \$15 NR. Frequent hunter discounts would be a good thing and temporary reduction in pricing when possible would always be a plus.

Against application fee from \$7.50 to almost double and no refund? Bad statement. Hunting is for everyone not for the rich. Raising tag and license fees will only affect the lower income. IE young hunters?

I like the simplification of license structure. I'm concerned that raising the resident hunt license (even by \$4.75) without providing "extras" (as with other licenses) may keep some hunters from buying licenses on principle alone. Also, the 1 day non-resident combo vs the 3 day may lose revenue for the department. I would like to see some sort of guarantee to not raise deer tag fees for x amount of time, or some sort of new cap placed on those fees. The large jump in price on premium deer tags will turn off most hunters that would usually put in for premium. I suggest \$50 for resident, and \$250 for non-resident, if you choose to keep the premium deer at all. Please do not lower non-resident antlerless elk. Don't raise application fees, at least not double!

I like the fact that the urban fishing license could be included in the combination tag. I do not like the idea of premium hunts at all. If the youth licensing comes about (10 years old starting age) please get the info out to the public, because a lot of people do not even know their kids need licenses when they turn 14, as they are not hunters or fishermen themselves.

Can I make an additional comment to be captured from the meeting this past Tuesday?

New Mexico does have a \$3 application fee. I do know that Commissioner Harris pounced on me Tuesday night after I stated that the application fee in the state of Colorado was \$8 and he added "and \$20 for a bonus point"!

I still feel that with recent technological, computer advances the cost of the application process most often referred to as "the draw" should be coming sharply down?

There was not a slide on this as part of the Power Point presentation last Tuesday evening.

How about this:

1. Do not increase the application fee from \$7.50 to \$13!
2. Do increase the "application fee" to \$10 to help offset other budgetary needs.
3. But, in return, keep the "buy a bonus point fee" at \$7.50!
4. Do not charge NR hunters for a NR General hunting license that they WILL NOT use if NOT DRAWN for a big game tag. What currently takes place is just short of ROBBERY in my opinion!

My thought is that the application for #3 above never gets duplicated and is "only" the purchase of a bonus point. The application NEVER gets into the "draw" process.

This would indeed show good faith with the hunting population of Arizona and other NR hunters.

First of all I want you to know I defer (most of the time, depending on n) to data so the following thoughts are based on intuition only.

I support the need to recruit and retain. That said I wonder if some of the financial burden of license fees could be transferred from the adults to the Jrs. My reasoning is the adults, even the casual purchase a license every 2-3 yrs type, will be the basis for our retention and may become recruiters. My personal belief is the Dept. has placed too much of the burden on the agency to recruit and not enough on existing hunters, who basically do it for free.

So my suggestion is to add a couple of \$\$s to the Jr. licenses/tags and deduct accordingly from the adults. I realize it is not a 1:1 because of the numbers of licenses sold.

Thanks for reading this. Loren I am always thinking but often without knowledge!!!!

ps I am also an advocate of a father, grandfather, guardian/son, daughter deer tag. That is 1 tag that can be used by one of 2 specified people to promote family type hunting.

are nonresidents being surveyed and considered?

are you working with ca/nv actively in regards to stamps?

likes that urban fishing is included in fishing license.

how does draw and 365 day license work together?

worried with 365 day license that people may purchase license only every other year because if they aren't drawn they don't need a license.

likes the idea of conceptual hunting and fishing combo for nr

concerned game and fish will lose money on urban fishing license because of rising cost of stocking.

concerned about people that are catching the bag limit every day while urban fishing, raising the cost of stocking.

concerned that hunting license will expire before usage of drawn tags. Maybe a person could purchase a license and choose the date it becomes enacted.

concerned that people will not buy a license if they weren't drawn for the tags they wanted.

we must make sure nonresidents know that if they purchase a hunting license, they get fishing privileges as well.

conceptual nonresident hunting license fee is reasonable for everything it comes with.

concerned that hunting license including fishing license will inflate fishing licenses and federal dollars, hurting other states.

concerned that nonresident prices aren't being raised enough.

wants people to have to pay for a license first before draw so if nothing else, we get their money for the license.

doesn't mind spending \$160 for nonresident hunting license because of 365 day structure.

365 day structure is great idea.

like the idea of the nonresident combo license

add migratory bird stamp and state duck stamp to resident combo license and upcharge a few more dollars.

likes the youth license structure and conceptual fee.

kids may be disappointed after they are no longer defined as youth and will have a much harder time drawing the same hunts.

likes the redefining of "youth" and feels it is much less confusing.

concerned nonresidents are getting too many tags compared to residents

concerned about where the new revenue is going to be going.

nonresident deer tag conceptual fee is too high.

make the nonresident deer tag price based on quality of deer in each location.

archery hunt should be different price.

doesn't think premium structure is right. pricing should be kept the same as it is currently.

with premium structure, some people will be priced out, although this may cause more people to purchase tags because they know the odds will be greater seeing as many may be priced out.

I agree with premium structure

I agree with premium structure if it is because the costs to the department in those regions are rising.

it is no brainer to raise nonresident fees. I love that. agree with premium structure for nonresidents

| |
|--|
| only. price should be based on draw percentage. |
| early october hunt should not be premium hunt. |
| doesn't like premium hunt because some people who deserve to be able to hunt won't be able to, and people who are more well off will be able to. |
| worried that we wont be able to sell all of the premium hunt tags because people don't want to pay that for december hunts. |
| as a resident, i believe nonresidents should pay more, but not as high was our conceptual premium hunt tags. |
| raise fees on nonresident premiums but not nonresident standards. |
| r/nr elk tag fees are reasonable. |
| reduce fees for youth elk tags. they should be \$25. youth deer and elk tag fees should be the same. |
| late october hunts should not be included in premium hunts. |
| we should keep the structure the same, no premium structure. |
| if we have premium hunts, the premium bull and cow hunts should be separated and not overlapping. |
| the percentage of premium hunt tags of all of our tags is too high. |
| base the number of premium tags on draw odds. |
| raise the application fee if it costs more to process an application than what we are charging. |
| I don't mind paying a little bit more but don't charge all the way across the board. It is too much. |
| believes these increases will be increasing our revenue far more than we are saying it will. |
| almost doubling application fee is asking too much |
| charge nonresidents more than residents |
| application fee needs to be a round number and not be some dollar amount and 50 cents. |
| hunt draw insurance is good idea |
| feels native americans should not be considered residents. |
| lower age for pioneer license to 65. |
| Youth between 10-13 should not need to pay \$5 for license- should remain unnecessary to have license as it is now. This will be a barrier because they have to acquire a physical license. |
| Application fee needs to be raised. Other states are \$20. Prefer a little from a lot rather than a lot from a few. |
| Would prefer no fee differentiation between cow and bull elk and deer tags. |
| Very few people are going to be happy about paying a premium for hunting during the rut. If all early archery hunts are going to become premium the season should be moved back a week to coincide with the majority an peak of the rut. All of the archery elk hunters would be happy for the change and more willing to swallow the price hike. I would be okay with a small tag increase across the board but premium tags give off feeling that hunting is turning into a rich mans sport and eventually tag fees may price hunters out of their favorite hunt or units. Do not raise the cost of general archery deer tags. Many sportsmen are fed up with the way the department has handled its recent scandals and the commissions blatant distaste for Archery elk hunters. These proposed fee increases must be handled with tact. |
| I DO NOT agree with your proposal as it again creates roadblocks for inividuals eithter wanting to take up hunting or those of us with children, who enjoy including other family members in on a hunt. Yes I see where it appears to save us money in some areas such as fishing licenses and junior licenses, but the tag increases are what kills the number of Arizona resident hunters and their families in the field each year. |

First, I disagree with creating "Premium" elk and deer hunts.

It appears you are attempting to create a "Market" specifically for the 'well to do'. This is just wrong and not fair for everyone, because now you've created a niche for the well to do, out of state people who can afford a premium hunt.

Most of us Arizona residents can barely afford putting in for tags for everyone in the family and someone generally may have to sit out a season due to costs.

It's a heritage that we all currently enjoy equally. Add these new tag costs and even less average people like me and my family may not be going into the field next fall / winter.

Currently what I generally buy for my family is bull or cow elk, deer, turkey and now javalina for me and one family member, only because now I can't afford tags for everyone.

My argument is that costs are going up for everyone. If you are going to increase rates, then raise it dramatically for Non-residents. Let them take the brunt of it, as they can afford it!

Also another thought.... if you lower your tag rates, you will then probably see more Arizona residents purchase more tags.

The reason you lost revenue from tags in recent years was because of the your raising of the fees and people could not afford the tag rates. Most people like myself live on a budget and try and save for tags but most of the time the cost comes out of that payday closest to the draw deadline date.

A suggestion in cutting your costs... involve your local hunters that are willing to help, by going out and assisting your game managers in counts on the ground, to save fuel costs for both vehicles and helicopters.

Also include us in other projects which cut costs.

But most of all live within finances available to the agency.

We resident hunters are the ones that take the brunt of the cost shifts and it's unfair.

You point out in your ppt presentation that hunting in Az will cost more than other states around us for the most part. That's sad.

Honestly if that's the case, I'll turn my fall/winter hunts into a family vacation where I can get more bang for my buck, where I can afford for more of my family members to hunt, and if that means going to New Mexico to hunt or another southwestern state then I will.

It's a shame that something so traditional as hunting can be curbed because of cost.

Hunting is an American and Arizona tradition and I embrace it. Like everything else in this country that's been a tradition, it's getting trampled on due to budget issues.

Although now it looks like we're going along the path of England back in the day, when only the rich could afford to hunt on the kings land and the serfs had to scrounge for food.

Cut costs and you'll see revenue rise. Tax more and people will go elsewhere and then you'll end up gathering even less revenue than what you intended.

This is my voice and the voice of other hunters like me that are opposed to any rate increases.

Please hear our voice and do the right thing, if you want to see more Arizona Hunters and their families in the field in the future.

To Whom It May Concern:

There is nothing simple about the "license simplification" process. The newly proposed AZGFD conceptual license structure and fees only make the application process more difficult while at the same time creating additional financial barriers to hunting in Arizona! The AZGFD is to be reducing the barriers to hunting in Arizona! Under the current conceptual proposal there will be both general and premium tags for both deer and elk.

How does this simplify the application process? Also under the current conceptual proposal there would be license, tag and application fee increases. How does this reduce the financial barriers to hunting in

Arizona for the average Arizona family? If the application process is not

truly simplified and the financial barriers to hunting in Arizona eased, I fear Arizona will lose future

generations of hunters.

Thank you for your consideration

Dear Arizona Game and Fish -

Because you have the statutory authority to raise costs does not mean that you must. If you had the ability to raise costs previously to the cap, but did not feel it necessary or choose to do so, then it is unacceptable to believe that you now feel it is a requirement. Certainly, from your own PowerPoint charts, expenses are once again aligning with revenues. It would seem the sense of urgency has passed. Additionally, while most if not all true sportsmen feel it their responsibility to contribute to the conservation of the resources which ensure the future of our sport, I find it unacceptable that the State of Arizona's failure to manage employee benefit costs be passed on to Arizona's sportsmen. These costs are already part of the General Fund budget, and should be paid for by all Arizonans. I, along with many of the other sportsmen in Arizona, feel that hunting is a right; one which is managed by (not allowed by) the Arizona Game and Fish. Hunting should remain as affordable as possible to allow for the maximum number and diversity of Arizona's sportsmen to partake in. Simplify the structure, seek out efficiency, and increase access. Do not raise the costs simply because statute allows you to do so.

After sitting through the presentation and listening to it on 2 additional webcasts, reading through some of the documents and the handout. I would like to offer my \$0.02 worth.

- The team has done a good job working through the complexities of this proposal
 - I think we could do a better job describing the application fee increase by using current and projected costs for actually processing an application and I think it should be a fee that attempts only to recover that actual cost. That should be based on the way our hunters now apply meaning internet versus paper and the costs associated with each of those methods as predicted. I think we also might be better off if we describe we intend to keep this few current with the actual costs as we calculate based on how hunters continue to apply in the future up to the current proposed \$13.00.
 - I think we have done an awesome job conveying our belief in the North American Model (the Director's Desk in the regulations!) and many of the organizations we work closely with on a regular basis tend to fall in line with us on the importance of the model premise. That said I believe our attempt within this proposal to use a differentiation and/or a "trophy hunt quality" based fee is a significant deviation from the intent of the NAM! I believe this to be the most critical factor in our proposal and the highest single source for public contention for our proposal. The public didn't agree with it last time either. It just leaves a bad taste and I believe it may be a basis for questioning our credibility. Also, I think I have seen at least a few of our constituents unhappy with this approach and view it as an elitist approach, this is a rather limited sample size though.
 - I believe we have a good argument that is supported by a great deal of our constituency for keeping up with the cost of doing business. In that argument I believe the best support comes from smoothing out the increases across the general license (hunting and fishing) and all permits.
 - The team did a really good job on the reduction of licenses and removing a lot of confusion.
- Overall good presentations but think we need to seriously consider the trophy fee approach.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment

We are non-residents from the state of Washington. Recently, my nephew and hunting partner received a survey from your department concerning the possible increase in license and tag fees for NR's. We have been purchasing licenses and applications for your state for the past twelve years and having successfully been drawn on three separate occasions for archery elk. We have thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity and the hospitality of your residents during these hunts. The survey asked if we would be in favor of a minimal increase in license and permit fees. We all agreed that the potential increase was within reason and returned the survey with expectable compliance.

Going on your web site we were shocked to see that the department is now seeking input for

“conceptual fees” for premium elk tags at \$1000. We are confused and to say the least very disappointed that the financial burden of the department will possibly take advantage of NR,s along with a substantial increase for resident hunters as well. The internet is buzzing with a lot of very disappointed hunting groups from both parties.

My family has hunted in six western states for elk and Alaska for caribou and have never paid anywhere near the amount for hunting privileges in comparison to what your department is now seeking. I have discussed this matter with a number of hunters that have enjoyed the opportunity of hunting Arizona in the past and all agreed that they would no longer apply for another Arizona hunt, no matter what the species if this increase is approved. Perhaps the TV personalities can afford to hunt your state but the average hunter that I am sure makes up the majority of your financial gain cannot.

I hope you seriously consider not to adopt your conceptual structure and keep the increase as you propose in your survey.

Fishing license-okay. Hunting R \$32.25 to \$35.00, single parent families? Okay!, Combos okay!, Youth-Very Okay, Application fee \$7.50 to \$10, Sheep tag \$265 to \$280, Premium deer \$34.75 to \$75, General deer \$34.75 to \$40, Premium Elk \$114 to \$160, Cow elk \$114 to \$120, Bull elk \$114 to \$135 NR Draw \$13, NR Deer \$45 and Jr?, NR Elk- C-\$125 B-\$145 Jr?,NR Pronghorn \$90, NR Black Bear \$25,NR Sheep \$300, NR Turkey \$25, NR Javalina \$25 Jr \$15.

You are proposing that certain hun units be designated as "Premium Units." I am against the "Premium" concept. For example, currently a deer tag is \$34.75. A premium deer tag would rocket to \$100! This fee would also apply to all December Whitetail and mule deer hunts. I am not in favor of the price increase and premium hunts. Secondly, it is proposed to have premium elk units. Currently an elk tag costs \$114. Your premium tag would cost \$200! I am not in favor of the proposed price increase, nor am I in favor of Premium elk hunt units. What is to prevent AZGFD designating other species for "premium hunts"? Will 37B unit become a "premium hunt"for javalina? Will Unit 21 become a "premium hunt" unit for deer? Will 6A become a "Premium Hunt" for turkey? The premium concept is a Pandora's Box! Do not designate units as premium hunts!

1. Do you need legislation in order to maintain the ability to survey funds?

2. Has the Commission already reviewed the conceptual structure?

Does this federal money as match assist with the retirement increase of 92%

Would there be consideration to re-negotiate like NV or CA?

Under the conceptual – Rim Lakes fishing license urban would also be included however what if I don't want that benefit I would still have to incur the additional cost

Discussion on how other states still include additional fees

Pricing still seems like a cut but how is this in relation to not lowering revenue for the NR (fishing)?

Money gained through the urban program funded things like stocking, where else is the money going?

The cost of the 5 day fish/4day hunt is still lower than CO/UT

365 should have large increase in # of licenses

Do I need active license to apply for the draw? (ie. UT only have to buy license every other year)-

In UT, buy NR even if hunt is unsuccessful, you still keep your bonus point

Hunters will be hunting other species maybe out of state folks should be more of the target for increase.

Why are all of the R prices going but lowered for NR fishing?

Why can't the offset lower youth prices?

NR seems to have gone down for combo license, why?

How much federal \$ per license is received?

What is the match projection? (getting at % revenue brought in by how much being federal vs how much is brought in directly from the license sales). Are the increases just to gain the federal match?

Eliminate the NR to buy hunting and force them to buy the combo

| |
|---|
| Resident combo seems like getting/buying things that are not needed (or wanted) |
| Is the point if not enough NR are sold, the R will increase |
| Are the NR combo putting in for bull? If you go up in price by \$30 they would still pay |
| The points for NR are hard to swallow like UT |
| Do youth licenses go toward the federal match? |
| If youth bought day before turning 18, would the 365 still be valid? |
| Support in the NR/R youth stay the same |
| Seems like a push or encouragement on combo's |
| Before I could not go with family option but could not buy combo due to wife not wanting to fish, has that changed with this concept? |
| Are there still lifetime licenses? |
| In CO, can purchase additional days, could that work here? |
| Is the debate for combo bird/waterfowl due to the surveys? |
| What about people with lifetime licenses?-grandfathered? |
| Is there apprentice hunting for NR? |
| Why did mountain lion NR not increase? |
| Do NR use guide service? |
| Does statutory cap include application fee? |
| UT issues premium in areas and poaching is a problem. Is this going to be a potential problem here with deer? |
| Premium units are not liked by 8 of the 8 members of the public |
| For something like archery, would you have to buy separate tags for dec? |
| Premium units seems like it creates political classes and large problem with bonus points. People wont understand the math for another 2 years. |
| What about dec hunts? |
| Thing most will gripe about is the late Dec. hunts |
| Is the increase in fee to discourage harvest or strictly for revenue purposes? |
| Are you listening to peoples concerns, playing on an even field. Seems like opening a can of worms on these separate fees for premium hunts. |
| Dec/Jan premium tags with general archery tags, would want general tags not to cost more for archery. |
| In pricing of previous hunting and fishing was it contemplating premium structures, just an idea not reflected with others? |
| What if increase in premium to NR only? |
| If someone will pay more for archery in premium, they push you off the area. Increase in price will push others out like archery. |
| Is there a biological reason for all of this or just financial? |
| Appears that other states charge NR more than what the conceptual is showing. |
| Difference does not seem to deal with the problems politically using the premium pitting hunters against one another. |
| How many elk come back into the state? (antlerless) |
| Could elk tags just be 125 across the board for R (bull/cow)? |
| Could you do something similar to UT or NM for antlerless cow for R? |
| Don't think most people would put in for NR is lower price (\$100) due to increasing gas, travel and other out of state expenses for the trip. |
| Premium elk would include what hunts? |
| Seems same as deer, so why do the premiums? |
| Premium for elk hunts was not agreeable by any of the members of the public (8) |

| |
|--|
| Why not just increase them all by \$5 and not go to premiums at all? |
| Afraid all folks pile up to premium areas, again, forcing others out |
| Is it supply/demand or some other ulterior motive or just someone thought it would be a good idea? |
| Are there possible structure differences so that there are no over laps? |
| Are other comments weighted like by guides, etc. in other meetings like hunt guidelines? |
| So limited # of kills and cap = revenue, so basically its need to add cost across the board or add these premium hunts |
| Could a couple of units be picked for early hunts for premium? |
| Premium hunts may help me as an individual but effect trophy draw and general public in negative way |
| Alternate units with habitat stamps could be another option? |
| What about making part of it donatable? |
| What the comparison with CO as far as budget? |
| Could we increase the # of elk? |
| Do we have land to support more elk? |
| Does the Department do predator control for elk? |
| Did elk move from unit 1 to 21 due to fire as tags went up? |
| How did application fees almost double? Change is more for NRI, less for juniors |
| Would some of the money go to the online system? – point of sale like NV or UT? |
| Could we use the same vendor they used instead of designing our own? |
| Would the new system maintain loyalty and bonus point, like UT? |
| Concern for addressing credit card issues – bumping out of system, etc. |
| If going to all online system, will need to address those customers who use other methods of payment. |
| UT/CO can turn in tags and be reentered into the next draw without needing medical justification, etc. how would that work for AZ? |
| Reduction in pricing if left over walkin tags – offer ½ off javalina as example |
| If has not been tagged out, unused should be an option |
| 365/or birthday, which is it issued from? |
| What about conservation groups views? |
| Find agreement with Utah |
| 365 is good |
| License structure is complicated |
| Simplify the youth is good |
| Simplify the Premium |
| Premium fees are not what the used to be |
| Premium is not good |
| Premium \$200 is too high |
| Smaller price adj. more frequently |
| \$13 is fine (Application Fee) |
| Tag surrender to other family member |
| 365 licese should improve sales |
| Concern that 365 day license would allow people to play system-buy every other year |
| Resident combo- fees increase but NR combo did not go up or not significantly |
| Will people still be able to purchase only when if that's all they fish? |
| What about state duck stamp? |
| How have we addressed potential loss of revenue associated with the waterfowl stamp loss? |
| How does 365 affect drawing? |
| New structure benefits multiple types of families |

| |
|--|
| Why is price of hunting migratory bird separate |
| Handout doesn't address youth deer hunts |
| Where did you come up with conceptual fees? |
| Why no set percentage changes across the board? |
| What is definition of premium deer? |
| Would odds for being drawn be better if you applied for premium? Can you apply for regular hunt if not drawn for premium hunt? |
| Only way I would support this is if it will increase the availability of of hunts |
| Is there middle ground between fees now and concepts proposed? |
| Economy stinks now so lots of people facing tough choices |
| Could we offer premium structure for nonresidents only? Look at the western states. Lots of money, time and willingness to pay for this. |
| Discrepancy between what's being considered as "premium" possibilities. |
| Fisherman don't seem to be picking up additional cost of doing business. They get better value. Needs to be evenly applied to everyone across the board. |
| I understand the cost of business is increasing but the fee increases need to be spread across the board |
| Will we still have opportunity to retain bonus points if not drawn? But pick up over the counter to hunt that year. |
| How will archery change? |
| Does the tribe pay the same premium as general applicant for premium bull structure? |
| Should there also be incremental changes on archery premium (differential based on premium potential, ie Sept/Dec time frames) |
| Some people choose not to have credit cards. Don't support charging different application fees for online vs paper. Maybe a few generations down the road? |
| Can we consider reducing NR mountain lion tag costs north of Colorado to \$510 |
| Like idea of frequent hunter discount. Is there options for preference points? Having successful people wait to allow better chances for unsuccessful people |
| What you've got is awesome. The current structure almost requires a master's degree to interpret. |
| What's the reason behind different increases in premium elk vs deer? |
| Could consider bumping youth prices to \$15 |
| All for keeping kids license as low as possible. Easier to introduce youth; especially if parents don't hunt. |
| Have NR combo at \$180 instead of \$160 |
| 1 day license could hurt you at conceptual prices in Yuma. Nonresident hunters may buy fewer days. |
| Consider standardizing fee structure for pheasant and sandhill cranes |
| Would like to have long-term commitment from Commission on future cap or no change. |
| Consider elimination of the Kaibab Stamp |
| Desert deer hunts are not premium deer hunts except in January |
| Don't like premium concept at all |
| Don't like any December White tailed deer hunts as premium either |
| Hunt #1179 is not a premium hunt |
| Don't reduce nonresident permit fees |
| Out of 25 people, 24 are against premium hunt |
| No premium fees. I would be willing to pay more for bull tag |
| Maybe some latitude on price for nonresident cows |
| Not in favor of differential fees for bulls and cows |
| Application fee shouldn't be doubled |
| Raise nonresident application fee to \$15. Keep resident application fee the same |

| |
|--|
| No fee differential for online vs paper application |
| Round application fee up to \$8 |
| Philosophical issue with premium fees. North American model, equal application regardless of income, keeps less simple |
| May result in more conservation, causing GFD to focus money on premium units which would be unnecessary. |
| Like youth simplifications |
| Need to educate public when changes occur |
| Largely okay with license structure |
| Like youth concepts and fee |
| Prefer calendar year license |
| Provide option of calendar year vs 365 day license |
| Fishing license- good idea to combine, makes simpler |
| NR fish-gives them incentive at lower price |
| Likes including 2-pole in fishing license |
| Doesn't like dropping nonresident combo price. Too many nonresidents now. |
| Nonresident combo-good idea, have nonresidents spend money here. |
| Consider adding kaibab stamp in license fee? |
| Doesn't trout fish, wouldn't want to pay higher fish license price |
| Youth license should be higher (\$10)- You'll be losing a lot of revenue otherwise. |
| How would timing of youth license work? When would it expire? |
| Likes conceptual one-day hunt/fish combo |
| Migratory stamp concept-eliminates confusion |
| A lot of licenses are going down. How will you make out on revenue? |
| Would like to see family license and have it at a discount. |
| Would the lifetime license change? Still be available? Same with pioneer license? |
| Good idea to include kaibab stamp in tag fee. |
| \$45 deer tag is a lot when putting in for your family (maybe excessive) |
| Doesn't like premium deer structure-makes it a rich man's sport-prices out ordinary folks. |
| Likes idea of premium tags. |
| Premium structure not good for people on fixed incomes. |
| Cold hunts (especially premium) start on day other than Friday? |
| What criteria make for a premium hunt? |
| Instead of putting in another general hunt, why not add a youth hunt? |
| Informed poll: One person in favor of premium hunts, six opposed |
| Premium hunts just cater to rich people. |
| Doesn't like increase in general elk tag. Fee should stay same, money is tight. |
| Doesn't like different prices for bull vs. cow elk. |
| Nonresident bull/cow tag prices should be higher. |
| Okay with dropping nonresident tag fee to attract more applicants as long as 10% cap stays in place. |
| Can't afford elk premium tag as conceptualized. |
| You should look more into what should constitute a premium elk tag. (% of "book-quality" bulls, etc.) Look at more factors for determining a trophy class animal. |
| Doesn't like idea of making a unit a premium. |
| You could have a premium hunt and define differently. |
| Poll: Are you in favor of a premium hunt structure with criteria to be defined? 3 for, 4 opposed |
| Blanket premium structure not good- need to define "premium" better. |

| |
|---|
| Would electronic apps eliminate application fees? |
| What's the cost difference between processing a paper or online fee? |
| Online is convenient, but have option- pay in advance vs paying when drawn. |
| Credit card issues with regards to online application. |
| Likes paper applications |
| If we are in a drout, why are deer tag #'s going up? Why are you issuing more tags? Seems doe-buck ratio not good. |
| Archery mandatory reporting should stay. |
| More jr hunts, less general. |
| A premium rut hunt should take place throughout the rut. Move the early archery elk hunt back a week; like it used to be. |
| <p>In regards to the license simplification proposal, I would like to share my opinions on some things. First off, I would like to say that putting Monday night's meeting on a webcast was a wonderful benefit to those of us that were not able to attend the meeting in person. I agree with most of the proposed changes. I can understand needing to raise prices to cover the department's expenditures from a business standpoint. Considering it has been almost 7 years since the last rate increase, it's no surprise that we are due for some increases. Most of the proposed increases seem legitimate, but I'm strongly opposed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premium tags; I feel this is an unfair proposal. A bull elk from a "premium" unit, and a bull elk from a "non-premium" unit, are both bull elk. I feel that there is no difference between those two groups of bull elk other than the possibility of one having a greater score based upon antler size. The same could be said for deer in the case of "premium" vs "non-premium" tags. I'm not opposed to increasing tag prices to meet operational costs, but I feel that the price of a tag should be the same price statewide, (per genus of course). I think it is better to be hung up on hunting, instead of being hung up on scores. This premium tag proposal comes across as glorifying some hunts as being a so called "trophy hunt". I don't think that is a good message to convey to hunters, especially when trying to recruit more youth hunters into the sport. • Application fee increase; I feel opposed to increasing the cost of merely applying for a hunt. The proposed price has nearly doubled, and I have a difficult time believing that it really costs that much to process these applications. Are there any numbers available so show what the costs to the department are to process applications? • 365 day license; I'm also opposed to changing hunting and fishing licenses to be valid 365 days from the date of purchase. It seems to me that it would only increase the admin's burden of everybody having an "anniversary date" for their license. There is also a possibility for licenses expiring before or during a hunt. I really think that the current calendar year system for hunting and fishing licenses is the best system for ensuring everyone stays legal. <p>Despite my opposition to the above items, I do think the department has made some good proposals for changes. Reducing the number of license options, and combining more options into one license are great ideas that will probably lessen workloads at the department. Also, a possible discount for those who apply for multiple hunts would be a great incentive for those of us who are avid hunters. Also, the incentives for the youth licenses and tags are great. I'm sure that the department already knows this, but the future of hunting lies in getting the younger generations interested and involved in hunting and fishing. So hats off to the department for providing those opportunities to the youth.</p> <p>One thing that was not brought up at the meeting was reasoning for the increase in some of the tag fees and the application fee. If you could justify those increases, I (as well as others), would probably be less opposed to them. One suggestion for the future is to add a slide to the PowerPoint presentation showing the basic expenses that purchasing a tag or applying for a hunt entail. Just raising prices without explaining why generally causes opposition from consumers.</p> |

In conclusion, I truly hope the department will consider the comments from the public before making decisions on the proposed changes. I'm thankful for the opportunity to hunt and fish in this state, and hope that those opportunities still exist many years from now. I understand that times change and we have to adapt to those changes. So I ask those that will be making the decisions for the future of hunting and fishing in Arizona to please consider the aforementioned suggestions in your decision. Thank you

Please don't pursue this any further. There is no reason a resident should be charged \$100 to hunt deer in December. The whole "premium hunt" stuff is a waste. The average resident cannot afford these ridiculous prices in times like these, please don't make hunting in Arizona a rich man's game. If anything at all just bump licenses and tags up a few dollars for everyone in order to deal with today's economy. If the department does go through with this License Simplification I would recommend you cut the number of tags for everything to make it an actual premium hunt, it's hard to say that we can actually have a quality hunt in December when there are hundreds (and thousands) of tags being issued before December (ie 36B has 2350 whitetail tags issued before the late December hunt starts). I hope my comment does not fall on deaf ears.

