

The background features a dark blue gradient at the top, transitioning to a lighter blue and white at the bottom. Overlaid on this are various numbers (0-9) in a light, semi-transparent font, scattered across the middle section. Below the numbers, there are several overlapping, glowing lines in shades of cyan and blue, forming abstract, organic shapes that resemble a network or data flow.

## **Idaho Bonus Point System**

**Commission Workshop**

**July 7, 2010**

**Jeff Gould**



## Table of Contents

<b>Background</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Previous Commission Review .....	1
Legislative Action .....	1
<b>Bonus Points</b> .....	<b>2</b>
General Concepts.....	2
Nevada Point System.....	3
Nevada Example .....	3
Pros and Cons.....	6
<b>Idaho Bonus Point Proposal</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Idaho Controlled Hunt Odds .....	8
Idaho Bonus Point Framework .....	9
<b>Public Input</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2005 Random Survey.....	11
2010 Public Comments .....	12
Prevalent comments in support of bonus points .....	13
Prevalent comments in opposition of bonus points.....	13
<b>Financial Analysis</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Implementation</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Administrative Considerations.....	15
Outreach Plan.....	15

# Background

## Previous Commission Review

The Idaho Fish and Game Commission have periodically considered strategies to maintain reasonable drawing odds for hunters applying for controlled hunts in Idaho. Idaho has maintained a straight random draw system with some restrictions placed on successful applicants (1-2 year wait periods) and trophy species applicants (one application/year). Over the past 15 years, several Commission workshops and presentations have focused on the merits of draw systems used by surrounding states and how each impact drawing odds and hunters.

The Nevada-style point system received the greatest support of any considered by the Commission and was further evaluated by a sample of licensed hunters participating in a random survey conducted in 2005. In January 2006, the Commission directed staff to proceed with a bonus point system contingent upon the legislature passing House Bill 523. Draft rules were prepared by staff to implement a Nevada-style bonus point system but the legislation failed.

*In January 2006, the Commission directed staff to proceed with a bonus point system contingent upon the legislature passing House Bill 523 (authorizing the Commission to assess a surcharge).*

## Legislative Action

In 2006, the Department sponsored bonus point legislation (H523) which passed the House but died in the Senate Natural Resources and Environment Committee. The rationale was that the legislation gave too wide of latitude to develop the program and fee.

In 2009, the Department sponsored a resident/nonresident fee increase bill (S1141) which initially did not include bonus point authorization or the fee language. The Senate amended the department bill twice to maintain current resident fees, increase nonresident fees, and include bonus point authorization and a fee. Senate bill 1141aa.aa (nonresident fee increase bill) moved forward without amendment from the House and was signed into law (Appendix I).

*IC 36-104.5(D) "The commission may by rule establish procedures relating to the application for the purchase of controlled hunt bonus or preference points by sportsmen and the fee for such application shall be as specified in section 36-416, Idaho Code."*

# Bonus Points

A Bonus Point System is a method to reward hunters who have applied for controlled hunts for several years and have not yet drawn a tag. Each year a licensed hunter participates in the system and is unsuccessful in the drawing, they will earn one point. The more years that a hunter applies for controlled hunts without drawing, the better their odds are of drawing in following years. Persistence is rewarded by increasing the number of chances in the drawing over time, but it never guarantees a tag.

*Bonus points increase a hunter's chances of receiving a low draw number in hopes of drawing a tag, but, unlike a preference point, they do not provide any guarantee of drawing a tag after so many points are accumulated.*

## General Concepts

- The number of permits does not change. The same number of hunters draw a tag whether under a random draw, or under a bonus point system.
- To create a drawing advantage for one group of hunters you must create a drawing disadvantage for another group of hunters.
- In a bonus point system, hunters choose to accept lower than average drawing odds for a period of years, in order to enjoy better than average drawing odds after that period.
- In hunts with poor drawing odds, this period may be substantially longer than for hunts with easier drawing odds.
- Hunters who begin applying the first year of a bonus point system have a significant advantage over those who apply for the first time in subsequent years.
- No hunter is guaranteed to draw a tag in either a random draw or a bonus point draw.
- No hunter is entirely precluded from drawing a hunt even if the number of accumulated bonus points is zero.

## Nevada Point System

The Nevada-style point system uses a formula whereby points are squared to increase the number of chances the hunter will have in the drawing. Every hunter's point total is squared each year before the drawing, and each hunter gets one additional chance added for the current year's application. Thus, in the first year hunters apply, each hunter has 0 points and receives 1 chance for the application. Jumping ahead to year 3, hunters have 2 points squared (2 X 2) plus 1 application = 5 chances entered in the drawing.

