

SCG Comments

Comment: Can you elaborate on the Department's official stance/position relating to the USFS's Travel Management Rule, which currently in the Kiabab NF it states, "In the case of motorized vehicle use for the purpose of dispersed camping, motorists can drive up to 30 feet from the side of all open system roads, unless otherwise posted." For the Coconino NF, it appears that the USFS is designating along which roads we can camp restricting us largely to unimproved camper/trailer "parks" when you review the miniscule % of open roads we will be limited to. Reading through some of the comments specifically made by the AZGFD to the USFS, it appears that the USFS largely ignored the Department's recommendations citing they had "already met and discussed the Department's suggestions" or some such reasonable facsimile. That said, is there any practical recourse the Department is considering given some of these circumstances?

Comment: Quail hunting with dogs is my passion. Why do you keep opening the season earlier in October, when it is too hot to hunt with dogs, and close it a week earlier than you used to in February, which is ideal dog hunting weather? Please consider keeping the season open to the second week-end in February like you used to. Thank you from my dogs.

Comment: Why is it you are giving out so many tags, hunting javelina this year was the worst ever, the deer herds are harder and harder to get too. AZGFD used to be the best at managing animals now it looks like you are turning into one of the worst the wolves we have to compete against with the elk herds how are they supposed to survive with the young and tired old bulls being slaughtered. your management skills are going DOWN. everyone where i live complain anyone i talk to complains about it. very [redacted] poor and sorry!!!!

Comment: why should i have to buy a license to hunt if i am not playing to hunt if i get draw

Comment: The use of game cameras needs to be regulated. During dry conditions animals, especially deer, can be effectively patterned. In 13 A for example you can not find a water source that does not have multiple game cameras. There are very few large deer that escape remote scrutiny and then being killed. How easy do we have to make hunting? I would propose no camera use once a season starts, which in Arizona would ban cameras from the end of August through December.

Comment: The war on elk needs to end. Elk numbers continue to decline yet elk permits continue to increase. Hunters need to know what the Department's goal is, other than to reduce elk numbers. Where are we headed? 20,000 elk? 15,000? It was not long ago when the reported population in the state was 35,000 elk.

Comment: Currently muzzle loaders get approximately 35% of the September/October, early bull hunt permits. That is unfortunately out of kilter with the overall allocation of permits

issued for muzzle loader Bull Elk (about 5.5%). It seems unfair to the regular rifle hunters that want an opportunity for one of the early Bull Elk permits. Today's regulations regarding muzzle loaders permit telescopic sites, in-line actions, sabots, shotgun primers, and other modern adaptations that are far from traditional. The adaptations close the gap between the muzzle loader and modern rifle, with regard to lethal range, and accuracy. It seems to me that this should be taken into consideration and if it would reduce the percentage of muzzle loader permits issued for the early Bull Elk permits. I support the concept of separate hunts, however there are currently units that exclude traditional rifles, but permit muzzle loaders, for Elk, and will continue to do so. This is quite an advantage to the muzzle loader hunters that want a "trophy" bull, while being at a severe disadvantage to a rifle hunter with the same desire. Additionally, muzzle loader hunters can hunt in any of the regular rifle hunts. Please review your allocations for these firearms hunts, particularly the early bull hunts. The overall formula may be correct, but the allocation for early hunts is not, in my opinion.

Comment:[redacted]This web site will go indebt about what the wolves are doing please watch the video. it's ashame how the democrates screwed up alot of the hunting and how they are trying to take over our lives. the wolves are destroying wildlife and ranch cattle. Please put a stop to them and bring back our hunting the way it used to be when AZGFD was the best in wildlife management now it is going down hill like the rest... too many hunting permits too little deer,javelina,elk are all going down hill.

Comment:Since it is the responsibility of every hunter to make every effort to recover wounded game, I think the responsible use of Blood Tracking Dogs should be allowed to help. Especially in the case of Bow hunting, where it is common for an animal to run several hundred yards into heavy cover after being fatally shot. A properly trained dog on a leash would pose very little risk of chasing and greatly improve chances of recovery. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment:We have a serious problem out in the units 1, 3b, 3c. The hound hunters have taken over the fall bear hunt! Split the fall hunt 1/2 and 1/2 for hunters like myself and other to be able to hunt before the hounds get out there! We work all summer long stalking our bears and finding where they are working and opening day we have hounds running loose and chasing the bears we work hard on all summer long to locate! More then 1/2 are illegally hunting! I have worked hard in the field to stop this! Please consider Stalkers and Callers before the hounds get out there and close our units! There are just too many hound hunters! Too many times they road hunt and drop the tailgates and let the dogs out!! Please help me change this for all the fall bear callers and stalkers.

Comment:Archery elk hunts are too early in September. Perhaps because of the warming in the past decade, the weather in Arizona doesn't cool down enough for elk to be fully in the rut. In some units, like 6b, the elk bugling is not in full swing by the time of the current archery elk hunts, which makes archery hunting elk difficult. I propose moving elk hunts later in the month by a week or two, even if the number of tags must be

reduced. I personally would rather have a quality hunt less often than a poor quality hunt more often.

Comment: I just want to make a general comment. I think it is great the Game and Fish Department is asking the public for ideas on future wildlife management. My idea is simple, "Don't change a thing!" I have been hunting and fishing in Arizona for the last 30 years and I feel like the fish and wildlife populations are for the most part, remaining very stable. What ever tools (surveys, hunter success, weather patterns, etc.) that the men and women of Game and Fish currently use, work great! I am genuinely impressed with the stability of wildlife populations from my own observations the last 30 years afield. Great Job!!!!

Comment: Dear Sirs, I think this meeting is a great idea and applaud the Game and Fish Department for setting this up. I have a couple of concerns I am hoping can be addressed in order to ensure this meeting is effective. I understand this meeting isn't about 2072 but I am sure the [redacted] thinks they can leverage it that way. I am one of the people working on a new conservation group, the Southwest Sportsmens Alliance. 1. The people behind HB 2072 may view this meeting as a way to clarify or establish an emergency "need" for something like HB 2072. I don't think this meeting should turn into a gripe fest or it will play into their hands. I think we should discuss "opportunities" and not allow the [redacted] or any other groups to make it appear that things are really screwed up. I think AZGFD does a good job, this meeting should focus on things the public can do to make things even better. 2. HB 2072 may be unlikely to rear its ugly head again (in its current form) however it will almost certainly come back as some other bill number. The commission and Arizona hunters have come out against the expo tag idea and it would be a real disservice to Arizona hunters if the people behind this bill were to waste any more time trying to justify this flawed concept. I hope we don't see a presentation in support of this in any way during the course of this meeting. 3. I would love to see the Arizona Game and Fish Department make some kind of Hunter Advisory statement that notifies the public that a group (the [redacted] and [redacted]) is working against their interests and cancel their memo of understanding. This group is causing more problems for AZGFD than they are fixing and they need to go away. Especially since the special interest license plates will ultimately be going away anyway and this group won't even be able to provide financial funding for conservation projects in the future (unless they make money off of public auction tags). 4. If [redacted] speaks one second longer than the standard public comment period I will personally yell "time is up" from the crowd until she stops talking. This lady is a one person wrecking crew for hunt opportunity in Arizona and has shown no respect for the department or the hunting public. She should be banned from the meeting altogether. 5. This electronic blue slip website is great however it also gives a small group of people (who are paid to push legislation) a way to make their voices louder. I would hope any comments in support of expos for auction tags are reviewed carefully (the language) to ensure they are not coming from a handful of individuals with a financial interest in this.

Comment: As an Arizona native and 59 year resident my compliments to the Commission and

the AGFD for calling for this "Summit"; it's refreshing and most important "transparent". I strongly support such public venues and will aid in any fashion possible to ensure its success both on Thursday night 3/22 and in future venue/organizational efforts. In principle I must share that I will not support any type of legislation, referendum or initiative that would in any fashion diminish the AGFD current ARS Title 17 Commission authority and control over our states wildlife. I support the transparent and public vetting process that the Commission authority requires. It seems of late that a quest for targeted species/program funding is taking over our headlines and the current legislative session. I would like to suggest 5 ways to come up with additional "targeted program funding" that I can and would support and have seen work in other states with great success. I have been hunting out of state across the west-mid west since 1973 and currently apply for hunts/points in 10 states. Also note that all of the following would fund/compliment successful existing AGFD programs. That said I would want 100% of the funding be "Dirt Dollars" similar to the current HPC species tag funds and Waterfowl Stamp funds and no overhead charged, if overhead were required it should be limited to 10% or less. So here are my suggestions: 1. I would support both a "Habitat or Conservation stamp" and an "Access stamp" for each hunter applying for any AZ big game tag, just one each calendar year would be required. In Montana both fees are \$10 each. We have been doing this for 60+ years on the North Kaibab deer hunts per our Sykes Act agreement. As for a benchmark on such a program I am really impressed with how Montana's "Block Management Access " program works. It really works and I have used it to hunt eastern whitetails on 100% private property at no additional cost to myself also pheasant hunting on 100% private property no additional cost. Go to [redacted] and give it a look. I have interviewed land owners and for example the ranch that I and my hunting partner hunted on and killed 2 bucks on this past November received the maximum payment available or \$12,000 this is real \$\$\$ and goes directly to pay their annual property taxes and for Christmas holidays. The beauty to their program is it is based on actual recorded "hunter days". The landowners are incentivized to have hunter participation and it directly related to the "reimbursement for access" formula, not to a "landowner tag" which NM/UT uses. It has many different forms per species/seasons and acreages and sign in out features. I would see the current AGFD regional Access Coordinators running the actual program in the Regions. Allocations of funding to the ongoing Species/HPC and Access programs would have to be defined. Also for some interesting background on the recent Montana Access Initiative I-160 go [redacted] 2. Another other possible approach that in my mind has merit but likely would not gain support in our state is outlined in the attached Az article from 2005. Wyoming has a stair stepped differential fees for "full priced" or "reduced price" tags. Bill puts premium on deer, elk permits, but it does cause a "pay to play" and does not create a level playing field which is so important to our hunter groups in Arizona, I simply point it out as a way to gain more species targeted revenues based on the control of tags by the Commission and not some outside group. [redacted] 3. Like many, many states do across the west Arizona could/should charge more for our NR Bonus points as well and earmark the funds. I could see a resident paying the current \$7.50 and \$15 for NR. I would support a \$10 or \$15 fee for both Residents and NR. I currently pay out some \$1800 a year in 10 states to protect my