To Whom It May Concern,

In response to changes made to Senate Bill 1223, the law allows Game and Fish to have more control over its fees:

It would be honorable, respectful and well deserved to see a discounted license fee for military members. I realize there is a rate for military members who are stationed here and that only discount I have ever seen is the standard AZ resident rate.

My suggestion is to have a substantial hunt/fish license discount for active duty, retired, Guard, Reserve members. These heroes are the ones who sacrificed and put their lives on the line to protect the United States and the countries that we support and defend. Thank you for all that you do for Arizona and her residents.

Arizona Game and Fish Department:

I would like to comment on the new fishing license fees.

I believe there should be an exemption for residents living in a nursing home. Most are on extremely limited budget and cannot afford this luxury, and facilities cannot pay for each individual. I would like to take my residents fishing at Goldwater Lake for Father's Day but am told that each will have to have a license as well as the care givers. Couldn't there be a waiver of some kind for this special event?

Our nursing home population cannot participate in what independent people would call fishing. Physical weakness and disease process make it impossible for them to sit for the day, casting and reeling to their hearts content. However, just being able to sit by the water, maybe hold a rod with the assistance of a caregiver for an hour or so would mean the world to them. Yes, we can go to the lakes for a picnic but that is a passive activity better left to the women in our group. There are so few meaningful activities a man will participate in at an advanced age, to take rod in hand perhaps for the last time, would be a blessing to them.

I want to first thank the AGFD Staff for traveling to Flagstaff to host a meeting for the public and present information about the concepts for license and fee structures. Please consider the following comments in your efforts to frame up a final license and fee structure proposal.

I strongly support the concept of bundling licenses. This will greatly simplify the license purchase process for the public and the dealer. I also support the issuance of a 365 day license if it will not pose a significant obstacle to forecasting/producing accurate budgets.

I realize operating costs have increased and will continue to do so but I worry about the time coming when license fees cannot reasonably cover operational expenses. I fear this time is closer than we may think. As such I urge AGFD to take a very close look at programs and related expenses to see if savings can be realized from cuts or modifications of programs. Field services I consider essential and I hope any cuts made in this area will not reduce field mission activities.

I recognize the need for recruitment but also feel strongly we cannot ignore retention. Based on this premise I urge you to consider raising youth hunt fees some to cover planned increases in regular licenses/tags. It is imperative license/tag fees do not drive away adults as they are they the recruitment and retention part of the equation. Without them, the youth will not participate or continue participating. This is especially important to retaining the casual hunter who may only purchase a license every 2-3 years. This casual hunter may be a recruiter and a retainer in the future.

I feel the increase in application fees needs a second look. It appears high to me. If the increase in costs is associated with services such as the correction period or multiple efforts to charge credit cards, then maybe these services should be abandoned. There was a time when such services were not offered and we all seemed to get by ok by being careful.

I am opposed to premium tag fees. I feel all tags should be priced the same, i.e. a mule deer in 13A costs the same as a mule deer in 22. I realize this is a standard practice in many other states but I do not agree with it. I think it violates the NA Model of equal opportunity for all. Please strongly consider eliminating this concept.

Lastly it is always important to remember the wildlife resource AGFD manages and protects is owned by the people and as such must be available to all the people.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Pioneer Complimentary Fishing Only should start at 65 years

Resident General is Fair including Colo River, 2 pole, trout and urban under \$40

Urban is high should be under \$20.00

Exempt: Resident using live bait with single pole with no mechanically line retrieving capabilities (cane pole, hand line)

Encourage low income households or persons to Fish.

My concern isn't so much about price of tags as much as it is about the over burden that the Draw process places on applicant funding of (potential) tags. Due to the extended period from when applications are due to the time when an actual draw is completed, there are millions of dollars in "limbo". These are either committed funds in checks (essentially applicants cash assets) being held for months by the G&F or they are credit holds that will come due unexpectedly over the period.

Applicants lives can change significantly over a multi-month period. I think it would be a welcome accomplishment by Game and Fish to either speed the draw process up so the vast majority of applicants can get their funds returned sooner and/or take an extra step on those applicants who are drawn but their credit card does not have enough available credit in that (one second in time) when G&F runs it through. It would be worth a little research for G&F to learn how little "available credit" the average Arizonan has PERPETUALLY available.. This is not the same as AVERAGE availability of credit. Once the issue is better understood by G&F, I believe many would agree that those people who have been waiting 5, 10, or 15 years to be drawn.... then get drawn....only to find out that their credit card only had \$900 of available credit but the Buffalo tag was \$1,050 at the exact instance that G&F ran the charge.... Should get another chance to assure payment is available.

My requested Policy Changes on Funds:

1) On credit applicants that are drawn and have insufficient funds- game and fish should make one 30 second attempt to rectify the funding issue.

2) For hunts where more than \$250 is required for the tag, The G&F will conduct the Draw in 30days or less and return the funds to the majority of applicants that are not drawn.

I have reviewed the power point presentation online and support the new structure. I especially support the new premium hunts as I have been a proponent of this for years. It makes sense to charge more for longer hunts, trophy hunts, and high demand hunts.

I am a non-resident from Nevada and have been applying for tags in Arizona since 1997. In the early days I hunted archery deer every year until the prices got too high now with the \$225.50 price I started hunting with a rifle, since the success rate for archery was only about 4% it was just not worth the cost of the tag. With success rate in the teens to low twenties for the rifle hunt I thought \$225.50 HIGH, I applied because at least I would be hunting and now you are talking about increasing that to \$300 and increasing the license and application fee. I have been applying for elk since 1997 and now the increase in the elk tags to \$650 for a limited opportunity tag it sounds like my days are numbered hunting in Arizona I am just getting priced out. I think higher prices for premium tags are understandable but not units like 18A, where by the way I apply because I have a chance of drawing. I went to the Kingman meeting last night and it seemed like the general consensus from the residents was to make up the money needed on the backs of the non-resident and with the increases proposed sounds like AZGFD feels the same way. Non-residents are only allowed up to 10% of the tags but in reality what we get is a lot lower if we get anything at all so paying for the license is mostly in reality just buying points because there may not be any tags available, at least in Nevada non-residents are guaranteed tags. I know that AZGFD needs an increase in funds to operate but is that goal met by pricing out the non-residents, you may make more on tags for the non-residents that don't get priced out and actually draw a tag but how much will you lose in licenses not sold to the ones that are priced out? If the prices do go up too much on the mediocre tags and I don't apply next year and I lose my loyalty point at that point I am done with Arizona after all every point lost is way too costly. All game and fish departments in every state claim that their goal is to increase the hunter numbers but it sure doesn't look that way, the hunter that are trying to hunt are getting pushed out. Thanks for reading and hopefully listening.

Guys and gals,

G&F has always operated with a business model. That said, I really think it ill advised to raise fees drastically in the name of license simplification. Our tag fees, when combined with license fees, are high enough right now compared to neighbor states and others in the west.

I also don't feel its fair to gouge non resident hunters yet again. Its already almost \$400 for a non resident hunter to get a deer tag in this state and he has to buy a non refundable \$150 hunting license to even apply. Most non resident hunters are family members of a resident anyway and raising their fees again will just drive them away. Most are not trophy hunting rich hunters as your current model suggests. Just because other states (New Mexico) are treating non residents badly is no reason we need to continue along that path.

Also, the effort to create "trophy" tags by charging larger fees for some hunts is misguided. We are trying to recruit more folks to hunting. This creates a second class hunter by having elite fees and will not help to recruit new hunters. Keep fees the same for each species. I know other states do this, but it flies in the face of the North American Model and will just encourage more trophy management for those willing to pay big bucks. They can already play that game with commissioner tags.

The Department needs to reduce its costs. Look at things you are spending money funding right now and jettison low value programs like nuisance wildlife programs. There is \$500K a year available most years from the Heritage Fund and more from Indian Gaming. Think about jettisoning nuisance wildlife handling or at least reduce costs with seasonal employees or non commissioned. Using hunter and fishers \$ to fund this is wrong. Look at other programs as well. Some may not be paying their way and not contribute anything towards sustainable use programs.

It strikes me that we are not creating more fishing opportunity and are in fact losing opportunity due to undetermined causes and yet the Department asks hunters and fishers for more money. What would we get in return? Currently we are seeing continually diminishing law enforcement efforts in most areas, less fisheries management programs to create more fishing opportunity or at least preserving the ones we used to have, and increasing focus on threatened wildlife.

I believe you need to raise fees slightly to offset less specific license fees (ridding us of trout stamps, two pole stamps, Colorado River Stamps, urban licenses, etc) but don't look for an opportunity for more department revenue. Thanks.

I am strongly opposed to the conceptual tag and fee increases suggested. Arizona is already the most expensive western state (excluding California) for resident licenses and tag fees.

Many western states have had NO increases since before the last increase we had in 2008.

Some of these states also don't receive General Fund revenues.

To make some of the more desirable hunts (Kaibab, early elk hunts) even more expensive by doubling or tripling the tags is outrageous. The North American Model of Wildlife Conservation states: "Opportunity to participate in hunting...is guaranteed for all....not by...financial capacity". I knew a few retired guys on fixed incomes who gave up hunting because of the increases that went into effect in 2005 and then the huge increases of 2008.

To whom it may concern:

Over the last 4 years, and specifically 2013, the Arizona Game and Fish Department has lost a ton of credibility with the public and if the Department continues with the fee increases as proposed it will take many years, if ever to regain the trust of the public. Throughout northeast Arizona the public does not for one second believe the Department will listen to sportsmen and they have reason not too. I believe that when the dog and pony show with Article 3 occurred the Department lost many good supporters of the Department. The Department wonders why public attendance at any meeting is low and the answer is simple, the Department does not listen to the public and until that occurs, public involvement will be very low. I really hope the Department remembers that their vision from Wildlife 20/20 is:

To be the national conservation leader supporting the continuation of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation and Arizona's most trusted, respected and credible source for wildlife conservation

products, services and information.

A lot of these proposals goes directly against the North American Model. People have fought for many years to keep American from becoming England in regards to wildlife and this proposal is a huge step towards becoming just like England.

Licenses:

All of the proposed licenses are a great deal except making 10-13 year olds buy fishing licenses. If anything, the age should be moved to 16 to match surrounding states and most of the United States. Decreasing the age limit is just another move against the North American Model. Most of Arizona is still in an economic recession which will prohibit many children from purchasing a license. I know the argument will be "its only 5 dollars" but frankly, many families can not afford 5 dollars in rural Arizona. I have also heard the Department say that they would not cite a 10 year old kid, so why have them buy licenses?? Its just another "stupid" law that no one is going to enforce. If it is not going to be enforced don't make the law.

I support:

- A 3 dollar increase in a resident combo license (I would be supportive of a \$10 increase with trout, urban and 2 pole included)

- Including the two pole, urban and stamps in all licenses

- Combining the waterfowl and state stamp (would support a move to 13.75 or 13, which it is now but makes it easier to purchase both at the same time)

Tag Fees/ AKA: The England Model:

I support increasing tag fees but only to a certain percentage and not splitting the hunting public into the "wealthy group" and the "non-wealthy" group. Once again the Department is going against the North American Model by having different prices, and not just "premium hunts" but also splitting bull and cow prices.

The increases on everything, except deer and elk, are reasonable. Even the pronghorn increase of 12.50 is nothing when you consider most people only get a tag once every 22 years.

The increase from 7.50 to 13 for an application fee is WRONG. There are many people that apply for 8 species a year which equates to 60 dollars now, increasing to 13 would bump that to 104, a 44 dollar difference. I GUARANTEE that if it goes to \$13 the number of applicants will decrease significantly. The department is trying to increase revenue but at some point the increased fees are going to deter people from applying which will result in a lower income after the changes than before. The economy is fairly stable at this point but what is going to happen if the crash of 08 happens again in 3 years when there is a new President? The Department will be severely hurt and may not recover.

Premium tag fees? I ABSOLUTELY DO NOT support this. Not only is this totally against the North American Model but many of the proposed elk premium hunts are not premium in any ones mind. Yes they may be premium in that a person has a chance to kill a trophy animal but many people do not care about trophy animals. If I want to go chase bugling elk I should not have to pay more than someone does in November.

The price of the world we live in increases every day so increasing of licenses and tags is understandable but make them EVEN across the board and do NOT divide hunters by splitting costs of tags for "premium" hunts.

The Department has been SHOVING the North American Model down the throats of sportsman for many years and now they are going against what they have been preaching.

If the Department wants to save money they need to look at where its going. How much money is going towards wildlife watching, shooting sports, and upper management. Wildlife watching and shooting sports brings in VERY LITTLE if any income and I would venture to bet that over 25% of the expenditures is on these two.

There are many more things that could be discussed but my only hope with this email is that the Department FINALLY listens to the sportsmen of this state. If nothing else, I hope the department comes down on some of these prices and gains some respect back from the majority of sportsmen in this state. Thank You for reading

As a life-long hunter in this state, I am very concerned with the new license simplification direction that the Arizona Department of Game & Fish is taking. In addition to hunting in Arizona, I have been fortunate to hunt in other states as well, and I have always believed that Arizona had the best, and most straight-forward organization to their license and draw process. For example, in other states there are numerous type of hunts(Regular, Premium, etc.) for the same species and weapon type. This can become quite confusing to anyone who wants to get a tag and go hunt. In no way would adding in premium hunts "simplify" the process in anyway. Let's be honest, it is a way to generate more money for the department and that is it! You see that there are popular hunts for which you have numerous applicants and you see that as a way to dig deeper into the sportsmen's pockets. The only way that this can be labeled "simplified" is that it is easier for the department to raise the fees charged for licenses and tags. That is wrong! Have you considered what would happen if the vast majority of sportsmen in this state go tired of the increased fees and boycotted the purchase of licenses and permits? How long would the department be able to continue without our financial support? What kind of damage would be caused to the wildlife in this state if there was a boycott?

Several sportsmen's groups are already making plans to band together against any changes to the license and tag fee increases or hunt changes. It wouldn't be a far stretch for them to stay banded together to boycott hunting altogether should this proposed change take place. Please, please consider all of this very carefully before you decide to implement this. Thanks

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm going to keep this short and sweet, and to the point. You can put whatever title you want to on this new plan but what I am focused on is the increase in fees. I am vehemently opposed to that!

Your agency wants to get youth involved to keep the sport going and then you turn around consistently and raise fees, and in this economy!! What are you thinking? You can't have both. I can't afford to pay to apply for me and my sons any longer and I'm sure I'm not the only one in this position.

What needs to happen is fees/applications need to be dropped. if you want to make up for something then do it with the out of state hunters. I'm tired of the state where I reside and pay taxes keeps reaching into my pockets for more of my hard earned dollars.

I'm generally proud and happy with the job your agency does but you guys need to come up with a new game plan if you want to keep us in the game and recruit new youth to the sport of hunting and fishing.

I am a non-resident hunter who has been applying for Arizona big game permits for over 20 years. In that time, I have drawn 3 premium elk permits, Strip deer, desert bighorn sheep and premium antelope.

Arizona has some of the finest trophy big game hunting available today. While I appreciate the interest to involve more hunters, especially younger resident hunters, I believe this can be done while trophy hunting potential is improved.

The most important thing to do is maximize the true trophy potential of your game herds. This means fewer tags should be issued across the board. Then, use youth hunters to take cows/does in their special seasons. If youth hunters wish to participate in trophy hunts, they should enter the same drawing as everyone else.

Arizona simply must require that the entire tag fee be paid up front - not just the application fee. This will reduce the amount of "casual applications" and "accidental draws" where grandma ends up with a Unit 9 early bull or a sheep permit.

Arizona should push revenue up by charging at least a \$20 non-refundable drawing fee per species. Better yet, 5-10% of the full tag fee (with minimum of \$20) should be charged to all applicants. Use the additional funds for enforcement, transplants and habitat improvement/acquisition.

Arizona should increase all resident and non-resident tag fees to the full cap amount immediately. The extra money will improve hunting for everyone. Yes, a few will drop out, but that is a small price to pay. (Sidebar - don't buy the argument that higher fees will make hunting unaffordable. Higher fees, if properly invested in wildlife, make hunting more affordable. Investment in wildlife means more animals and better access. More animals increase success rate and hunter opportunity. Better opportunity means greater and faster success. If someone can save a tank of gas by taking an animal sooner, they save!).

Arizona should allow hunters to purchase additional bonus points each year, increasing their odds in exchange for contributing more revenue. This could be done on a flat fee basis via a voluntary decrease in the application refund. \$50 per point per species with a limit of 1 extra point per species each year would bring a great deal of money into play.

Like it or not, funding is the key to improving hunter opportunity. That means maximizing trophy potential for those lucky enough to draw elk, sheep and deer tags. A 400-point elk is worth the same as a bunch of 350-point elk, so more areas should be set aside that permit bulls to grow to their potential.

Arizona can have it all, and absolute focus on true trophy opportunity is the key.

As a retired person I find it hard to pay the price of a fishing license at today's price. I find it hard to believe that a solution can't be made for all involved. Most of my retired friends fish 3 to 4 times a year and feel that the price of a fishing license is high.

Why not create a better system, and have six month and yearly license, and in doing so, we can all maybe continue to fish. I hope you don't increase the price of a yearly license. I don't hunt, so I won't comment on the subject

I will not be able to attend any of the meetings. My 2 cents:

- I never bother with any hunting license I can't get through the draw, so having a whole bunch of things where I need to drive to an AZGFD office doesn't help me at all.
- The concept of premium deer and elk tags makes sense to me. I sometimes feel I am subsidizing other hunters when I take the worst possible tag (such as my late archery cow tag this year). The numbers you discussed for premium hunts looked sensible to me.
- This was not discussed anywhere, but one thing I really don't like about the AZ system is that there is no way for military members to back out of a tag. For example, I apply in January for a late bull tag, then I get sent to Afghanistan. Not only do I lose the tag, I lose my bonus points. Most western states have a way of taking care of this. I know any refund policy is a can of worms, and soon everyone is whining about his sick grandmother, but really it is tough to know your schedule 10 months ahead of time when in the Marine Corps.
- In general, I wish you would study more carefully how other states do their draws. We seem to be the only state perennially in the position of having to track down hundreds or thousands of credit cards in the middle of the draw. Simple math is that if you have tens of thousands of applicants, a few percent of them will have credit cards stolen in that time, or have something happen that causes the card not to work. Two ways around this are to (optionally or otherwise) collect the full fee up front, or to allow the user to store a backup credit card in case the first one fails. I realize there are some issues with credit card fees and processing a bunch of refunds, but it seems like other states have workable systems.
- One advantage to a faster credit card system is that you could get the elk/antelope results out before the Colorado (and maybe even NM) draw deadlines. I put in in other states, and get frustrated when our draw is clearly complete, but results haven't been posted due to wanting to finish every last credit card issue.

I would like the license to expire a year from the date it was purchased, not the calendar year. What I have found, that some who are thinking of purchasing a license 6 or more months into the year would rather just take their chance at not getting caught fishing without a license than to pay for a full year when it's going to expire in a few months. Thanks my two cents.

After reviewing the powerpoint presentation my general observation is that there is not much simplification going on, mostly just price increases. Specifically, I do not agree with increasing the application fee to \$13. That is almost a 100% increase. I would guess most applicants are using the online system to apply for hunts. This should reduce costs to AZGFD. The application fee should not be raised any higher than \$10. I do not agree with making all the early archery elk tags premium tags. The cost of an archery elk tag should be the same as the standard rifle elk tags. The early rifle elk tags should be increased to \$300. These tags are truly the premium tags with very high rates of success. Thank you for considering my recommendations.

To whom it may concern;

As a retired citizen of the age of 68, why doesn't the Game & Fish restructure the time line of when a Hunting/Fishing license expires? Take the consideration of when off road permits for ATV's are bought and expire. The sticker or tag is a one year usage cycle i.e. May 2013 to May 2014.

As an example; If I was to purchase a Hunting, or Fishing or combo license on May 28th, 2013; why can't they expire one full year after purchase. As it stands today, if I was to purchase a license today at the rate the Game & Fish licenses cost, it would expire the 1st day in January 2014. I would like to get my

monies worth by having it expire after one full year after purchase. This is the same structure when purchasing the off road \$25 dollar tag fee for ATV's. This makes a lot of sense doing it this way instead of paying a set fee and only getting a ½ year usage. Please take this under consideration and proposal to change the date structure of your licenses. Also please consider dropping the age bracket for seniors to 65 or 67 of age to get discounts on license purchases. Remember us seniors are on fixed incomes. A reply would be greatly appreciated.

Why do you have to always increase the cost of hunting and fishing? Why can't it be like other states where the cost is minimal to residents? Sounds like AZDFG needs to take some lessons on game management.

I will be attending the meeting in Wickenburg but wanted to be sure and get my concerns and questions out.

What would be the justification in the percentage of the hikes in price?

Are there revenue issues that lead to the need for the increases?

There are some good items in the proposal and increases are inevitable but the percentage is quite high and in some cases puts AZ prices above other states.

The bottom line is as the proposal stands I would be paying out roughly \$270.00 in application and license fees for my family just to apply for hunts in AZ even if we are not drawn.

Myself, My daughter, and my son all go in for deer, elk, Javelina.

If we were drawn for a premium elk tag I would be out a weeks pay before we even hit the road.

This will price out many folks that generate revenue currently.

To me the premium tag doesn't make sense, an across the board increase keeps everyone in the hunt and doesn't price folks out.

Pricing folks out of the hunts pulls money from the entire state, not just Game and Fish.

A couple of comments or recommendations on the license restructuring from my perspective for Arizona Game and Fish Department consideration:

a. Any free restructuring should consider and include the disabled (in particular the ever-increasing disabled resident veteran) participation. The current 100% disability requirement for license reduction is unrealistic for the majority of veterans who's costs of fishing or hunting participation costs is proportionately higher due to their disability considerations. If the intent of restructuring is to increase participation through reduction of barriers, there should be a more reasonable threshold to engage and promote participation of the disabled. This need not be a "free" license, but there should be a prorate license cost reduction which assists in off-setting those higher costs to the disabled in a manner similar as that offered to engage the youth. My recommendation is to provide a licensing and/or fee reduction at the 50% disability level vice the extant 100% level - contemporaneous to reductions provided by the National Park Service, US Forrest Service, etc.

b. While license simplification would be beneficial, I am personally opposed to any reductions (vice simplification) to non-resident license and fee costs which transfers a financial burden of recoupment to residents. The game and fish of Arizona are entrusted to the residents of the state of Arizona, and the use of the Arizona resource by non-residents should be a premium cost to non-residents. It is appreciated there are indirect revenues involved (tourism, additional business, etc.), but the point is if the Game and Fish Department is to streamline game and fish licensing and fees then indirect costs outside the Department should not be a factor in those considerations. For instance, the presentation states hatchery trout and urban lack stocking costs have risen 24%. Non-resident costs should rise an equivalent 24%, not an amount which incorporates factors which include resident population or participation. Bottom line, it is the residents and not the non-residents which provide volunteer assistance in habitat improvement and other functions which sustain or promote wildlife populations.

c. Lastly, basing license or fees on the equivalency of adjacent states in my opinion needs reconsideration or justification. Arizona is known to have bull elk contemporaneous if not larger than

Colorado and New Mexico. Utilizing fees of the states of Utah and Wyoming, however, is inconsistent with adjacent considerations and arbitrary if not capricious. In short, why not equivalent costs of elk licensing and fees in the states California and Nevada which are more adjacent and correlative to the consumer price index; and, oppositely, why was Pennsylvania or West Virginia excluded? If equivalency is the point, the closest adjacent states with elk populations should be used for comparisons; or, association made nationally to all states having elk populations. This should also be the same basis for other big game cost and fee associations.

d. The presentation promotes the “business modality” approach for the Game and Fish Department. However, if the attempt is to make the Game and Fish Department more business astute, a similar enforcement increase should also be considered – as opposed to merely promoting licensing and fee increases to attempt to offset or ignore associated business losses. As such, I’d recommend the Arizona Game and Fish Department consider a resource “host” process for hunts, lakes and streams similar to the National Forrest Service Campground Host program – or, alternatively, a non-LEO reserve officer program. This would provide non-enforcement “eyes and ears” in the field to reduce or more effectively reduce fish and wildlife violations. While the Arizona Game and Fish Department promotes a Game Thief program, the program in my opinion is substantially ineffective in other than significant big game or major fishing violations. Omnipresence, I would submit, is far more effective and less costly in resources than enforcement.

Dear Sir/Maam:

I am a non resident and have been applying for Elk, Bighorn Sheep, and Deer in Arizona for many years with no success. I have purchased the \$157 annual Game Hunting license each year just to be able to participate in your draw process. I have paid your agency approximately \$2,669 over the last 17 years just for the opportunity to get in your draw and receive a bonus point each year. I have never received a single Elk or Bighorn Sheep license in Arizona and have invested alot of money trying for that opportunity.

While I do not oppose a license fee increase, I feel the license fee increase is too drastic and would hope that the AZDGF would consider moderate periodic license fee increases over time. I oppose the proposed "premium" license fee structure as it is unfair to people like me who have already paid several thousands of dollars over multiple years for any chance at getting an elk or deer license in one of your states better hunt units. I currently have 19 bonus points for elk and feel that I may finally draw an AZ elk license in the next few years and it is going to cost me a mint to finally hunt your state.

I am a working man with a family and have been saving for years to hunt your state and the new proposed "premium" license fees would about break me.

I would recommend any license fee increases be spread out equally over all species licenses and not charge more for the proposed "premium" license fees.

If it is not affordable, I will unfortunately have to take my business elsewhere in the future.

Thank you for your consideration.

I started deer hunting in Arizona in 1963. The license was 5 dollars and the tag was a buck. A quick check on-line and we find that a dollar in 1963 is now worth 7.55 because of inflation. My license should now cost 37.75 and deer tag 7.55. I just paid 42.25 to apply for deer 5.6 times more than inflation. What additional value am I receiving? None! I am actually paying for other programs. The Game and Fish uses my license and tag dollars to fund programs that have little value.