Year	Bonus Points (B)	Bonus Points Squared (B <sup>2</sup> )	Current Application	Total Chances Entered (P)
Year 1	0	0	1	1
Year 2	1	1	1	2
Year 3	2	4	1	5
Year 4	3	9	1	10
Year 5	4	16	1	17
Year 6	5	25	1	26
Year 7	6	36	1	37
Year 8	7	49	1	50
Year 9	8	64	1	65

- Once a hunter draws on a species, points reset to 0 and they start over.
- Deer is the only species that hunters do not incur a waiting period to apply again if not drawn (i.e., pronghorn rifle=5 year wait, bighorn sheep or elk=5 year wait or 10 year if animal harvested).
- If applicants fail to apply for a particular species for 2 consecutive years, they lose all of their bonus points for that species.
- Applicants may apply for "points only" for all species of big game at \$10 per species plus the hunting license fee.

## Nevada Example

Online resources help hunters evaluate the drawing odds of specific hunts before they submit applications each year. These two drawing odds tables were generated from Hunterstrailhead.com to illustrate how drawing odds perform differently in lower-demand and higher-demand hunts (data from Nevada application records).

Over the course of 5 years, drawing odds remained fairly steady for a regular (Hunt #35) and late season (Hunt #61-64, 66-68) buck hunt in Nevada. Overall, drawing odds improve more quickly in lower-demand hunts (Hunt #35) as compared to higher-demand hunts for those hunters with maximum points. This example also illustrates how drawing odds are reduced for first-time applicants.

Hunt #35 (Buck)				Drawing Odds							
Year	Tags	Applicants	T/A	7 pts	6 pts	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pts	0 pts
2005	39	128	30%				85%	70%	50%	26%	7%
2006	48	165	29%			94%	85%	71%	50%	26%	7%
2007	51	157	32%			97%	91%	79%	59%	32%	9%
2008	43	153	28%			94%	86%	72%	51%	27%	7%
2009	30	110	27%				84%	69%	48%	25%	7%

Hunt #61-64, 66-68 (Buck-Late)				Drawing Odds							
Year	Tags	Applicants	T/A	7 pts	6 pts	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pts	0 pts
2005	79	702	11%				51%	37%	23%	11%	3%
2006	85	739	12%		78%	67%	53%	39%	24%	11%	3%
2007	72	664	11%			66%	53%	38%	24%	11%	3%
2008	63	706	9%		70%	59%	46%	33%	20%	10%	2%
2009	62	733	8%	75%	66%	54%	42%	29%	18%	8%	2%

*The Nevada-style point system is more effective at rewarding applicants in lower-demand hunts as compared to higher-demand hunts.*

The second example uses actual drawing results from 2009 to reinforce the concept that while a bonus point system increases the percentage of maximum bonus-point applicants that successfully draw, no hunter is guaranteed a tag. In both cases, there are hunters with a high number of bonus points that were unsuccessful in the controlled hunt draw.

Hunt #35	Successful	Unsuccessful
	30	80
7 pts		
6 pts		
5 pts		
4 pts	5	0
3 pts	5	4
2 pts	10	9
1 pts	6	22
0 pts	4	45

Hunt #61-64, 66-68	Successful	Unsuccessful
	62	671
7 pts	1	0
6 pts	0	1
5 pts	3	6
4 pts	5	4
3 pts	12	20
2 pts	20	65
1 pts	14	223
0 pts	7	352

Overall, there is a greater percent of maximum bonus-point applicants that draw tags than the percent of applicants in lower bonus point categories.

Lastly, depending on odds for a given hunt, under a bonus point system it will take several years for drawing odds to exceed those of a random draw system. The following examples from Nevada compare the projected drawing odds under a bonus point system to drawing odds without a bonus point system.

In a lower-demand hunt, 615 hunters applied for 156 deer tags (25% random drawing odds). Both projected and actual drawing odds for hunters with 2 or more accumulated points exceeded random drawing odds for this lower-demand hunt.

Bonus Points	Total Chances	Hunters Applied	Actual Successful	Projected Successful	Actual Draw Odds	Projected Draw Odds	Draw Odds w/o Points
6 pts	37	1	1	1	100%	100%	25.4%
5 pts	26	3	3	3	100%	100%	25.4%
4 pts	17	14	13	14	93%	100%	25.4%
3 pts	10	48	40	42	83%	86.5%	25.4%
2 pts	5	83	41	36	49%	43.3%	25.4%
1 pts	2	211	45	37	21%	17.3%	25.4%
0 pts	1	256	14	22	5%	8.7%	25.4%

However, in a higher-demand hunt, 712 hunters applied for 26 deer tags (3.7% random drawing odds). While the projected drawing odds for hunters with 3 or more accumulated points exceeded the random drawing odds for this higher-demand hunt, actual percentages of successful hunters varied considerably from projections—a factor related to random variation associated with the small numbers of hunters in higher point categories.