bonus points the highest are in Wyoming with Sheep at \$100 and the most reasonable besides Arizona is Utah at just \$8. 4. And finally to get more exposure for our Super Big Game raffle when you apply for any of those species in the regular draw on line, before you exit that species you would be asked on line if you want to purchase that species Super Big Game ticket for the current fee charge, I think we would get quit an increase in those species targeted funds to add to our current HPC program for each species. Again I want to thank the Commission and AGFD for calling for this summit and I will lend my wholehearted support to ensure its positive/collective success.

Comment: What are we doing to preserve our dwindling desert Deer populations? Is there a possibility to close units now to let Deer populations recover?

Comment: I have been a long time AZ hunter, now have a pioneer license and have also been a AZ Hunter Safety Instructor. I have asked and been asked to explain the Hunter "POINT" system and have never received a rational answer from any Game and Fish official. The only answer that I ever received was "BECAUSE". Please address what seems to be a totally bizarre "point" system in the draw for hunters. It would seem reasonable that when one is denied due to lack of permits and acquires points, that in order to be fair and give every hunter a chance at hunting, that the person(s) with the most points would automatically be drawn. The current system that allows hunters with no points to be drawn and those with multiple points to not be drawn, is totally unreasonable and unfair. I understand that there are more applications than permits available and that the draw is a "Random" computer draw but when one has point (multiple points) they should be automatically drawn and the remaining permits be submitted to a random draw. I understand that there are very few Buffalo permits, however, at one time, I personally had 18 points and my neighbor with no points got drawn. I felt great for my neighbor but this current draw system has no rational explanation. Thanks for your consideration.

Comment: How is this bill going to benefit the average sportsman? I am opposed to this bill and what it will do to the average hunter here in Arizona. I feel that the back room push that the organizers of this bill have done has tarnished us as a hunting community. Not only do I speak for myself, but for my family and generations of hunters to come.

Comment: Could the AZFG offer a big game species (Elk, Deer, etc) tag for men or women returning from war? This could be done through a special draw (state wide or condensed down to installation). I truly believe this will stimulate mental recovery while promoting AZ hunting, not to mention the possibilities of extra income for state and local agencies.

Comment: Will meeting vidoe be posted on your web site for those who are not at the meeting. Why is it so hard to catch bass at Lake Pleasent, been there many times and no one is catching anything. Also never liked to have to pay to go fishing...only in Arizona...Shouldn't our taxes and licence fee's pay for the cost to manage the park.....

Comment: My primary comment for this new Sportsman's Constituent Group is to please take advantage of the great number of nonresident sportsmen who believe in the North American Model for Wildlife Conservation, and who want to help fight special interest groups like [redacted] who aim only to profit from it. Include us nonresidents in the fight from day one. We want to contribute, be it with dollars, or organized instruction on who to contact. Broadcasting this meeting via webcast was a great first step in that endeavor. Although I am not a resident of Arizona, I have family and friends there. We have all participated in the Arizona Game and Fish big game draw process for 18+ years, and are not interested in having the system diluted by a dishonest special interest group. We believe in the North American Model for Wildlife Conservation. We do not believe it should be compromised. [redacted] and their long list of associated organizations are the chief architects in the privatization of this great public resource. The damage they have done in Utah and other states is well documented. We don't want them to bring it to Arizona ever. Wildlife should not be for sale to the highest bidder. The Arizona Game & Fish Department has been doing an outstanding job managing wildlife for both residents and nonresidents. It's obvious [REDACTED] does not speak for the majority of sportsmen in Arizona. If they did, they would not have initially tried to pass HB2027 in an "emergency" bill, while circumventing AZG&F approval. The original bills unaccounted for sale proceeds provide adequate evidence of [REDACTED]'s lack of integrity. Arizona does not need an outside organization to step in, exploit and plunder this resource before all our children get to enjoy it. Those who have supported AZG&F financially for the last 20 years don't deserve to have their place in line stolen. I served on the board of directors on the largest conservation organization in my home state for 6 years. During that time, we accomplished great successes without controversy, and without stealing a dollar of public resources. I applaud the Arizona Game and Fish Commission for arranging this meeting and being proactive in battling special interest groups before this gets out of control, like it did in Utah. Thanks you for arranging this comment forum.

Comment: Auction tags are no good in principle. It unfairly favors those with more money and violates the very concept of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation that has served this country well for many years. Wildlife and these tags belong to the people of Arizona and should not be treated as a commodity to be sold to the highest bidder. This is a road we do not want to go down. As an Arizona native and a holder of a lifetime Arizona hunting license, I am opposed to auction tags of any kind.

Comment: Since HB2072 was an attempt to take control of not only our big game tags but eventually our G&F management I am urging you to consider creating a conservation habitat stamp for every big game tag. Say that amount is \$25 and the proceeds go to various hunting/fishing/outdoor groups for conservation projects at the direction of G&F. Dedicate the funding to habitat improvement, youth encouragement and other key projects as determined by a new board comprised of G&F, various groups and Joe Average Public Hunter. We also need to do something through the legislature to make the issuance of big game tags exclusively the purview of the G&F department and

commission. Thanks.

Comment:why did you stop turkey hunting with a 22 mag.

Comment:Should the discussion of how do we get more big game animals come up - here are my comments. Elk are at all time high numbers. From a "meat on the ground" perspective, there may be an equivalent amount of big game "biomass" to previous years in areas where there are elk, maybe more. Looking to desert mule deer populations there is no question that predator poison programs were effective and aerial gunning can work. I recommend that other strategies must be used - start looking at ways to grow forage for mule deer and pronghorn and removing barriers to movement. When there was lots of rain in the 1980's(and forage) deer herds were at historic highs. Killing predators alone in the face of prolonged drought is not going to work-just look at the dismal deer numbers in the 1940's and 50's and again in the early 70's when there was aerial gunning, trapping and poison.

Comment:As an Arizona resident who has hunted and fished in this state since the 1970s,I STRONGLY urge the Department,in conjunction with the Forest service,to consider a program of forest land adoption.Just as the Highway department has developed the adopt-a-highway clean-up program,an adopt-an-acre or adopt- a- section program could benefit our fish and wildlife greatly. You have an army of sportsmen who would be willing to participate in wildlife and habitat enhancement.I know that everything we do nowadays is driven by laws and lawyers,but is my hope that a plan for such a program can be developed and implemented.

Comment:It doesnt seem fair to me that we have to pay every year to retain our points once they are paid for we should be able to retain them untill they are used.

Comment:Three years ago I wrote a letter addressing the number of early bull elk tags going to muzzleloader hunters. I was answered with a letter that seemed to strengthen my concerns. To date nothing has changed. With muzzleloader hunters demanding 6% of the tags but getting 30% to40% of the early bull tags every year, draw odds being basically the same, hunter success also the same as early centerfire rifle hunters and permit numbers low enough that there is roughly 10 square miles of elk country per hunter, I cannot see any justification for muzzleloader hunters to get such a high percentage of the early bull elk permits. The figures and reasons quoted above all come from AZGF's own statics.