Over the years I have watched the AZG+F find additional funding sources, OHV, Heritage, NRCS money and others. In my opinion the license simplification is just another pot of gold for the agency. It will result in higher prices, more money for the agency and will feed the growth of questionable programs.

| |
|--|
| I strongly recommend that the Commission review all current programs and cut or scale back those that don't pay their way. Urban Wildlife and Nongame are two that come to mind. I understand that the agency is to manage ALL wildlife, but I feel that it is using too much of my money for these and other programs. In government, cutting back is not a well know concept. However, in the private sector it is a frequently used practice. I think that it is time to cut spending rather than raise prices. |
| Hello, After reviewing the power point presentation I'm all for the new Conceptual License, Tag Structure and Fees. This will simplify the process and save money for the consumer. At the same time this will raise the needed funds to operate Game and Fish. Count me in. This is the best idea I've seen in years. |
| Like reduced costs for youth. Like fishing proposals-Resident/Non-Resident. Like the combo NR hunt/fish |
| Why offer urban when not used? |
| Like idea that you only need one fishing license. |
| Keep fee at 63 (NR fishing) |
| Renew 365 day license early |
| Military family- Military member can buy resident license after 30 days-family members must wait 6 months |
| Like migratory/duck combo stamp |
| Why not include migratory bird stamp with hunting license? |
| Do not like only 1 apprentice license per year |
| Do not like that apprentice license is only available at regional office |
| Should offer apprentice license at camp with any mentor |
| Do not like mentor requirement-youth may show up for hunt but mentor does not-kid just shows up-have to drive to office to get apprentice license |
| Maybe include 2 mentor/apprentice opportunities with hunting license |
| Migratory bird stamp valid june-june. Problematic for 365 day license. |
| How do conceptual tag fees compare to other states? |
| Require 10-17 year-olds to take hunter education |
| Not against paying more money for premium hunt/animal, but month does not guarantee premium hunt. Maybe in alternative area? |
| Seems like a way to get more money for same tag that costs less other time of year |
| Creates different hunt structure, \$100+ may mean persons cant afford tag |
| Can understand higher tag fee for trophy class animals |
| I would sign tag over to child (Dec tag), but I don't think I'd do that if it were a premium tag |
| Manage for premium hunt to ensure hunter gets money's worth. |
| If all archery elk tags are premium, what will that do to archery recruitment? |
| Should be fair across board-one price |
| I won't be able to afford to hunt |
| Function of better quality -not less people in field |
| I know a lot of people who will be priced out of hunting archery elk |
| In a lot of units you'll have 280 to 350 class bulls-those are not premium elk |
| Alternate mgt units (premium) |
| Catering to folks with money |
| AZGFD is focusing on bull elk structure |
| I can hunt during the week if I want fewer hunters in the field |
| Time-frame would be quality hunter experience |

| |
|---|
| 27,1,11m, 9, and 8 where trophy class bull |
| This is for guys with deep pockets (Premium) |
| Premium structure poll: For: 0 Against: 15 |
| If you put up that much money and aren't drawn, then you're really up a creek |
| What are you trying to do? \$20 more for antlerless-Shouldn't be different |
| Usually you adapt to improve system. How is premium/antlerless improving system? |
| Don't see paying more as a "social norm", with appeal to middle/upper class |
| No price increases |
| How does \$350 cow tag compare to NM prices? If it is cheaper, more NM resident will hunt in AZ |
| How much revenue with increase? |
| Where will the revenue go? |
| How do we know fees won't go up every year |
| Bundling youth fees are good |
| How many applications each year? Fees? |
| Online application fee should be less than manual fee |
| Why should person without computer pay more? |
| How much do you pay vendor? |
| Prefer same application fee for R/NR-less confusing |
| \$13 application fee too high |
| Application fee hard to swallow (doubled) |
| \$10 is better for application fee |
| I don't get BP if I'm drawn-not a plus |
| UT has dedicated hunter program- so many hours volunteer/benefits given to hunter |
| I hunt frequently, but I am not interested in discount-you should have money |
| First time hunter discount |
| Will department use same draft rule notification process? |
| Application fee for resident-\$10 nonresident-\$25 |
| Application fee included in the tag |
| Application fee is \$10 for all |
| We are simplifying; don't add more junk (regarding future items to consider slide) |
| Aggregate fishing privileges may not be beneficial to all |
| Make urban buy the class A |
| \$26.50 (at Colorado River) to \$30 |
| Leave the fishing with stamps and privileges |
| Have a class A and a Superfish at \$37 |
| \$37 is a good deal |
| Auto renewal is a good idea (auto notifications) |
| Complexity causes people to go to other states |
| Access to TMR is a concern |
| Cow & Bull should be the same |
| Elk NR is too low |
| NR should be more |
| Elk are on Federal land; nonresidents should not need to pay too much more |
| Archery should not all be included (23,9) Not (6a,6b) |
| Not all archery are premium |
| Will the 365 day license cause issues with the draw? |

| |
|---|
| Will there still be youth hunts? |
| More hunter Education |
| AZGFD needs to advertise |
| Youth may be too low |
| May lose non-residents with \$20 1-day license |
| No premium |
| Successful hunts don't get into draw |
| Male elk tag should cost more than female |
| Premium dollars should go to the premium hunts |
| Overall I think Most of the draft is balanced and I would not have too much issue, again the main sticking point for me was the application fee. |
| Thanks again and I look forward to seeing the next phase unfold. |
| Thank you so much for your response concerning your department's proposal to increase hunting fees. I have written many government agencies in the past and I can truthfully say I have never received a personal response. I do not envy the decision process you are under taking on the increases but you have a job to do to improve the performance of your department. Please keep in mind that the economy is on a slow and steady improvement and there are many out here that still could not afford a substantial increase in tag fees. |
| Eliminate Urban and combine with general fish |
| Keep calendar year license |
| 365 licese will gain people. Is it perception? For small game? |
| First time hunter/fisher will benefit |
| Folks in June-those who previously wouldn't buy, would buy |
| NR combo- As a guide could use as a selling point |
| Are we going to see price jumps on January 1, 2015? |
| Resident combo not high enough- \$60 or \$65 at least |
| For \$65 price gives me opportunity |
| Department will lose money if we don't charge enough |
| Commend on \$5.00 for youth- What needs to be done for recruitment |
| Too low and charge for migratory bird |
| Gain youth |
| Charge \$10 for youth and \$5 for migratory bird stamp |
| Great idea- but how will the youth price affect revenue? |
| Change guide license fee for NR |
| Antelope NR- Take to cap (\$600) |
| Muzzle deer hunts-if premium- lose hunters-won't hunt |
| Too much- 19 and 20 year olds can't afford |
| Average Joe won't be able to hunt premium elk |
| Too many elk hunts in premium |
| Not as opposed to cost as concept of premium- group cost a lot though |
| With premium- Penalizing archery hunters |
| Application fee- Too much burden on resident |
| Average fees for family goes up too much |
| \$10 resident fee/\$15 nonresident fee |
| Families with 5-6 members that apply for all species have high cost |
| Bonus point only price |

| |
|---|
| With November hunts- Penalize those who can't hunt during that time (due to health) |
| If donate to HOL- get BP back |
| Higher prices may lead to poaching |
| These are higher than California |
| 365 is good on fish |
| Certain price points may increase revenue |
| NR fish is a good deal |
| NR fish may be too low (\$65-\$75) |
| There are too many NR Fish |
| Is the license valid on application date or draw date? |
| Fixed income families may be impacted |
| This seems fair |
| Youth combo is too low |
| Youth combo should be \$10 |
| \$5 is silly (youth combo) |
| I like the one day combo |
| Pioneer needs to be renamed |
| Outfitter are driving the costs making hunting European elite, millionaire's sport |
| No ads in the regs |
| Limit guides in an area |
| Quality of deer has dropped |
| Deer may be too much |
| Deer increase seems fair |
| Premium may lead to class warfare |
| A deer shot with a bow should be the same as a rifle |
| Premium is good (2 people) Premium is bad (6 people) |
| Those who pay more may feel like they have more right to be there |
| General NR elk too low |
| Don't lower NR Cow |
| Increase fee for bulls |
| Elk should be \$125 |
| No premium on the elk |
| For personal reasons I like premium but I am worried about it turning into European model |
| Post-Hoc trophy fees |
| No premium for the archers, maybe for rifle or muzzle loader |
| Weapons should be priced different |
| No Premium (4) Yes (6) |
| \$13 application fee too much |
| Pay for the elk tag and get your money back |
| Support 365 Concept |
| Allow online purchase for bobcat |
| Evaluatate need to purchase license for the draw |
| Increase cost of NR combo |
| Keep class "N" or develop conceptual |
| Like residential combo for ave. hunters |
| Promote youth opportunities |

| |
|--|
| Open January for archery javelina |
| Like migratory bird conceptual license |
| Consider lifetime antelope |
| Look into wait periods for successes |
| Kaibab inclusion makes sense |
| What's the purpose of Kaibab stamp? |
| Limit number of hunts prior to premium. December premium doesn't make sense (Pick single Unit) |
| Don't support premium deer concept |
| Kaibab and strip premium concept |
| If go premium, really make it premium |
| More governor's tags to raise fees |
| Look at how to target low income participation |
| Don't support premium structure |
| Resident general elk is too high at \$145 |
| Application fee is too high |
| Premium structure forces local hunters elsewhere |
| If we go premium, need to rotate units |
| Set application fee at \$10 or R/NR with different application prices (double cost or couple dollars more) |
| Enhance chances of being drawn v. frequent hunter discount (Loyalty bonus/drawn) |
| Look at "factoring" bonus points for loyal applicants (doubling; etc) |
| Like draw insurance idea |
| Getting rid of super hunt/combo? Want it. Easier. Handy |
| Glad no increase for guide license fee |
| Viewing public as customers |
| Why giving NR a break. What percentage or dollar amount is from NR? NR:R ratio. Cater to residents |
| Appreciate simplification in general and youth license fees |
| Why did we max fee for NR bear, but not javelina and mountain lion? |
| Raising NR premium elk tag-more like \$2,000 to \$3,000. They have the money |
| When was old cap established? |
| Take care of Residents. But new nonresident money is still important |
| Is it necessary for application fee to nearly double? An extra \$1.5 million |
| How much does it cost to process applications? Cost \$8 to \$10 to process paper applications |
| Not even covering costs of processing paper |
| Even doubling application fee-may not result in profit. (Answer not necessarily) |
| Some states no paper applications |
| Why not charge differential application fee for R/NR. NR \$15 |
| 365 a no-brainer good idea |
| Do a better job of reaching out to customers. (Less public servant) |
| Everyone enjoys seeing wildlife-they don't pay. Need alternative funding for them |
| These fees seem reasonable-but not so much the premium. Be cautious of "rich" sport |
| When kill cow-in August- Killing 2 (Cow and Calf) same for November cow hunt |
| Higher cow hunt price |
| Should charge paper apps more |
| Low income family discounts? |
| May not make a difference how high you raise it. If you want to hunt you're going to hunt. |
| Possible difficulty tracking 365 day license |

| |
|--|
| Concern over 365 day license in combination with draw process. |
| 365 day license complicated |
| Will guide license or special licenses change? |
| Continue super conservation license |
| Concern over 365 day license structure complicating guides license and standard hunting license because they would expire at different times |
| NR hunt should be higher, at least \$200 |
| Hunting and Fishing for nonresidents should be independent |
| Nonresidents should purchase license only if they draw |
| Leave nonresident combo as is |
| If nonresident is going to be up, \$160 is doable |
| Make sure youth has same opportunities, \$5 per child is reasonable |
| Stick with super conservation license |
| We may lose NR because we are raising their tag fees too much |
| Deer tags too high. If it has to change, make it minimal because Arizona deer aren't great |
| No premium structure |
| Change our definition of "premium". A deer is a deer |
| Premium hunt should only be hunts north of the Colorado River. The date doesn't matter. |
| Against premium, but if we are going to do it, make sure it is for quality deer |
| Premium hunt poll: 13 against, 0 For |
| Premium hunts price people out of hunting |
| There isn't enough money in the bank for the average person if their whole family is drawn. |
| Offer NR pursuit permits to avoid NR paying for \$160 license. Maybe 3-day permit? |
| Keep elk tag at \$114 for Residents |
| Keep NR elk tag similar to what it is currently |
| We increased number of tags and that should offset price. |
| Someone coming across the country won't care about paying another \$100 for a NR elk tag |
| Discount for someone who is from AZ but moved and has come back to hunt. |
| Dislike different price for cow vs. bull |
| Like different prices for cows and bulls |
| If we go to premium structure then make it for hunts after September 15 |
| Premium hunts defeats purpose of license simplification |
| Application fee increasing too much. Almost doubling |
| Set application fee at \$10 if you don't keep it the same. Prefer keeping it the same |
| Willing to pay more if that is what it costs to process an application. Unwilling to pay double that cost. |
| No problem increasing NR fees for the benefit of the Residents |
| Likes idea of 365 day structure. |
| Small number of people who can afford to hunt already. |
| On archery hunt, one must kill bulls with bow, not rifles, etc. |
| Over time you may lost adults due to low price of youth license. |
| If you are going to implement premium structure, there should be less competition. |
| Comments/questions |
| 1. Would there be a separate draw for the premium hunts? I would vote to keep them on the same draw with different choices and not use a system like Utah. |
| 2. The game and fish should modify the bonus point system the following way: |
| a. Drawing your 1st or 2nd choice uses up your bonus points. |
| b. Drawing 3rd through 5th choice, does not affect bonus points |

- c. Your bonus points in CO are not taken unless you draw your first choice.
 - d. This would reduce the amount of leftover tags and associated costs.
 - e. It would improve the fairness of the left over tag process.
 - f. Make Hopi permits available to general public as 3rd through 5th choices. (Only Hopi can submit as 1st or 2nd choice.)
3. I am for increased fees for Premium hunts.

This will be very difficult to sell to the general public. It seems as though we are trying to make one size fits all instead of providing a service to our internal as well as the "biggest stakeholders" our external customers. On a personal level I totally disagree with a premium elk hunt I currently have 15 bonus points and now I will have to pay more to put in for bull elk; are we leaning more toward the European Model (the people with the most money win) or are we going to stick to the North American Model??

To Whom it May Concern:

1. I completely support the Department's efforts to remove potential barriers that may keep youth from getting out the field. The \$5 combination license is a great idea. I also support the move to keep the youth license and junior tags at the same price, regardless of residency. I also hope that the youth license will be good for 365 days, even for a youth who purchases it the day before she turns 18.
2. I support the 365-day license. However, I believe the Department should require that a draw applicant have a license that is valid on the last day of the application period. In Utah, an applicant need only have a valid license on the day they apply. If an applicant times things correctly, he can get two years' worth of applications on a single license purchase. Realistically, this is only an issue for non-residents who would not otherwise purchase a license in Arizona every year anyways for other hunts. Also, it might not be as big of an issue for Arizona given the staggered timing of the Elk/Pronghorn and fall draws, but it is something the Department should consider.
3. I am philosophically opposed to the concept of "premium" hunts with increased pricing. I believe it is contrary to the concept of the North American Model that wildlife should be managed in the public trust for all to enjoy. If revenue is the issue, then simply raise the price for all elk tags by the small amount necessary to recoup the lost "premium" surcharge. Other states with premium hunts do so under a very different draw system. In Utah, for example, Limited Entry and Premium Limited Entry hunts are run under a bonus point system, whereas thousands of general season tags are offered under a pure preference point system. An applicant can wait years to draw a premium tag (with a premium price), yet he can still hunt under the general draw nearly every year without affecting his limited entry bonus points. Nevertheless, if the Department goes the "premium" route, I can support the conceptual price for premium elk tags only. A premium deer tag should not be double the cost of a regular tag. Also, December whitetail hunts should not be valued the same as late season and north-of-the-ditch mule deer hunts. The whitetail almost never actually rut in December, and many of the units are in areas south of the dashed line in the regulations warning hunters of the dangers of the border.
4. The conceptual \$13 application fee is far too high. The application fee should reimburse the Department for the cost of transcribing applications and running the draw. It should not be used a supplemental revenue source. So, unless the costs of running the draw have nearly doubled, the application fee should not change. In addition, as part of an effort to lift barriers keeping youth from hunting, I believe the application fee should be waived or reduced for youth tags (and possibly even for youth applicants for standard hunts if the system will allow such a change). The Department should also consider waiving the application fee for leftover tags, especially where that tag is purchased in person at the counter.

Last night I attended the License Simplification Meeting in Lake Havasu City. I thought it was a good meeting, though not well attended by the public. I am happy to see fee pricing approvals are no longer required by the State Legislature. This will give the AZGF and the Commission more flexibility in establishing price structures and it should speed up the process.

While I approve of most of the Conceptual Proposals, I am concerned with a few. I will address my pros

and cons.

I like the idea of license purchases going from the January-December theme to the 365 day from purchase proposal. I think this will be a beneficial move for most people. The only pitfall I see to this proposal is that without upcoming expiration notification to license holders, some may lose track of their date and move into an expired condition. It would be nice if the department could develop a reminder program.

Fishing-I am opposed to the notion of incorporating Trout, Urban, 2 pole and CA/NV stamps into a one size fits all license. I see no reason that those who choose not to fish for trout, on urban waters, or along the California or Nevada borders should have to pay for those benefits. I live in a border state area and have no problem with the continuance of the border stamp program. It has served us well in the past and should continue to do so. I'm sure many people who fish Arizona waters never fish the states border areas and I'm sure many people who fish the border waters never fish the urban lakes or fish for trout. The states trout and urban waters are stocked with fish at a substantial cost to the department. I have always thought the trout stamp and the urban fees were established to defray those costs. Since there is no cost to the department for stocking waters with bass, bluegill, catfish, etc., why should those of us who fish only the warm water species be forced to help defray the costs of trout and urban stocking when we never get or don't want the benefit of those programs? Maybe one fee for a General Fishing license with CA/NV and 2 pole stamps included and a Super Fishing License that encompasses all programs would be a better way to go. I also would like to address the proposed Non Resident fee schedule. We have many snowbirds who visit our area. Some stay for 3 or 4 months, some for as much as 6 months. Many people visit from other states only once or twice a year, some for 2 or 3 days, some for as much as a couple of weeks. They like to fish lakes like Alamo, Pleasant, and the Colorado River waters. Maybe a 30 or 60 day license would provide a more fair and realistic cost to those people.

Hunting-I am in agreement with the Hunt proposals other than the split fees for Bull and Cow elk. I think these fees should be the same. I generally apply for antlerless and have no problem paying at the same rate as the bull hunters. I also think the proposed application fee structure should be Changed to one fee for Resident and Non Resident hunters. There shouldn't be any cost difference in processing, so why the split fee?

I appreciate the department's request for feedback and comments. It gives us a sense of being part of the process.

I am a winter visitor to AZ and am concerned about raising fishing license fees

Already some visitors do not buy a license because of cost. Raising fees would

likely make revenues drop as more people would fish without license.

My thoughts on license fees are this. Keep the price for big game tags the same dollar amount whether its a rut hunt or a general hunt. Dont discriminate between the wealthy and the not so wealthy. On bonus points, increase the pass percentage to 50%, this will start to "clean" up people with 20 plus years of bonus points hoping for a specific hunt at least once in their lifetime!

Dear Sirs:

As an avid angler, I just wanted to chime in on the matter of Arizona fishing license expirations. I would like to see the expirations be one year from the date you purchased them instead of the current policy of having all licenses expire in January regardless of when you purchased it.

Thank you very much for your consideration!

As I watched the bill moving through the state government, my initial thoughts were here we go more price increases with less real opportunities. After looking at the concepts in the power point presentation, I was not surprised to see that I was right. I have been in AZ for over 30 years and have

never seen a need or even had the desire to fish the border waters or use two poles. Why should I be required to pay for things like this that I would never use! The same thing applies to Urban fishing tags.

The concepts for hunting licenses is even worse for taking more money for less opportunities. The highest costs of most all the western states and with less available hunts. The premium hunts are great IF you have a large amount of disposable money but it sucks if you have a limited budget like most of us. Between the increased tag costs and the application fees the resident costs are approaching non resident fees in neighboring states that have more opportunities. Migratory bird stamp (HIP) is bad enough but tying it in with the state duck stomp is nearly worthless to most hunters. Everything is going up for the average adult hunter EXCEPT opportunities to hunt.

The so called License Simplification Concepts look more like a money grab than anything else. I for one will be looking more at out of state hunting after this year and I think many average hunters will do the same.

I had an opportunity to attend the Parker Bass club tonight and give a shortened version of last night's presentation. The president Tom was the one who had issues with paying for things he wouldn't use at the public meeting.

By and far the 17 members there were in favor of the conceptual changes, with many overwhelmingly. Half were hunters too. They liked the simplification, the new prices, and even the new youth \$5. They had a few questions on the premium hunts but seemed okay. I told them my info was limited and they could get more info on the azgfd website.

I asked everyone to please Summit their comments both for and against and to make suggestions. One of the members owns the local AM radio station and has invited me to come on the morning program with him to discuss the proposals. We are going to try to set something up for July.

Overall I'd say it was a very successful meeting. And oddly, the local weekly Parker Pioneer Paper actually ran a press release on the Public meeting Wed 5/22. Never saw one in the Havasu paper and they are published by the same publisher. Weird.

\$55 for out of state fishing is steep and might discourage anglers who come for 2 weeks a year to fish

One Day Hunting permits might hurt revenue during Dove Season with hunters from California coming for one or two days then going home.

Hunting is getting more complicated by adding premium tags.

"A deer tag is a deer tag" there should be no premium.

Could support premium tags if we knew where the money went, to improve habitats in premium units, more surveys, etc.

Change the premium hunt dates to "premium dates"

NR youth should pay more for Bull Elk.

Everyone should pay more for Bull elk tags

Bull elk tags should stay the same

A system should exist for surrendering tags and returning bonus points for unforeseen circumstances.

People that just fish the Colorado \$23.50 + \$3.00 river stamp are seeing a \$10 increase in the cost of their annual license. Comment was made that it was too steep considering they will never use the other inclusions (Community fishing, trout, etc.)

License holders will need notification by mail if 365 day license is in place.

Migratory Bird Stamp should be \$5.00, another comment was that \$5.00 might be too low.

NR antelope tags should be \$630, they will still come.

People will not pay for premium December hunts because of cost, however, would pay \$85 for muzzleloader hunt.

4 people on a premium Elk draw with licenses would be over \$1000, which is a lot of money on a personal check that is floating around for months.

Bull Elk Premium tags are too expensive.

Premium hunts should be in the rut.

Dear Game and Fish

It seems to me the new found law Senate bill 1223 that allows you to simplify license structure fees is nothing more than a green light to take advantage of the general hunting population of Arizona. If you just take the "Premium elk" tags alone and look at the raise of the fees of the premium hunts, 4,523 tags raised from 114 to 200 is 86 dollar increase. $86 \times 4,523 = 388987$ dollar increase for the department, a 43% increase. And that is just the elk tags, how much is the total of all the fee changes you are proposing for the upcoming 2014 season? Is this really a necessity to raise it that much or are you just doing it because you can. What does that do to the retired community who are on a fixed income? I have been taking my grandkids hunting on my hunts and then taking them on their hunts. You want to increase the number of hunters by getting the youngsters involved but when these fees increase like 43% in the case of archery elk fees is going to diminish the amount of people who can afford to even apply for a tag. I can see where the September/October rifle tags are a premium but the archery, come on and get real. What are the percentages of kill of really large bulls with a bow compared to a rifle? I don't believe your fee structure follows the other states, it goes way above most of them. As a non resident I can hunt archery elk in Utah with an over the counter elk tag for around 400 dollars.

Looking at some of the fishing fee structures, you are going to force me to purchase a 2 pole tag along with a NV/UT special permit which I will never use. Once again, you are taking advantage of the average Joe fisherman. I can see where your license structure could be simplified like fish, trout and two pole stamp but don't force me to purchase the Colorado river stamp when I will not make the trip from Tucson to fish it, never have, probably never will.

What is your goal with this new fee structure? I see where last year your budget was a little over 98 million, how much are these new fees going to increase that? Better yet, where are we going to see the value in these increases? We don't need more wildlife managers spending much of their time at home on the computer and not in the field much. We don't need trained law enforcement wildlife managers going around Tucson responding to calls of javelina to be replaced or whatever. Give some money to Pima county and let them take care of it. Are we going to see more fish, I doubt it. Take Luna lake for example, it used to be a great fishery and has gone downhill for several years now. What have the G&F done to remedy that? Instead of some of these outrageous increases look at some of your current programs and figure out a way to save some money, make the appropriate cuts that are necessary. Your still going to sell the tags with these new increases but what will happen to the current pool of hunters. You are going to create a new elite group of hunters that have lots of money. Along with that comes a new set of morals and ethics. Are you ready for that. The Arizona game and fish is supposed to represent the common population of the people of this state and others as well.

I oppose these new price guidelines and think they are totally unfair and out of line. A 43% raise is far above normal. I have never in my life received more than say a 4 or 5 % raise. Please bring your new price structure closer to this rate of increase.

Arizona Tag & license Simplification.

The simplification of the licenses & bundling of benefits that a license gives are great ideas and fully support this change along with the 365 day license instead of calendar date license. The tag fee's I feel are a little exorbitant for the first year of change, what about splitting the difference between current and current on the deer, elk, sheep and antelope? The idea for raising the application fee from \$7.50 to \$13 also seems like a large jump how about that going to \$10 and we see if it pays for itself. The premium tag for deer and elk I have been on the fence over and after discussing it with many coworkers

and friends the feeling is that it will not do anything to help increase the likelihood of drawing a tag any sooner all it will accomplish is putting a bigger dent in our wallets. All of the youth concepts I can really get behind, you guys are doing a good job of making it more accessible for parents to take advantage of getting the kids out from behind a TV and into the field along with taking some confusion out of what age a kid can do what.

I will not continue my NR hunting in AZ if the fees spike, I will hunt Utah instead, simple math, simple solution.

I just moved here from Arkansas and their fishing licenses were only 10.50 and good for the year. Also, you can fish as many poles as you want. I know that is not feasible here but getting a license with 2 pole and trout (since just about every lake around here has them) stamps are included and good for 365 days is a good deal.

AZ Game and Fish,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on proposals to change the license and fee structures. I will keep my comments direct and concise - feel free to follow-up with any questions you may have.

1. Bundling for licenses. I prefer if you keep it as it is. I already take advantage of the Hunt/Fish combo and the Family license opportunities. Adding-in Urban fishing and 2 pole stamp and Colorado access is of no value to me: I would be paying extra for options I won't use - typical of "bundling".

2. 365 versus calendar expiration. Keep it at calendar. It will be easier for people to know when they need a new license, versus trying to remember if their license has expired or not. Also, I expect the calendar year expiration will provide a more consistent revenue source for AZ G&F.

3. Premium tags. Absolutely NOT!!!! This concept creates an elitist mentality and is, in my opinion, un-American. We all deserve the same opportunity at a trophy bull or buck despite our income level.

I noticed a couple of states charge extra for premium tags but the resident fee is not affected, only the non-resident. There is some logic to that approach, even though AZG&F does not receive tax revenues. Residents are still paying taxes year-round to fund all the infrastructure necessary to maintain our roads and administration, without which AZG&F cannot manage resources nor would people be able to get to hunting/fishing areas. Additionally, Arizona has limited wildlife resources and it's reasonable to provide an advantage to residents over non-residents to access those resources.

If AZG&F needs additional resources, fees should be raised incrementally across the board - everyone carries the burden. With that said, AZG&F, as stewards of public trust and monies, has an obligation to keep fees as low as possible.

4. Fee increases. There was no mention of why fees were increased as they were. I would appreciate knowing the logic behind fee increases.

5. \$13 versus \$7.50 application fee. Why a 73% increase? Perhaps I should have included this with #4.

Thank you, again, for the job you do - our reputation for trophy class animals across many species speaks for itself - and for the opportunity to comment on proposed changes.

I know bonus points are under the Article I regulations and premium tags are under the proposed 2014 hunt regulations by AZGFD. I have several issues with both two matters of concern:

First of all, the bonus point system is broken. Everyone knows that an applicant with no bonus points can get drawn, while another applicant with 5 or 6+ points is not drawn. This very unfair. Also, some older hunters cannot afford to wait 5+ years to draw a tag. The AZ Game and Fish Commission should change the system so bonus point holders get drawn first and those with no bonus points get drawn

last. I am not sure how all the details could be worked out, but that is the commission's job.

Secondly, premium tags are simply a bad idea! This would be unfair to people on a low or fixed income. I do not want to see hunting in Arizona become a rich man's sport. I believe you will have a lot of unsold tags. Also, I recently watched the AZGFD web-cast on the 2014 fees. It seemed like non-resident and youth fees were in general reduced, while resident adult fees were generally increased. This seems unfair! I would have no problem paying a little more for licenses and tags, but only if my issues with bonus points and premium tags are addressed.

Please feel free to pass my message along to all concerned parties. Thank you in advance for your attention to these important issues!

To Whom It May Concern:

I approve the concept of simplifying the License Fees, having 365 day license, it would even better if when you got a license, you always had the same number, you just renewed it each year.

The concept of a PREMIUM DEER or ELK tag, I have No problem with, though I think the Fee should be closer, say \$40.00 for Deer & \$75.00 for Premium, otherwise you get in charges of turning it into a rich man's deal. I personally think NON Residents pay enough for their tags, but I definitely think that we need to re-think the pricing of Lion Tags, especially for NON-RESIDENTS. We now have units with a 3 Lion Limit, Other Units with Multiple Bag Limits, yet we want to charge a Non-Resident that may have a deer or Javalina tag, \$225.00, when we are trying to reduce lions in these units. Why NOT an Option for the Non-Residents when they apply for a Tag, that if they get drawn, that they could also receive a Companion LION Tag for the same price as a resident. My guess is that currently, NO ONE from out of state actually buys a Lion tag unless they specifically come here for LION hunting and let's face it, Arizona is NOT known for its huge Cats, guys go to B.C., Idaho, etc., for the large cats, yet, if they get drawn for deer, etc., I bet almost everyone would buy a LION tag if they were paying the same price as a resident.

We need to do everything we can to encourage lion hunting, in the end it might only result in 3 or 4 cats getting killed a year, but that is still an extra 3-4 that wouldn't have been harvested and if the fee structure results in only an extra \$10K a year, that is still \$10K more than the department is receiving now.

Might also consider a combo – Bear & Lion tag for Non-Residents – allows them say 1 bear & 2 or 3 lions for a flat fee of say \$200.00. Just a thought.

To whom it may concern,

For starters, the AZGFD talks all the time about how we need to get our young people involved for the future of hunting. But then goes the opposite direction by cutting the number of youth cow elk tags. How does this help our kids get involved? I have voiced my disappointment about this in the past but apparently nobody cares. I put my 2 sons in for cow tags and they haven't been drawn in 3 years. How is that possible when we need to get kids involved? Practice what you preach. There is no way a kid should have to wait 4 years to hunt elk if we are trying to get them involved and excited about hunting. I guarantee you that the majority of parents would rather see their children get drawn instead of them. The other problem I have is with the cost of elk tags in general. AZ has one of the most expensive elk tags for residents while having one of the least expensive for non-residents. How is that right? AZ is one of the places that people dream about hunting trophy elk, mule deer, and antelope. So why would be charge them hundreds of dollars less than other states while "putting the screws to" the people that live here? It's just not right. Montana charges \$1000 to hunt elk there if you are a non-resident. Fill the coffers with out of state money instead of taking it from the people that live here.

One of the ideas mentioned in the email was a possibility of having premium hunts and charging more for them. I absolutely disagree!! All this does is cater to the rich trophy hunter. This is a disturbing trend throughout the west.

All three of the above mentioned things have one thing in common. They all bring in more money for

the AZGFD. It is truly disturbing if that is what is actually happening. If you want to bring in more money do as I said before, get it from non-resident hunters by raising THEIR tag fees, not by cutting youth tags and charging residents the highest tag fees in the country.

I know the majority of the hunters out there feel the same way. Thank you for your time.

Things I would like to see changed are as follows:

- Make the fishing license an annual pass. Countless times over the years me and my family have wanted to buy a license late in the year, when the trout fishing is better, but sometimes don't because it expires January 1. If it lasted a year after purchase I would buy them more often.
- Out of state fees are high. I have family out of state and when they come into town to fish for one or two days is to expensive.

I am opposed to any license fee increase. The outdoors offer one reasonable opportunity for folks and families of average means to enjoy what our state has to offer without being gouged.

If there is an issue regarding increasing costs and a need to "tax" the public to pay for it , I offer a few suggestions.

1. Cut or eliminate programs that are too costly to maintain and do not directly benefit the outdoor consumptive user. For example, to name a few:

The Mexican wolf program has been a costly failure from the get go. Get out of it.

Kill or substantially curtail any and all projects or departments related to non game and endangered species.

Let the feds manage wild horses and burros.

Forget future participation in WAFWA.

Let the feds deal with the jaguar issues.

2. Cut staff.

3. Reduce salaries to top management.

Please reconsider the planned increase for premium hunts for Arizona resident applicants. I applaud the plans for simplification and a fee structure that encourages more Arizona residents to get into the outdoors. However increasing premium hunting fees to Arizona based outdoorsmen and women is not the solution to operational deficits. Those planned increases for premium hunts should target only non resident applicants. If those applicants become successful in a draw system that favors residents then the lucky non resident applicant should pay the premium few. Dont penalize those who contribute to the AZGF year end and year out and have done so for over 50 years. Dont penalize the new outdoorsman who wants to hunt elk with primitive weapons by limiting it to those who "can afford it".

To Whom it may concern,

I am a non resident and I hunted Arizona for the first time in February for Javelina. I was successful in tagging my animal and it was a very memorable hunt. I am from the upper Midwest so it was a completely new experience for me and I enjoyed it thoroughly. My wife is from Arizona so that is what brought me to hunt there.