Bonus Points	Total Chances	Hunters Applied	Actual Successful	Projected Successful	Actual Draw Odds	Projected Draw Odds	Draw Odds w/o Points
11 pts	122	1	0	1	0	75.1%	3.7%
10 pts	101	0	0	0	0	0	3.7%
9 pts	82	3	1	2	33.3%	50.5%	3.7%
8 pts	65	3	1	1	33.3%	40.0%	3.7%
7 pts	50	12	1	4	8.3%	30.8%	3.7%
6 pts	37	7	3	2	42.9%	22.8%	3.7%
5 pts	26	14	4	2	28.6%	16.0%	3.7%
4 pts	17	30	1	3	3.3%	10.4%	3.7%
3 pts	10	60	5	4	8.3%	6.2%	3.7%
2 pts	5	152	8	5	5.3%	3.1%	3.7%
1 pts	2	192	0	2	0	1.2%	3.7%
0 pts	1	236	2	2	.8%	.6%	3.7%

Both examples are from an established system where applicants have a variety of bonus points. Any bonus point system requires at least the minimum number of years as it takes to process a single cohort of hunter before it stabilizes. That is, a hunt with drawing odds of 25% will require a minimum of 4 years to stabilize, a hunt with drawing odds of 10% will require at least 10 years, and so forth. If the number of applicants does not increase or decrease, after that amount of time the odds should standardize near projected values.

Each change in the number of tags and the number of applicants will affect drawing success.

## Pros and Cons

Bonus points reward unsuccessful applicants with additional chances and improved drawing odds in the future.

- Points work best in lower-demand hunts (i.e. 25 tags per 100 applicants) as opposed to higher demand hunts (i.e. 10 tags per 100 applicants).
- Although there are no guarantees, this system enables hunters to manage their points to suit their needs.
  - Group applications average points among group applicants before squaring the point value. This can benefit new hunters with no points should they apply with hunters with maximum points.
  - Some hunters will strive to accumulate maximum points over multiple years in hopes their odds will pay off in “once-in-a-lifetime” or higher-demand hunts.



- Other hunters will seek out lower-demand hunts to increase hunt drawing success and hunting opportunity.
- Having the freedom to choose how to manage accumulated points is important to many hunters.

The negative aspect of a bonus point system is that some of the disadvantaged groups, such as first-time applicants (new and youth hunters), face long odds against drawing success.

- Although first-time applicants still have a chance to draw a limited controlled hunt tag, their odds are initially reduced.
- Depending on the hunt, it may take several years to see odds improve higher than the current random draw system after a hunter starts to accumulate points.
- In a new system, a large group of initial applicants begin accumulating maximum points and are strongly favored during ensuing years. It takes several years for a point system to settle out and take effect.
- Lastly, these systems are costly and complicated and may not accomplish what hunters really want.

# Idaho Bonus Point Proposal

## Idaho Controlled Hunt Odds

Idaho uses a random drawing process where every applicant has the same chance of drawing a tag. Typically, hunters draw in proportion to the drawing odds. For example, a hunter who applies for a deer hunt with a 25% chance of drawing is predicted to draw 1 deer tag every 4 years. Because the drawing is random, some hunters draw more or less often than predicted drawing odds.

2009 Idaho Controlled Hunt Summary (see Appendix II):

- **110,400 first choice** applications for basic controlled hunt tags
  - 7,600 first choice applications for extra & unlimited controlled tags
- **ELK-33 %** overall draw odds
  - 63% lower demand hunts; 18% higher demand hunts
- **DEER-29%** overall draw odds
  - 55% lower demand hunts ; 23% higher demand hunts
- **PRONGHORN-9%** overall draw odds
  - 26% lower demand hunts ; 51% higher demand hunts
- **MOOSE-19%** overall draw odds
  - 50% lower demand hunts; 11% higher demand hunts
- **TURKEY-25%** overall draw odds
- **BLACK BEAR-11%** overall draw odds
- **MOUNTAIN GOAT-<7%** overall draw odds
- **ROCKY MOUNTAIN BHS-<4%** overall draw odds
- **CALIFORNIA BHS-<4%** overall draw odds

Note: Lower-demand hunts are those with  $\geq 25\%$  draw success, higher-demand hunts are those with  $\leq 10\%$  draw success, these percentages were calculated after excluding unlimited, youth, extra, & outfitter allocated tags.

## Idaho Bonus Point Framework

The general bonus point framework is patterned after the Nevada bonus point system (i.e. points squared, all species). Proposed bonus point guidelines and features are listed in Appendix III. The following 5 proposed features will have a significant influence on how a bonus point system is actually implemented.