Comment:Concerning the topic of recruitment and retention: The 2006 data from the US Fish and Wildlife Service Survey shows "watchable" wildlife participation has been increasing, but in the watch at home category (+12%), not away from home, which declined, but at a lower percent rate (-3%) than hunting (-4%) and angling (-15%) between 1996 and 2006. These numbers all pre-date our economic downturn, so 2011 numbers may be worse. The data shows a very strong relationship with participation in all wildlife

activities with areas of lower population densities. The urbanization of the U.S. population makes it much harder to go hunting before or after school or work. All the nearby open land is a restricted area. Even the recent effort to expand legal hunting areas around our cities still keeps very large areas managed as parks closed to hunting. Audubon Arizona has made a commitment to engaging inner city youth in conservation through programming and internships. We have a partnership with BLM called River Pathways - a high school curriculum about rivers and riparian habitats. We are in our third year with Phoenix Union School District and starting a program in Tucson with Tucson Audubon and Las Cienegas NCA. We are working hard to integrate conservation biology into the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) initiative in Arizona. Youth are not exposed to the sciences related to the environment and conservation. Focus is on BioTechnology and medicine. The biggest challenge to getting youth outdoors is transportation. We have a once a month "Careers in Natural Resources" night at our nature center for junior high and high school students. Tucson Audubon has a family riparian weekend and the newly initiated "World Series Birding", both good examples of Audubon efforts to engage families and youth in outdoor watchable wildlife activities. Also, a number of our 9 volunteer chapters in the state host family birding walks (Desert Rivers, Maricopa, and Sonoran Audubon in Phoenix metro area). Chapter host birding walks in conjunction with nature festivals that reach new audiences, of course the Christmas Bird Counts and site specific projects like Rio de Flag, Prescott Creek, Tanque Verde Wash, and Santa Cruz River restoration projects plus volunteer citizen science monitoring of our Important Bird Areas. Chapters and Audubon Arizona organize volunteer work days that include building burrowing owl habitats, planting pollinator gardens, controlling invasive plants and many other projects. What we have noticed is that the use of social media is necessary to engage new audiences. People do not join organizations the way they used to, rather they sign up for specific projects and activities. Even websites are used less and less, except to get at a specific thing-like this comment card. Websites need to be reinforced with short e-News info items, tweets and/or facebook posts. The new AGFD guidelines and requirements for partner organizations engaged in AGFD sponsored youth activities, that include getting the legal clearances for adults to be directly involved with youth, are consistent with requirements developed by the National Audubon Society and meet federal regulatory requirements. Audubon Arizona completes a background check for all volunteers and employees that will be in direct contact with youth. I do suggest including a way to honor approved background clearances of partner organizations, rather than requiring individual volunteers to go through multiple paperwork.

Comment: When is the State going to recognize that we have a major problem with coyote over-population in the suburbs? The State has done nothing to control their population. Since they are at the top of the food chain with no predators to keep them in check, generations are growing up with no fear of humans. When their food source is no longer able to sustain them, they prey on our pets and are now attacking humans. What will it take before the State steps in and does something about controlling them? Maybe if someone on the board or some other official loses a pet (as we have) to them, or has their grandchild bitten by one, we might see some action.

Comment: Please address the concerns of citizens who support non-game species in Arizona. I enjoy the hiking trails and recreational opportunities in Arizona and voluntarily lead a hiking club. Our family is active and we volunteer our time on a variety of projects, including the annual bird count and ferret spotting. We gladly pay our fees at trailheads and parking areas, and obtain all necessary permits for hiking. We have benefited from the expertise of park rangers and wildlife managers. In return I want to make sure the wildlife is protected for years to come as I introduce Arizona to younger people and to visitors to our state. Offering opportunities to work with wildlife agencies is a wonderful way to bring younger people into careers in a variety of fields. Not all work can be accomplished with volunteers. Do you plan to expand your volunteer management program with paid staff? And do you plan to support your non-game species staff? Human resources are invaluable for the protection of our natural resources.

Comment: AZGFD is the best wildlife agency in the western US, if not the whole US. Its wildlife biologists and wildlife managers are the best there are. What the Department/Commission lacks is marketing and communication with its license holders and the vast majority of its customers, the citizens of Arizona. For years the Department/Commission have allowed a few critter groups to act as if they represent the license holders and citizens of Arizona. They don't. Through its website, social media and direct contact with its customers the Department/Commission must re-educate our citizens as to what it is, their Commission. Specifically on 2072. The Legislature and Commission has "given away" enough tags already. Giving away (selling at cost) about 350 more will not solve any problems. The "plan" proposed by [REDACTED] is no plan. There is no meat on the bones. So far there is no plan presented (a real business plan) from which any reasonable person could conclude that this "plan" can produce the claimed outcome. All it does is take tags away from the common pool and finance a private organization. I'm against the whole concept.

Comment: I received an email late last year that the Commission was considering night predator hunting (Unit 31 and 32) to limit the effects of coyotes killing domestic cattle (calves) and deer (fawns). I request the status of that issue by the Commission>

Comment: I have several questions and suggestions. My 1st question is on all the draws. This is the way I understand it. If 400 permits are available for a hunt, and 397 or 398 or 399 have been filled, the next application has 4 hunters on it. That application will be bypassed because it would exceed the 400. The draw will continue to the next application and continue until the 400 is met. Is this true?? Permits should be able to go over by a max of 3 this would have completed the draw in the above example and that application would have been excepted. 2nd, This is for the regular draw for any one species. If a hunter is drawn this year, they should not be able to apply again for one year. If they do manage to get something they would have to wait 3 years before applying again. If a hunt does not sell out the left over permits would be available over the counter. They would be handled just like the over the counter permits are handled now.

Comment:thanks for hearing me say this, i my area i see the something that i have not seen in my lifetime, no water, drought, no quail,and we all see many blm big water tanks in remote areas that are rotted out for many years very sad to see, is there any money going toward wildlife long term water catchments in eastern arizona deserts? the Jimmy Carter days for forest serice and blm were better.

Comment:will there ever be an opprpotunity to have an additional abbreviated Dove season in the spring? Or possibly a junior Dove season?

Comment:As a member of the HAHWG I have witnessed the affectiveness of a steering committee for groups such as this. I strongly urge the chairman to appoint a steering committee of volunteers chaired by a member of a current Game and Fish sanctioned body to create a detailed list of action items to be addressed by this group. This committee should consist of members of sportsmen/women's groups "critter" groups and non-affiliated members of the public with vested interest in the issues of the Arizona Game and Fish Department. This committee should report back to the chairman with a precise list of goals to be accomplished by the group.

Comment:FIRST RULE in hunter safety never hunt alone. So why don't you Einstein's have a buddy hunt permit?? Very simple 2 hunters get one permit between them. All you have to do is put both names on the tag! Who wants to go hunting when you don't have a tag? You know how hard it is for two people to get drawn and for the same area? You have a better chance of winning the lottery without buying a ticket! Your cost to implement this, little computer programing MAYBE a extra line for second name on permit form. Make it a online application only another novel idea! If you use this idea I GET THE FIRST PERMIT FRAMED.

Comment:.What should be done to move forward in a positive, cooperative manner? .How could the Sportsmen's Constituent Group (working title at this point) be structured to accomplish the above? Managing federal land. It starts by stating the land belongs to all Americans, not just folks from AZ. All rights and privileges shall be distributed equally among all owners of federal land. License and fees shall be the same. Draw tags shall be dispersed equally.

Comment:Why do muzzleloaders get as many permits as rifles in the early elk draw. With the technology today, these weapons will shoot 200 yards without a problem. I believe it should be combined as one draw for either weapon.

Comment:Would you consider renaming the group to be more inclusive? Perhaps: Sporting Enthusiasts Constituent Group or Sporting Enthusiasts Citizen Group or Constituents for Sporting Arizona

Comment:Clarificatrion please. As I read the agenda statement, I am hearing the intent to form a group that is a coalition of Sportsment to work together to interface with AZGFD. Am I reading this correctly or missing the point?

Comment: Can the deer draw be moved forward so hunters and their families can plan for their vacations. You may be drawn, but not be able to take your vacation because you need some lead time for your employer. When are archers going to have the chance to hunt the rut in 12A? Can the duck season be started later due to the fact that the ducks don't even get to our state till December?

Comment: The SCG should have one member from each active "species" group in AZ. (AES, NWTF, RMEF, etc.) Meetings should be held not less than quarterly (monthly would be better). All actions by the group should have the goal of following the North American Model for Wildlife Management!!! (It may not be the perfect model, but it protects the rights of Arizona citizens to continue to hunt and fish in the manner that has been working well for decades.) I believe each wildlife group being represented could be asked to help support the ongoing meetings, etc. of the SCG. The representatives would have to be volunteers as opposed to being paid, although perhaps the organizations may be able to support travel expenses. The SCG could then function as a TRUE representative of Arizona sportsmen (as opposed to a particular un-named group that was originally set up to serve as a voice for sportsmen!!!) Thank you!!! [redacted] Life Member NWTF

Comment: My focus is on the Early Bull hunts and the disparity between the number of Muzzleloader hunts versus the number of Rifle hunts - again this is on the early Bull hunts. According to the department's figures, 39% of the 2011 early Bull hunts were taken by Muzzleloaders - this is too high. The success of the muzzleloaders - especially the state of the art muzzleloaders today - should dictate hunters should be able to use either a muzzleloader or a rifle. Tough decision - parity is what I am looking to the Commission to establish.

Comment: I am writing to plead with the Arizona Legislators and Wildlife Commission to please do not hand over the state's wildlife resource to a special interest group [REDACTED]. I have already spent nearly \$2000 in planning to hunt Arizona and yet I've never been there to hunt yet. The loss of these high demand tags from the pool will nearly ensure I will never be rewarded for my patience and planning of hunting Arizona. [REDACTED] promises they can deliver money in order to better manage the state's wildlife, please ask them exactly how much has been raised AND spent on actual on the ground projects in Utah. Again, please do not hand over the state's wildlife resource to a special interest group.