I am an avid sportsman and have hunted and been successful with most big game animals including turkeys in my home state of Minnesota. So when I had the opportunity to hunt Javelina in Arizona I jumped on it.

That being said, I come from a state that has very reasonable non resident fees for both hunting and fishing. Sometimes I think they are a hair too low for certain licenses because I understand residents should enjoy their states game and fish at a reasonable price and have quality hunts and fishing

experiences.

With that I would like to start with some positives I seen in the proposed increases. Leaving youth prices for both resident and non pretty low is a good thing in any state . I also like the idea of adding the fishing license to the NR general hunting license .

Now for what I see as negatives. I am disappointed to see a higher charge for antlered youth tags though. We should not be teaching youth that antlers are worth more.

I know this isn't a new rule but I feel a need to state my opinion on the matter. I understand NR having to buy a AZ general hunting license on top of tag fees when successful in a draw for a tag . What bothers me is having to pay that fee just to apply for preference points or not getting some kind of refund on the general hunting license when not successful in a draw , even if it's a partial refund. I understand charging a fee to just apply for preference points for NR but \$160 is too much.

As for Antelope, Elk and Deer tags for NR, I thought they were priced pretty high as is. With the proposed fees it will effectively price me out of hunting any other big game in Arizona which is a shame. I would love to try a little Quail hunting though and maybe Javelina again as they seem my only options for my price range. Although Javelina isn't exactly cheap either, as a comparison if a NR wants to hunt deer in Minnesota it costs \$165, Black Bear \$230 no other fees. One may not be able to compare the upper Midwest with the dessert as far as populations of game and I know that probably makes NR fees higher but I do think showing the difference in price is important.

I know you guys have it difficult no matter what as you can not please everyone. I also know my views may not hold much water as I am a non resident but I am a person that would be spending some more money in your state if the license fees were not as high.

Combining many of the past fees to be included under one new increased fee license is nothing more than smoke and mirrors approach to increasing revenue. I don't want a two pole stamp or urban lake permit. I liken this to the fees my cable company charges. I get 120 channels for this one wonderful monthly fee. The trouble is I only watch about 30 of the channels.

Giving the kids a break on fees is a smart gesture but the reality is the accompanying parent will make up the difference by buying an "expensive" license as well. More smoke and mirrors.

Oh my! costs to operate are going up. So are mine. About \$90 to fill bass boat with gas and \$110 to fill the truck. Let's throw in some groceries \$100, camping and launch fees \$60, and before you know it you have spent over \$360 on one trip. So whats a little more for an increased license fee?

I'll tell you what it is; I'm just not going anymore. Just not worth it. Gizzard shad in Roosevelt, thieves ripping you off at Alamo, low water causing difficulty in launching and bent props, poor service at State Parks; must I go on.

I know what you are thinking. They (us) all complain at first but eventually they all get used to the new fee increase and come back. Not this time guys; America is broke.

I have heard many people discuss this idea and was wondering if it had been brought up.... The idea is to choose a certain number of units each year (1-4 perhaps) and close them to hunters for specific species, with the expectations that a handful of tags would be auctioned off for those units. For example you might close for one year 3A 3C bull and auction off 20 tags. Obviously the numbers would need to be discussed. This would accomplish three things.

First, it would allow those who have money and want a private preferred hunt the ability to bid on tags that that would allow for that (keep in mind, I am not one of these people).

Second, depending on the Unit, Game and fish would most likely recover or collect more money on the few tags through the bid process not effecting the program financially. I would submit that apart from a tag fee the cost should be the same for out of state hunters allowing them to bid and have the

opportunity to hunt AZ while increasing competition for the tags which in return will increase the cost.

Third, it would allow for species to bounce back after years with many combined rifle and archery kills improving both quality and quantity of animal.

Dear AZG&F,

As a father of five, there are many positive things that I appreciate the new changes. Lowering the cost for youth involvement is vital to recruitment of new hunters. I really appreciate the proposed \$5 Youth Combo. Some of the changes I don't like but I can live with those.

The one change that I really must fight against is the new proposed Application Fee. As I mentioned, I have five children. If I applied for all of them and myself for every big game species it would cost a whopping \$468 just in application fees. This is without any guarantee that they would actually go hunting. This is just plain wrong.

In addition to my own children I have taken my nieces and nephews and other friends of my children. With these kind of fee's, it is no wonder why new hunter recruitment is low.

As a lifetime license holder and lifetime member of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, I feel like I have shown my commitment to preserving our hunting heritage, but these fees are very punitive to those of us who actually do take the time and effort to give others the experience of hunting.

I know that you expect a great jump in revenue with this big change, but you will further hurt the cause of new hunter recruitment and prevent people like me, who actually do take youth hunting and fishing, from making much of an influence.

I respectfully ask that you find a way to reduce the cost for us to take youth hunting by drastically reducing the cost of the application fee for youth. There are many ways you could do this such as just having a lower application fee for youth or allowing only one application fee for all species for youth. You could refund all non-successful youth application fees.

I think that \$637 in fees just for my family is ridiculous! Over a 5 year period, this would be an incredible \$3,185! Especially when you consider that we have to do this just to get a chance to go hunting - we may not even get drawn once! This policy is destructive and punitive to mentors even at \$7.50, but at \$13, it is ridiculous.

Who can afford to be a mentor at those prices?

Thank you for your time and please consider this.

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Big Horn Sheep | \$13 |
| Elk | \$13 |
| Deer | \$13 |
| Turkey | \$13 |
| Javelina | \$13 |
| Antelope | \$13 |
| Buffalo | \$13 |

Total App Fees \$91

Multiplied by 5 children plus myself \$546, \$637 if my wife applies with us. If I take others (nieces,

nephews, friends of my children) it could easily be \$1000 per year just in application fees! This is just plain wrong!

To whom it may concern,

I have been a long time supporter of the Arizona Game and Fish. I have been applying as a non-resident for 14 years for elk, deer, and sheep tags. I have purchased a hunting license every year and have always considered the money I put into the Arizona system an investment. I have drawn a deer tag for 12BW in 2006 and had a very fun hunt. I hopefully look forward to hunting elk in Arizona one day and if the stars align sheep?

I wanted to give a brief comment on the proposed license fees.

Let me start with deer... I don't believe all of the hunts north of the Colorado River should be considered trophy hunts or premium tags. I think the later hunts are premium hunts and do demand premium prices. That being said the early hunts are listed as opportunity hunts and according to the game wardens are NOT premium or Trophy hunts. Therefore, I don't believe the trophy fees should apply to the early hunts. I think any of the rut hunts should be considered trophy hunts/premium hunts. In regards to elk...The chart listed is not an apples to apples comparison of the four states listed. New Mexico charges \$780.00 for premium/ high demand units. They don't have the \$150.00 hunting license that Arizona charges. Utah has an \$800 dollar tag fee and a \$65 license. Their \$1800 premium hunts can't be compared to the other states because their premium hunts allow the hunters to hunt archery, rifle and muzzle loader. This gives the hunters about two months to hunt bulls in the rut. Wyoming premium/ special hunt gives the person better odds of drawing. The standard price for an elk tag in a limited entry unit is approximately \$600 with no hunting license requirement.

A better chart would be...

AZ Premium bull...\$1,160 (premium tag and hunting license)

NM Premium.....\$780

Utah Premium.....\$865 (limited entry hunting license for a season in the rut plus hunting license)

Wyoming.....\$600 (allows hunters to hunt the entire unit for all September and October with same tag)

I happen to be in a place in my life wherein I can afford the proposed fee increases. That being said, I think that this will cause a huge burden on people who want to hunt in your state. I believe there are several things that could be done to help generate revenue (if that is what is needed) without alienating a large group of people who want to hunt. I would think that a \$25-\$35 application charge could/would raise significant revenue without completely pricing people out of the hunts.

I have not taken much time in the past to write about tag fees. I don't believe that people actually read these emails but I thought I should try and write to you on this one. If the current proposed tag fees had been in place when I first started applying I don't think I would have ever started trying to hunt in AZ. I am glad the system you currently have was in place when I first started. I will continue to apply in your great state regardless of your decision but I know I couldn't have afforded the fees 14 years ago.

Thank You for your Time

To Whom it may concern,

To be honest I'm not sure where to start...

First perhaps, I'll go on record as stating that it's doubtful that the "24 sportsman's organizations" that supported the recent Senate Bill 1223 had any idea that the AZGFD had an agenda to eliminate many forms of outdoor activities from our heritage by way of gouging our residents to the extent that we will no longer be able to afford this God-given pastime. I'd also be first in line to reject the control that was given to the department based on the fee structure you're proposing. Your excuse that this will be "simplified" is also quite misleading. Simple perhaps in terms of number of licenses available, but at the same time forcing us to "purchase" licenses for things most of us will never use, need, or want.

I guess we could be thankful that you just don't turn in all tags and licenses into a huge auction where

the “average resident” will no longer have any legitimate “opportunity” to hunt and/or fish in this state as it will have become a “rich man’s” sport. This is truly sad.

You might ask what I’m basing this on, and that’s a fair question. To that end I compared Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah’s license fees and tags to that of Arizona (for Residents that is). I took the current fees for each, averaged them, then compared to Arizona’s both current and proposed fee structure and found the following:

Application Fees

currently 2.0X

proposed fee 3.5X You need to explain why you are doing this to us as the average cost of application fees are \$3.67, yet you want to raise it to \$13?.

Fishing License

currently 1.5X

proposed fee 1.4X (move in the right direction, yet still too high)

Hunting License

currently 1.7X

proposed fee 1.9X This is already too high and you want to increase it more?

Combo Hunt and Fish

currently 1.6X

proposed fee 1.7X This is already too high and you want to increase it more?

Turkey Tag

currently 0.9X

proposed fee 0.9X Good, keep as-is, it’s consistent with our sister states.

Deer Tag

currently 1.2X

proposed fee 2.9X The average cost of a deer tag is currently \$35 in the other three states. You want to raise it up to \$100

Jr. Deer Tag

currently 1.0X

proposed fee 1.0X Good, keep as-is!

Elk Tag

currently 1.8X

proposed fee 3.2X The average elk tag for residents is 62.33, yet you want to increase the cost for a resident elk tag to \$200? You should be fired!

Jr. Elk Tag

currently 1.3X

proposed fee 1.3X This is higher than our sister states so why aren’t you lowering this? What is your justification for allowing this?

Antelope

currently 1.8X

proposed fee 1.9X The average cost of an antelope tag is 47.33 for our “sister states” residents, yet you

want to raise our tag fee to \$90?

Jr. Antelope Tag

currently 2.1X

proposed fee ?.?X You don't identify what this fee would be, but likely keep it the same forcing our youth to pay double the fee. Again, this makes no sense.

Bighorn Tag

currently 0.9X

proposed fee 1.0 This is consistent with our sister states.

I've attached a spreadsheet with the calculations taken off of Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico's G&F websites today. These rates are accurate, but I'd guess you already knew this data...

Obviously I would vote to either keep as-is, or bring them in line w/our sister states and reduce the fee structure for residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Must states honor their seniors by offering hunting/fishing at a significant reduction.

IE: Colorado fishing License is just \$1!

SO many Seniors are on a low fixed income and would enjoy just fishing but can't afford the license. Thanks...

I don't think I like the idea of premium hunts. A late season hunt does not guarantee that it will be a premium hunt (Tucson).

The increase in fees for a premium may exclude some people from being able to hunt in their chosen area (Tucson).

The proposed fees aren't high enough to dissuade applications for the premium hunts and my draw odds aren't likely to get any better even though I'll be paying more. What would I be getting for my money (Tucson)?

Your proposed fees are too high for families with more than one child (Payson).

I like the premium deer pricing concept (Payson).

I also like the elk premium pricing concept, but it wouldn't be good for larger families (Payson).

Application fees should remain unchanged (Payson).

It would be nice if we could get a license in a form of a card instead of the paper. Maybe something we can renew each year instead of using all the paper.

Instead of increasing fees to the public how about not wastefully spending on gigantic 3/4 ton trucks? If you're going to increase fees bass need to be managed better. Quit catering to trout fishermen only.

To the Commission,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Arizona Game and Fish Department for letting the public, your customers, have input into such a monumental change in the way you do business. SB 1223 will allow the Department to serve all present, future, and hopefully, returning customers better.

The Yuma Valley Rod and Gun Club has been very active in the Hunter Angler Heritage Work Group for the past so many years. Time and again we have run into the same wall of the license and fee structure that was previously installed. With the new structure we have the opportunity to pass on our heritage as hunters, anglers, sportsmen, and outdoorsmen to future generations more easily.

Our Board of Directors had the privilege of attending the information meeting held in Yuma regarding

the simplification structure. We are all in agreement with the licensing changes that have been proposed, with the exception of the "Premium Hunts" proposal. Though there would be opportunity for some of our local members with some of these style hunts we must stand against the idea.

The Department and Commission have done a tremendous job managing our wildlife based on the North American Model. The idea of putting a price tag on our game animals instead of a license fee does not follow that model. The idea of "Premium Hunts" will limit opportunity for some of the customers of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, also known as citizens of the State of Arizona. The wildlife and habitat belongs to all of us and the Yuma Valley Rod and Gun Club believes that everyone should have the same opportunity.

To be perfectly clear our Club stands firmly against the idea of "Premium Hunts" in any form.

Raise the fishing license fees is OK. BUT Send competent Fish & Game Wardens here in Havasu, and Not tell us "That we are low on funds so we cannot check Havasu" ie: Two people had 22 small mouth bass at site 6, Called the local warden, "I'm too busy" was the reply.... end of conversation. Four oriental people had 5, 5 gallon buckets with 100s of 6-8 inch stripers, No Arizona license, Why? Because they had a California license and thought it was good on the dock at site 6 because we can see California. Called again, again to busy, Snowbirds catch stripers, smallmouth bass over the limit, Catch and take to the car and put in a cooler, Catch some more and repeat. Nothing us locals can do. Calling is a waste of our time.

We are getting sick of this type of treatment, I and my wife purchase our fish permit, The "snowbirds" do not or I should say most of them do not, WHY? "because no one checks our license here in Havasu"

Did you apprehend the spear divers who speared Largemouth bass on the nests at Mesquite 1 & 2? The locals called repeatedly

I have never been checked by a Arizona Fish & Game Warden here in Lake Havasu since we lived here for 15 years, But I have been checked by California fish and game numerous times, I am on my boat 3-4 days a week fishing.

I could go on forever with true stories here in Havasu, but that would only bore you.

So raise the fees but spend some money for competent Game Wardens her in Lake Havasu.

Why is it that every time anyone gets to make a change it always cost us more money. Hunting is getting to be a rich mans sport thoes of us on a fixed income or with a couple of children hurt every time we get ready to apply for tags not to mention buying lcnenses. But I guess we gave the control away.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Comments on AZGFD "Conceptual" ideas:

I strongly oppose a premium hunt structure in Arizona. A change like that is not consistent with the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation because it will disproportionately affect lower income hunters. I do not believe that a higher permit fee should ever reflect a higher quality hunt. This is not a "license simplification". I currently apply for hunts that would become "premium" under the conceptual changes, however I would not be able to due to my low income status. I also disagree that early archery bull tags are premium hunts because the hunter success rates are consistent with many late bull rifle hunts.

Permit fees should remain the same for each game animal genus, regardless of sex. This is also more consistent with the North American Model.

I am opposed to \$25 turkey tags. I would still apply if it were \$20.

The deer tag increase is too high. I am in favor of \$40 deer tags.

Elk tags should be the same regardless of sex or hunt type. I would be in favor of \$130 elk tags, but not more.

I am in favor of consolidating licenses and stamps into just a few options.

The cost for a one-day resident fishing/hunting license is too high. This will actively discourage participation in fishing/hunting of learning fishers/hunters during a camping trip. I would like to see this license cost \$5.

I am in favor of the \$5.00 youth license.

I am not in favor of a \$13 application fee, I would cap that fee at \$10. \$13 would definitely make me participate in less hunt draws.

Comments on other ideas for future changes:

I am in favor of an increase of permit and license fees of 10% above the current levels.

I am in favor of a free or very reduced hunt/fish license for wounded veterans of US Armed forces.

I am in favor of reducing the cost of a lifetime hunt/fish combo license in order to provide a financial incentive to buy it. The way it is now, it does not offer much of a discount over buying a license most years until I am eligible for a pioneer license.

I would like to see offered an Apprentice license for fishing, identical to the one now offered for hunting. I have used the apprentice license for adults I know who are interested in trying hunting but would have never started without me taking them out. Those people are now license holders. I know of similar people who would like to try fishing but would like to start without buying a license initially. It is much easier to convince them to try it out if they don't have to fork over that much money if they are unsure if they like it or not.

Gentlemen: As a thirty year hunter of Mearns Quail in your beautiful state, I have a comment on the changes on the dates. I am in complete agreement with moving the Mearns Quail opening date to the first week in December (December 6th this year). As you are aware, for many years the season opened the last week in November.

My suggestion is that the season be extended for an additional week in February to compensate for the loss of hunting days in November.

I truly love hunting these unique game birds. I consider each one a trophy and feel honored to be allowed to hunt them. I'm certain that there may be extenuating circumstances that I am not aware of, and would appreciate your comments on why the opening day was pushed back. I would also like to hear your reasoning on why the season could not be extended to the middle of February.

I appreciate all that you do for hunters and fishers in Arizona.

I was able to attend a town hall meeting in Globe.

I want to make certain my thoughts are heard concerning some of the changes presented.

I support the following

Simplifying license structure to include all stamps and the increased fee as presented.

Premium hunt fees at least double what regular hunts cost, and fee to include any required stamps. Premium hunts should be determined on the basis of the time of year they are scheduled as presented. Increased tag fees as presented for residents and non-residents

I have one more subject that I would like to see changed which was just touched on at the town hall meeting I attended. I would like to see some of the regular hunts and all of the premium hunts start on Monday rather than Friday. Still to have the same number of days in the hunt. In my opinion this would give the serious hunters an opportunity to hunt with lower number of hunters in the field, and would reduce the number of hunters the game wardens would have to deal with during the hunt. With the hunts starting on Friday every hunter is in the field on or before Friday and the folks that only have the weekend to hunt overrun the folks who plan to hunt for the duration of the scheduled hunt. They shoot at anything that has horns which puts the animals in defensive mode and they will not show themselves for several days after the weekend warriors leave. If a hunt starts on Monday these weekend warrior folks still get a weekend to hunt it will just be after the serious folks have probably already taken their game and went home.

These are my thoughts and most of my friends and colleges agree, thanks for asking for the input.

Keep urban fishing separate. If I want to pay for that program I would go get a license to fish there. I would rather my money go into better programs. I'm sorry but half the people fishing at the urban lakes have no respect for rules or regulations. So please don't force me to spend my hard earned money on a bad program.

Hi:

I attended the recent public meeting held in Tucson and would like to submit additional comments during this process.

Please understand in the current economic climate it will be a "hard sell" for increases in big game application fee, premium tags and simple tag increases.

What is proposed to simplify the fishing complication is to be applauded. Junior Hunting Licenses set at \$5/year is going in the right direction for recruitment and support of single-parent families.

I do feel that budget issues such as this whether for a State of Arizona agency, State Department, State University or even that of a personal, private family must be attacked on two fronts.

Those fronts are income and expenses. There was essentially nothing in your recent presentation in regard to AZ G&F, reduction of expenses. I also think that the slide on fuel costs was in error?

Income:

1. Premium Tags

You have many of us at a current, unfair disadvantage. Myself and many of my hunting cohorts have been saving up bonus points for years and maybe in some cases DECADES for a final "Once in a Lifetime" hunt here in our home state of Arizona.

After saving up bonus points by paying \$7.50/year, who would refuse to pay the "Premium Price" if you are waiting for Desert or Big Horn tag, Trophy Bull Elk or Late Whitetailed Deer?

I believe that at last count, I have 22 bonus points for sheep and 11 for elk. My last elk tag in Arizona was in the year 2002.

I do feel that if Strip MD Tags, December WT and MD, Trophy Bull Elk, ML Bull Elk and September Bull

Archery tags are considered "PREMIUM", that Archery deer tags for December and January should be included as well. Those hunts also earn the "PREMIUM" definition in my book.

2. Application Fee(AF)

Here is a novel idea. I have always felt that with recent computer technology advancements that the AF should drop to \$5! I now realize that it is indeed a "cash cow" for AZG&F. So how about this: Increase the "Application Fee (AF)" to \$10 rather than the proposed \$13, BUT in return set the "Bonus Point" purchase fee at \$5. That would send a VERY POSITIVE message to the hunting community.

As always I will be available to discuss these comments if warranted.

Would like the ability to buy across the family hunt/fish with the fish and vice-versa for families whom have members that hunt/fish and fish only.

i.e.

main family hunt/fish – spouse family fish – child family hunt/fish – child family fish

I think the game and fish dept. Needs to be considered the class of people that purchase most of the tags. I believe that if the prices get too much higher that there will be a drop in hunters applying for tags and buying licenses. There might even be an increase in poaching incidents. From a financially concerned person.

On the license side of the concept I feel the department has done a good job particularly in helping families with kids.

On the tag side I'm not so convinced. I feel there should be a direct relationship between a resident tag and a non resident tag. This proposal seems to start the process of giving the non resident a reduction even though the tag may be going up it's not going up at the same rate our resident tags are.

My thought would be to simply say a non resident tag is 10 x (or some other number) the cost of a resident tag. Resident tag = \$100 non resident = \$1,000

Thank You for the opportunity to have a say on OUR hunting and fishing.

Can you tell me why you don't give a senior discount on fishing lic. some people are on a fixed income and be leave it or not \$18.50 is a lot of money. Just thought I would ask the Question other wise I want to thank you for stocking the lakes and ponds.

If you folks would just model Colorado. They have such a no non-sense system. They get most of my hunting dollars simply because I don't get drawn here in my state that I have resided in for the past 24 yrs. I have drawn ONE bull tag. That's pretty bad. You people should have one hunt that is for residents only like Colorado. It's sad that the dept. is so greedy for the \$ All these out of state people don't pay taxes here we do. Rather than donations for habitat just establish a fee for habitat users. That hunters fisherman hikers. If they use the woods they pay fee. just like Colorado. It's called a Habitat stamp. And the fishing could stand a lot of work. Thanks for probably nothing.

I suggest considering NR hunting/fishing licenses for short periods, like for one or two 7-day periods at reduced fees. I have friends who hunt here for one week per year and have to buy an annual NR license. Other states have short-term hunting/fishing licenses for NRs.

Although I hold a lifetime fishing license with trout stamp. I believe a yearly fishing license should be valid for one year from date of purchase, not from January 1st to December 31st.

After watching the discussion and conceptual change video I have a few thoughts. First, I like the new hunting and fishing combo structure. I think it makes a lot of sense for the residents, non residents and youth. My only problem is raise in "Premium Hunt" tags. I agree that it should be raised for Non-Residents but I don't think us residents should be hit with the increase as well. I like the examples of

other states that we shown, particularly how NM and WY have a higher charge to NR for "Premium Tags" but their residents are able to enjoy the same flat rate.

I know for myself these raises would be hard on me. I have a small family, I'm in school full time and we live on my wife's salary as a school teacher, these raises would make it difficult for me to enjoy the hobby I love. I have been hunting since I was a kid and have been able to harvest quite a few elk and deer but with these increases it will onl restrict my ability to hunt as well as afford to also put my kids in. Hunting is what I love and I hope that Arizona doesn't become a place that only the "rich man" can hunt and overloaded with non residents.

It seems to me that you guys aren't simplifying them, you are trying to make more money from them. Am I missing something here, the tags are all being raised?

I am against any premium fees for tags, they should be the same price, the draw odds already favor the AZ Game and Fish with the 7.50 license application fees to the draw odds.

I have a couple of ideas that I would like to have implemented.

1. Modify the disabled Veteran statutes. Many other states have changed their license fees to be free at the 60% disability rate. Some even give free or reduced tags at this rating. I think that this would help people get out and hunt. The activity alone is good for mental health especially at a time when 1 in 3 combat vets have some form of PTSD from combat. (Im 90% myself but am lucky enough to have a high paying job so I get out a lot. Hunting is VERY crucial to my mental health. I know people in AZ that would like to hunt but cant because of their combat related disability)

2. There should only have to be 1 tag for a species. Currently to hunt deer with a bow and controlled rifle you have to have 2 tags yet only 1 can be filled. Idaho has a fee for the draw and then following the draw results the tag is purchased. This would eliminate the refund process for unsuccessful draws and allow for people to apply for multiple species controlled hunts without having to come up with surplus money upfront in hopes of drawing a tag.

3. I cant remember the state however; a program to promote the take of unwanted game (ie coyotes) would be helpful in management. The state I cant recall would award points for the draw of future hunts. We can now purchase 5 per year but if you could get 2 per coyote more people would get out and shoot a coyote in hopes of drawing on a ram or bison hunt for example.

To whom it may concern,

I subscribe to your newsletter, and enjoy reading it and keeping up on department current events of interest to me. I felt that you should know that my Norton anti-virus protection software always marks your emails as a potential threat or as a phishing spybot. I have the AZGFD listed in my contacts, and marked as a safe sender, but the software always throws up alarms when I receive one of your emails. I was just wondering how many other people on your email list are maybe not getting your messages because their anti-virus software is blocking them.

You may want to look into what it is in your emails that triggers such a response. I have never had this situation with any other email contact.

Just a heads-up.

Keep up the good work

Good afternoon. I just read through your power point on the licence simplification process and have a few comments. Overall I think the concept is well prepared and has some good ideas. There are a couple of details I think should be re-evaluated. --

1. Slide #33 shows that 2 out of 3 Other states do not significantly raise the cost for residents for the "Premium Hunts". They do significantly increase the price of those to non residents. Your proposal shows residents price for premium hunts more than double the general hunt price and non residents increases by a far smaller percentage. As someone who has been supporting the AZGFD for over 35

years I am insulted that my cost will double for these tags while some non resident with no tie to AZ will not see that kind of an increase for them.

2. I would like to see a benefit added to the lifetime licence. An additional bonus point or discount on the tags would be appreciated. Your lifetime licence holders have been and will be there year after year for the long term. Back to point 1, they are the ones that will be taking the biggest hit as a group on the double the price "premium hunts"

To conclude, thank you for the opportunity to comment. Good luck with completing the project, I hope it all goes well. Have a nice day.

Dear AZGFD:

Please change the license valid dates to co inside with the fiscal year, i.e. valid from July 1 through June 30. My first year I inadvertently was hunting in January on an expired license. With this change it would make the process more user friendly.

My only comment to the AZGFD license program pertains to reptiles and amphibians. I am a recreational field herper, meaning that my hobby is seeking out native reptiles and amphibians in their native habitats. I am also a USGS volunteer working with local USGS agents on various herp related field surveys and projects. I also volunteer with local state and county parks in my community to give educational lectures on herp related subjects.

I visit Arizona frequently with my friends to enjoy finding and photographing the diversity of your native herps. I also have several herper friends who are AZ residents. I do not collect animals, only photograph them, which means that sometimes I will actually capture them but only for the purpose of taking photos and gathering data – data which I have shared with members of your department staff.

My only suggestion or comment regarding simplifying AZ license fees is to request that maybe you at least combine reptiles and amphibians under one license. As it is now, I must purchase an out of state hunting license to handle, photograph and release reptiles, and an out of state fishing license to handle, photograph and release amphibians. In view of the high cost of AZ out-of-state licenses, it's usually impractical for me to purchase 2 licenses for a 3 day stay in your state. It seems like this situation could be improved upon greatly by the combining reptiles and amphibians together under either a hunting license, or a fishing license.

I appreciate your consideration.

Thank you

Please do not raise the cost of hunting and fishing licenses. Thank you

To whom it may concern and care for the common outdoors person,

Wow, it is too bad someone had the nerve to make that type of fee table. Please leave it alone. It is hard enough to afford licenses, permits, gas, butcher, equipment, etc. The pricing proposed is like a private game ranch in Texas! I prey you reconsider trying to make hunting a "rich mans sport" and leave the fees alone. Don't forget what hunting is all about and keep it pure instead of pricing the average person out of hunting. Your fee and proposal is similar to New Mexico which is horrible. Check Utah, Wyoming, Texas they are reasonable and don't charge like this proposed schedule. I already pay for my father and nephew who can't afford it now. If this goes through I'm going to have to tell them they can't go hunting anymore since I can't afford the extra licensing fee's and permits. My father is an older retired man on fixed income and my nephews only have a mother and are students. Hunting brings all three generations together once a year to go hunting. Please don't help destroy traditions that are hard enough to keep going. The proposed pricing is clearly crossing from game management to the capitalization of natural resources for financial gain only and is preposterous.

I humbly ask please do not cross this line

Dear Game & Fish:

When you raise the fishing fee for AZ residents please take the perspective of the customer who are mostly retired living on Social Security. Most of the White Mountain fisherman I talk with and see are retired, disabled living on Social Security. Their COLA increases are less than 2%. They tell me they wait for their SS check to buy more equipment. They can't afford to golf so fishing is their pasttime. It almost seems like it should be a God given right to fish. A \$46.00 two pole trout license with a 2% + increase = \$47.00. I'm sure you would like to increase it more but your consumers cannot afford it.

I am against the application fee of 13 dollars per applicant, the premium tag fees are excessive and unreasonable, with the draw odds in the 1% range, you get more money from the 99% that didn't get drawn. With these fees in place you are going to be pushing your loyal hunters to look elsewhere to hunt or to give it up completely due to the cost of a family putting in together. These are too drastic of changes that don't simplify anything license or fees, but make the game and fish more money in the short term only not long term. I hope you give more thought of whom you are trying to go along with this charade of simplification=more revenue for the game and fish?? Thanks for your time

Reduce mountain lion tag price... Same as resident. Similar to Nevada

Lower structure north of Colorado River

Not same plane as NR. Maybe \$25

Raise price of sheep tag

January archery hunts are premium. Why not charge the same as premium.

Permit January Archery tags

What about middle October elk hunts would they be premium?

More elk

Equal opportunity for all

Rich man's sport

Support higher fees for non residents--won't impact applications

Premium impacts on landowners charging access fees.