**Bonus Points are Optional.** Controlled hunt applicants will be entered into the bonus point system each year and charged for a point when submitting an application unless they choose to opt out. Applicants that opt out will only have one controlled hunt application in the random draw regardless of previous points earned.

**First-Choice Only.** Bonus points can only be used for the first-choice during the first drawing period. Those unsuccessful in drawing a tag on their first-choice hunt will be entered in the second-choice hunt drawing if applicable and will only be entered into the drawing one time.

- Bonus points will not be used or accumulated for
  - second drawing
  - leftover sales
  - unlimited controlled hunts
  - extra tag controlled hunts

**Point-Only Option.** Applicants may select the point-only option rather than apply for a tag for their first-choice.

**No Wait Period.** Under this proposal, waiting periods will not apply if a hunter applies for the point-only option. For example:

- Hunters drawing an antlered deer or elk controlled hunt tag may apply for a deer or elk point-only the following year.
- Hunters drawing a trophy tag and not harvesting may apply for a point-only for the same species the following year.

**Trophy Species Restriction.** Trophy species include moose, bighorn sheep, and mountain goats. Controlled hunt rules restrict the applicant to only one trophy species controlled hunt application per year. Additionally, those applying for a trophy species tag may not apply for antlered deer, elk, and pronghorn controlled hunts during the same year.

These rules will remain the same with the following changes or additions for bonus point applications:

- Hunters applying for a moose, bighorn sheep, or mountain goat controlled hunt tag may apply for a point-only option for other trophy species the same year. For example, a hunter applying for a moose tag may also apply for Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep, and mountain goat bonus points.
- Secondly, hunters applying for a moose, bighorn sheep, or mountain goat controlled hunt tag may also apply for a deer, elk, and pronghorn bonus point the same year.

Controlled hunt applicants must purchase an Idaho hunting license and submit a nonrefundable application fee with each application. Under this proposed system, a bonus point application fee will be an additional fee for applicants that do not opt out.

- Resident hunting license is \$12.75, nonresident hunting license is \$154.75
- Controlled hunt application fee is \$6.25 for residents, \$14.75 for nonresidents
- Bonus Point application fee is \$6.25 for residents and nonresidents

# Public Input

## 2005 Random Survey

In September 2005, the department conducted a scientific random survey of 1,600 licensed hunters in Idaho to better understand their thoughts on (a) the current controlled hunt draw system, (b) implementation of a bonus point system, and (c) other ideas that may improve drawing odds.

The survey used the Nevada-style bonus point system as the model with two examples of draw odds for a person with maximum points in a high and low demand hunt. Draw odds for applicants with low points in future years were not portrayed. Complete results tabulated from 1,043 respondents are summarized in Appendix IV. Key points from the survey include:

- 70% felt that unsuccessful controlled hunt applicants should receive an improved chance of drawing in subsequent years.
- 61% felt that it would be acceptable for the Department to implement a bonus point system.
- 39% responded that they would participate in a voluntary point system, 35% would not.
- 61% did not think it would be important to “purchase points”
- 60% did not support an increase in the wait period after drawing an antlered hunt to a period of 5 years (as opposed to 1).
- 50% felt it would be acceptable to limit applications in high demand hunts to only one application
- 65% did not support higher tag fees for high-demand hunts

Survey results indicated there was a strong majority who felt unsuccessful controlled hunt applicants should receive an improved chance of drawing in subsequent years. The majority also felt it would be acceptable to implement a bonus point system as described in the survey. Nearly one third indicated they would not participate if this was a voluntary bonus point system.

Ideas that did not garner support were (a) increasing the wait period from 1 to 5 years after a hunter successfully draws an antlered hunt, (b) purchasing bonus points, and (c) increasing tag fees for high demand hunts.

## 2010 Public Comments

Department staff recognizes that online surveys should be viewed cautiously because they do not produce scientifically valid results that are representative of the total hunting public. Arizona compared 15,000 responses collected from an online survey to those collected in a nonresponse telephone survey and found the results from the online survey differed statistically from the telephone survey due to a nonresponse bias.

With this in mind, IDFG developed an online questionnaire that afforded hunters an opportunity to provide comments for each option they considered (Appendix V). The objective was to determine if hunters support a bonus point system and if there were common messages about particular features within the proposed framework.

This survey generated tremendous interest over a two week period in June and more than 3,700 hunters provided comments on the web. An additional 50 comments were provided at regional open houses. In general, results were similar to the 2005 survey.