Comment: Over the course of many years I have volunteered for several wildlife groups in Arizona, what I have observed is the corporation between The national groups and the state groups is almost non existence. I think a board existing of volunteers, a volunteer from each wildlife organization national and state, to come together at least six times a year to coordinate efforts so more could be done for our wildlife.

Comment: Over the course of many years I have volunteered for several wildlife groups in Arizona, what I have observed is the corporation between The national groups and

the state groups is almost non existence. I think a board existing of volunteers,a volunteer from each wildlife organization national and state,to come together at least six times a year to coordinate efforts so more could be done for our wildlife.

Comment:First, thank you to the commission and AGFD for facilitating this discussion. I agree the focus should be positive and forward looking, avoiding a rehash of HB2072 events to date. However, positive steps forward must - my sense is for many - first provide a framework for coalescence against the concept of HB2072 taking root in Arizona. As to structure, many "critter" groups already exist (I belong to multiple) and it was my understanding (hope??) that [REDACTED] provided a unifying point of coordination. Action item #1: Determine if [REDACTED] is committed to pursuit of their concept. If so, then structure and follow-on action items necessarily mirror [REDACTED] albeit in an adversarial role on this point ... and positive may be difficult, at best. Is the purpose of a Sportsmen's Constituent Group temporary, intended to mend fences, or permanent, to act as a check-and-balance? The concept of HB2072 must be put to bed, the debate concluded, else division and mistrust will likely continue.

Comment:Why are the applications for desert bighorn sheep and rocky mountain bighorn sheep placed in one group for the drawing, and the awarding of 20% of permit-tags to the applicants with the greatest number of bonus points comes from that single grouping? There is a separate bag limit for each of these subspecies; the drawing process should treat these subspecies as two separate groups and 20% of each would be awarded to the highest bonus-point holders. To accomodate this process, it would be required that all applicants choose the same subspecies for both their first and second choices. By utilizing this method, applicants are competing with only those putting in for just that subspecies, not with the entire group of wild sheep applicants that may split their choices between the subspecies. Theoretically, the current drawing process for wild sheep, awarding 20% from one, combined group, could result in all the rocky mountain sheep permit-tags being issued with that first 20% portion of the drawing.

Comment:Good Evening, As a big game guide in the state of Arizona I fully support and stand with the Sportsmen & Women in attendance this evening in their quest to find viable solutions to raise funds for the big game of Arizona. I have stated and continue to oppose any measures that would privatize in any way, our big game populations and allow some an advantage to circumvent the draw. While I do support our current auction and raffle tag system, I do not feel that more auction tags or an expo proposed by [redacted] are the long term solutions to this issue. I stand with those that support either a "Habitat Stamp" program for each big game tag that is issued or a moderate fee increase for the tags- both resident and non resident. However, I feel that the additional funds raised by big game habitat stamps or tag fee increases should be designated and set aside to be used 100% for the benefit of our big game only- not spent on other "non game" species. While I don't profess to know how much money needs to be raised each year to benefit our big game, I know that certain individuals within Game & Fish would. I strongly believe that the public, our Game & Fish, and organizations like the Arizona Elk Society & others, can work hand in hand to develop an honest, transparent program that will produce real results for our big game and the

habitat they share. This would result in everyone continuing to have a fair opportunity to hunt our public resource whether guided or unguided through the current draw system.

Comment:. What should be done to move forward in a positive, cooperative manner? (i.e., How could we better work together on issues, challenges and opportunities?) Remember the values and teachings of Aldo Leopold and Theodore Roosevelt. Don't attempt to sell tags or wildlife to the highest bidder in the name of conservation. Engage and encourage youngsters and minorities to get out and enjoy wildlife, because they will be the stewards of the future. . How could the Sportsmen's Constituent Group (working title at this point) be built to accomplish the above? By choosing group members that value a collaborative approach, that truly care about the future of wildlife, and that value fair and equitable access to enjoy our wildlife resources. By inviting constituents from the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the Izaak Walton League, Trout Unlimited, Ducks Unlimited, and the Rocky Mountain Elk foundation.

Comment:Can we agree that legislative actions and ballot initiatives are not components of a comprehensive and progressive wildlife management model?

Comment:Moving forward, I believe we should seek to bring all the interested parties together for a common goal, which could be, to enhance and create opportunities for Arizonan's to enjoy our outdoor and wildlife opportunities in a responsible manner. There are many challenges ahead, including cultural changes, economic hardship, expanding development (urban sprawl), energy projects that devour large tracts of land and informing all Arizonan's of the importance of maintaining a healthy and progressive wildlife management program.

Comment:Thank you for arranging this meeting. I would like to voice my support for the creation of a mandatory habitat management stamp with the purchase of every hunting license. Those wishing to buy a lifetime license should be given the option to purchase a lifetime habitat management stamp (like the trout stamp option). Proceeds from the stamp sales must go 100% to habitat management/conservation activities. There must also be 100% transparency of what happens with the funds.

Comment:How can our organization help your group meet your difficult task? We are a non-profit, non-partisan organization that works directly with government agencies that represent our community. We are currently working with [redacted] to keep our roads and trails open to the public. Our board of officers (BOO) will be viewing the webcast tonight.

Comment:I'd like to see this organization as a vehicle for the "regular" guys/gals to have a voice in any matter that affects our public lands and our hunting, fishing and camping opportunities. By 'regular" guys I mean someone that just wants to go out in the woods on a weekend and hunt, fish or camp. I think that while many other organizations out there do a good job, they are really a special interest group that one buys a way into.

This organization should be structured not as a special club with one focus but as one that will advise government agencies when they initiate rules or laws that are contrary to public use. If advising fails, this organization should have the teeth to take the government agency (or any other organization) to court. I'd like to see this new organization have a board of elected officers from all areas of the state. All matters would be voted on by the group. The group would consist of any person that attends meetings on a regular basis.

Comment: I am glad that the department/commission has taken the leadership to establish this group. I hope that a sportsmans council can be established with leaders from a wide variety of sportsmans groups having an equal place at the table. A gentlemen agreement to discuss all future issues, legislation, etc. with the council before moving forward should help avoid such public and polarizing disagreements as have recently transpired. As sportsmen we need to find a way to support each other and accept different styles, techniques, and customs as long as they are legal. To fight over these things in public sheds a negative light on us all.

Comment: I hold a lifetime license in AZ which I paid dearly to obtain. My official address is now TX. This means I cannot afford to support AZ big game draws due to the extremely high cost of "out of state" tags. Even though I have two houses in AZ and spend most of my time here, I don't apply for big game tags because of the cost. I feel the department should allow lifetime license holders to buy resident tags which would increase the state revenue and reward the license holder for buying the expensive license. More lifetime licenses would be sold and more revenue would come in for big game hunts.

Comment: How could the Sportsmen's Constituent Group (working title at this point) be structured to accomplish the above? Arizona Old School Sportsmen Laws and Ethics I feel given the present state of hunting a presumably grim future the Arizona Game and Fish should lead by example to preserve hunting for present and future generations. I feel the Arizona Game and Fish should adopt a code of simple, easy to interpret, easy to follow, and easier to enforce laws and ethics for Arizona sportsmen to follow. A proactive stance and leading by example will not only instill RESPECT to the Arizona sportsmen towards the environment, animals, and other people utilizing public land, but also show respect to the ranchers who control much of the private land in Arizona. Perhaps some of these closed ranches may permit public access once again? This stance may also transcend to other states throughout the Western United States. I propose "Arizona Old School Sportsmen Laws and Ethics": 1. All hunting permits are distributed to the public through a lottery system to allow for equal opportunity (i.e. general draw and special raffle tags). 2. Arizona Game and Fish Department and Sportsmen's Constituent Group believe in keeping open spaces open (private or public), free from development, and open public access. 3. Game is respected is not exploited. Hunting permits are NOT auctioned off to sole beneficiaries. 4. Do not leave anything left unattended or abandon on public lands outside of one's camp. Pack it in, pack it out. This includes game cameras, tree stands, blinds, and any trash. 5. No feeding or baiting wildlife for any reasons. 6. No off-road vehicle travel. Do not hunt

and shoot game that you will not be able to retrieve with traditional physical methods. 7. No sitting water within ¼ mile on public land. If one is hunting around water limit time spent to a maximum of 1 hour as to keep disturbance to the animals and other recreationists to a minimum. 8. Bury human waste. Do one's personal business a respectable distance from water sources and roads. 9. No flying for the purpose of locating game. 10. Keep excess number of helpers or "gang hunting" to a minimum as to not disturb other tag holders. 11. Hunt by fair chase. Do one's best to obtain a quick and ethical kill and not waste any meat. I believe that this proactive stance will help the sportsmen of today and tomorrow enjoy more sustainable and quality experiences for years to come. Of course there will be some who object to this, but I feel that most people will respect the purpose and principle for sake of preservation. I would also encourage the Arizona Game and Fish to work with the Private Land Owners, Forest Service, State, and BLM land agencies to adopt unified laws and ethics. Many of my friends, my family's friends, my family, and I are regulars in the woods here around Williams, AZ and frequent the National Forests, private, state and BLM lands on a regular basis. I am the 5th generation here as both sides of my family had homesteads at one time in Arizona. I hope that the future generations and present citizens continue have the opportunity to see the Arizona that I have and realize that it is an awesome place as I have seen it.