Cost of processing applications???

Why don't we charge credit card fees at time of application?

1. I recommend that fees be left as they are.

2. I do not see a need to simplify the process.

One hunter's opinion, agreed upon by others I've spoken with...

I like the license fee structure and it would likely get me out in the field more to hunt more game and fish locally more. I often pass on the urban program due to additional license requirement and opt not to migratory bird hunt, trout fish or two pole fish if I don't choose to afford the extra stamps. Sometimes I do, but most years I don't. If I do decide to, it means I buy more ammo, gas, food, hunting gear, fishing gear... most of which AZGFD benefits from on the sale and certainly our state commerce benefits from. Sounds like a win win win to me.

I do not understand how license increases are justified when access and travel in hunt areas are being continually and increasingly restricted. Hunting opportunities are being made more difficult to enjoy, and for some to even accomplish and it costs more? Seems like we're on the high end of the comparative chart, but I don't see that we are comparatively that much better with available game and hunting opportunities. In some cases we on the low end of available game. I have no issue with the conceptual regular fee structure on tags and can tolerate the small increases, only because I love the sport, but you'd better sweeten the pot somewhere. Bonus tags for additional game maybe? Get me out in the field more and I'll spend more money.

I do not support the premium tag structure AT ALL. Seems like a gouge to capitalize on "a chance" at a bigger trophy. You're profiting on a perception at the expense of loyal hunters who give their dollars year in and year out. Your setting up a "class" division in what ought to be an "equal opportunity" opportunity. For me, if the premium tag structure is put in place and those premium areas are the areas I want to put as my choices for Elk and Deer, I just won't. So you are not going to make the extra \$55 you're going for you'll lose \$45 or \$145 I would have paid in the first place - and all those other purchase relative to big game hunting go along with it. Sounds like a lose, lose, lose. It is poor stewardship of public trust and loyalty and a mismanagement of the department you've been entrusted with by the tax payers and outdoors men, women and youth that make it possible for you to get paid for what you probably love to do.

Love the 365 expiration. In my outdoor ministry efforts I probably invite 100 adults and their kids new to hunting and fishing to join me beginning early in the summer and I dare to say more than 75% of them decline to fish, hunt or put in for a tag if it is after June because they want a license that will last them a full year. Just like the math with the premium tag program, you and everyone else lost when it doesn't serve the user well enough. Consider that when deciding on the premium tag program.

This isn't a shell game boys and girls. Mess with my loyalty and my money and you'll lose me from the game altogether. I'm sure you feel the magnitude of your decisions and I don't assume to know the woes of expenses vs income. Welcome to the world of every working American currently trying to enjoy and preserve our liberties under blind leadership. Please lead in a way that does something for the people, not to the people.

Leave the current structure in tact!

What I've seen so far does not look good.

I support keeping the youth hunt fees intact but,

>I do not support the premium structure for fees or hunt areas, Raising

>the cost for resident elk to \$145 in Arizona is Ludicrous!

Current Resident fees for elk in;

CO - \$46

WY - \$52

MT - \$20

I understand that costs are increasing. Raise the fee for nonresident elk tags up to \$800 like Montana has versus \$650 in the proposal.

AZ is the trophy elk state in the U.S. why not demand a premium from NR?

To whom that reads these comments,

It would be fantastic if fishing licenses were a year from the date of purchase. I always get the urge to fish in the fall and I don't want to buy a license for just two months. So I always tell myself I'll wait till January to buy a license but I get busy and forget till the urge to fish in the fall returns. It's a cycle I can not seem to break so I haven't fished in twenty years. Now I need to buy new gear but I will not buy it for just two of months of fishing. If I knew my license would be good for a year from the date of purchase I'd love to go fishing again. Thank you for your time.

I am so against the Premium Hunts. ALL Sportsmen should have a chance to draw a tag. Premium Hunts with Premium prices will discourage so many, it will be a rich man sport. Most average person can not afford the prices today. I think the game and fish should start with looking at their spending. More you have the more you spend.

50 years of hunting and fishing here in Arizona

Hello,

It appears there were some oversights in the goals and guiding principles I wanted to bring up that can help leave the fees where they currently are. The only "simplification" noted is it adds 2-pole and trout stamps to the licenses. So, Why would this DOUBLE hunting permit fees?

Regarding "allows the Commission/Department to operate like a business." YOU ARE A REGULATORY AGENCY-NOT A BUSINESS. The State of Arizona already has a taxation agency there is no need for another that is competitive with private game ranches.

"Provides Commission flexibility to adjust license, permitting structure..." Just because you have the ability to do something does not make it right or just. Please do not price us out of hunting!
"and pricing to meet customer demand and market conditions." I am an economist and can say this fee structure goes against this goal and actually diminishes this "goal." Customer demands would lower the price of tags and offer more tags. This goal does neither. For market conditions, as you are aware we are coming out of the worst economic conditions since the GREAT DEPRESSION! Disposable income levels are at an all time low, hyper-inflation of ammunition and commodities are horrible and unemployment levels are at record highs! If your goal is meeting market conditions and customer demand please fire your current economist. I would gladly consult for FREE! I have the appropriate licensing, education and experience for the job. The only market segment this all helps is the wealthy. If this is the group you are trying to satisfy than this is a great fee schedule.

In regards to the "Guiding Principles"

Consider prior statutory fee caps? Why is this a goal. Fee caps are instruments so regulatory agencies don't get carried away and are already set extremely too high.

This goes against "removal of barriers for recruitment of new hunters/anglers. Increasing fees negates this belief in its entirety! Who's genius idea was it to say "hey, lets double prices, this will remove barriers and increase the number of hunters and anglers." That person should be FIRED for incompetency.

In Regards to "Simplified structure, bundled privileges, reduced cost for youth." There is no simplification since you break out standard and premium hunts, there is no reduced cost for youth since the price is added to the application fees and parents fees. The fees are just piggy-backed or put on the front and back ends. This is how the criminal bankers did loans prior to 2008.

"In regards to maintain revenue & services." You are not a business, you are a regulatory agency. You should be operating off of budgets and adjusting accordingly on an annual basis. Since you are so set on running it like a business, run it like a smart business and not like a corporation in the stock market. TRIM THE FAT, do away with wasteful spending, consolidate debt and expenses. Your not a guide so can cut down on the extravagance at the outdoor shows.

You are in a position because the people of Arizona trust you to do whats best for the outdoors person. Not what's best for the bank account or treasury of Arizona.

Please sleep on it, re look at it and I am convinced you will see how horrible of an idea this current fee schedule/table is to the outdoors person.

The burden of the fee's are the hunters to bear only. increase the anglers to make it not so one-sided.

I hope you are fair in increasing the prices by doubling or tripling permit fees for GUIDES!

Thank you

Commissioner Madden, Yesterday I sent in feedback on the proposed fee structure by the AZGFD. It is my opinion that the G&F has essentially gone "rogue" in fees and is out of control. While the overall intention appears to be an advantage, the rates and fees proposed will eliminate the ability for the average resident to afford to hunt in Arizona as we have been doing. This appears to be turning into a "rich man's game" where soon we won't be able to afford to even apply. This is especially true when we compare this to 3 (or 4) sister states as I noted below. Please know that I felt compelled to send this correspondence directly to each of the G&F Commissioners. As such, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions on the issue. Note that regarding the "Premium tag" philosophy, only Utah has done this for some tags whereas the AZ G&F is proposing to do this for ALL Sept and early Oct bull elk tags. CO, NM, and WY do not charge their residents for "premium tags" period, as it should be. Below is the feedback sent to the AZGFD listed email address with the exception of the spreadsheet attachment, which is not an option here. Know that I looked up all current rates for the compared tags and licenses for 2013 and would be glad to send it to you (need an email address however). Thank you for your time, Paul Dufek sent Tuesday, June 4th, 2013 To Whom it may concern, To be honest I'm not sure where to start. First perhaps, I'll go on record as stating that it's doubtful that the "24 sportsman's organizations" that supported the recent Senate Bill 1223 had any idea that the AZGFD had an agenda to eliminate many forms of outdoor activities from our heritage by way of gouging our residents to the extent that we will no longer be able to afford this God-given pastime. I'd also be first in line to reject the control that was given to the department based on the fee structure you're proposing. Your excuse that this will be "simplified" is also quite misleading. Simple perhaps in terms of number of licenses available, but at the same time forcing us to "purchase" licenses for things most of us will never use, need, or want. I guess we could be thankful that you just don't turn in all tags and licenses into a huge auction where the "average resident" will no longer have any legitimate "opportunity" to hunt and/or fish in this state as it will have become a "rich man's" sport. This is truly sad. You might ask what I'm basing this on, and that's a fair question. To that end I compared Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah's license fees and tags to that of Arizona (for Residents that is). I took the current fees for each, averaged them, then compared to Arizona's both current and proposed fee structure and found the following: Application Fees currently 2.0X proposed fee 3.5X You need to explain why you are doing this to us as the average cost of application fees are \$3.67, yet you want to raise it to \$13?. Fishing License currently 1.5X proposed fee 1.4X (move in the right direction, yet still too high) Hunting License currently 1.7X proposed fee 1.9X This is already too high and you want to increase it more? Combo Hunt and Fish currently 1.6X proposed fee 1.7X This is already too high and you want to increase it more? Turkey Tag currently 0.9X proposed fee 0.9X Good, keep as-is, it's consistent with our sister states. Deer Tag currently 1.2X proposed fee 2.9X The average cost of a deer tag is currently \$35 in the other three states. You want to raise it up to \$100 Jr. Deer Tag currently 1.0X proposed fee 1.0X Good, keep as-is! Elk Tag currently 1.8X proposed fee 3.2X The average elk tag for residents is 62.33, yet you want to increase the cost for a resident elk tag to \$200? You should be fired! Jr. Elk Tag currently 1.3X proposed fee 1.3X This is higher than our sister states so why aren't you lowering this? What is your justification for allowing this? Antelope currently 1.8X proposed fee 1.9X The average cost of an antelope tag is 47.33 for our "sister states" residents, yet you want to raise our tag fee to \$90? Jr. Antelope Tag currently 2.1X proposed fee .?.X You don't identify what this fee would be, but likely keep it the same forcing our youth to pay double the fee. Again, this makes no sense. Bighorn Tag currently 0.9X proposed fee 1.0 This is consistent with our sister states. I've attached a spreadsheet with the calculations taken off of Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico's G&F websites today. These rates are accurate, but I'd guess you already knew this data. Obviously I would vote to either keep as-is, or bring them in line w/our sister states and reduce the fee structure for residents. Thank you for your time and consideration

The best thing that you have and you want to mess it up. Colorado may charge twice as much but at least you can buy over the counter. So I guess I will be spending my money else where.

Please streamline the on-line license and permit programs.....

I would like to see more recognition for the veterans who support the AZGF. Other than being 100% disabled is not enough. Maybe a discount on the hunting license, or tags. Or maybe an extra draw point

for the veteran. The Navajo Nation Game and Fish gives a discount to veterans who show a DD214 honorable discharge papers along with the hunting application.

Everyone,

As the cost of everything is going up I can see the logic in this. However, I don't see the logic in reducing some of the non-resident fees and I think almost doubling the processing/application fee is way to much. Thank you for your consideration.

How can ya ask for fees of any kind? The fishing is the worsed of any state Ive fished. The hunting ya have to be drawn for and aint much to hunt and if ya brougjt home any of the deer Ive seen in this state (where I used to live) they would ask if ya covered the babies white spots , they are so small. And the nerve to ask for money to use more then 1 pole fishing , thats so petty . Aint nothing but limp lack of fight trout anyway. Cant wait to sell out and move to a state that has fishing & hunting for a price its worth. In this state it aint worth much.

In regards to the simplificationof the fishing license please, please, please do away with the limit on fishing poles. A person can effective use only 1 fishing pole at a time anyway. I have fished many, many other states and AZ is the only one in which I

Hello, I am a former arizona resident of thirty years and have had a lifetime license for quite some time. I have since reluctantly moved out of state for work. One of the most enjoyed parts of living in Arizona was the wonderful hunting opportunities it provided for myself and my family. Fortunately my wife and I are still able to use our lifetime hunt licenses but are extremely bummed that we are now pooled with all the other nonresidents that apply. The 10% cap is a really harsh adjustment.

In an effort to encourage more to invest in lifetime licenses by others I would recommend allowing lifetime license holders to be kept in the resident pool and not subject to the cap. I am fine with paying the nonresident fees as I wouldn't expect to get all the benefits of a resident. I imagine that increasing the frequency that nonresident lifetime license holders draw tags could also dramatically increase revenue generation for the azgfd.

In an effort to prevent abuse of this (nonresidents taking citizenship in an for six months, buying a lifetime license and then heading back home out of state) you could perhaps require a 5 or 10 year residency as a stipulation. I dont think this would be too much of an issue but perhaps a solution. Thank you so much for the consideration and keep up the great work.

All the hunts need to stay the same price. It is hard enough with the price of gas to be able get where your going as it is.If need to cut the # of tags in a number of units

I totally agree with a license being valid for 365 days as opposed to a calendar year.

I would also like to see a structure where I could purchase the licenses/privileges I want. By that I mean I hunt and fish, but my wife only fishes. The existing Family License does not work for us. I end up buying my Combination Hunt/Fish License, a Two Pole Stamp, a Migratory Bird Stamp, an Arizona Waterfowl Stamp, sometimes a mountain lion tag (just in case right!) and this year an Urban License, and then her Fishing License plus a Trout Stamp. I don't bow hunt, so the Super Conservation License is not for us. I think some type of "mix and match" format if I purcshed all of the above at once at a discount would be great.

By the way, I appreciate everything you folks do. Not many people understand that nearly all wildlife management in Arizona is funded by sportsmen and that Game and Fish handles that. Thank you all for your hard work.

I am a firm believer of the license simplification and the MDF supported this measure—however, we do not support the premium tag measure and would like to see that not go through. I think we as hunters have enough issues with one another and just adding this class to the application will only make it worst.

I love the idea of the youth tags and family tags being lowered and I have no issues with the increase in

tag prices but the premium tags I do not nor does the MDF support.

Thank you for your time and for allowing everyone to be able to voice their opinions.

To Whom it may concern,

As a Department employee I am writing to provide some input for your consideration as you move forward with this process.

As an employee and someone who enforces these different licenses I strongly support a simpler license structure. Under our current structure I see very high compliance rates and people seem to be “figuring it out” but there are a lot of ways where a person can get messed up. Anything we can do to simplify the process the better. Most of the folks I talk to in the field are trying to do the right thing and they want the opportunity to spend some time in the field hunting or fishing.

Since our presentation has come out there are two comments that I hear the most. The first is that people don't think that it will matter what they say because the department will do whatever they want to do anyway. We have definitely lost credibility with a lot of our constituents when it comes to hunt structures, guidelines, etc. People don't think what they say matters and that the department has their mind made up already. We need to consider this and only make changes that are supported or that are absolutely necessary. (Yes we need to increase costs, because operational costs have gone up. But do we need to implement some of the other changes? Maybe not.)

The second thing I have heard is an overwhelming dislike of the premium hunt structure. I have heard a few comments in the past from people who have said they would pay more for increased opportunity at a “premium” tag. The majority however are scraping by and say they are lucky to be in the field. For these folks I think we need to do whatever we can to cover our costs while minimizing any increases. People feel this premium structure will price them out of some of the better hunts across the state that they love to participate in. This is totally against the North American Model of Wildlife Management that we have been holding on a pedestal for quite a while. Another argument against this type of hunt is that those hunts are not all premium. Just because a hunt occurs at a specific time frame does not mean it is a great hunt. The model that was shown for deer and elk are two different models and have some contradictions. In the deer example the units looked at are alternative management units. On the elk front all elk units are included, both alternative management and standard management. If we are bent on going this direction it should only be for alternative management units. The other thing that would need to be addressed is the hunter density. If a person is going to pay premium costs then they should not have to compete with 300 other hunters during that hunt. Overall though it would be preferred if that option just went away.

When looking at the proposed cost of elk tags it is apparent that for residence we are higher than the rest of the west. I don't know if that is appropriate or not but for those people out hunting for meat I think it is a little high. If we are going to increase costs this much I like the cow/bull differential. If a guy wants to go after meat he can get a cow tag and spend a little less. Also if a guy wants a bull he can pay a little more because if successful he will come home with more meat to offset the cost difference.

Something to consider for the future might be a poverty license. For someone who comes in that is xx% below the poverty line we have a reduced price license so they can get that and either fish at an urban lake, kill rabbits etc. for food. Alaska has this type of license but it is only for those who are very poor. Anyway, thanks for considering these thoughts and if I come up with any more valuable input I will let you know.

I think the cost of the urban fishing license in Phx metro area is too high, considering the temperature in the summer time. Some nites during the summer the temps. are still in the 100's and nobody can really fish in that weather, not to mention the amount of fish that die and surface in the summer. It would be nice if we could fish year round, but in this climate its not really possible, therefore i beleive the price of

fishing lisenes should be reduced. Thanks

I would Like to see the Game and Fish change the pioneer license to the age whenever you start drawing social security, (62, 65, or disability). Most of the people that age cannot afford the higher fees and physically cannot hunt that hard. Usually just fish. Hopefully, you will give this some consideration.

Why are you not revisiting the guide license and Outfitter fees? Seems to me that there is a great opportunity to make their fees equally priced and they are profiting off our "state" animals and our "land" to operate a business that is largely focused only on quality. It appears everyone should pay to play and today if you are raising fees on tags than there should be equal fees for them as well. There appears to be more guides and outfitters especially on the trophy/quality hunts than ever.

Hello,

I just finished reviewing the full presentation for the "potential" license structure and fee changes. I have no issues with 90% of what is being proposed, but I do find significant fault with the implementation of a different price structure for "premium" hunts as opposed to "general" tags, especially for deer. I've been fortunate enough to draw what would be considered "premium" deer tags three times in the last 8 years and in no way were any of them "premium" hunts. I drew a southern AZ Dec WT tag and hunted from dawn to dusk for 8 days and saw a grand total of 5 bucks, and we killed two of them (I shot a fork on the last day). The last Kaibab muley hunt I went on resulted in not being able to find anything better than a 3x3. Last December I was in the 35s for a Dec muzzleloader tag and it took 6 days to find a single mule deer buck. G&F has done a good job with trying to get more people afield by issuing more and more tags for more and more seasons, but you can't have it both ways. Either cut the overall tag numbers and make those rut hunts actual "premium" experiences, or don't charge people more for a tag that is no better than the rest of the hunts in Oct/Nov. I've been an AZ resident for 13 years and have yet to draw an elk tag so I can't really say too much about elk...

Greetings,

I would like to provide feedback on one specific item on the proposed hunting and fishing license concepts.

I am very apposed to a "Premium Hunt" definition or classification in Arizona for any species.

To the holder of the future of elk hunting in Arizona

AFTER VIEWING YOUR VIDEO- DISCUSSION OF WHAT THE PROPOSED CHANGES ARE

and THE EFFECT THAT IT WILL HAVE ON THE AVERAGE HUNTER, I SEE THREE THINGS.

1. IT WILL COST MORE TO HUNT.
- 2.MORE DIFFICULT TO DRAW A GOOD BULL TAG.
3. MAKES IT EASY FOR THE WEALTHY TO GET A CHOICE BULL TAG.

(More money to the AZGFD). and that's OK.

This is an unbiased view , but knowledgeable.

(I will not be hunting elk again- after this fall).

I am 76 years old ; So, I am retiring my bows & rifles,

I have taken many bulls in Arizona during the past 40 years.

All good things do end ; It's been a wonderful challenge & satisfying conclusion.

This is a picture of the bull's antlers , that I harvested last fall . thank you

First of all, how can you justify having higher tag pricing than all of the surrounding states? Second, when I asked years ago why tag numbers were so low in this state, a poaching problem was the given answer. This certainly won't help that cause. Third, why don't we allow those who live in the county/unit they are hunting to pay a regular fee and those who reside out of that county/unit to pay a small surcharge? I absolutely am against the trophy hunt pricing. I would wait forever to get drawn only to pay more-great theory(sarcasm). Fourth, charge the out-of-state hunters more!

I understand that prices need to be raised. However, that revenue needs to go into game management and enforcement, NOT, administrative fees or positions! Thank you for your time

As a Arizona Resident and I am fine with the give and take that the new License Simplification would implement for Residence of Arizona. However, I feel that a key problem that has existed with the Licensing for Out of State is continuing to get worse. When you compare Elk tags in this state to Colorado an out of state tag here is \$150 more due to purchasing a hunting License through Arizona. On top of that if you are not drawn that's \$150 bucks that you donate to this state. CO only charges processing and a habitat stamp combined that only comes out to around \$25. For someone who has hunted with family from CA in CO many years and purchased over the counter tags there for upwards of \$600 I would gladly hunt there over AZ to save \$150. My family members in CA have bypassed AZ for years because of this (In my Opinion) Flawed Licensing System. Out of State hunters bring in a lot of money not only to Fish and Game but to the state as well.

I feel that by including a hunting license for out of state residence and a nominal fee when for processing you would see a large influx of out of state resident applications. For the Out of State residents who are not drawn there should be a pre-processing charge and a cost of a bonus point. This idea is very similar to the way CO handles Out of State applicants and it just makes sense for someone that wants to hunt a prime unit.

Example: If there is a similar unit in both states that normally takes 5 bonus points in CO you would spend around \$110 to gain 5 points. Here in AZ an Out of State Resident would spend \$750. To most people, including myself this is a no-brainer. I hope that this idea will be discussed and a financial analysis of the current and proposed idea be accomplished. I thank you for the opportunity to be heard.

I have been hunting in AZ. for over 50 yrs. I realize you need to fund your life style the way you want. Hunting wasn't a rich man's sport when I was young but has become so. If I never hunt in AZ again it will not be missed.

I am opposed to having Premium hunt tags.

What is going to happen to the extra money if the Premium Hunt is my first choice and I get drawn for my second choice which is a non Premium Hunt on a mail in application ?

I also think that people who wait until the last day to apply for tags online and the site goes down before their application can be submitted should be out of luck. A deadline is a deadline. Everybody knows the website almost always goes down.

I have missed out on more than one tag because of that

I don't think you should sell tags online on credit when mail in applications must be sent in cash (a check).

I have been an AZ Lifetime combo license holder since it was introduced, and hunted deer and elk every time I could get a tag. I always put in for elk with bull as 1st choice and antlerless as second choice, since I am not a trophy hunter (mine are on my plate). After 28 years I had not planned to leave AZ, but did in 2008, due to work considerations and have retired in Alabama. I have not put in for deer, and only applied for the early limited elk hunts due to the cost of out of state tags.

I can hunt elk in Colorado as a non-resident cheaper than AZ with a lifetime license, or TX for less if you count travel. If you lower the antlerless tags, or let me apply for tags at somewhere between resident

and non-resident I would be back. But between the current cost, and requirement to buy out of state tags, and the couple of thousand dollars travel cost, I cannot afford to hunt AZ.

Alabama does not have elk, but for deer allows 3 bucks per year and 2 doe per day in most of the state.

Retirement is like a long vacation in Las Vegas. The goal is to enjoy it the fullest, but not so fully that you run out of money.

I now live out of state. Lived in Arizona for 20 years. It use to be that I could apply for Elk and if I was drawn, then pay for license and tag fees. Now, even if I do not get drawn, like this year, I had to pay for my out of state license up front for nothing. I think that is unfair. And, I still do not understand the % chance of draw for an out of state applicant?

I hope you don't increase our license fees and tag fees, I'm disabled and so is my wife on a small fixed income and will be hard put to come up with extra money

I surport the Bill SB 1223 on Licenses, and any other bill that helps the Game and Fish Departments to manage the sale and make necessary adjustments as needed.

As an Arizona Hunter, I thought I'd throw in my 2 cents. California is screwed up in many ways, but they did do something very smart a couple years ago. They changed their hunt/fish licenses to an electronic system. People are able to order stamps and licenses online. This would be a tremendous improvement for Arizona. For example, I have friends who come out here from California for Dove Opener. They have stop at a store in Arizona to pick up their out of state license. And there is always the worry that the stores might be out of licenses. It would be far easier for them to be able to order those licenses online before they come out here. Also I think hunters should be able to buy their license at any time, and that it would then go 365 days from the date of purchase. Let's get rid of the calendar year license nonsense. It's all about offering people greater convenience.

To whom it may concern,

Regarding the license simplification, I have some concerns with the proposed changes. I do like the proposed changes to resident licenses, both fishing and hunting as this will make it simpler and people will not worry if they have the correct fishing license for a particular species or area. However, I do not feel that yearly non-resident licenses should decrease in price as is proposed with some of the bundled licenses. I also disagree with the creation of premium hunts. I feel this would complicate the application process as individuals would not know how much money to send in if they are applying for multiple hunts that are not both premium or standard. Also, I have the money to pay these fees, but I have many friends who may not be able to afford the increased fees for an archery bull elk hunt in the rut and this may keep many hunters from getting to experience something as incredible as a rut elk hunt. I also do not believe that non-resident tag fees should be decreased at all as was done with some of the species. I know I pay a much larger amount of money when I try to go to New Mexico to hunt deer and I have no problem with this as should any person who comes to Arizona to hunt game. I know that money has been tight for game and fish since no money is received from the state, but I feel this is hurting hunter opportunity which is supposed to be very important to game and fish agencies. Maybe cuts should be made to programs that are controversial, that don't produce income, and that have proven rather unsuccessful such as bringing wolfs back to Arizona or spending money on jaguars that occasionally roam into Arizona. I hope you consider these concerns as the new program may hurt opportunity in Arizona. Thank you for your time

Why cant buying a hunt or fish lic be the same as a driver lic? Meaning; if you buy it in june, then you have to renew it in june. It seems very unfair it always has to be in october!

Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the new license proposals.

I would recommend that the Lifetime Combination Hunt/Fish license include Urban License privileges.

Thank you for your work on this fine project.

I was born and raised in Arizona. Dad took us hunting and fishing a lot. Then I got married, job movement, yada yada yada. Now I live in Missouri in the summers and about six months in my house in Sun City, Arizona. When I tried to get a license at your main facility up north on Cave Creek or wherever, the young lady was not very customer friendly. Treated me like a leper, actually. Left a bad taste for what I used to respect. So, I delay my annual trip until after deer season here in Missouri, do my fishing here, hunt small game here, and if I want elk or antelope, other states will probably get my business. Apparently, my lifetime license in Missouri will prevent me from ever being considered a resident in Arizona, and the non-resident fees are just too steep. I will check the new regulations when they come out, but my experience three years ago pretty much soured me on dealing with you people.

AZGFD,

Hello! I am okay with the regular increase in tag fees and am happy to see some savings in combining licenses, however I am strongly opposed to the concept of "premium" tag fees.

Here are most of my comments references these new concept ideas.

First, I think that the combination of the fishing fees and carrying on into the combination hunt fish licenses is overall a very good idea.

The one outstanding exception is that the non-resident combo license fees are apparently being dropped in price by almost \$100 with an increased value to those customers. Residents are getting the increased value but are overall having to pay more for that value. I suggest that there be a re-evaluation of the non-resident fees to reflect these items, that is that they should pay at least what they did before if not rounding the fees UP to the nearest \$10s similar to what was done with most of the resident fees.

I do have some concerns about the 365 day duration of licenses as to the administration and tracking of them but if there are ways to administratively control and advise license holders of their expirations without additional cost to the azgfd, it is a great cost/value for the sportsperson. I realize that it is the sportsperson's own responsibility to make sure that they have valid tags/licenses but this could become a nightmare to many who are forgetful or not self disciplined/organized.

I am generally against the Premium fee concept. I watched the online meeting video and thought that most of the comments given there reflect my feelings. However, if such a concept were to be implemented, then I strongly recommend that the premium hunt fees be reduced. For instance, the proposed deer tag fee triples in price and the elk tag fee increases by nearly 60%. These increases are, in my opinion way out of line for the average AZ hunter! We are not getting any special draw privileges/ "bonus points"/ or any other benefit from these Premium concepts. I also believe that they unfairly discriminate against the special hunting groups (muzzle loaders, archers, etc.).

I also think that several of the other proposed ideas may have good benefits to most hunting and fishing sportsman and should be more thoroughly investigated and thought out and then presented to the public for comments.

The best thing I could propose concerning fishing licenses is to make them good for a full year from date of purchase versus calendar year. Most fees and licenses are valid for one year from date of purchase except for fishing licenses.

Another suggestion is to make a 3 day license for a reasonable cost. I am only an occasional fisherman so I hate paying full price in September for a license that will expire in 3 months. I think my suggestions will actually generate more revenue from people like myself.

As President of the [redacted] I would like to add to the discussion regarding licensing and fees.

In regards to those of us who seek out reptiles and amphibians I believe we need to assess the need for

separate licensing for reptile and amphibian. Requiring a hunting license for Reptiles and a fishing license for Amphibians seems redundant to me. As an example, California only requires a Fishing license to seek out reptiles and amphibians for photography or even "take." One license, one fee, for both reptiles and amphibians. Here in Arizona, if I want to "hunt" reptiles AND amphibians I have to obtain a combo license, instead of just a hunting OR a fishing license.

So my suggestion is that for pursuit, hunting, or take of reptiles AND amphibians (per bag limits, seasons, etc) only a basic hunting license shall be required. Thank you

Streamlining and Revenue Producing being key, as well as flexibility, if it hasn't already been suggested, I would like to suggest a new "Arizona 1 Day Fishing Permit". This new permit could be designed and styled similar to the Tonto National Forest Permit, with a scratch-out use date, and would be required to keep on your person the day of use, like regular fishing licenses are required to be. They would be valid for any 1 day in a calendar year, and would be perfect for those who might only get out to fish 2 or 3 times a year. Perhaps having size/bag limits printed on the back as well.

They could be bought in multiples, given as gifts, and would surely stimulate retail sales of fishing accessories as well. Kids of license age, as well as friends and/or relatives who like to fish, but don't get the chance to go often, would love having 'grampa', or your brother, or even spouse or friend, give you a fishing permit as a gift. They could be put in Christmas cards, Birthday cards, etc, or bought and given as Employer Incentive Awards, Door Prizes, or virtually any purpose as a "use it when you want it" special gift. The marketing opportunities are almost unlimited.