- Q1: 59% supported making bonus points optional
- Q2: 62% supported the use of bonus points only in the 1st choice drawing
- Q3: 54% did not support the point-only option (61% in 2005)
- Q4: 61% did not support accumulating points during a wait period
- Q5: 55% did not support accumulating points for all other species in the same year
- Q6: 56% supported the bonus point system (61% in 2005)

Survey results indicated that the majority of respondents supported a bonus point system that was optional (59%), applied to the first choice only (62%), and generally rewarded unsuccessful applicants (56%). How points could be accumulated, used during a wait period, and applied to different species generated the bulk of written comments. A majority did not support the point-only option (54%) and a higher majority did not support accumulating points during wait periods (61%). A majority also did not support accumulating points for all species in a given year (55%). Although many hunters viewed the fee as a positive in terms of revenue to the department, a higher number of hunters did not want to pay additional fees.

## Prevalent comments in support of bonus points

- Receive points only for the particular species or the hunt in which you apply
- Receive points only for trophy species (moose, sheep, goat)
- Many support BPs only if youth chances are protected and suggested a ratio of bonus point tags to random-draw tags (i.e. 80 BP:20 RD, 50 BP:50 RD)
- Many non-residents stated that they will begin applying if BP is implemented
- Some support only if points cannot be bought, which avoids benefitting only rich people. Although many BP supporters favored being able to buy points, the prevalence appeared to be opposed
- Many comments that IDFG needs to be sure general hunting opportunities are maintained
- For those writing a resident/non-resident opinion, about an even split between support for residents only and support for non-residents only

## Prevalent comments in opposition of bonus points

- Discriminates against youth hunters
- Unfairly benefits the rich
- Point systems do not work and are proven failures in other states. Once you go to BP, you can never go back
- Idaho's system is fine; it does not need fixing. The current system is fair
- This is just IDFG trying to increase revenue; if IDFG needs more revenue, charge more for other things but not for this concept
- Idaho's present system is why non-residents apply here; go to BP and non-residents will stop applying to Idaho

# Financial Analysis

Chief of Administration Jim Lau will provide separate handouts to the Commission as he presents the financial analysis portion of the workshop.

The cost and expected revenue is largely dependent on the final details of a bonus point system. As the complexity of the system increases, so does the cost of system development and maintenance.

Assuming very few changes occur, revenue from bonus point applications would be approximately \$500,000 if current CH applicants participated. For every 10% increase in participation above current levels, revenue would increase by \$100,000. If the system allowed for a "point only" option, no wait period, and no trophy species restrictions, the revenue would increase but how much is a difficult estimate.



# Implementation

## Administrative Considerations

*IC 36-104.5(D) "The commission may by rule establish procedures relating to the application for the purchase of controlled hunt bonus or preference points by sportsmen....."*

Commission rules would identify the parameters and specific details of a bonus point system. Once approved, the Administration Bureau would modify the current licensing system to allow for the sale of bonus points. The second task would be to develop a controlled hunt draw system that integrates the use of bonus points.

Licensing: Programming for the sale of bonus points will take approximately 5 months to become operational. This time frame is reduced if points are not "optional." Target dates for the sale of bonus points relate to controlled hunt application periods which are as follows: Spring bear/turkey-February; moose, sheep, and mountain goat -April; deer, elk, pronghorn, and fall bear-May.

Draw System: The controlled hunt draw system would either be outsourced or rebuilt in house to meet the requirement for both reporting and the drawings. Developing a Request for Proposals, and awarding a contract to develop and maintain a bonus point system will take 5 months. The development and evaluation of a system will take an additional 8 months. These estimates assume most of the work is outsourced. This process must be completed by the second year of selling bonus points when points are used.

## Outreach Plan

- **PowerPoint Presentation for use by Regions:** Create a presentation designed to explain how the bonus point system works. It will include animated graphics to demonstrate how points are accumulated over time.
- **Bonus Point Webpage:** Create a stand-alone informational webpage with a direct link from the Fish and Game homepage. The page will include a video version of the PowerPoint presentation including voice-over narration.
- **Bonus Point Pamphlet: Communication** will develop a tri-fold pamphlet. 60,000 copies will be printed initially; 30,000 copies for in-state distribution and 30,000 will be mailed directly to nonresident customers.