Comment: There are so many problems inherent with this "advisory" board that the best course of action would be to dissolve it at tonight's meeting. Although the public is invited to attend, the overt intention of the Sportsmen's Constituent Group is to exclude the largest constituency, wildlife & outdoor enthusiasts who don't hunt, from having proportionate influence in the management of AZ wildlife. The majority of AZ's six million residents do not participate in blood sports. They expect Game & Fish to uphold its mission to "conserve, enhance and restore Arizona's diverse wildlife...for the enjoyment, appreciation, and use by present and future generations." Yet recently, despite public opposition, laws and regulations were passed which allow night hunting, dog hunting and hunting within city limits. Laws allowing hunting in wildlife preserves and parks are already on the books. Extreme, "anything goes" hunting, like in Texas, seems to be the goal of the Commission, and thus, the mission of the Department. That a hand-picked, by pro-hunting special interests from pro-hunting special interests, G&F Commission is seeking additional input from pro-hunting special interests is inexcusable. AZ's small minority of hunters would be well advised to remember that, unlike in Texas, they hunt on PUBLIC lands with the consent of the PUBLIC.

Comment: Thank you for hosting this meeting. I wish I could have attended in person. As a lifetime license holder and lifetime member of wildlife conservation groups I consider myself a sportman and avid hunter. You have to realize that many actions of the AZGFD are in open opposition to those of us who want to continue the tradition of hunting. You talk out of both side of your mouth by trying to get us to support you in hunter recruitment but then also support and even champion Wolf reintroduction. This greatly affects hunter opportunity but more importantly has now given the liberals and

environmentalist unending legal avenues to chip away at hunting in general. You can't have it both ways. You can see you have crossed the line with most of us. Although recent actions may be misguided and be opposed by some of us, the principle is the same. We know you aren't on our side anymore. You fight us every step of the way. You change the hunt dates so that success rates are low and wonder why participants decrease. You champion ideas that will lead to the end of hunting and control my predators. Even casual reading can see what wolf re-introduction has done elsewhere. Now I hear you are going to start messing with lion hunting... You cater to liberals and environmentalists and then pretend to support us. We don't believe you anymore. Your actions speak so loudly, we must find a way to stop you... and we will. Until you start to oppose the activities that those of us who are funding your existence (through taxes on gear and license and app fees) don't want, you will be treated as the enemy you have become. I'm hopeful that these meetings can help you correct your course, but if not they will help us identify those of you that need to be removed.

Comment: The environment tends to be left out of water planning discussions in Arizona, and yet many of Arizona's best natural values rely on water resources. Members of this group serve as important stakeholders to water planning processes. One possible goal for this group could be to work to identify common interests among the participants here, specifically regarding the water needs of fish/wildlife/recreation. By developing a cohesive message about important water-related threats and opportunities for protecting fish/wildlife/recreation, the group could contribute substantively to the many ongoing processes around the state and ensure their interests are well represented when important decisions are being made.

Comment: Please do not support, endorse, or in anyway encourage HB 2072. It is all smoke and mirrors and a way for the privileged few to gain control over some of the tags we as average working men and women hope to draw. It is tough already, don't make it worse.

Comment: Concern with economics - GF vs Public benefits Relative concern with costs with short term license fees: e.g. dove, fishing, quail and non-biological fees e.g. 2 pole stamp Also concerned with data use for best science management, esp. hunts with no data: small game, blue grouse, chuckar Also not enough data is collected on junior's hunts - they are feel good, but not working for recruitment. Finally, alternative management hunts don't serve a value.

Comment: Stop the legislative process now. AZGFD should designate a full time ombudsman to cooperate with sportsmen and women AZGFD should consider expanding the Commissioner tag programs to raise more money Ombudsman should work hand in hand with the Commission and sportsment to create any proposed legislation needed.

Comment: I am not opposed to the online draw, G&F increasing and capturing increased license revenue or hunter/revenue recruitment strategies. Ultimately the same number of hunters will be in the field so the online application doesn't effect hunt quality. However, I am opposed to reduced draw success and leaving those who prefer the

paper apps punished and competing against much higher applicant numbers. I recommend offering a bonus point to those who apply on the paper application. This affords the hunter the choice of better draw odds or the convenience and ability to apply for hunts on credit with a card that they may not have been able to otherwise. This allows AZGFD, wildlife, and the the hunter to benefit from increased license revenue, the hunter to benefit from a choice and a level playing field for all applicants.

Comment: Moving forward I would like to see the department become more of a facilitator of communication with all sportsmen and wildlife and/or critter groups. Part of the problem in Arizona is the lack of communication between each other, the department, and with each of the respected critter groups. We have over-lapping banquets, meetings, events, and other gatherings because we don't communicate. We should be networking a lot more w/todays technologies. I feel this would be a great start for the future. The wildlife of Arizona belongs to all of us. Lets keep it that way for the future.

Comment: I would support a habitat stamp up to \$25.00 to support our projects and eliminate any need for third party organizations.

Comment: I don't have a problem with the a habitat stamp, except that the price needs to be appropriate as [redacted] mentioned. However, I don't think that auction tags should be eliminated. It appears that, from my personal knowledge, most people don't realize that money raised through auctions gets spent on projects for each specific species. If those controls weren't in place, the money would get spent on projects or equipment that didn't directly affect wildlife primarily. I've had this discussion with scores of people over the years and it's amazing that not even most hunters know the inner workings of your department. You guys mostly do an excellent job, (nobody's perfect), so keep it!

Comment: My biggest concern that comes up in my family and hunting buddy group each year would be that of the max bonus point holder quota of 20%. This is entirely too low of a percentage. It would do better for everyone to up the percentage thus allowing for our "max point holders" to draw the sought after tags. Each year, many aged hunters pass away with their bonus points in hand, never holding their dream tag. Those who put in for the most years should be drawn first. My father speaks more about out-living his competition, rather than applying for a good hunt. I would like to see at least 50% of all draw tags be allocated to max point holders. It's a win, win for everyone. Those who apply early will know that they can draw a tag if they are faithful.

Comment: A recommendation for the makeup of participants in with the Sportsmen's Constituent Group with a vested interest in sustaining and enhancing wildlife in Arizona which could include; 1) Representatives from wildlife organizations, such as Mule deer, elk, Quail, Turkey and rod and gun clubs. 2) Representatives from shooting sports organizations 3) Representatives from OHV organizations 4) Representatives from Public at Large to name a few. A combination of voices can provide guidance to Game and Fish, the public at large, Legislators and local communities which better

protect wildlife habitat and our outdoor opportunities. Wildlife habitat is disappearing to Urban sprawl and solar projects.

Comment:I submitted a comment this morning but i'll do it again. I think the focus of this group should be how to represent the regular guy in matters that affect hunting/fishing, camping and use of our natural resources. So far I've heard talk about money and predators. We should really focus on saving our ability to hunt/fish and enjoy our resources. Without pointing any fingers, prices are rising (in some cases to enforce laws that are already on the books),public land use is slowly be taken away and the antis are getting stronger.

Comment:The gentleman wanting to move to general funds for dept. funding doesn't understand the basic premise that most wildlife agencies are funded primarily by hunting and fishing licenses and tags is to keep the POLITICS out of the management of wildlife and use scientific facts for management.

Comment:Unfortunately I am unable to attend tonight's meeting/webcast, but I appreciate the opportunity to log a comment. A critical first step would be to invite birders & wildlife watchers to the table by naming the committee something other than the disappointing "Sportsmen's Constituent Group." "Sportsmen" is not an inclusive term in the eyes of many birders and other wildlife watchers who are not hunters/anglers themselves. Instead the name implies hunting & fishing and an emphasis on game species. I prefer Wildlife Conservation Group -- what happened to this original working title? A focus on conservation and a name that reflects our shared goals -- a healthy, stable ecosystem and maintainance of our spectacular biodiversity -- would make a difference and attract more stakeholders. As a birder I would gladly pay for a Wildlife Legacy Stamp or Conservation License Plate but I have little interest in settling for purchasing a hunting license. While we share many goals, many of our user needs are distinct. Please create a way for us wildlife watchers to have an ownership stake in the management of our wildlife!

Comment:As we speak this evening the common theme has been to communication whether that be from sportsman themselves or general public who does not hunt and fish. I feel that if the game and fish had a public forum that was readily accessible on their website it would create an online ecosystem for all generations. Any individual would be able to submit feedback openly, and create online collaboration to better Arizona conservation.

Comment:The diversity of Arizona's game and habitat is as diverse as the sportsmens/conservational land use groups. The idea of uniting these groups is critical, especially in a state where a majority of the land is for public use. It is great to see the opportunity provided through this idea of the Sportsmen's Constituent Group to unite these groups to maintain and improve the habitat and game of Arizona. It is just as important for all involved to recognize that a unity will need to be for the overall improvement and protection of the passion and legacy that comes from being stewards of the land.