Arizona cities and towns that participate in the Urban Fishing program that would be accepting of an "Any Arizona Water" 1 day permit, could receive a small proportional percentage of the revenue as well. Avid Arizona fishermen, both Statewide and Urban, will continue to buy the regular yearly licenses as a cost-saving feature, so yearly license revenue should not be adversely affected. And the additional revenue from a 1 Day, Use-it-When-You-Want-it Fishing Permit, even moderately marketed, would almost certainly help with AZGFD operation expenses and budgets.

It would seem to be a Win/Win for the state recreation business as a whole, outdoor sport supply retailers, and that 'what-to-get-John/Jane gift idea.

Like I said, if it hasn't already been proposed, I hope you give this some serious discussion. Thank You

I've read in part that you would like to run the department like a business and make a profit to help pay for insurance increases and pension plans. It has been a long time according to your graph. And revenue has dropped off some on the same graph. Well guess what? I and others haven't had an increase either and the economy hasn't improved along with your graph. As with any business including where I work we've all had to make cutbacks to maintain. Why not publish some of your cutbacks and personnel cuts so we can understand how it has affected you.

As far as input on your proposals here is how I feel about them in no special order.

I'm not in favor of having a trophy class type hunt which costs more money and points.

As far as increasing the license fee I am in favor of a reasonable increase but not in favor of increasing the application fee to buy and maintain a computer system of your own to reduce or eliminate the shut down at deadline time. The deadline is the deadline people shouldn't wait for the last minute to apply.

The tag fees are getting outrageous for residents. How can you justify such increases.

I was born and lived my life in Arizona and accompanied my father when I was too young to hunt. We (Arizona) have always been a leader in hunting opportunities and should not try to be NM, Utah, or Colorado. It should remain a unilateral non class based hunt for everyone.

Dont think there gonna change much on the price of tags and licenses. But one thing i think they should look into is letting your license carry over thru January 31. Just cause thats realy when the hunting

season is over. That way as a hunter all we have to purchase is another archery tag for the new year. Then in August for the new archery season we can purchase our new license for the hunting season. And be ready for the rifle season and the archery season...

I think some consideration should be given for public safety discounts for active/retired military/police/firefighters. Many benefits have been significantly reduced for these groups of public servants; a small discount would recognize their commitment to our state's residents and encourage persons with law enforcement and paramedic training to be in the field as "back-up" for AZGF staff.

In response to the proposed license fees.

1. The new licence fee structure recommendations are ok.

2. The new tag fee structure is NOT ok. In particular the recommendation to set higher fees for so called premium deer and elk hunts. These hunts are the only hunts left in the state that are what I would consider quality hunts. They are also very difficult to draw. A deer tag and a elk tag is a tag and those hunts take years to draw. Set a price for a deer and elk tag and leave all tag fees the same NO premium tags fees. This is catering to people with more money.

To whom it may concern:

I am a non-resident hunter from Pennsylvania. My family visits your Great State almost every year. For several years my son and I have have been trying to draw an archery elk tag for Unit 6A. Having to purchase a license before applying for a tag has been very expensive and there is no telling if either of us will ever draw. If one of us draws we will both make the trip.

As part of your License Simplification, I propose that you make it more affordable for non-residents to apply and earn points. Thank you.

Dear AZGFD, I have been an Arizona hunter and fisherman for 43 years. I believe that the department has done a good job overall with the management of our wildlife resources.

From what I have gathered, I feel lowering the price for youth hunters is basically a good Idea. I understand that new hunter/fisherman recruitment is essential and vital for the program.

Myself and most if not all the hunters/fishermen I know started going to hunting camp with their families (mostly dads, uncles and cousins) way before any of us could actually hunt ourselves. This is where we learned the love of the outdoors, camping, cooking, shooting our .22's, taking part in the actual hunt and then learning field dressing and game care if someone in the group was successful.

This brings me to the point I want to make. Please do not raise the fees for big game animals so much that it prices most middle and lower income people out of the game. I truly believe that this is the core and majority of people who are the hunters and fisherman of this state. Cause of pricing us out will result in many of us not being able to go hunting and fishing, if we can't afford to go this severely limits the chance that the kids will get to go and learn as I did, thus reducing hunter/fishermen recruitment.

Arizona's wildlife and resources belong to the Arizona sportsman and sportswomen.

Here our my suggestions for resident fees.

Raise adult combination license fees \$5.00

Lower youth combination license fees \$10.00

Raise Premium Deer Tags \$20.00

Raise regular Deer Tags \$5.00

Raise Premium Elk Tags (Archery Bull, Muzzle Loader Bull and Early Bull) \$65.00

Raise all Cow Elk hunts \$25.00

Raise Antelope tags \$45.00

Raise all bear, turkey and javalina tags \$8.00

Leave predator (mountain lion) fees the same.

Most of the fees I recommend above in my opinion, would not price the average Arizona sportsman like myself out of the game we love.

Nonresidents should pay the make-up and balance of what is needed to make your program work and run as is required for sustainability.

I think that the new rates are crazy. The fees are already to high.

There are a lot of people like me that go hunting just to get out. Most years I do not even get to shoot at anything let alone bring something home.

I enjoy the fact of trying and being out. It cost me more to go hunting than it does to feed my family for the month. That is not right.

I feel that a couple more trophy hunts should be offered at a select premium price and increase the out of state fees. This would absorb the cost for Arizona residents.

Look at the average income for the state in rural areas. It is low and yet fees like this keep going up. I know people every year that don't get a hunting license because it now is to expensive and yet before they would just because.

Reduce the fees for those of us that live here.

Thank you for letting me give my opinion.

Probably the wrong forum, but I would like to see a change in the Big Game application process, where a person is able to apply for Deer and Elk at the same time instead of Elk in January and Deer in June.

Don't understand the need to apply at two different times. In almost all western states you are able to apply for all big game at the same time.

Why is Arizona different?

when we buy a hunting or fishing license online we shouldn't have print our own license

when a gets drawn for elk or antelope fills thier tag cannot draw for two years

The cost is causing young people not to be-able to hunt. It put a problem for a hold lot of family we are losing many hunter the away it is. So raising prices will only chase more hunter and hunter to be away.

I am against the new proposed changes. The new fees are outrageous, how can a typical family afford these unjust fees? I propose that you have the application fee capped at 10 dollars, all junior licenses and tags be at 25 dollars, you increase the tag fees by no more than 10% for any given species and do away with the premium tag allocations, and no more than 20% more for non-resident tag fees, and if you purchase a bonus point only it should be at 5 dollars, you can't tell me it takes that much man power to justify that it costs the application fee. You will also need to increase the hunting and fishing license's by no more that 10% too. This will be justifiable, otherwise you are going to be pricing many people to look for other alternatives for hobbies, and then who will be supporting the Arizona Game and Fish in the future?

Thank you for allowing the public to comment on the proposed License Simplification structure. My comments below are in response to the License Simplification PowerPoint proposal on the AZGFD website. While I support the concept of the License Simplification proposal, I believe there are several issues in the proposal that are counter to the Department's mission and goals.

First, I fully understand the Department's need to have flexibility in setting license and tag fees in response to market conditions and its customer's needs. I applaud this effort. I realize the cost of business has continued to grow despite license and tag fees not increasing since 2006. This in itself justifies the need to increase certain licenses and tag fees. However, there seems to be inequity in fees when considering license and tag fees across the spectrum. Below are some examples:

- The youth license proposal of \$5 is unreasonably low. As a parent trying to recruit my children into hunting, I fully understand and appreciate the need to have reduced license and tag fees for youth, however \$5 is giving it away. I would suggest setting the youth license at no less than 25%, but no more than 50% the cost of the adult license.
- Tag fees for predators are unreasonably low. Both turkey and javelina tag fees are more than bear and mountain lion which are significantly larger, less abundant, and more valued as a trophy. I would suggest increasing bear and mountain lion tag fees to the statutory maximum, which would still be a

steal. I highly doubt the increase of \$5-10 will deter any sportsmen from purchasing.

- Current fur prices for Bobcats are running between \$500 - 1000 yet we are only charging \$5 for the CITES tag for trappers/hunters to sell their bobcat.
- Pheasant has no tag fee.
- The price for non-resident bighorn sheep is undervalued. While under the NA model of Wildlife Management, wildlife must be accessible to all, I believe this permit is undervalued for its economic potential.
- Guide licenses continue to be unreasonable low. This license allows private individuals to make a profit off of a public resource. Most guides are charging \$2500 to \$10,000 per hunt, yet their license is only \$300. In addition the fee is the same for resident guides versus non-resident guides. This needs to change and be more reflective of the market.
- Lastly, many special licenses the AZGFD offers require no fee, yet the Department spends considerable time in the administration of those licenses.

Second, with the cost of business going up, I understand and support the need to increase the application fee. However, nearly doubling the fee is difficult to accept. I would suggest either a lesser amount around \$10 or conducting an internal study to research the cost of paper applications versus online applications and then set a separate fee structure for each application method that is indicative of the costs of processing the different application types.

Third, the proposal of "premium" tags is completely contrary to the principles of the N.A. model of wildlife management of wildlife being held in public trust for democratic hunting. The creation of a premium hunt creates an upper class, whether that is the animal or the hunter, which then becomes inaccessible to some segments of the public. In addition, the proposed hunts included under the "premium" suggestion are not necessarily premium hunts. For example, a 25 permit September bull rifle or muzzleloader hunt in an elk alternative management unit such as unit 9 could definitely be argued as a "premium" hunt. Yet under the proposal the 775 permit early bull archery hunt with another 25 early antlerless elk hunters hunting at the same time in unit 6A is also considered a "premium" hunt. I doubt anyone could argue there is any similarity in the quality of the hunt or animals between the two hunts listed above, yet under the current proposal they both would be classified "premium" hunts and cost the same.

If the Department considers this proposal, I would strongly suggest the Department look more closely at a proposal more along the lines of separate fee structure for standard management hunt units versus alternative management hunt units. At least the different management structure results in a better quality hunt and animal, which could possibly justify the higher fee. However, even at that I believe the Department should carefully consider the type of hunt. Again, there is a big difference in quality of both the hunt and reasonable expectation of animal harvested between either an early rifle bull elk tag versus a late rifle bull elk tag or an early Kaibab rifle deer tag versus a late Kaibab rifle deer tag.

Also, if the Department strongly considers this avenue, I would suggest there needs to be reasonable alternative opportunities to avoid "premium" fees. For example, if all early archery bull elk hunts become "premium" fee structure, I believe those permit numbers should decrease and more opportunity be directed towards an earlier or later hunt structure that would fall under the standard fees. Lastly on this topic, the creation of "premium" fees is in complete contrast to the Department's goals and principles set forth in the License Simplification bill to simplify license structures and remove barriers for recruitment and retention. The creation of "premium" fees creates a whole new category of fees thus confusing the customer and creating another barrier to recruitment and retention!

Fourth, I applaud the Department on the proposal of different fees for antlerless elk versus antlered elk. I believe the fees are very defensible and maybe even low. I support antlerless elk at \$125 and would suggest the statutory minimum be increased for bull elk. I believe \$150 for bull elk is low and should approach the \$200 range, but not exceed it. If "premium" fee structures are adopted I support the price, except for the \$100 December whitetail deer hunts.

Lastly, as we all know, the cost of business is only going to increase through time. I believe the proposed fees for highly sought after game animals such as deer or elk are near the maximum limits our average sportsmen are willing to pay. Sportsmen pay for the vast majority of funding of wildlife conservation and account for an overwhelming majority of the AZGFD income, yet the entire public gets to enjoy our natural resources. I strongly encourage the Department to pursue new and different funding avenues, such as a general tax fund, possible new tax on every new housing development built, possible new tax on every municipality when it increases its jurisdiction, increased OHV decal fee' or increased watercraft registration fee. In relation, OHV and watercraft users pay a far less fee for using the natural resources than a hunter or angler.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

"Conceptual fishing license with added benefits is great". Non-resident fee is not too much for what they get. There were no comments on the 1 day licenses, and "\$24 is a good fee for the community/urban licenses".

Resident, calendar year seems simpler for hunting than 365. Question: "Would notifying people that their license is expiring add extra costs? Having a reminder sent 1 month prior to expiration would be nice."

Non-resident combo: "It's confusing, but have you considered habitat stamps like Colorado that are species/habitat specific?", "current regulations are confusing", "\$160 is not too much money for NR's."

Resident Combo – "\$57 is good", unanimous amongst group.

Youth licenses – "\$5 is too low", "Should be \$25, a lot of people can afford more than \$5", another said "\$5 is fair". One attendee said it would be worth it to increase the price of youth licenses if the price included a firearms safety course.

Migratory Bird Stamps – Only comment was on the availability of them for purchase online.

Family licenses – no comments

General list of tags (Antelope, etc.) – no comments

Buffalo – no comments

General Deer – "Hate to see prices go up, however, I will pay it, and understand it's a price of doing business"

Premium Deer – All participants by a show of hands were against a premium deer hunt structure.

General Elk – Prices are fair, cow elk tag should be a little cheaper than Bull.

Premium Elk – "I do not like the concept of a premium elk hunt", all participants by a show of hands were against a premium elk hunt structure.

application fee should be "\$10 for residents and \$25 for non-residents", another said "\$13 is fair and it should be the same price for both residents and NR", another attendee suggested starting at \$10 and then using gradual increases every year

General comment – Price caps should be set every 5 years.

Dear Sirs:

Please reconsider the regulation, only as it pertains to non-residents, that gives 20% of the drawn licenses to people with max bonus points. For non-residents, this regulation effectively will never allow most people a CHANCE to draw an AZ Strip deer tag unless they have max points because the non-

resident UPTO 10% limitation is reached only with people that have max points. I can understand giving the people who have been waiting the longest the best chance, but they should not have the ONLY chance.

I have been fortunate enough to draw an elk license once in your state and I really appreciated the opportunity. I drew without max points for elk in unit 23 but I know from the statistics that if your draw system does not change, I will never draw a deer tag on the AZ Strip or the Kaibab late rifle season. Everyone should have a chance, even if it is a very small chance. Thanks for taking my input

Dear AGFD,

I support the license and tag fee increases as proposed. My only comment is the same one I have submitted in past year's, and that is to make NR mt. lion tags the same price as resident for DIY hunters or NR hunters on guided hunts without the use of hounds. For NR hunting with hounds, keep current NR fee structure and rules in place.

This would presumably result in increased revenues and sportsman support due to the opportunity for take incidental to other activities by NR hunters, but would disallow the exploitation of the resource by NR outfitters and hunters. NR campers and fishermen might also participate knowing that opportunities would be limited, but harvesting could take place legally if presented with the opportunity.

Thank you

I am sending this e-mail to voice my feelings on the application fee increase. I am strongly against this part of the proposal. I feel this would limit some people with large families or tight budgets from applying and is a large step toward making the sport of hunting the wealthy person sport as it is in some other countries, also I feel this would hurt the recruitment of new people young and old alike to are sport. I very much hope my input is considered and a judgement made that is best for hunting and fishing in Arizona.

To whom it may concern,

As a small retail outfitter, state license dealer, and taxpayer we strongly support the proposed changes in SB 1223 to the way Arizona Game and Fish sells licenses, stamps, and permits.

Benefits will be realized immediately from all parties involved. The license dealer will be able to concisely sell a customer exactly what he or she will need rather than spending several minutes explaining what that sportsman/sportswoman should have. This means we can spend more time with that customer rendering advice and selling necessary equipment to make their a trip a success.

The licensee will (under the proposed changes) benefit from a full 365 days of validity to their license. This is likely to translate to more trips made and more hours afield as it is common for many sportsmen/sportswomen to not renew their license until they know they are going on a trip. A full 365 days of validity means any licensee can on a whim, get up and go. Further benefits to the licensee will be (under the proposed changes) bundled stamps. This should translate into more frequent angler trips to more types of water than previously. For example; a regluar customer of ours does not have an urban fishing license(cost prohibitive), but was recently on a successful trout fishing trip during which he was shown some urban waters that contain good size bass. Under the proposed changes, he would be covered and would have enjoyed a different type of fishing and likely spent a few dollars on necessary tackle at a small business in that town. Also, it is more likely under the proposed changes that entire families will become licensed and enjoy their trips together due to the savings.

One of the most important proposed changes is to the pricing of the youth combo license. At five dollars, even the most financially burdened family can't deny their child access to the great outdoors. Exposure at this young age will in turn, lead to adult license sales in a few years. Recruitment is

paramount for wildlife conservation, and exposure to healthy hobbies like hunting and fishing will last a lifetime.

I am in favor of changing the fishing license to be a year from the date you purchase rather than the 1st of every year.

I will soon be able to take advantage of your Pioneer license and but for still feel a change is needed. Thank you.

I would like to see the abandonment of the 2 different licenses, and combine them into 1 Arizona fishing license. Although I live in the valley, I am reluctant to buy 2 licenses, 1 for urban lake fishing and 1 for the rest of the state. At present, I may just buy a reservation license only, to avoid all the expense that is now associated with fishing in the state of Arizona and fish only on the reservation or buy a day permit in another state, like Colorado. With 1 license for all Arizona lakes and streams, urban and rural, it would make it a lot more attractive and less costly, especially when the entire family participates. Thanks for allowing me to express my thoughts.

I do like the idea of making the license good for a year from the time of purchase rather than the current system. If I buy it on May 2, 2013 it should be valid until May 1, 2014. I've thought it should be like that for years! I think that there should be discounted packages when you combine multiple things, for instance. a fishing license, trout stamp and two pole stamp combined at a possible lower fee when purchased all at once compared to each separately.

I also would like to see on the lifetime fishing license, an option for the fishing license, trout stamp, AND the 2 POLE STAMP.

Hello,

I like the plan you are putting forward. I believe there should be a premium price for premium hunts. Many states are already doing this. The prices you have proposed are in line with other states and still very affordable for a resident when you consider the costs associated with hunting. Thank you

To whom it may concern:

License "Simplification"? Catchy name guys, but complete crap! (Two different prices for the same species is not more simple.) You are out of your minds with these price hikes. Let me get this straight, you are trying to decrease the hunting population, right?

Consider that the hunting population is already decreasing or struggling because of the increases in price on gas!, guns and ammo, hunting equipment, and the cost to just put in. What a strain you are creating and adding to your hunters; when putting in for hunting apps and draws is something that should be exciting, not stressful. Now hunters will have to decide which hunts, or years, they can put in, or which family members get to put in.

Obviously, you are encouraging people to buy the combo license, that increase is more reasonable; but there are those who don't, and the increase on the individual licenses is too much. The increases on the tags are absolutely ridiculous, especially considering they were just hiked 6 years ago! I understand that your costs go up as well, but these increases are TOO MUCH!

\$200 on a bull tag?!?! An \$86 increase???

\$100 for a deer tag that once cost me \$25?!!!!

\$90 for antelope???

\$300 for sheep?

And another horrendous 75% increase on application fees? The last raise in prices was a slap in the face and, TOO SOON, this one is too.

So hunting is now a rich man's sport in Arizona? These "premium" tags are despicable! They are the epitome of financial discrimination; and a good example of why the G&F commission should not have been allowed to manage or adjust the fee structures. Colorado has "premium" hunting, but they don't sneak in "premium tags" under their own residents; and their deer tags are still only \$34 for their

residents (\$49 elk! and \$34 antelope). NM, as you provided, is also not cranking the prices on their residents. Is AZ G&F managing their budget as well as AZ state? Are hunters paying the price?

More and more Arizona residents are going to other states to hunt; or they just stop hunting altogether because of foolishness and mismanagement of hunts, permits, and jacked up prices. You will continue to see your revenue go down with these price increases. Please do not completely ruin this state for hunting!

Very disappointed

Dear AGFD,

I wish to provide the following comments pertaining to the Conceptual License and Fees structure.

1. I am generally supportive of all efforts to simplify the license structure and I am fine with the conceptual ideas presented.
2. Realizing that the original impetus for the premium tag structure was the preservation of resident hunt opportunity when the non-resident cap was lifted I see no reason or benefit now to institute this element. I would only support the premium tag concept if it was more apparent that it would improve the draw odds for these hunts by either reducing interest because of the cost or by adding tags because the increased revenue could be offset by less general season tags. If the AGFD does advance a recommendation for premium deer tags please realize that there is marked difference in quality between a higher value strip mule deer tag and a relatively lower value December WT tag.
3. I do not support and do not understand the rationale for the increase in the application fee. Seems to me that this cost should go down with improvements in technology and now that the AGFD has finally figured out a way to allow internet applications.
4. I'm okay with raising the cost of a resident deer tag but think that the conceptual \$10 jump in one step is too great for your most popular product. A more modest \$5 increase with this cycle would be much more palatable.
5. I support the conceptual increase in the cost of an elk tag and also support the differing costs between a cow and bull tag.
6. I generally support the other conceptual costs for other resident tags. However a resident antelope tag still seems to be too low and quite a bargain for this high demand hunt. Conversely the cost of a resident buffalo tag is still too ridiculously high and it is hard to fathom how this cost was ever derived. If it is to support the Raymond Ranch facility then make those tags bear the higher cost. I do not believe the House Rock facility is actively utilized anymore and should not require as much underwriting.
6. I would prefer that we keep the current calendar year validity period for hunting licenses. I'm fearful that keeping track of a 365 day period will result in an increase in violations or invalid applications.
7. Please consider reducing the cost of a non-resident lion tag north of the Colorado River to encourage more non-resident interest and help manage lion numbers better where resident interest is challenged because of the remoteness. I realize that some differential probably needs to exist between resident and non-resident costs so I would suggest that the non-resident lion tag cost be \$20.

Thank you and I look forward to your formal recommendations

I have been a hunter fisherman in this state since I was in the first grade. Most recently for the last 17 years. I have not complained about pricing or the cost of hunting here but I think that the cost is about

to eliminate me from ever hunting again. You are catering to the out of state hunters and the hunters with families with your new pricing schedule. I think that the cost of out of state permits and hunting licenses should increase more than what you have. Also the part time residence that are only here from september to march should have to pay a higher fee. The locale residence should remain where they are. As for permits you should go back to the past and if you are drawn for a hunt for a big game species like elk or antelope you have to wait at least one year before you apply again. This would allow more hunters the opportunity to get drawn. Especially hunters that put in in groups of 3 or 4. Also for those hunters that have applied for antelope for 17 years without being drawn. Remember the hunter supports the Game and Fish we all are not kings and can afford you raising fees to where only the rich can hunt. This causing the poaching problem we now have in this state.

I would not support what I have seen. My understanding is all archery bull tags would be considered premium hunts. If this is correct I would suggest making just the more popular (larger bulls) units which I believe are managed differently as premium hunts and leave the others units alone. Just like the Kaibab hunt. That is my 2cents.

What can us normal middle class working hunters say to put this money grab to a stop. Simplification my Ass. And what is this shit about premium hunts. How is that defined. You can bet I will start doing more homework on this subject. More and more I feel my State Constitutional rights are being impinged...

We are watching you.

Arizona Game and Fish Department
License Simplification Team

Comments on License Simplification:

I have been following the AZG&F process regarding License Simplification and have studied the handouts and Powerpoint slides in some detail. Yesterday I took time to view the May 20, 2013 webcast and have been very impressed and pleased with the Commission and Staff's dedication to simplification, innovation leading to creation of additional value for the average hunter/angler, commitment to youth (attraction, retention and attempts to track through \$5 license issuance) and the overall process. I also appreciate the opportunity to comment on the concepts presented and am confident that final staff recommendations and Commission action will be a net positive for the average hunter/angler, reflect all comments while protecting the public trust and maintain a sound funding source for the continued excellent work of the Department. I have attempted to categorize my comments for ease of processing as well as provide background regarding my hunt/fish activities.

Background: I am 53 and a 24 year resident of Tucson. I've purchased a combination hunt/fish license for 23 consecutive years including an over the counter (OTC) archery deer tag. I have applied for elk tags (mostly bull but occasionally cow second choice) almost every year. I purchase my license and apply for elk draws using the on-line system and purchase my OTC deer tag at a G & F office. I elk hunt/scout approximately 20 days per year when drawn. I deer hunt approximately 20 days per year during all OTC seasons. I fish occasionally (25 partial days per year) and recently (last 3 years) have also purchased urban fishing licenses. Since moving to Arizona I have never hunted out of state but do occasionally travel out of state to fish.

365 Day License: I generally by my Class F (hunt/fish) license and OTC deer tag as my own Christmas gift. This covers me for the entire upcoming calendar year. I no longer hunt javalina but have friends who do, requiring them to have a valid license for the coming year in October (for the draw). The 365 day license seems to be a positive in some ways but may cause some administrative headaches regarding multiple license numbers during a calendar year associate with a single hunter ID number. A possible solution, at least for on-line purchasers like me who buy the same license every year may be a single license number with a renewable option. Because the financial outlay for a lifetime license isn't

an option for me at this time and I'm several years from a Pioneer License, a renewable license would have the same affect.

Hunt/Fish Licenses: Although I don't take advantage of option (because I only hunt deer and elk and do some fishing and the \$ doesn't pencil out for me), the "Super" license was an innovative change when implemented that has many advantages and no drawbacks I can think of. Any inclusion of additional privileges, even with nominal additional cost, could provide additional opportunity and value to the "average" hunter/angler. A one size fits all will almost never fit all but too many options is the problem you're currently trying to remedy. I support the packaged privilege concept.

Premium Tags (Deer & Elk): I generally support the concept of "Premium" hunts. The conceptual fees for premium tags do not seem to me to be out of line with the value of the resource. The ability of any hunter to have an opportunity to draw a tag during the rut or in a prime trophy area at a reasonable cost should be protected. I do have concerns about which hunts may be considered premium.

Deer: For 23 years I have strictly bow hunted (OTC) deer in Arizona during both the early and late seasons. This year (2013) is the first year I've applied for a deer (13A, 13B) in an attempt to accumulate bonus points for an eventual archery Arizona Strip tag. I would clearly view that as a TROPHY HUNT and would be more than happy to pay a premium for a tag if drawn as well as significant hunt expense for travel and supplies (I've never used a guide and am a DIY solo hunter). My concerns are the possibility of all December deer being considered "Premium", including OTC archery, although slide 32 of the presentation states "does not include archery". While hunting during the rut is exciting, I don't consider hunting December 13th – 31st in Unit 37B to be premium when I can wait until January 1st when it's not. I would support all OTC archery deer remaining under a single annual tag/cost regardless of the months I choose to hunt.

Elk: Again, I strictly bow hunt elk. While I usually apply for September hunts I have hunted in November, a limited opportunity provided several years ago in some units. Although the September hunts do provide some increased opportunity for trophy bulls, the hunts were moved to earlier in the month several years ago and the rut seems to be at the very end of the hunt if at all (Unit 5B). If all early archery bull hunts are to be considered premium, (with an increase in fees from \$114 - \$200) could additional archery bull opportunities be provided in other months?

I am generally supportive of the concepts presented by the Department and appreciate the opportunity to comment. I will continue to follow and comment on the process as it moves forward. I am sympathetic to the challenges that your team faces in providing new and innovative options while protecting the resources entrusted to you.

To Whom It May Concern,

I have been an Arizona resident for nearly 10 years and have always felt the fees for resident tags were kind of high. After viewing your online power point, I disagree with the increases to residents adults again and the premium fee structure. Maybe rich people in the Phoenix area can afford these expensive licenses and tags, but many of us with lower paying jobs can hardly afford the current fees. If AZGFD needs more funds, then increase the fees to non-residents and increase the fees for youth, especially out of state youth. It is terrible that an adult resident of Arizona must pay more than a non-resident youth. That kid has another state he can already get a great deal in, why give him an amazing deal in our state, too, when some resident adults are not hunting because of our ridiculously high prices! AZGFD claims they are concerned about the decrease in hunters, but I personally know resident adults that are not hunting because of the cost of licenses and tags. THIS IS NOT RIGHT! Increase fees for non-resident adults and youths, NOT resident adults!

Hello,

I am an IT guy, I never re-invent the wheel when looking for solutions. I suggest reaching out to other

state level departments to learn which models have proven to be effective and satisfactory for both the public and the department. Just skip California as we don't need any of that poison! States in the western half of the US should also have similar game management goals (and limited big game) as Arizona.

I am sure other state employees, directors would be open to share details and provide access to policies, operations models, laws, schedules, laws, etc.

I believe the current cost are fair. I have several things I think should be looked at. I have brought this up before and have not received any comments back.

1st,

It appears to me that the muzzle load hunts are up and the archery is down. The muzzle load hunt should be limited to the primitive style hunt with a flint lock type and not the modern muzzle load that is good for a 200+ yd shoot. Some say the reason is they only have one shot. When I shoot an animal I only use one shot, my answer is learn to shoot.

2nd,

A certain number of tags should be set aside for Pioneer Combo License. Those individuals have supported AZGF for years and only have a few years left to hunt. I happen to be one of those I think it should be set up just like the youth hunt.

Hello,

Please don't raise hunting fees..... I am poor... |

Thanks

My suggestions:

Cons:

Trying to simplify the licensing by bundling is not a good idea. All bundling does is make people buy something that they would not normally buy or use. Cable channels do it and customers don't like it. Charge people for only what they want and nothing more. I don't want a Nevada/California fishing stamp and I should not have to buy one. The pricing was not that difficult to begin with.

Premium hunt structure:

Any sort of pricing that separates the haves from the have nots is not a good idea. Game and fish needs to be as affordable as possible for all with regards to pricing. I'm afraid with all these increases you are slowly but surely eliminating your already limited customer base. When forced to make financial decisions a family will first start to eliminate the non-essentials.

Charging premium fees for hunts that aren't premium is just a sales job. If it is a unit that is managed strictly for older trophy class animals then a premium could logically be placed on the tag. 13a and 13B could be considered a premium hunt. However a hunt that has 2,3, or 4 general hunts along with a late hunt is not a premium hunt. December whitetail hunts should not be considered premium hunts because there are so many general hunts that precede them. These units aren't managed for older trophy class animals either.