# Appendix I

**Senate Bill No. 1141**

**First Regular Session – 2009**

IN THE SENATE

SENATE BILL NO. 1141, As Amended, As Amended

BY STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AN ACT

1 RELATING TO FISH AND GAME; AMENDING SECTION 36-104, IDAHO CODE,  
 2 TO PROVIDE THAT THE FISH AND GAME COMMISSION MAY ESTABLISH  
 3 PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE APPLICATION FOR THE PURCHASE OF  
 4 CONTROLLED HUNT BONUS OR PREFERENCE POINTS BY SPORTSMEN AND  
 5 TO REFERENCE CERTAIN FEES; AMENDING SECTION 36-416, IDAHO CODE, TO  
 6 REVISE AND TO PROVIDE FOR LICENSE FEES; REPEALING SECTION 36-1104,  
 7 IDAHO CODE, RELATING TO SPECIAL BEAVER TAGS; AMENDING SECTION  
 8 36-1104A, IDAHO CODE, TO DELETE REFERENCE TO LYNX TAGS AND FEES  
 9 AND TO PROVIDE FOR OTTER TAGS AND FEES; STATING LEGISLATIVE  
 10 INTENT RELATING TO CERTAIN MONITORING; DECLARING AN EMERGENCY  
 11 AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.  
 12

13 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

14 SECTION 1. That Section 36-104, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended to  
 15 read as follows:

16 36-104. GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMISSION. (a) Organization –  
 17 Meetings. The members of the commission shall annually meet at their offices and organize by  
 18 electing from their membership a chairman, who shall hold office for a period of one (1) year,  
 19 or until his successor has been duly elected. In addition to the regular annual meeting, to be  
 20 held in January, said commission shall hold other regular quarterly meetings each year at such  
 21 places within the state as the commission shall select for the transaction of business. Special  
 22 meetings may be called at any time and place by the chairman or a majority of the members of  
 23 the commission. Notice of the time, place and purpose of any and all special meetings shall be  
 24 given by the secretary to each member of the commission prior to said meeting.

25 (b) Authorization for Commission Powers and Duties. For the purpose of administering  
 26 the policy as declared in section 36-103, Idaho Code, the commission is hereby authorized and  
 27 empowered to:

- 28 1. Investigate and find facts regarding the status of the state’s wildlife populations in  
 29 order to give effect to the policy of the state hereinbefore announced.
- 30 2. Hold hearings for the purpose of hearing testimony, considering evidence and  
 31 determining the facts as to when the supply of any of the wildlife in this state will be  
 32 injuriously affected by the taking thereof, or for the purpose of determining when an  
 33 open season may be declared for the taking of wildlife. Whenever said commission  
 34 determines that the supply of any particular species of wildlife is being, or will be, during  
 35 any particular period of time, injuriously affected by depletion by permitting the same to  
 36 be taken, or if it should find a longer or different season, or different bag limit should  
 37 be adopted for the better protection thereof, or if it finds that an open season may be  
 38 declared without endangering the supply thereof, then it shall make a rule or proclamation

1 embodying its findings in respect to when, under what circumstances, in which localities,  
2 by what means, what sex, and in what amounts and numbers the wildlife of this state may  
3 be taken.

4 3. Whenever it finds it necessary for the preservation, protection, or management of any  
5 wildlife of this state, by reason of any act of God or any other sudden or unexpected  
6 emergency, declare by temporary rule or proclamation the existence of such necessity, and  
7 the cause thereof, and prescribe and designate all affected areas or streams, and close  
8 the same to hunting, angling or trapping, or impose such restrictions and conditions upon  
9 hunting, angling or trapping as said commission shall find to be necessary. Every such  
10 temporary rule shall be made in accordance with the provisions of chapter 52, title 67,  
11 Idaho Code.

12 4. At any time it shall deem necessary for the proper management of wildlife on any  
13 game preserve in the state of Idaho, declare an open season in any game preserve as it  
14 deems appropriate.

15 5. (A) Upon notice to the public, hold a public drawing giving to license holders, under  
16 the wildlife laws of this state, the privilege of drawing by lot for a controlled hunt  
17 permit authorizing the person to whom issued to hunt, kill, or attempt to kill any  
18 species of wild animals or birds designated by the commission under such rules as  
19 it shall prescribe.

20 (B) The commission may, under rules or proclamations as it may prescribe,  
21 authorize the director to issue additional controlled hunt permits and collect fees  
22 therefor authorizing landowners of property valuable for habitat or propagation  
23 purposes of deer, elk or antelope, or the landowner's designated agent(s) to hunt  
24 deer, elk or antelope in controlled hunts containing the eligible property owned by  
25 those landowners in units where any permits for deer, elk or antelope are limited.

26 (C) A nonrefundable fee as specified in section 36-416, Idaho Code, shall be  
27 charged each applicant for a controlled hunt permit. Successful applicants for  
28 controlled hunt permits shall be charged the fee as specified in section 36-416,  
29 Idaho Code. Additionally, a fee may be charged for telephone and credit card  
30 orders in accordance with subsection (e)11. of section 36-106, Idaho Code. The  
31 department shall include a checkoff form to allow applicants to designate one  
32 dollar (\$1.00) of such nonrefundable application fee for transmittal to the reward  
33 fund of citizens against poaching, inc., an Idaho nonprofit corporation. The net  
34 proceeds from the nonrefundable fee shall be deposited in the fish and game  
35 account and none of the net proceeds shall be used to purchase lands.