Comment: Can those of us that are watching via webcast get a copy of the questionnaire? Perhaps post it on the website.

Comment: I simply want to voice my opposition to [REDACTED] in the state of Arizona.

Comment: I would like to watch last night's meeting. I was unable to watch live. Where can I find the podcast or re-broadcast? Can you send me the link?

Comment: I thought the meeting was supposed to be focused on how we move forward together as a state. The repeated theme of attacks on the group that is trying to back the auction/raffle approach to raise funds does not show well for the hunters' solidarity. Let's try to stay away from the sniping. By the way, I agree that the added fees on licenses will impact the new hunters in the state. With the economy in the state it is in, we can't expect to grow the hunter and fisherman populations by adding fees to those just starting out. For myself, I typically have to foot the bill for 4 or 5 hunters in my family because they wouldn't be able to afford it on their own. Bumping up the price is not my preference.

Comment: We met last night at the sportsman's constituent group. I will put together some ideas that I have that I believe is the future of wildlife management in Arizona. It is important in the 21st century that the Arizona Fish and Game department remains progressive and evolves into an organization that represents all the people of Arizona and puts biodiversity as its number one objective.

Comment: This group should form a committee to educate all legislators about the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation and how the pending legislation totally does not conform to it.

Comment: I think it is important to understand that time is of the essence with regard to communicating the group's opposition to auctioning off public big game tags, much less by an unethical outside organization. An organized method of delivering this message to all Arizona legislators should be formulated immediately. Selecting alternate means to fund these needed projects should be chosen immediately or simply a compilation of suggestions should be proposed to legislators. Given the progress of impending legislation, time is of the essence.

Comment: Thanks again for allowing our input through the SCG. I think there was enough support for my habitat stamp proposal that we should plan on moving forward to the next steps and see if there is enough traction to make it fly. Vision for the future of the SCG: Develop a communication system using the internet, social media, etc to reach out to ALL stakeholders and the general public. Develop a plan to communicate what is being done by the Commission and the Department and how the public can participate. We need to get the story of G&F wins into the spotlight. Basically, a

public relations campaign to enhance the public's perception of G&F. Develop a plan for a coordinated statewide youth and hunter recruitment system. There are many disjoint efforts that could be enhanced through sharing best practices, economies of scale and access to funding. Investigate what actions can be legally taken for predator control as it relates to coyotes and mountain lions. Develop a suggested regimen for the LHPC's to follow to address predators when they identify a need. There is much more we could do, but I think that is plenty for the next 12 months. I am good on ideas, organizing, planning and project management. I am not a hands on builder. I will be happy to help at a high level as much as my time will allow. If we can accomplish planning and progress reporting in a monthly meeting, I could probably make that work in my schedule, if you would like my participation.

Comment: I watched the webcast last night. I was surprised at the direction that the public comment took the meeting. I heard important issues such as habitat projects and hunter recruitment and retention. I did not hear the most important issue that could face hunters, that of the various threats to hunting itself. Some of these threats potentially are: 1. Anti-hunting groups attempting to stop hunting in Arizona. 2. Groups attempting to transfer public wildlife to themselves, such as HB2072. 3. Land agency regulation or policy change that could negatively impact hunting. I feel that addressing these threats should be the primary function of the Sportsmen's Constituent Group. An organized group with a system or framework in place would be much more effective than the helter skelter attempt that we have seen with the HB2072 tag grab. I see several functions that would be important in this: 1. Monitoring issues before they get too large to stop. 2. Informing and coordinating members. 3. Developing relationships and educating media and legislators. I feel that this should be the number one priority for the Sportsmen's Constituent Group.

Comment: . What should be done to move forward in a positive, cooperative manner? (i.e., How could we better work together on issues, challenges and opportunities?) . How could the Sportsmen's Constituent Group (working title at this point) be built to accomplish the above? Arizona Old School Sportsmen Laws and Ethics I feel given the present state of hunting a presumably grim future the Arizona Game and Fish should lead by example to preserve hunting for present and future generations. I feel the Arizona Game and Fish should adopt a code of simple, easy to interpret, easy to follow, and easier to enforce laws and ethics for Arizona sportsmen to follow. A proactive stance and leading by example will not only instill RESPECT to the Arizona sportsmen towards the environment, animals, and other people utilizing public land, but also show respect to the ranchers who control much of the private land in Arizona. Perhaps some of these closed ranches may permit public access once again? This stance may also transcend to other states throughout the Western United States. I propose "Arizona Old School Sportsmen Laws and Ethics": 1. Do not leave anything left unattended or abandon on public lands outside of one's camp. Pack it in, pack it out. This includes game cameras, tree stands, blinds, and any trash. 2. No feeding or baiting wildlife for any reasons. 3. No off-road vehicle travel. Do not hunt and shoot game that you will not be able to retrieve with traditional physical methods. 4. No sitting water within 1/4 mile on public land. If one is hunting around water limit time

spent to a maximum of 1 hour as to keep disturbance to the animals and other hunters to a minimum. 5. Bury human waste. Do one's personal business a respectable distance from water sources and roads. 6. No flying for the purpose of locating game. 7. Keep excess number of helpers or "gang hunting" to a minimum as to not disturb other tag holders. 8. Hunt by fair chase. Do one's best to obtain a quick and ethical kill and not waste any meat. 9. All hunt permits are distributed through a lottery and raffle system where all Arizona citizens have an opportunity to draw permits. 10. Animals in Arizona are respected and are not exploited or auctioned off. I believe that this proactive stance will help the sportsmen of today and tomorrow enjoy more sustainable and quality experiences for years to come. Of course there will be some who object to this, but I feel that most people will respect the purpose and principle for sake of preservation. I would also encourage the Arizona Game and Fish to work with the Private Land Owners, Forest Service, State, and BLM land agencies to adopt unified laws and ethics. Many of my friends, my family's friends, my family, and I are regulars in the woods here around Williams, AZ and frequent the National Forests, private, state and BLM lands on a regular basis. I am the 5th generation here as both sides of my family had homesteads at one time in Arizona. I hope that the future generations and present citizens continue have the opportunity to see the Arizona that I have and realize that it is an awesome place as I have seen it.

Comment: I have been actively applying as a nonresident hunter since 1985. In that time, I have drawn 7 exceptional big game tags. Half the hunts were successful, but all are counted among the best of my life. That said, it would appear a small group is trying to hijack wildlife management from AZGFD. Given that I annually apply for permits across the west, I must tell you that your department is as good as it gets. Only Kansas is equal. I encourage the department to dismiss the efforts of this group. From what I can tell, they do not appear to have the best interest of Arizona's wildlife at heart.

Comment: Thank You for conducting this meeting. My hope is something positive will come from the effort. I did attend the meeting in person and found it disturbing that the members of the group responsible for the uproar displayed little remorse for their actions; indeed, a couple of them even seemed proud of their efforts. They cited "Mom's Rules" were not being followed and they were being unfairly singled out. From where I stand they were being told quite clearly that Mom was saying, "Just wait until your father gets home". That lack of remorse for their actions is where the problem lies. How can sportsmen unite when two very different directions are in play? Until this incorrectly focused group of individuals quits their attempts to steer wildlife policy and funding through the legislature, the sportsmen of AZ have everything to lose including the agency's commission system. It has been my experience the core leadership of this group will never give up the attempt to control the power of the commission. They need to be in the room and at least tell sportsmen what they envision the future of wildlife management to be. One other item is the presence of the [redacted] and [redacted] representatives in the mix. These folks were quite supportive of giving former governor Symington the authority to fire commissioners without cause. They need to be in the room and convinced to play ball. It is my feeling that the effort to bring all groups together where possible is imperative for the future of all

Arizona sportsmen. Perhaps the correct forum would be a collaborative effort that would focus on a vision and mission statement for sportsmen. Some thought must be directed at retention of the commission system of wildlife management and all efforts to circumvent the current system thwarted.

Comment:I would like to start off stating that I OPPOSE HB2072 and any sale of public trust assets for the gain of a private organization with no transparency. I DO SUPPORT THE EXISTING HPC PROCESS!!!! Some comments I heard regarded poor communication and a disconnect between sportsmen and AZGFD. The HB2072 issue was raised by an online discussion forum. So, CAN AZGFD HOST AN ONLINE DISCUSSION FORUM LIKE [redacted]? It appears that online forums do represent much of "Joe Hunter" and other wildlife enthusiasts. By doing so, the AZGFD and AZGFD commission would be able to view concerns and issues related to "Joe Hunter". The moderator would be the only person who has to interact from the AZGFD so I wouldn't think that open meeting laws would be violated. Since the AZGFD already has a website, perhaps that could be added at a minimal cost. Can the department offset costs by allowing advertising on the forum? Many of the issues people brought up have already been addressed by existing programs that AZGFD has in place. Public awareness seems to be the problem. For the record, in regards to habitat and access issues, I do support a Habitat Stamp program as long as the funds can be sheltered and retained for exclusive use for wildlife. I do not want to see the fund subject to policial raid. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments post meeting.