Archery hunts in September that have cow hunts going on at the same time or more than 200 (much higher even close to 800) hunters in the field at the same time is not a premium hunt. If you are going to call it premium then you need to offer premium experiences and opportunities. The archery hunts

should be moved back 1 week later in Sept, like they used to be in order to start making this more like a premium hunt.

Pros

I like the hunt insurance option as long as it is reasonable. Too many times people have things that arise that does not allow them to go on hunt. This would have to be set up with careful consideration to avoid abuse and point creep. I like giving people the option of turning in tag and not lose thier bonus points. I would like to see the next person in line get the tag. The person who turns in tag might lose half their tag fee ammount for surrendering tag. To reduce or eliminate abuse people should only be able to surrender tag 2 times over a lifetime. After that they can donate to HOAL or another organization but they will lose all their fees and BP's. Point creep will become a bigger issue if people get to keep forfeiting their tags and keeping bonus points. Tags should be surrendered at least 72 hours before hunt starts in order to keep BP's. this will allow dept time to notify next person in line.

You could even a \$5 or \$10 fee on to applications who would like to go on the next in line list.

Try to share all the costs evenly accross the board and not just the tag holders. Try not to overburden non residents hunters with extremley high tag fees. After all, they have to buy licenses for many years before they are usually drawn.

Would also like to see G&F increase the number of auction tags to 5-10 per spieces. We can use the additional funds to help keep costs down for the rest. Never would I want our state to be like Utah with regard to auction tags but to increase by a few would help.

G&F needs to tighten their belt more. Just like the rest of us have had to do in our own lives. We have learned that we can't have everything and we have learned to do without somethings. The dept needs to seriously look at programs that don't pay for themselves. It seems our non-game branch is getting bigger and bigger all the time and the hunting/fishing community is flipping nearly 100% of the bill. Maybe it is time to reevaluate the need for all these programs. I'm sure there are other ways to cut back so everybody is sharing some of the "pain".

In conclusion:

Sportsmen and women will generally support what the dept does if they are treated fairly and respectfully with full transparency.

I am in favor of the license simplification. I don't think you are raising the prices enough for non-residents. I apply annually for nonresident hunts in WY, UT, NV, and NM. Arizona should have raised their fees before now to remain in line with other western states.

Increasing price would cause more poaching and losing hunter like me. I donated to Arizona game and fish and I get this, I'll go different state and spend my money where its worth it

Is the app fee included in the new proposed tags? If not adding them to the tags puts them out of reach for a lot of people.

It looks like the archery hunters will be hit hardest as most of their tags will be premium tags. Will the lifetime licenses be changed to include the proposed changes to the new yearly licenses.

Please do not raise the prices. We can barely afford to get to go now. I'm worried my kids won't get to go at all.

Being retired and on a fixed income I oppose any increase in the license fees. There are states here in the west that I can hunt big game animals as a non-resident at far lower cost for some species than as a resident of Arizona. I have hunted antelope in Wyoming twice now as I can't seem to get drawn in my home state of Az. Cost was \$35 a tag with 5 available each year.

With the National Forests in Arizona doing what they can to limit hunter access it has become less desirable to hunt here. The increase in fees would be the final reason to quit hunting here at all.

The situations on our lakes is not much better with fees being assessed and the services that were provided either stopped entirely or reduced and the access to the shoreline prohibited. Enforcement of camping rules stops at dusk when the Sheriffs and G&F officers leave the campers to their own devices. This is especially true at Bartlett Lake.

I like the simplification of the License structures and I think that this simplification may increase the customer base in areas like fishing. One thing that concerns me is that premium tag/fees for deer and elk. A lot of hunters like myself look forward to having an opportunity for a rut hunt or for a great area, but with higher fees for those opportunities, many will be unable or unwilling to pay that huge price for premium hunts and without those opportunities the enthusiasm for hunting might decrease for many hunters.

It is also harmful to those who may live in or near these units and know the area or want to hunt closed to home or to their cabin etc, that they now have to pay double just for this reasonable desire.

In addition, it adds to the complexity of the tag and hunt fees at the same time you are trying to simplify things.

Thank you for the work you have done on this and I know that a lot of effort has been made by the commission. The premium tags and hunts is one thing the commission may want to reconsider.

With the number of hunters continuing to fall while costs associated with game management continue to rise, I would think Arizona would want to look at what the adjacent states of New Mexico and Utah do as one means to address the challenge. Specifically, both those states use a different fee structure for both residents and non-residents for both deer and elk permits, with the price of a permit rising in proportion to the relative quality or demand of the permit. For example, in Utah, a general deer permit costs \$40 for a resident, and \$268 for a non-resident, while a limited-entry permit (a permit in a more desirable area) costs \$80 and \$468, respectively, and a premium limited-entry permit (most desirable areas of the state) costs \$168 and \$568, respectively. This fee structure allows maximum participation by the hunting public, while allowing those willing to wait or pay more an opportunity to hunt less crowded areas, where success is higher, with greater opportunity for trophy-class animals. Nothing is more frustrating to me as a hunter than to see someone draw a coveted early rifle bull elk tag, only to hunt one or two days, or draw an East Side Late Kiabab deer tag, and hunt only the opening weekend. By changing the fee structure to charge more for those mentioned permits, folks who more fully appreciate the privilege and opportunity would be the only ones applying for those permits, while less dedicated hunters could still hunt in seasons and areas where more permits are available. I associate with both dedicated and not-so-dedicated hunters, and have discussed this concept with them, with the consensus that adopting such a fee structure would not discourage either group from continuing to participate in the drawing process for deer and elk tags. More detail for the cost structure for the mentioned states can be obtained from their web sites. Thank you for your interest and consideration.

Hello,

I am concerned about the future with these new fees. I think it would be better to increase everything by a set percentage. I know everything is going up and increase is needed. But I am noticing more and more people hunting less for expense reasons. Now this eventually removes children from being introduced to hunting and fishing. Children are slowly thru the years have been decreasing in these sports (fishing and hunting) but it is their parents that introduce the kids to the sport. If you raise hunting prices for adults eventually they will decide not to hunt and that kills the future for children to be introduced to the sports. No matter how many clinics or classes you offer it will be the parents that take them or not take them. I am concerned that is will be the impact seen starting 2014. Just raise the prices a set percentage across the board rather than creating frustration with border line current

hunters still taking their children. The sport is our heritage needing to be continued and introduced to the future hunters. Leaving the prices low for children but increasing the price on the parents that will continue taking the kids will just hurt the future because folks making hard decision of how to spend money and vacation time will eventually give up on attempting to hunt or fish. We all have to make decisions these days on how to spend our money but we have our parents that showed us how nice it is to hunt, fish and camp is. If we were not introduced as kids to it we would not even have it in our adult minds to put in our money and vacation spending decisions would we? Our parents let us know how nice it is spend a weekend in the woods. The future is in our hands to introduce to the kids.
Thank you for hearing me out.

I am writing to oppose any license fee increases. I feel with the increase in fees you are just driving out the average joe's, and making it a rich mans sport. Lets not make it the sport of Kings! Lets keep the costs affordable for all

This input must have been drawn up by fisherman and not hunters, it seems that this only benefits if you fish in Arizona and not if you hunt. Taking from one and giving to the other, isn't wise at all. I myself with these new fees wont' be able to afford to put in for my whole family. trying to give to the Juniors by adding huge new fees on to everyone else doesn't seem too wise, who pays for the junior tags, yes, the parents, so you are trying to retain hunter recruitment, but this isn't the way to do it. I believe the there should be no more than 10% increases to the existing tag fees, hunting licenses, fishing licenses and do away with the make money premium hunt structure. If you want to alienate the lower to middle income people, then these new fees are right on, but I believe that in doing what you have proposed will in the long run ruin the Arizona Game and Fish.

I hope these don't get implemented for the majority of non rich Arizonans that live and pay taxes and love the outdoors

To Whom it May Concern,

PLEASE-PLEASE create a review board that would allow mistakes on applications to be looked at (maybe case-by-case?). Also, limit the amount of fine print in the application process -- getting a tag to hunt shouldn't require a person to have a doctorate.

I am a non-resident and recently lost 4 of my VERY expensive elk points (\$170/yr x 4 = \$680!) because I missed some small print on the hunt codes. I inadvertently entered myself into an archery cow hunt during the rut and oddly won it. Now I am sure you are thinking, well tough luck to you, but think about it. Why would an Eau Claire, Wisconsin resident want to spend \$1280 (4 points \$680 +tag \$600) on a cow elk that is 1600 miles away? Logically, this just doesn't make sense to me one bit and I would hope someone else would understand too. For just quick comparison purposes, if I wanted to hunt a cow elk, I could buy a tag over the counter in Wyoming for \$288 (no points) and it would be 600 miles closer to home.

I am very unhappy with Arizona's "tough-guy" stance on the application process.

Re: Conceptual License Structure and Fees

The Southern Arizona Quail Forever Chapter membership has approved the following for inclusion in the license structure and fees.

Creation of an upland bird stamp.

- o Such a stamp would be mandatory for hunting of all upland species and would identify hunters for harvest data and hunt satisfaction surveys.

- o Currently, the AGFD has no way to identify and survey upland bird hunters. This is a significant problem as the current system limits the amount and accuracy of the data collected. This lack of data limits the ability to understand the current status of the different species and what management changes may be necessary or appropriate for

them.

- o The stamp could also be used to educate hunters about their role in the stewardship of the species and habitat.
- o Revenue generated from stamp would be dedicated to the stamp program and upland bird research and projects.

I felt the need to revisit the comments I made earlier. Those comments still represent my feelings about the proposal.

I wanted to revisit one in particular-fee increases.

I fear we have hit the wall in terms of our wildlife resource funding about one half of the Dept. operations. I fear there may be little left to acquire. I also realize there are many wildlife jobs that require attention now compared to when I started my career when we were (all 240 of us) existing on our wildlife resource. During my career I saw Heritage, WCF, OHV, Waterfowl CF, Teaming, etc. come to the table and the agency grew a bunch. Each one of these non-appropriated funds was going to allow us to do so much more-which we did.....but it was soon not enough.

I realize our customers in the 70s were primarily the license holders and today they are way in the minority. I also will always support the concept "we are the wildlife people in AZ" and often get upset when I see a Rural-Metro fireman talking about relocating rattlesnakes on TV. I also know the demand has outstripped the employee base.

I guess where I am going is I can see a need to reassess programs and expenditures in light of this pending license fee increase. I fear there will probably be little support for much of an increase based on my limited universe of contact.

I know AGFD is constantly looking for other means to support non traditional programs but the holy grail still seems to evade search efforts.

So all that said, I think any fee increase request probably needs to be presented with a plan to some how save operation dollars to make the increase more effective.....big and difficult request.

Thanks for listening to an old story.

I recently sent in feedback on the newly proposed fee structure and wanted to add a couple of items. They are:

1) It is currently less expensive for resident adults in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah to hunt elk in their states than it is for a resident Arizona junior to hunt elk in Arizona (on average, it cost just over \$48, including application fees, for resident adults to hunt elk in these three states). Even when you add in the most expensive nearby state outside of Arizona (New Mexico), the average cost only goes up to \$59.00/elk tag. It is therefore about the same in these four other states for resident adults to hunt elk in their states as it does for a junior in Arizona to hunt elk in Arizona. The fee philosophy in Arizona is wrong and doesn't pass the simple "eye test"... this looks & is wrong.

2) As a state employee myself where our "organization" has undergone severe cutbacks due to lack of state and federal funding, we had to identify and remove and all waste if it existed. We have also had to cut out viable and important programs simply because the funding wasn't available, therefore we are all having to do more with less. Why does the Arizona Game and Fish Dept. not have to do the same and be held accountable to identify serious fiscal waste? I believe there is serious waste in the AZGFD, which I also heard was operating on over a \$90M budget annually, yet instead of trying to be fiscally responsible and cutting out waste, the department is instead attempting to have simply pass on all costs regardless and not identify and eliminate waste.

As an example of this waste, I recently heard that Wildlife Managers spend much (if not most) of their paid salary time working out of their home because there simply isn't enough for them to do in department offices or in the field. If this is true, then why are we paying for WMs to sit at home? This

by itself sounds like a huge waste of money, and perhaps many of these positions should be part-time positions as opposed to full-time.

I suggest the department hire an independent agency (as did our organization a few years ago) to research and identify where waste was occurring so that it could be properly addressed/dealt with. Before you simply "pass the buck" so-to-speak, prove to us that the need for these funds are legitimate as I do not believe they are. Just showing job cost ledgers only identifies where funds are being spent, not where waste is occurring.

This brings us to the reason for the request in raising fees to hunt and fish in Arizona in the first place... because the AZGFD is wasting so much money that in order to maintain the current spending levels more funds are needed, period. Since funding comes through fees it's apparently more desirable to charge more money in way of fees than to identify and cut waste.

Hi,

I had a couple question/concerns about the propositions given that I didn't hear answered on the online broadcast. I like the idea of the 365 day license for those who are not avid hunters/fishermen who always get a license every year. Will it be similar to a day fishing license where you get to choose when the license starts? Because I put in for javelina every year and thus need a license for the next year in October. Will I be able to purchase a license and give it a Jan 1st start date?

Secondly, concerning licenses and the big game draw system. Currently you have to use your License number to put in for big game. So when you get drawn you have the license already for the hunt time. With the 365 deal, say a license expires in July. They put in for deer and get drawn for a November hunt. If they don't renew their license then they could have a tag without a valid license. How will this work?

Thirdly, about the application process with the Premium structure. If someone puts a premium hunt for first choice and a regular hunt for second choice with an application by mail, would they have to write a check for the premium hunt and if drawn for the regular hunt, be refunded the \$55 difference? Similarly if you put in online, I would assume that whichever you get drawn for, that amount would be taken out of your account (on top of the initial \$13 app fee).

On a slightly different note, concerning the application process, I think there should be a check box that says if you want your second choice to be looked at in the bonus point round. As you know if your first choice is a very difficult to draw hunt and your second is not, you may get the second choice in the bonus round and never even have a chance at your first choice. I know this happens a lot with javelina hunts and it happened this year to me and my brother getting our second archery cow tag within the 20% bonus round and didn't get a chance to get the bull tag in the 1st and 2nd choice round. Just a suggestion for those who want an extra opportunity to draw a difficult hunt and get their second choice as a last resort.

Thank you for your time.

Arizona Game and Fish Commission

Dear Members:

A prior commitment prevents me from being at the 6/14 meeting. I hope you will consider my points. I have attached data outlining the percentage increases the last time tags were increased and a comparison with eight other western states as to what they charge residents.

As you can see in these attachments we are 54% higher for a resident hunting license, 81% higher for an elk tag and 12% higher for deer. These would rise to 76% license, 130% elk tag and 45% deer tag.

Licenses and tags have been raised in 2001, 2004 and 2007. A resident deer tag was raised to \$19.50 in 2004. If raised to \$45 that would be a 131% increase in 9 years. An elk tag was raised to \$71 in 2004. If

| |
|---|
| <p>a bull tag goes to \$145 the cost would have more than doubled in those 9 years.</p> <p>The conceptual tags would be 27% more for resident bull elk (only a 11% increase for nonresidents), 39% increase for a turkey tag and almost 30% increase for a resident deer tag. The proposed "premium" hunts would be almost triple what they are now for deer, 75% higher for elk.</p> <p>At the same time residents will be asked to pay more nonresidents would see a 29% reduction for a combo license and a whopping 40% decrease for a cow elk tag.</p> <p>Four of these eight western states game and fish departments also do not receive general fund monies (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico). Both Idaho and Colorado have not increased resident deer and elk tags since BEFORE our last increase in 2007 and New Mexico has increased it only \$2 for elk and \$3 for deer for residents in that same time frame.</p> <p>Obviously the more elk the more elk tags can be sold so many of these states can charge less. But do we need to charge 59% more than they do in New Mexico, 2.5 times what they do in Oregon, 3.5 times what they charge in Utah and Wyoming, 4 times what they charge in Colorado and Idaho and 9 times what residents pay in Montana? We have two and a half times the number of elk that Nevada has yet we will be 19% higher than them if the proposed elk tag increase is adopted.</p> <p>Finally I'm not sure why the application fee should be raised 73% when more and more hunters are using online services to buy a license or apply for a big game hunt. I have to assume this requires less manpower.</p> <p>Perhaps an alternative to these increases would be to tie the license and tag costs to the C.P.I. and adjust the cost every two or three years.</p> <p>The AZGFD's core concepts of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation states: "Opportunity to participate in hunting....is guaranteed for all....not by....financial capacity".</p> <p>Director Voyles in the 2012-13 Arizona Hunting regs. stated: "hunting in America is not a privilege reserved for a chosen few by birthright or personal wealth."</p> <p>Please keep it affordable for all of us. Thank you.</p> |
| Doesn't like \$13 fee if not truly moving to point of sale. |
| When applying charge tag fee upfront. |
| Pronghorn should be premium. |
| Mail only for premium hunts |
| Likes premium structure- Count 4 |
| Good with DR premium concept |
| Elk-like concept as presented |
| Mountain Lion tag fee should go down |
| Not agree with fee for BB |
| Combination resident should not increase since nonresidents are getting a deal |
| "Conceptual fishing license with added benefits is great". Non-resident fee is not too much for what they get. There were no comments on the 1 day licenses, and "\$24 is a good fee for the community/urban licenses". |
| Resident, calendar year seems simpler for hunting than 365. Question: "Would notifying people that their license is expiring add extra costs? Having a reminder sent 1 month prior to expiration would be nice." |
| Non-resident combo: "It's confusing, but have you considered habitat stamps like Colorado that are species/habitat specific?", "current regulations are confusing", "\$160 is not too much money for NR's." |
| Resident Combo – "\$57 is good", unanimous amongst group. |
| Youth licenses – "\$5 is too low", "Should be \$25, a lot of people can afford more than \$5", another said "\$5 is fair". One attendee said it would be worth it to increase the price of youth licenses if the price included a firearms safety course. |
| Migratory Bird Stamps – Only comment was on the availability of them for purchase online. |
| Family licenses – no comments |

| |
|--|
| General list of tags (Antelope, etc.) – no comments |
| Buffalo – no comments |
| General Deer – “Hate to see prices go up, however, I will pay it, and understand it’s a price of doing business” |
| Premium Deer – All participants by a show of hands were against a premium deer hunt structure. |
| General Elk – Prices are fair, cow elk tag should be a little cheaper than Bull. |
| Premium Elk – “I do not like the concept of a premium elk hunt”, all participants by a show of hands were against a premium elk hunt structure. |
| application fee should be “\$10 for residents and \$25 for non-residents”, another said “\$13 is fair and it should be the same price for both residents and NR”, another attendee suggested starting at \$10 and then using gradual increases every year |
| General comment – Price caps should be set every 5 years. |
| <p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>Please reconsider the regulation, only as it pertains to non-residents, that gives 20% of the drawn licenses to people with max bonus points. For non-residents, this regulation effectively will never allow most people a CHANCE to draw an AZ Strip deer tag unless they have max points because the non-resident UPTO 10% limitation is reached only with people that have max points. I can understand giving the people who have been waiting the longest the best chance, but they should not have the ONLY chance.</p> <p>I have been fortunate enough to draw an elk license once in your state and I really appreciated the opportunity. I drew without max points for elk in unit 23 but I know from the statistics that if your draw system does not change, I will never draw a deer tag on the AZ Strip or the Kaibab late rifle season. Everyone should have a chance, even if it is a very small chance.</p> <p>Thanks for taking my input,</p> |
| <p>Dear AGFD,</p> <p>I support the license and tag fee increases as proposed. My only comment is the same one I have submitted in past year's, and that is to make NR mt. lion tags the same price as resident for DIY hunters or NR hunters on guided hunts without the use of hounds. For NR hunting with hounds, keep current NR fee structure and rules in place.</p> <p>This would presumably result in increased revenues and sportsman support due to the opportunity for take incidental to other activities by NR hunters, but would disallow the exploitation of the resource by NR outfitters and hunters. NR campers and fishermen might also participate knowing that opportunities would be limited, but harvesting could take place legally if presented with the opportunity.</p> <p>Thank you</p> |
| <p>I am sending this e-mail to voice my feelings on the application fee increase. I am strongly against this part of the proposal. I feel this would limit some people with large families or tight budgets from applying and is a large step toward making the sport of hunting the wealthy person sport as it is in some other countries,also I feel this would hurt the recruitment of new people young and old alike to are sport.I very much hope my input is considered and a judgement made that is best for hunting and fishing in Arizona.</p> |
| To whom it may concern, |

As a small retail outfitter, state license dealer, and taxpayer we strongly support the proposed changes in SB 1223 to the way Arizona Game and Fish sells licenses, stamps, and permits.

Benefits will be realized immediately from all parties involved. The license dealer will be able to concisely sell a customer exactly what he or she will need rather than spending several minutes explaining what that sportsman/sportswoman should have. This means we can spend more time with that customer rendering advice and selling necessary equipment to make their a trip a success.

The licensee will (under the proposed changes) benefit from a full 365 days of validity to their license. This is likely to translate to more trips made and more hours afield as it is common for many sportsmen/sportswomen to not renew their license until they know they are going on a trip. A full 365 days of validity means any licensee can on a whim, get up and go. Further benefits to the licensee will be (under the proposed changes) bundled stamps. This should translate into more frequent angler trips to more types of water than previously. For example; a regluar customer of ours does not have an urban fishing license(cost prohibitive), but was recently on a successful trout fishing trip during which he was shown some urban waters that contain good size bass. Under the propsed changes, he would be covered and would have enjoyed a different type of fishing and likely spent a few dollars on necessary tackle at a small business in that town. Also, it is more likely under the proposed changes that entire families will become licensed and enjoy their trips together due to the savings.

One of the most important proposed changes is to the pricing of the youth combo license. At five dollars, even the most financially burdened family can't deny their child access to the great outdoors. Exposure at this young age will in turn, lead to adult license sales in a few years. Recruitment is paramount for wildlife conservation, and exposure to healthy hobbies like hunting and fishing will last a lifetime.

Respectfully submitted,

Colorado River Outfitters (AZGFD Lic. Dealer 0611)
Parker, AZ
coloradoriveroutfitters@yahoo.com
928-669-5421

I am in favor of changing the fishing license to be a year from the date you purchase rather than the 1st of every year.

I will soon be able to take advantage of your Pioneer license and but for still feel a change is needed.

Thank you.

I would like to see the abandonment of the 2 different licenses, and combine them into 1 Arizona fishing license. Although I live in the valley, I am reluctant to by 2 licenses, 1 for urban lake fishing and 1 for the rest of the state. At present, I may just buy a reservation license only, to avoid all the expense that is now associated with fishing in the state of Arizona and fish only on the reservation or buy a day permit in another state, like Colorado. With 1 license for all Arizona lakes and streams, urban and rural, it would make it a lot more attractive and less costly, especially when the entire family participates. Thanks for allowing me to express my thoughts.

Bruce Brekke

I do like the idea of making the license good for a year from the time of purchase rather than the current system. If I buy it on May 2, 2013 it should be valid until May 1, 2014. I've thought it should be like that for years! I think that there should be discounted packages when you combine multiple things, for instance. a fishing license, trout stamp and two pole stamp combined at a possible lower fee when purchased all at once compared to each separately.

I also would like to see on the lifetime fishing license, an option for the fishing license, trout stamp, AND the 2 POLE STAMP.

Hello,

I like the plan you are putting forward. I believe there should be a premium price for premium hunts. Many states are already doing this. The prices you have proposed are in line with other states and still very affordable for a resident when you consider the costs associated with hunting. Thank you

To whom it may concern:

License "Simplification"? Catchy name guys, but complete crap! (Two different prices for the same species is not more simple.) You are out of your minds with these price hikes. Let me get this straight, you are trying to decrease the hunting population, right?

Consider that the hunting population is already decreasing or struggling because of the increases in price on gas!, guns and ammo, hunting equipment, and the cost to just put in. What a strain you are creating and adding to your hunters; when putting in for hunting apps and draws is something that should be exciting, not stressful. Now hunters will have to decide which hunts, or years, they can put in, or which family members get to put in.

Obviously, you are encouraging people to buy the combo license, that increase is more reasonable; but there are those who don't, and the increase on the individual licenses is too much. The increases on the tags are absolutely ridiculous, especially considering they were just hiked 6 years ago! I understand that your costs go up as well, but these increases are TOO MUCH!

\$200 on a bull tag?!?! An \$86 increase???

\$100 for a deer tag that once cost me \$25?!!!

\$90 for antelope???

\$300 for sheep?

And another horrendous 75% increase on application fees? The last raise in prices was a slap in the face and, TOO SOON, this one is too.

So hunting is now a rich man's sport in Arizona? These "premium" tags are despicable! They are the epitome of financial discrimination; and a good example of why the G&F commission should not have been allowed to manage or adjust the fee structures. Colorado has "premium" hunting, but they don't sneak in "premium tags" under their own residents; and their deer tags are still only \$34 for their residents (\$49 elk! and \$34 antelope). NM, as you provided, is also not cranking the prices on their residents. Is AZ G&F managing their budget as well as AZ state? Are hunters paying the price?

More and more Arizona residents are going to other states to hunt; or they just stop hunting altogether because of foolishness and mismanagement of hunts, permits, and jacked up prices. You will continue to see your revenue go down with these price increases. Please do not completely ruin this state for hunting!

Very disappointed

Dear AGFD,

I wish to provide the following comments pertaining to the Conceptual License and Fees structure.

1. I am generally supportive of all efforts to simplify the license structure and I am fine with the

conceptual ideas presented.

2. Realizing that the original impetus for the premium tag structure was the preservation of resident hunt opportunity when the non-resident cap was lifted I see no reason or benefit now to institute this element. I would only support the premium tag concept if it was more apparent that it would improve the draw odds for these hunts by either reducing interest because of the cost or by adding tags because the increased revenue could be offset by less general season tags. If the AGFD does advance a recommendation for premium deer tags please realize that there is marked difference in quality between a higher value strip mule deer tag and a relatively lower value December WT tag.

3. I do not support and do not understand the rationale for the increase in the application fee. Seems to me that this cost should go down with improvements in technology and now that the AGFD has finally figured out a way to allow internet applications.

4. I'm okay with raising the cost of a resident deer tag but think that the conceptual \$10 jump in one step is too great for your most popular product. A more modest \$5 increase with this cycle would be much more palatable.

5. I support the conceptual increase in the cost of an elk tag and also support the differing costs between a cow and bull tag.

6. I generally support the other conceptual costs for other resident tags. However a resident antelope tag still seems to be too low and quite a bargain for this high demand hunt. Conversely the cost of a resident buffalo tag is still too ridiculously high and it is hard to fathom how this cost was ever derived. If it is to support the Raymond Ranch facility then make those tags bear the higher cost. I do not believe the House Rock facility is actively utilized anymore and should not require as much underwriting.

6. I would prefer that we keep the current calendar year validity period for hunting licenses. I'm fearful that keeping track of a 365 day period will result in an increase in violations or invalid applications.

7. Please consider reducing the cost of a non-resident lion tag north of the Colorado River to encourage more non-resident interest and help manage lion numbers better where resident interest is challenged because of the remoteness. I realize that some differential probably needs to exist between resident and non-resident costs so I would suggest that the non-resident lion tag cost be \$20.

Thank you and I look forward to your formal recommendations

I have been a hunter fisherman in this state since I was in the first grade. Most recently for the last 17 years. I have not complained about pricing or the cost of hunting here but I think that the cost is about to eliminate me from ever hunting again. You are catering to the out of state hunters and the hunters with families with your new pricing schedule. I think that the cost of out of state permits and hunting licenses should increase more than what you have. Also the part time residence that are only here from september to march should have to pay a higher fee. The locale residence should remain where they are. As for permits you should go back to the past and if you are drawn for a hunt for a big game species like elk or antelope you have to wait at least one year before you apply again. This would allow more hunters the opportunity to get drawn. Especially hunters that put in in groups of 3 or 4. Also for those hunters that have applied for antelope for 17 years without being drawn. Remember the hunter supports the Game and Fish we all are not kings and can afford you raising fees to where only the rich can hunt. This causing the poaching problem we now have in this state.

I would not support what I have seen. My understanding is all archery bull tags would be considered premium hunts. If this is correct I would suggest making just the more popular (larger bulls) units which I believe are managed differently as premium hunts and leave the others units alone. Just like the

Kaibab hunt. That is my 2cents.

What can us normal middle class working hunters say to put this money grab to a stop. Simplification my Ass. And what is this shit about premium hunts. How is that defined. You can bet I will start doing more homework on this subject. More and more I feel my State Constitutional rights are being impinged...

We are watching you.

Arizona Game and Fish Department
License Simplification Team

Comments on License Simplification:

I have been following the AZG&F process regarding License Simplification and have studied the handouts and Powerpoint slides in some detail. Yesterday I took time to view the May 20, 2013 webcast and have been very impressed and pleased with the Commission and Staff's dedication to simplification, innovation leading to creation of additional value for the average hunter/angler, commitment to youth (attraction, retention and attempts to track through \$5 license issuance) and the overall process. I also appreciate the opportunity to comment on the concepts presented and am confident that final staff recommendations and Commission action will be a net positive for the average hunter/angler, reflect all comments while protecting the public trust and maintain a sound funding source for the continued excellent work of the Department. I have attempted to categorize my comments for ease of processing as well as provide background regarding my hunt/fish activities.

Background: I am 53 and a 24 year resident of Tucson. I've purchased a combination hunt/fish license for 23 consecutive years including an over the counter (OTC) archery deer tag. I have applied for elk tags (mostly bull but occasionally cow second choice) almost every year. I purchase my license and apply for elk draws using the on-line system and purchase my OTC deer tag at a G &F office. I elk hunt/scout approximately 20 days per year when drawn. I deer hunt approximately 20 days per year during all OTC seasons. I fish occasionally (25 partial days per year) and recently (last 3 years) have also purchased urban fishing licenses. Since moving to Arizona I have never hunted out of state but do occasionally travel out of state to fish.