36 (D) The commission may by rule establish procedures relating to the application  
37 for the purchase of controlled hunt bonus or preference points by sportsmen and  
38 the fee for such application shall be as specified in section 36-416, Idaho Code.

39 6. Adopt rules pertaining to the importation, exportation, release, sale, possession or  
40 transportation into, within or from the state of Idaho of any species of live, native or  
41 exotic wildlife or any eggs thereof.

42 7. Acquire for and on behalf of the state of Idaho, by purchase, condemnation, lease,  
43 agreement, gift, or other device, lands or waters suitable for the purposes hereinafter  
44 enumerated in this paragraph. Whenever the commission proposes to purchase a tract  
45 of land in excess of fifteen (15) acres, the commission shall notify the board of county  
46 commissioners of the county where this land is located of the intended action. The

1 board of county commissioners shall have ten (10) days after official notification to notify  
 2 the commission whether or not they desire the commission to hold a public hearing on  
 3 the intended purchase in the county. The commission shall give serious consideration  
 4 to all public input received at the public hearing before making a final decision on the  
 5 proposed acquisition. Following any land purchase, the fish and game commission shall  
 6 provide, upon request by the board of county commissioners, within one hundred twenty  
 7 (120) days, a management plan for the area purchased that would address noxious weed  
 8 control, fencing, water management and other important issues raised during the public  
 9 hearing. When considering purchasing lands pursuant to this paragraph, the commission  
 10 shall first make a good faith attempt to obtain a conservation easement, as provided in  
 11 chapter 21, title 55, Idaho Code, before it may begin proceedings to purchase, condemn  
 12 or otherwise acquire such lands. If the attempt to acquire a conservation easement is  
 13 unsuccessful and the commission then purchases, condemns or otherwise acquires the  
 14 lands, the commission shall record in writing the reasons why the attempt at acquiring  
 15 the conservation easement was unsuccessful and then file the same in its records and in  
 16 a report to the joint finance-appropriations committee. The commission shall develop,  
 17 operate, and maintain the lands, waters or conservation easements for said purposes,  
 18 which are hereby declared a public use:

19 (A) For fish hatcheries, nursery ponds, or game animal or game bird farms;

20 (B) For game, bird, fish or fur-bearing animal restoration, propagation or  
 21 protection;

22 (C) For public hunting, fishing or trapping areas to provide places where the  
 23 public may fish, hunt, or trap in accordance with the provisions of law, or the  
 24 regulation of the commission;

25 (D) To extend and consolidate by exchange, lands or waters suitable for the above  
 26 purposes.

27 8. Enter into cooperative agreements with educational institutions, and state, federal, or  
 28 other agencies to promote wildlife research and to train students for wildlife management.

29 9. Enter into cooperative agreements with state and federal agencies, municipalities,  
 30 corporations, organized groups of landowners, associations, and individuals for the  
 31 development of wildlife rearing, propagating, management, protection and demonstration  
 32 projects.

33 10. In the event owners or lawful possessors of land have restricted the operation of  
 34 motor-propelled vehicles upon their land, the commission, upon consultation with all  
 35 other potentially affected landowners, and having held a public hearing, if requested by  
 36 not less than ten (10) residents of any county in which the land is located, may enter  
 37 into cooperative agreements with those owners or possessors to enforce those restrictions  
 38 when the restrictions protect wildlife or wildlife habitat. Provided, however, the  
 39 commission shall not enter into such agreements for lands which either lie outside or are  
 40 not adjacent to any adjoining the proclaimed boundaries of the national forests in Idaho.

41 (A) The landowners, with the assistance of the department, shall cause notice  
 42 of the restrictions, including the effective date thereof, to be posted on the main  
 43 traveled roads entering the areas to which the restrictions apply. Provided,  
 44 however, that nothing in this subsection shall allow the unlawful posting of signs  
 45 or other information on or adjacent to public highways as defined in subsection (5)  
 46 of section 40-109, Idaho Code.

(B) Nothing in this section authorizes the establishment of any restrictions that impede normal forest or range management operations.

(C) No person shall violate such restrictions on the use of motor-propelled vehicles or tear down or lay down any fencing or gates enclosing such a restricted area or remove, mutilate, damage or destroy any notices, signs or markers giving notice of such restrictions. The commission may promulgate rules to administer the restrictions and cooperative agreements addressed in this subsection.

11. Capture, propagate, transport, buy, sell or exchange any species of wildlife needed for propagation or stocking purposes, or to exercise control of undesirable species.