Comment:My name is [redacted]. I do not represent any particular group although I am a member of several pro-gun / pro-hunting / shooting organizations. I am seriously concerned about the agenda of the anti-gun / anti-hunting crowd. They usually find some judge that is sympathetic to their cause or use the unchecked power of the EPA to accomplish their misguided objectives. Before we know it we again lose some freedom and something is banned. This is not the way the checks and balances in the Constitution are supposed to work. Our forefathers intended the courts to be the weakest of the three branches of government. Also, our government should be limited to the powers and balances set forth in the Constitution. I fear that if things continue the way they are, Arizona will become another California, and both wildlife, hunters, and fishermen will suffer because of it! My question is this: How can the SCG better communicate our views to the AZGF Commission, the AZGFD, and our governmental representatives both at the state and federal levels?

Comment:I attended the SCG Mtg. in Phx last week. I was present for the entire mtg. I submitted written comments on behalf of an organization I represent. The following comments are my own and do not represent those of any group. 1. During the mtg. several speakers brought up the need for more revenue. I suggest a complete assessment be made of current programs and current needs before any consideration is given to increasing fees. As a former employee I interacted with a lot of constituents assisting them in the big game application process. During these sessions I observed a very representative cross section of the AGFD hunting constituency. Let me assure you

many were struggling with applicable fees. Likewise I checked licenses of many thousands of AZ anglers and hunters in my 26 year career. Here I also witnessed/met the average constituent. Most did not drive new p.u.s or have new boats. These experiences have left me with a strong desire to be absolutely certain their money is spent in a productive manner. As one spokesperson said "the common solution today in government is to throw more money at a problem". I add one thing to that "truth" and that is and "add another program without evaluating the continued need for existing programs". 2. In order for this new group to be successful, it must be lean, fast, and easy to put in action. This will mandate active members that have the trust of larger groups. In addition this group will have to be well-supplied with the most current information much of which must come from AGFD. I think the action plan that was described last week is a good beginning. Once a group is formed it will evolve. The problem is how much time it takes to evolve. Hopefully with some direction and nurturing the evolutionary process will be short. Another problem is the size of AZ and the difficulty in getting active representation from across the state. The new pod cast system at Regional Offices will help but still many potential representatives do not live near a Dept. Office. 3. Structure will likewise be a product of time. The basic structure must include representation from the current active wildlife cons. groups. Likewise there needs to be representation from the non-hunting/angling groups. Enlisting some groups will be difficult and not occur. In order to maintain leanness I feel there should be no more than 12-18 standing members. The most obvious distribution may be by AGFD Regions. From a historical perspective the [redacted] was in the time of my childhood and early adult life the SCG. Unfortunately over time their leadership wandered away from their constituency and they lost the powerful voice they had achieved and maintained from the 1920s through the early 1970s. A subset of this model is what is needed now.

Comment: As a former professional staff member for two National Wildlife Conservation groups, I have seen firsthand, the trials and tribulations of various constituent groups attempting to work together and also attempting to circumvent others. Having been an active participant of the group that originally conceptualized the Utah model, and eventually withdrawing from the process, I will tell you first hand that while the concept may have merit; the risk is far greater in terms of disenchanting the average sportsman. I would suggest identifying a common theme or interest, [recruitment & retention] all groups come together to work on that specific concept, if a combined convention or super banquet were determined to be the best fundraising option, the Commission may consider authorizing one tag or one tag per species with the generated funds running to the approved topic [recruitment & retention] instead of back to species generating the revenue? Sportsman would likely be much more tolerant of an additional "special tag" concept if it were capped at an additional 10 +/- as compared to the 330 +/- proposed? I would also propose that like the current structure "All" funds be returned to a dedicated fund administered by AZGF, with input from the stakeholders, no monies should be retained by any entity for any reason. Another suggestion would be to divert for one year the "Super Tag Raffle" proceeds to fund recruitment & retention pool of money, a case could be made that in

the long run, any such one year diversion would in the long run be beneficial to all species when the future constituent pool increased Respectfully Submitted,

Comment:we are intersted in conservation partnerships that use scarce resources effectively

Comment:Thank you for the recent email. I agree and am glad that the truth and other side of the story being pushed has been provided by the Game and Fish Department. I feel that the Sportsmans Groups just want more tags for their auctions and I am not convinced of their motives. I do not want to Arizona to head in the wrong direction in regards to selling game tags to the highest bidder such as Utah. AZGFD has been doing a great job and as employees tenure age and costs such as fuel increase so should the department budget and the increase should be covered in tag cost increases. Recruitment is not going to be helped thru auctions. (I will personally recruit two) and if we all make that attempt the future of our sport will remain strong.

Comment:I am currently getting my son-in law involved in archery hunting. My young grandsons go camping with me and if they choose to I hope to hunt with them in a few years. I hope that hunting isn't becoming a rich mans sport. I hope that in the future the average Joe will be able to have a quality hunt. Seems like we could be getting priced out of thr sport we love.

Comment:These are some areas that could be considered to improve G+F public view. 1. Trail cameras excess use and abuse. Planes are not legal to use in looking for animals(Fair Chase, north american model) 2. Control of antler hunters,Permit? 3. Quicker return of draw information Succesful or not. 4. Better use of internet to get information out to the public 5.Possible beverage tax to get additional \$\$, this would be like Missouri. 6.Bonus point gained for work done with G+F.

Comment:21 March 012 For the thousands that never get drawn for 5-20 years [yes they are out here in real life] t there needs to be some changes. 1. DAV Vets, should be given 20Permt Points & eligable every year. Those that put him with him, if not DAV Vet, are subject to #2 2. All others when drawn, set-out for 1 or 2 yrs on the Draw only-OVC or any other tags - open BEING FULLY TRANSPARENT 3. Open all the data on the Draw by last name-Those that have been drawn 3 out of past 5 or those drawn 7 out of 10 years.

Comment:With a long-term and possibly irreversible decline in public participation in hunting activities, state wildlife agencies will need to adapt and to modify their philosophical approach and on-the-ground programs to maintain revenue streams and relevance - The Arizona Game and Fish Department is no different. The demands placed upon state wildlife agencies have already forced them to broaden their focus beyond their traditional role in enhancing hunting opportunities. That trend will and must accelerate, and it is essential that these agencies, while not discarding traditional constituencies, attempt to incorporate animal welfare sensibilities into their daily programs and develop new constituencies to support their important conservation and

biodiversity work. By creating a truly inclusive constituent group, there is great potential to address this very challenge. Bringing all wildlife constituents to the table and engaging each user group may open the door to new funding sources that have not been utilized in the past. Data provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service show that the number of adult hunters in the United States has fallen consistently over the past decade. During this same period, however, the number of wildlife watchers has grown consistently. In Arizona specifically, wildlife watchers outnumber hunters 6 to 1. Although this trend is not unique to Arizona, this new constituent group is positioning our state to better engage nearly a quarter of Arizonans by welcoming wildlife watchers to join the discussion. We acknowledge the key role of The Arizona Game and Fish Department and would like to provide support where possible and appropriate. I ask that the name and mission of this working group honor the values of all Arizonans and the resources we all have to bring to the table. Please feel welcome to contact me directly at [redacted] or [redacted] should you have any questions. Thank you again for this opportunity to comment.

Comment: There are several aspects of the Game and Fish that needs to be addressed. I gave several points at the Sportsman's constituency group. The following are a list that you should Take into consideration for the future of wildlife management:

1. The name of the department needs to be changed. There should be less emphasis ongame with a broader emphasis on natural resources and ecosystems. This could be something like the department of natural resources or even just wildlife. A progressive name would be the department of biodiversity or ecological preservation.
2. The department needs to approach the broader public of Arizona. The six million people of Arizona outnumbers the much smaller hunter population which is about 100,000 and decreasing. When a person first goes to the Game and Fish website, the first thing a he notices is the emphasis on hunting and fishing instead of conservation. Pictures of dead animals is the last thing I want to see and would rather not log on.
3. State game and fish commissioners need to represent a broader base of the public. The Governor is guilty of appointing to commissions hunters and other individuals that do not represent the general public. That is the case with the Arizona Game and Fish Commission. Ecologists, environmentalists should be appointed to the commission to give a broader range of ideas and opinions. It is now all too one sided. Even the average "Joe" from the general public would improve commission representation.
4. More money for wildlife needs to allocated from general revenues and less from hunting licenses. This is because the hunter wants to claim the wildlife because he feels he is supporting most of revenue of the department. This is wrong! There are other ways to fund the department including the lottery (which I think part of it already goes there), license plates (which is already in place), and tax returns (which I believe is already available). I think the department can also look into other methods including some I have seen in other countries including perhaps camera and observation areas for wildlife with a charge to get in as well as shops to buy souvenirs and other items. Loch Garten in Scotland has an observation area for osprey where the public can observe the birds nesting and raising their young. The RSPB (Royal Society of the Protection of Birds) runs it and all the money goes to preserving the

area and the birds. There is even a web page where you follow the birds as they migrate to Africa in the winter. There is a GPS tracking device on each bird. This helps in research, preservation and gives the public an opportunity to become involved in a very successful osprey conservation effort in Great Britain. This could be applied to the mountain lion, Mexican wolf and even the bald eagle. I have a Harris Hawk nest near my house and I am sure that many people would love to see these raptors nesting and raising their offspring. The general public could also pay a yearly membership fee that the department could use as a funding method similar to what the RSPB does. The conservation groups such as the [redacted] have Certificates of Adoption for animals in which people donate money and receive a certificate of adoption with their name printed on them. There are millions of people that are not hunters or fishermen that love the outdoors and wildlife and if approached would gladly give money to support a good project. The Phoenix Zoo does very well because it attracts the average person who is interested in wildlife and can become involved. People are not likely to support a hunter oriented organization which I believe the department is at this point.