365 Day License: I generally buy my Class F (hunt/fish) license and OTC deer tag as my own Christmas gift. This covers me for the entire upcoming calendar year. I no longer hunt javalina but have friends who do, requiring them to have a valid license for the coming year in October (for the draw). The 365 day license seems to be a positive in some ways but may cause some administrative headaches regarding multiple license numbers during a calendar year associate with a single hunter ID number. A possible solution, at least for on-line purchasers like me who buy the same license every year may be a single license number with a renewable option. Because the financial outlay for a lifetime license isn't an option for me at this time and I'm several years from a Pioneer License, a renewable license would have the same affect.

Hunt/Fish Licenses: Although I don't take advantage of option (because I only hunt deer and elk and do some fishing and the \$ doesn't pencil out for me), the "Super" license was an innovative change when implemented that has many advantages and no drawbacks I can think of. Any inclusion of additional privileges, even with nominal additional cost, could provide additional opportunity and value to the "average" hunter/angler. A one size fits all will almost never fit all but too many options is the problem you're currently trying to remedy. I support the packaged privilege concept.

Premium Tags (Deer & Elk): I generally support the concept of "Premium" hunts. The conceptual fees for premium tags do not seem to me to be out of line with the value of the resource. The ability of any

hunter to have an opportunity to draw a tag during the rut or in a prime trophy area at a reasonable cost should be protected. I do have concerns about which hunts may be considered premium.

Deer: For 23 years I have strictly bow hunted (OTC) deer in Arizona during both the early and late seasons. This year (2013) is the first year I've applied for a deer (13A, 13B) in an attempt to accumulate bonus points for an eventual archery Arizona Strip tag. I would clearly view that as a TROPHY HUNT and would be more than happy to pay a premium for a tag if drawn as well as significant hunt expense for travel and supplies (I've never used a guide and am a DIY solo hunter). My concerns are the possibility of all December deer being considered "Premium", including OTC archery, although slide 32 of the presentation states "does not include archery". While hunting during the rut is exciting, I don't consider hunting December 13th – 31st in Unit 37B to be premium when I can wait until January 1st when it's not. I would support all OTC archery deer remaining under a single annual tag/cost regardless of the months I choose to hunt.

Elk: Again, I strictly bow hunt elk. While I usually apply for September hunts I have hunted in November, a limited opportunity provided several years ago in some units. Although the September hunts do provide some increased opportunity for trophy bulls, the hunts were moved to earlier in the month several years ago and the rut seems to be at the very end of the hunt if at all (Unit 5B). If all early archery bull hunts are to be considered premium, (with an increase in fees from \$114 - \$200) could additional archery bull opportunities be provided in other months?

I am generally supportive of the concepts presented by the Department and appreciate the opportunity to comment. I will continue to follow and comment on the process as it moves forward. I am sympathetic to the challenges that your team faces in providing new and innovative options while protecting the resources entrusted to you.

To Whom It May Concern,

I have been an Arizona resident for nearly 10 years and have always felt the fees for resident tags were kind of high. After viewing your online power point, I disagree with the increases to residents adults again and the premium fee structure. Maybe rich people in the Phoenix area can afford these expensive licenses and tags, but many of us with lower paying jobs can hardly afford the current fees. If AZGFD needs more funds, then increase the fees to non-residents and increase the fees for youth, especially out of state youth. It is terrible that an adult resident of Arizona must pay more than a non-resident youth. That kid has another state he can already get a great deal in, why give him an amazing deal in our state, too, when some resident adults are not hunting because of our ridiculously high prices! AZGFD claims they are concerned about the decrease in hunters, but I personally know resident adults that are not hunting because of the cost of licenses and tags. THIS IS NOT RIGHT! Increase fees for non-resident adults and youths, NOT resident adults!

Hello,

I am an IT guy, I never re-invent the wheel when looking for solutions. I suggest reaching out to other state level departments to learn which models have proven to be effective and satisfactory for both the public and the department. Just skip California as we don't need any of that poison! States in the western half of the US should also have similar game management goals (and limited big game) as Arizona.

I am sure other state employees, directors would be open to share details and provide access to policies, operations models, laws, schedules, laws, etc.

I believe the current cost are fair. I have several things I think should be looked at. I have brought this up before and have not received any comments back.

1st,

It appears to me that the muzzle load hunts are up and the archery is down. The muzzle load hunt should be limited to the primitive style hunt with a flint lock type and not the modern muzzle load that is good for a 200+ yd shoot. Some say the reason is they only have one shot. When I shoot an animal I only use one shot, my answer is learn to shoot.

2nd,

A certain number of tags should be set aside for Pioneer Combo License. Those individuals have supported AZGF for years and only have a few years left to hunt. I happen to be one of those I think it should be set up just like the youth hunt.

Hello,

Please don't raise hunting fees..... I am poor... |

Thanks

My suggestions:

Cons:

Trying to simplify the licensing by bundling is not a good idea. All bundling does is make people buy something that they would not normally buy or use. Cable channels do it and customers don't like it. Charge people for only what they want and nothing more. I don't want a Nevada/California fishing stamp and I should not have to buy one. The pricing was not that difficult to begin with.

Premium hunt structure:

Any sort of pricing that separates the haves from the have nots is not a good idea. Game and fish needs to be as affordable as possible for all with regards to pricing. I'm afraid with all these increases you are slowly but surely eliminating your already limited customer base. When forced to make financial decisions a family will first start to eliminate the non-essentials.

Charging premium fees for hunts that aren't premium is just a sales job. If it is a unit that is managed strictly for older trophy class animals then a premium could logically be placed on the tag. 13a and 13B could be considered a premium hunt. However a hunt that has 2,3, or 4 general hunts along with a late hunt is not a premium hunt. December whitetail hunts should not be considered premium hunts because there are so many general hunts that precede them. These units aren't managed for older trophy class animals either.

Archery hunts in September that have cow hunts going on at the same time or more than 200 (much higher even close to 800) hunters in the field at the same time is not a premium hunt. If you are going to call it premium then you need to offer premium experiences and opportunities. The archery hunts should be moved back 1 week later in Sept, like they used to be in order to start making this more like a premium hunt.

Pros

I like the hunt insurance option as long as it is reasonable. Too many times people have things that arise that does not allow them to go on hunt. This would have to be set up with careful consideration to avoid abuse and point creep. I like giving people the option of turning in tag and not lose thier bonus points. I would like to see the next person in line get the tag. The person who turns in tag might lose half their tag fee ammount for surrendering tag. To reduce or eliminate abuse people should only be able to surrender tag 2 times over a lifetime. After that they can donate to HOAL or another organization but they will lose all their fees and BP's. Point creep will become a bigger issue if people get to keep forfeiting their tags and keeping bonus points. Tags should be surrendered at least 72 hours before hunt starts in order to keep BP's. this will allow dept time to notify next person in line.

You could even a \$5 or \$10 fee on to applications who would like to go on the next in line list.

Try to share all the costs evenly accross the board and not just the tag holders. Try not to overburden non residents hunters with extremley high tag fees. After all, they have to buy licenses for many years before they are usually drawn.

Would also like to see G&F increase the number of auction tags to 5-10 per spieces. We can use the additional funds to help keep costs down for the rest. Never would I want our state to be like Utah with regard to auction tags but to increase by a few would help.

G&F needs to tighten their belt more. Just like the rest of us have had to do in our own lives. We have learned that we can't have everything and we have learned to do without somethings. The dept needs to seriously look at programs that don't pay for themselves. It seems our non-game branch is getting bigger and bigger all the time and the hunting/fishing community is flipping nearly 100% of the bill. Maybe it is time to reevaluate the need for all these programs. I'm sure there are other ways to cut back so everybody is sharing some of the "pain".

In conclusion:

Sportsmen and women will generally support what the dept does if they are treated fairly and respectfully with full transparency.

I am in favor of the license simplification. I don't think you are raising the prices enough for non-residents. I apply annually for nonresident hunts in WY, UT, NV, and NM. Arizona should have raised their fees before now to remain in line with other western states.

Increasing price would cause more poaching and losing hunter like me. I donated to Arizona game and fish and I get this, I'll go different state and spend my money where its worth it

Good day !

As a professional Garment manufactory and exporter,Wenzhou JingYi Garment Co.,Ltd majored in garments internationaltrade which belongs to Zhejiang, China.

Our mainproducts include leather overcoats, leather dresses, fur coats and washed leather products.

Supported with modernization equipment and manufacturing system, professional designer and worker, we can provide our customers with satisfying products, based on different requirements.

If there is any way I can help you, pls do not hesitate to write to me. I will quote you our best price for your reference without delay. You will see that our price is most attractive.

We look forward to cooperate with you in the near future.

Is the app fee included in the new proposed tags? If not adding them to the tags puts them out of reach for a lot of people.

It looks like the archery hunters will be hit hardest as most of their tags will be premium tags.

Will the lifetime licenses be changed to include the proposed changes to the new yearly licenses.

Please do not raise the prices. We can barely afford to get to go now. I'm worried my kids won't get to go at all.

Being retired and on a fixed income I oppose any increase in the license fees. There are states here in the west that I can hunt big game animals as a non-resident at far lower cost for some species than as a resident of Arizona. I have hunted antelope in Wyoming twice now as I can't seem to get drawn in my home state of Az. Cost was \$35 a tag with 5 available each year.

With the National Forests in Arizona doing what they can to limit hunter access it has become less desirable to hunt here. The increase in fees would be the final reason to quit hunting here at all.

The situations on our lakes is not much better with fees being assessed and the services that were provided either stopped entirely or reduced and the access to the shoreline prohibited. Enforcement of camping rules stops at dusk when the Sheriffs and G&F officers leave the campers to their own devices. This is especially true at Bartlett Lake.

I like the simplification of the License structures and I think that this simplification may increase the customer base in areas like fishing. One thing that concerns me is that premium tag/fees for deer and elk. A lot of hunters like myself look forward to having an opportunity for a rut hunt or for a great area, but with higher fees for those opportunities, many will be unable or unwilling to pay that huge price for premium hunts and without those opportunities the enthusiasm for hunting might decrease for many hunters.

It is also harmful to those who may live in or near these units and know the area or want to hunt closed to home or to their cabin etc, that they now have to pay double just for this reasonable desire.

In addition, it adds to the complexity of the tag and hunt fees at the same time you are trying to simplify things.

Thank you for the work you have done on this and I know that a lot of effort has been made by the commission. The premium tags and hunts is one thing the commission may want to reconsider.

With the number of hunters continuing to fall while costs associated with game management continue to rise, I would think Arizona would want to look at what the adjacent states of New Mexico and Utah do as one means to address the challenge. Specifically, both those states use a different fee structure for both residents and non-residents for both deer and elk permits, with the price of a permit rising in proportion to the relative quality or demand of the permit. For example, in Utah, a general deer permit costs \$40 for a resident, and \$268 for a non-resident, while a limited-entry permit (a permit in a more desirable area) costs \$80 and \$468, respectively, and a premium limited-entry permit (most desirable areas of the state) costs \$168 and \$568, respectively. This fee structure allows maximum participation by the hunting public, while allowing those willing to wait or pay more an opportunity to hunt less crowded areas, where success is higher, with greater opportunity for trophy-class animals. Nothing is more frustrating to me as a hunter than to see someone draw a coveted early rifle bull elk tag, only to hunt one or two days, or draw an East Side Late Kiabab deer tag, and hunt only the opening weekend.

By changing the fee structure to charge more for those mentioned permits, folks who more fully appreciate the privilege and opportunity would be the only ones applying for those permits, while less dedicated hunters could still hunt in seasons and areas where more permits are available. I associate with both dedicated and not-so-dedicated hunters, and have discussed this concept with them, with the consensus that adopting such a fee structure would not discourage either group from continuing to participate in the drawing process for deer and elk tags. More detail for the cost structure for the mentioned states can be obtained from their web sites. Thank you for your interest and consideration.

Hello,

I am concerned about the future with these new fees. I think it would be better to increase everything by a set percentage. I know everything is going up and increase is needed. But I am noticing more and more people hunting less for expense reasons. Now this eventually removes children from being introduced to hunting and fishing. Children are slowly thru the years have been decreasing in these sports (fishing and hunting) but it is their parents that introduce the kids to the sport. If you raise hunting prices for adults eventually they will decide not to hunt and that kills the future for children to be introduced to the sports. No matter how many clinics or classes you offer it will be the parents that take them or not take them. I am concerned that is will be the impact seen starting 2014. Just raise the prices a set percentage across the board rather than creating frustration with border line current hunters still taking their children. The sport is our heritage needing to be continued and introduced to the future hunters. Leaving the prices low for children but increasing the price on the parents that will continue taking the kids will just hurt the future because folks making hard decision of how to spend money and vacation time will eventually give up on attempting to hunt or fish. We all have to make decisions these days on how to spend our money but we have our parents that showed us how nice it is to hunt, fish and camp is. If we were not introduced as kids to it we would not even have it in our adult minds to put in our money and vacation spending decisions would we? Our parents let us know how nice it is spend a weekend in the woods. The future is in our hands to introduce to the kids.

Thank you for hearing me out.

I am writing to oppose any license fee increases. I feel with the increase in fees you are just driving out the average joe's, and making it a rich mans sport. Lets not make it the sport of Kings! Lets keep the costs affordable for all

This input must have been drawn up by fisherman and not hunters, it seems that this only benefits if you fish in Arizona and not if you hunt. Taking from one and giving to the other, isn't wise at all. I myself with these new fees wont' be able to afford to put in for my whole family. trying to give to the Juniors by adding huge new fees on to everyone else doesn't seem too wise, who pays for the junior tags, yes, the parents, so you are trying to retain hunter recruitment, but this isn't the way to do it. I believe the there should be no more than 10% increases to the existing tag fees, hunting licenses, fishing licenses and do away with the make money premium hunt structure. If you want to alienate the lower to middle income people, then these new fees are right on, but I believe that in doing what you have proposed will in the long run ruin the Arizona Game and Fish.

I hope these don't get implemented for the majority of non rich Arizonans that live and pay taxes and love the outdoors

To Whom it May Concern,

PLEASE-PLEASE create a review board that would allow mistakes on applications to be looked at (maybe case-by-case?). Also, limit the amount of fine print in the application process -- getting a tag to hunt shouldn't require a person to have a doctorate.

I am a non-resident and recently (with my hunting partner Jesse Deckert, cc'd herein) lost 4 of my VERY expensive elk points (\$170/yr x 4 = \$680!) because I missed some small print on the hunt codes. I inadvertently entered myself into an archery cow hunt during the rut and oddly won it. Now I am sure

you are thinking, well tough luck to you, but think about it. Why would an Eau Claire, Wisconsin resident want to spend \$1280 (4 points \$680 +tag \$600) on a cow elk that is 1600 miles away? Logically, this just doesn't make sense to me one bit and I would hope someone else would understand too. For just quick comparison purposes, if I wanted to hunt a cow elk, I could buy a tag over the counter in Wyoming for \$288 (no points) and it would be 600 miles closer to home.

I am very unhappy with Arizona's "tough-guy" stance on the application process.

Arizona Game and Fish Department
5000 W. Carefree Highway
Phoenix, AZ 85086

Re: Conceptual License Structure and Fees

The Southern Arizona Quail Forever Chapter membership has approved the following for inclusion in the license structure and fees.

Creation of an upland bird stamp.

- o Such a stamp would be mandatory for hunting of all upland species and would identify hunters for harvest data and hunt satisfaction surveys.

- o Currently, the AGFD has no way to identify and survey upland bird hunters. This is a significant problem as the current system limits the amount and accuracy of the data collected. This lack of data limits the ability to understand the current status of the different species and what management changes may be necessary or appropriate for them.

- o The stamp could also be used to educate hunters about their role in the stewardship of the species and habitat.

- o Revenue generated from stamp would be dedicated to the stamp program and upland bird research and projects.

I felt the need to revisit the comments I made earlier. Those comments still represent my feelings about the proposal.

I wanted to revisit one in particular-fee increases.

I fear we have hit the wall in terms of our wildlife resource funding about one half of the Dept. operations. I fear there may be little left to acquire. I also realize there are many wildlife jobs that require attention now compared to when I started my career when we were (all 240 of us) existing on our wildlife resource. During my career I saw Heritage, WCF, OHV, Waterfowl CF, Teaming, etc. come to the table and the agency grew a bunch. Each one of these non-appropriated funds was going to allow us to do so much more-which we did.....but it was soon not enough.

I realize our customers in the 70s were primarily the license holders and today they are way in the minority. I also will always support the concept "we are the wildlife people in AZ" and often get upset when I see a Rural-Metro fireman talking about relocating rattlesnakes on TV. I also know the demand has outstripped the employee base.

I guess where I am going is I can see a need to reassess programs and expenditures in light of this pending license fee increase. I fear there will probably be little support for much of an increase based on my limited universe of contact.

I know AGFD is constantly looking for other means to support non traditional programs but the holy grail still seems to evade search efforts.

So all that said, I think any fee increase request probably needs to be presented with a plan to some how save operation dollars to make the increase more effective.....big and difficult request.

Thanks for listening to an old story.

I recently sent in feedback on the newly proposed fee structure and wanted to add a couple of items.

They are:

1) It is currently less expensive for resident adults in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah to hunt elk in their states than it is for a resident Arizona junior to hunt elk in Arizona (on average, it cost just over \$48, including application fees, for resident adults to hunt elk in these three states). Even when you add in the most expensive nearby state outside of Arizona (New Mexico), the average cost only goes up to \$59.00/elk tag. It is therefore about the same in these four other states for resident adults to hunt elk in their states as it does for a junior in Arizona to hunt elk in Arizona. The fee philosophy in Arizona is wrong and doesn't pass the simple "eye test"... this looks & is wrong.

2) As a state employee myself where our "organization" has undergone severe cutbacks due to lack of state and federal funding, we had to identify and remove and and all waste if it existed. We have also had to cut out viable and important programs simply because the funding wasn't available, therefore we are all having to do more with less. Why does the Arizona Game and Fish Dept. not have to do the same and be held accountable to identify serious fiscal waste? I believe there is serious waste in the AZGFD, which I also heard was operating on over a \$90M budget annually, yet instead of trying to be fiscally responsible and cutting out waste, the department is instead attempting to have simply pass on all costs regardless and not identify and eliminate waste.

As an example of this waste, I recently heard that Wildlife Managers spend much (if not most) of their paid salary time working out of their home because there simply isn't enough for them to do in department offices or in the field. If this is true, then why are we paying for WMs to sit at home? This by itself sounds like a huge waste of money, and perhaps many of these positions should be part-time positions as opposed to full-time.

I suggest the department hire an independent agency (as did our organization a few years ago) to research and identify where waste was occurring so that it could be properly addressed/dealt with. Before you simply "pass the buck" so-to-speak, prove to us that the need for these funds are legitimate as I do not believe they are. Just showing job cost ledgers only identifies where funds are being spent, not where waste is occurring.

This brings us to the reason for the request in raising fees to hunt and fish in Arizona in the first place... because the AZGFD is wasting so much money that in order to maintain the current spending levels more funds are needed, period. Since funding comes through fees it's apparently more desirable to charge more money in way of fees than to identify and cut waste.

Hi,

I had a couple question/concerns about the propositions given that I didn't hear answered on the online broadcast. I like the idea of the 365 day license for those who are not avid hunters/fishermen who always get a license every year. Will it be similar to a day fishing license where you get to choose when the license starts? Because I put in for javelina every year and thus need a license for the next year in october. Will I be able to purchase a license and give it a Jan 1st start date?

Secondly, concerning licenses and the big game draw system. Currently you have to use your License number to put in for big game. So when you get drawn you have the license already for the hunt time. With the 365 deal, say a license expires in July. They put in for deer and get drawn for a November hunt. If they don't renew their license then they could have a tag without a valid license. How will this work?

Thirdly, about the application process with the Premium structure. If someone puts a premium hunt for first choice and a regular hunt for second choice with an application by mail, would they have to write a check for the premium hunt and if drawn for the regular hunt, be refunded the \$55 difference? Similarly

if you put in online, I would assume that whichever you get drawn for, that amount would be taken out of your account (on top of the initial \$13 app fee).

On a slightly different note, concerning the application process, I think there should be a check box that says if you want your second choice to be looked at in the bonus point round. As you know if your first choice is a very difficult to draw hunt and your second is not, you may get the second choice in the bonus round and never even have a chance at your first choice. I know this happens a lot with javelina hunts and it happened this year to me and my brother getting our second archery cow tag within the 20% bonus round and didn't get a chance to get the bull tag in the 1st and 2nd choice round. Just a suggestion for those who want an extra opportunity to draw a difficult hunt and get their second choice as a last resort.

Thank you for you time.

Arizona Game and Fish Commission

Dear Members:

A prior commitment prevents me from being at the 6/14 meeting. I hope you will consider my points which Lynn Roe has so kindly agreed to forward to you.

I have attached data outlining the percentage increases the last time tags were increased and a comparison with eight other western states as to what they charge residents.

As you can see in these attachments we are 54% higher for a resident hunting license, 81% higher for an elk tag and 12% higher for deer. These would rise to 76% license, 130% elk tag and 45% deer tag.

Licenses and tags have been raised in 2001, 2004 and 2007. A resident deer tag was raised to \$19.50 in 2004. If raised to \$45 that would be a 131% increase in 9 years. An elk tag was raised to \$71 in 2004. If a bull tag goes to \$145 the cost would have more than doubled in those 9 years.

The conceptual tags would be 27% more for resident bull elk (only a 11% increase for nonresidents), 39% increase for a turkey tag and almost 30% increase for a resident deer tag. The proposed "premium" hunts would be almost triple what they are now for deer, 75% higher for elk.

At the same time residents will be asked to pay more nonresidents would see a 29% reduction for a combo license and a whopping 40% decrease for a cow elk tag.

Four of these eight western states game and fish departments also do not receive general fund monies (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico). Both Idaho and Colorado have not increased resident deer and elk tags since BEFORE our last increase in 2007 and New Mexico has increased it only \$2 for elk and \$3 for deer for residents in that same time frame.

Obviously the more elk the more elk tags can be sold so many of these states can charge less. But do we need to charge 59% more than they do in New Mexico, 2.5 times what they do in Oregon, 3.5 times what they charge in Utah and Wyoming, 4 times what they charge in Colorado and Idaho and 9 times what residents pay in Montana? We have two and a half times the number of elk that Nevada has yet we will be 19% higher than them if the proposed elk tag increase is adopted.

Finally I'm not sure why the application fee should be raised 73% when more and more hunters are using online services to buy a license or apply for a big game hunt. I have to assume this requires less manpower.

Perhaps an alternative to these increases would be to tie the license and tag costs to the C.P.I. and adjust the cost every two or three years.

The AZGFD's core concepts of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation states: "Opportunity to participate in hunting....is guaranteed for all....not by....financial capacity".

Director Voyles in the 2012-13 Arizona Hunting regs. stated: "hunting in America is not a privilege reserved for a chosen few by birthright or personal wealth."

Please keep it affordable for all of us. Thank you.

Doesn't like \$13 fee if not truly moving to point of sale.

When applying charge tag fee upfront.

Pronghorn should be premium.

| |
|---|
| Mail only for premium hunts |
| Likes premium structure- Count 4 |
| Good with DR premium concept |
| Elk-like concept as presented |
| Mountain Lion tag fee should go down |
| Not agree with fee for BB |
| Combination resident should not increase since nonresidents are getting a deal |
| Gentlemem/Ladies, I would like to suggest something that many other states have already enacted. That is, Allowing disabled American Veterans to get a break on fees for hunting and fishing.. These brave men and women have already paid the price to this great State and Nation. I would suggest that 50% DVs get 1/2 off and 100% get a free license. Both to be verified by a letter from the VA granting the disability. I would appreciate your consideration on this matter... |
| I would like to recommend having all tags for youth at very low cost. Not just the hunt permit -tags in "juniors only hunts" , but all youth should be able to purchase tags at a greatly reduced rate. For example: Idaho youth deer tags are \$10.75 and youth elk tags are \$16.50. This would make it much more feasible for families to get involved in Arizona's great hunting opportunities, and would be a great investment in the future of wildlife management. |
| In this day and age of technology we should be able to prorate hunting and fishing licenses. They either need to be valid for 1 year from the date of sale, or they need to be prorated so the later in the year it is, the less they cost. I CAN'T TELL YOU HOW MANY PEOPLE I KNOW OVER THE YEARS THAT WERE INTERESTED IN BEING INTRODUCED TO HUNTING AND FISHING - BUT DID NOT WANT TO PAY FULL PRICE, ESPECIALLY IN THE FALL OR LATE IN THE YEAR WHEN OPPORTUNITY AND INTEREST ARE AT THE HIGHEST LEVELS (mostly young people!!!). I have purchased for them at times, but for the most part they just decided it was not worth it. It isn't rocket science folks, it is simple math - and it is only fair. Us old timers have been buying licenses for years, but how much is the next generation of folks in the outdoors worth? The Department has done some good things with youth hunts and license discounts, but there really needs to be more incentive with a year from date, or prorated license. I have also known many adults, who for whatever reason have contemplated trying hunting or fishing, but it is usually in the fall - and they look at the price and see it is about to expire and just blow it off... |
| Take all of the increases to AZ residents OUT and put the desired income increase into the non-resident fees. |
| You should authorize a permit that is required for all those that participate in any pursuit with hounds of mountain lions or bears. Currently multiple people can participate so long as one person has a tag (Pinetop). |
| You should develop an appropriately priced permit that allows a mountain lion hunter to continue to pursue lions after they have reached their annual bag limit (Kingman). |
| Nonresidents should have to pay a higher fee to be a guide in Arizona. Many other states have differential resident and nonresident fees and regulations (Kingman). |
| Nonresidents should have to pay more for a bobcat CITES tag than do residents (Kingman). |
| I like the premium concept, but you need to recognize that you will need to reduce permits in the premium units by at least 50%. I don't want to be bumping elbows with other hunters when I have paid a premium price for a tag (Kingman). |
| I don't like the premium concept (Kingman). |
| As a non resident with a son and father (3 of us) vested several years in the Arizona point system I feel |

the increase would be too much at this point in time.

I would support \$700-\$750 for Bull Elk and \$350 for Buck Deer. I do not like the "premium" tag though. Archery in Sept is very tough still and labeling archery "premium" and charging additional for it is not ok. Sept rifle hunt yes, but not Archery.

I do like the reduced fees for youth non-residents still. We are planning a hunt for my son in 5 years there. I appreciate that!

I just viewed the Powerpoint for the licence simplification and all I can say is 'thank you'
As somebody who lives out of state, but will be a regular visitor (monthly) to Arizona, my first viewing of your licence and regulation web pages had me scratching my head about what licence I would need.

Simplification is the key word and with the fishing licences in this proposal you've certainly achieved that goal.

Great job on simplifying the licensing overall. The only big issue noted is the premium tags. This was tried in the past and a bad idea then. Nothing has changed. It is still a bad idea, unless you are truly trying to cater to guides and outfitters. There are many people both in state and out that put in for these hunts with no intention of killing a trophy class type of animal. A deer is a deer and the same for elk. Just because some areas are managed a little differently and the hunts occur during prime times for seeing and potentially harvesting an animal does not make them a premium hunt. Most of these hunts are already special/premium in nature due to it generally taking long periods to draw the tag. We should not have to pay more to possibly hunt an animal in a certain unit or during a certain time of year.

Very nice to see things are going to change, I've been waiting for license simplification in AZ for 10 years. I was wondering whether or not there be any changes to Lifetime licenses?

If go premium, Dec archery deer should also have a premium cost. For OTC hunts, archers would have to purchase a validation to hunt the Dec season (attach to OTC tag)

NR mountain lion tag should be \$15

NR mountain lion tag should be 3 x Resident cost (\$45)

Okay to bring mountain lion and black bear NR tag to 5 or 6 times resident fee

Offer a mountain lion tag with every other draw tag

Application fee for Resident= \$10; NR should be \$20. Many other states have differential fees.

Lowering mountain lion tag fees to \$15 to \$45 will increase mountain lion tag sales and may also increase NR hunt license sales

Not all September archery hunts should go premium

Group members did not state if they supported Premium structure or not.

Didn't like cow elk tag increase for Residents but decrease for Non-resident

I work for Big Brothers Big Sisters of Flagstaff. We take groups of kids fishing 15-20 times a year. Everytime we go out we have to come to the station and buy a group permit for \$25. It would really help out if there was an option to buy a year group permit, even if it cost more money. Thank you for your time in reviewing this comment.

I answered my survey today and dropped it in the mail. I would like to add a few comments and questions though. I question the intentions of a survey that asks pointed questions in a bias manner and does not provide a comment area. Ex: Should a bull tag cost more than a cow tag? By asking in this manner you can use the results to say. "yes, XX% are in favor of raising the price of a bull tag" instead of asking "Should the price of a cow tag cost less than a bull tag?" then XX% would be in favor of LOWERING the price of a cow tag. It is a great bait and switch technique.

I am NOT in favor of a trophy bull tag. Its Arizona, almost the entire state is a trophy area. It costs what it costs. Sure, I would love to say that an early season rifle tag should cost 10X what a late season one does. But those people usually waited a lot longer than me to draw a tag, so, no. keep all the tags the same. How would you justify a almost \$300 jump in a nonresident bull tag? Raise by an across the board

percentage. Don't forget that Arizona's elk roam on NATIONAL forest. If G &F needs additional funds, then increases should be across the board. In your response you wrote "The complexity of obtaining the legal permits/tags/licenses is cumbersome and may be impeding some people from participating in the outdoor activities that you and I enjoy." Is that really true or are a few complaining because they cannot, or will not follow simple instructions or directions? Or, do some people who can afford to pay more (and are used to getting what they want by paying for it) complaining because it takes them as long as it takes me to get drawn? If someone wants to pay \$5000 for an elk tag let them hunt in New Mexico.

I have hunted in Arizona as a non resident for over 20 years. I love the state, and I feel the system is somewhat fair. I was very disappointed with the actions of some of your employees (the jaguar incident, the deputy w/ archery elk incident and the latest TIP embezzlement scandal) but I still stand behind the department in what they do overall. In closing, I ask that you strive to keep hunting and fishing affordable to the working class. I have two sons that I would like to see to experience Arizona as I have. Please don't price that out of my budget in the name of satisfying a few. Please make decisions based on NONBIASED facts not a biased questionnaire like the department sent me. Thank you