5. Public land use decisions need to represent all Arizona people compared with land use decisions in favor of hunters, trappers and cattlemen. The decisions to a large degree with this commission tend to favor the cattlemen and the hunter. This needs to change.

6. Certain wildlife practices need to be banned. This would include anything that would be considered inhumane such as leg hold traps. (This has already been done in this state). Methods of take or "harvesting" wildlife need to be more humane. (Archery is the most inhumane form in which the animal dies of shock). By the way, these agricultural terms (and terms such as bag limits) need to change. You cannot look at wildlife anymore as a form of crop or something that needs to be harvested. The public does not like this type of vocabulary. It should be replaced with something more consumer friendly.

7. Habitat modification is going to be a primary wildlife management tool. Life will be controlled with life.

8. There will be a movement away from killing! As in number 7, predators and other forms of life will be responsible for controlling herd size and health. Habitat is most important! Predators cannot be blamed and continue to be the stepchild of the department! The public does not like this.

9. Nonnative species and exotics should be banned. We should focus on native species.

10. The field of wildlife management has been weakened by inbreeding within the profession. From [redacted] the field needs a "whole-earth, web-of-life, one people brand of philosophy."

11. Artificially maintained populations will lose favor with the public.

12. We are losing 30,000 species per year [redacted]. The most important responsibility of the department and commission in Arizona is to preserve the species diversity and ecosystem of Arizona; no matter what the cost! I think the people of Arizona would be very supportive of this objective. It is a global issue and Arizona can lead the rest of the world in the area of conservation. I would like to think

of it now as preservation. Preserving the whole ecosystem and not just certain species of animals should be the ultimate goal. The department needs to evolve.

Comment: I am a longtime sportsman and I urge you to support the effort to set aside a small number of tags to help improve access to public lands and recruit the next generation of hunters and anglers. Since the Arizona Game and Fish Department receives no general fund dollars and the number of anglers and hunters is declining, we must ensure that the Game and Fish budget can be sustained by the Sportsmen and to help solve the access to public lands problem which is a growing concern.

Only 54 tags or less than half a percent of our current tags is reserved to be sold and this is a much more reasonable approach than raising license fees and tag fees to cover increased Game and Fish Department costs. It is good for the state and for the long-term support of hunting and fishing in Arizona. I encourage you to support the concept.

if the department has more money there is less of a need to raise license and tag fees for all, which benefits all of us, especially we who are not rich. It is very difficult to afford to put in all the species for a family of 3 or 4, even 2. Some people say "just put in for one species", which gives you a chance to hunt something about every 5 or 6 years. It is hard for an adult to keep interested in hunting at that rate, let alone a child. The number does not have to be 54, could be 60, something that is valuable and could make a lot of money without hurting everyone, making it not necessarily easier to get a tag for children but, keeping it from getting harder. As far as roads, some are closed because USFS cannot afford to maintain. Maybe money earned could be used to assist them. The road closures are going to end up bad for all. I was trying to get firewood in the Kaibab last year, the closed roads are right in the prime of the best downed oak. Unless you are going to carry that stuff out it will sit there. Sooner than later that will just be a lot of fuel for fires, no monetary value at all and a huge waste of resources. They advised me those areas could not be enforced due to lack of money on their part, so they were closed. Closing miles of acreage discourages all ages. I understand some of the problems due to overusage, and maybe even illegal offroad use, however, I have never seen this abuse as they suggest. There are many problems and few answers. Continually raising fees is not the answer ALL the time, get more creative!

Comment: 21 March 012 For the thousands that never get drawn for 5-20 years [yes they are out here in real life] there needs to be some changes. 1. DAV Vets, should be given 20 Permt Points & eligible every year. Those that put him with him, if not DAV Vet, are subject to #2 2. All others when drawn, set-out for 1 or 2 yrs on the Draw only-OVC or any other tags - open BEING FULLY TRANSPARENT 3. Open all the data on the Draw by last name-Those that have been drawn 3 out of past 5 or those drawn 7 out of 10 years.

Comments submitted by Region 2:

Comment: 1 Stop the legislative process now. 2 AZGFD should designate full time ombudsmen to cooperate with sports men and women. 3 AZGFD should consider expanding the commissioner tag programs to raise more \$. 4 Ombudsmen should work hand in hand with the commission, staff & sportsmen to create any proposed legislation needed

Comment: Economic: Game & Fish vs. Public

- relative concern w/ costs: w/ short term life. Fee's (hunt dove fishing quail example) non biological fee's - 2 pole stamp.
- data use for best science mgmt.
- non data - sm. Game hunts - BL Grouse chucker - last - collecting Data - JR. Hunts - feel good
- it is working for recruitment
- altermanagement hunts

Comments submitted by Region 5:

Comment: Moving forward I would like to see the department become more of a facilitator of communication with all sports new & wildlife and/or critter groups. Part of the problem in AZ is the lack of communication between each other, the department, and with teach of the respected critter groups. We have our - trapping banquets, meetings, events, and often gatherings because we don't communicate. We should see mentoring a lot more w/ today's technologies. I feel this would be a great stand for the future, the wildlife of AZ belongs to All of us. Lets keep it this way for the future.

Comment: The diversity of Arizona's Game and Habitat is as diverse as the sportsmen's/conservation/ land use groups. The idea of uniting these groups is critical, especially in a state where a majority of the land is for public use. It is great to see the opportunity provided through this idea of the Sportsmen's Constituent Group to unite those groups to maintain and improve the habitat and game of Arizona. It is just as important for all involved to recognize that a unity will need to be for the overall improvement and protection of the passion and legacy that comes from being stewards of the land.

Comments submitted by Region 4:

Comment: What about our young outdoors people. I am a father of two young boys and it has been the responsibility of my wife and I to teach them the ins and outs of hunting + fishing. If we just sell off our tags to the highest bidder then there will be nothing left for their kids. The Game + Fish do have lots of great things for our kids and hunter education is a great thing and my family have gone through the course but if money is the big picture for the commission then this is all in vein.

Comment: Prices are already high to put in for big game. If it increases much more many families won't, better yet, can't put in for the opportunity to hunt in this great state! 100% against special stamp.

Comments submitted by written comment card:

Comment: Networking on organization tasks (not re-inventing programs) Development to get our youth out into field. AZ Fish & Game corner article published weekly in [redacted] local paper to promote activities.

Comment: The idea of a single group that can potentially represent all sportsman is worth pursuing. I would suggest we develop a mechanism that can involve all sportsmen and all interested persons in all issues affecting wildlife, outdoors, shooting, fishing, hunting, lakes, rivers, streams, birding etc. This mechanism can be in communiqué, form, web, Facebook, news base etc. In turn the remainder of 6,000,000 people can be involved and help Arizona wildlife and outdoors.

Comment: I want to be involved in this group called "Sportsman Constituent Group. Need to make a congress or coalition of sportsmans groups and private persons communication, water, volunteers, predators internet or internet communication place on Game and Fish website for people to make comments & ask questions like idea of points for work, against raising cost. Fish & Game meetings in other towns other than regional offices this is how you talk to average hunters + citizens.

Comment: Consider having a "Meet the Commissioner" type meeting with 1 commissioner around the state in communities. This would allow an exchange of ideas between to commission and residents. It would also allow issues to be aired and explanations to be provided on issues of importance. The only communication is at commission mtgs, on individual letters, or dept news releases. A "Town Hall" approach might help.

Comment: Need to put together a threat assessment I.E. what are the highest priority items (How much do we budget to address) A. Predators B. Recruit/Retain C. Access D. Environmentalists

Comment: How do we get the average sportsperson interested? How do we get the word out about activities beside the AZ Game & Fish calendar? How do we get people who want to volunteer? One thing almost all of us do after work is watch television. Does AZ Game & Fish still have a show on channel 8. What about televising (whatever) on. A channel besides channel 8 or make a movie w/ popular youth, movie stars, etc. Also though the Game & Fish website does show the youth camps. We really have no idea if I'm a varmint caller and want to help on a Bighorn water hole project – I have no idea of their agenda unless I'm a member of their club and vice versa. Maybe more sharing between the groups on activities would be nice.

Comment: 1. I think we should meet in each game region – there should be meeting notices well in advance so all people will have a chance to speak. 2. Each region will have a point of content so we all know the thoughts of all people who loves the outdoors.