12. Adopt rules pertaining to the application for, issuance of and administration of a lifetime license certificate system.

13. Adopt rules governing the application and issuance of permits for and administration of fishing contests on waters under the jurisdiction of the state. The fee for each permit shall be as provided for in section 36-416, Idaho Code.

14. Adopt rules governing the application for and issuance of licenses by telephone and other electronic methods.

15. Enter into agreements with cities, counties, recreation districts or other political subdivisions for the lease of lands or waters, in accordance with all other applicable laws, including applicable provisions of titles 42 and 43, Idaho Code, to cost-effectively provide recreational opportunities for taxpayers or residents of those local governments or political subdivisions.

(c) Limitation on Powers. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the commission to change any penalty prescribed by law for a violation of its provisions, or to change the amount of license fees or the authority conferred by licenses prescribed by law.

(d) Organization of Work. The commission shall organize the department, in accordance with the provisions of title 67, Idaho Code, into administrative units as may be necessary to efficiently administer said department. All employees of the department except the director shall be selected and appointed by the director in conformance with the provisions of chapter 53, title 67, Idaho Code.

SECTION 2. That Section 36-416, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

36-416. SCHEDULE OF LICENSE FEES.

(a) Sport Licenses

License	Resident	Non-Resident
Combination License	\$ 31.75	\$ <del>198.00</del> <u>238.25</u>
Hunting License	11.00	<del>139.75</del> <u>153.00</u>
Fishing License	24.00	<del>80.25</del> <u>96.50</u>
Sr. Combination License (65 and Older)	10.00	N/A
Sportsman's Pak License	108.50	N/A
Jr. Combination License	15.75	N/A
Jr. Hunting License	5.50	N/A

1	Jr. Mentored Hunting License	N/A	<del>5.50</del> <u>30.00</u>
2	Youth Small Game License	5.50	<del>5.50</del> <u>18.25</u>
3	Youth Hunter Education		
4	Graduate Hunting License	3.25	3.25
5	Jr. Fishing License	12.00	<del>12.00</del> <u>20.00</u>
6	Disabled Combination License	3.25	N/A
7	Disabled Fishing License	3.25	N/A
8	Military Furlough Combination License	15.75	N/A
9	Military Furlough Fishing License	15.75	N/A
10	Small Game Hunting License	N/A	<del>80.00</del> <u>96.00</u>
11	Daily Fishing (1st-day) License	9.75	<del>9.75</del> <u>11.00</u>
12	Consecutive Day Fishing License	5.00	<del>5.00</del> <u>6.00</u>
13	3 Day Fishing with Salmon/Steelhead Permit	N/A	<del>29.75</del> <u>35.75</u>
14	Nongame Hunting License	N/A	<del>27.50</del> <u>33.75</u>
15	(b) Sport Tags		
16	Deer Tag	\$ 18.00	\$ <del>256.75</del> <u>300.00</u>
17	<u>Controlled Hunt Deer Tag</u>	<u>18.00</u>	<u>300.00</u>
18	Jr. or Sr. or Disabled American Veteran Deer Tag	9.00	N/A
19	Jr. Mentored Deer Tag	N/A	<del>9.00</del> <u>22.00</u>
20	Elk <u>A</u> Tag	29.00	<del>370.75</del> <u>415.00</u>
21	<u>Elk B Tag</u>	<u>29.00</u>	<u>415.00</u>
22	<u>Controlled Hunt Elk Tag</u>	<u>29.00</u>	<u>415.00</u>
23	Jr. or Sr. or Disabled American Veteran Elk Tag	14.75	N/A
24	Jr. Mentored Elk Tag	N/A	<del>14.75</del> <u>38.00</u>
25	Bear Tag	9.75	<del>150.00</del> <u>184.25</u>
26	Jr. or Sr. or Disabled American Veteran Bear Tag	5.00	N/A
27	Jr. Mentored Bear Tag	N/A	<del>5.00</del> <u>22.00</u>
28	Turkey Tag	18.00	<del>65.75</del> <u>78.25</u>
29	Jr. or Sr. or Disabled American		
30	Veteran Turkey Tag	9.00	N/A
31	Jr. Mentored Turkey Tag	N/A	<del>9.00</del> <u>18.00</u>
32	Mountain Lion Tag	9.75	<del>150.00</del> <u>184.25</u>
33	Gray Wolf Tag	9.75	<del>150.00</del> <u>184.25</u>

1	Antelope Tag	29.50	<del>256.75</del> <u>310.00</u>
2	Moose Tag	165.00	<del>1,750.00</del> <u>2,100.00</u>
3	Sheep Tag	165.00	<del>1,750.00</del> <u>2,100.00</u>
4	Goat Tag	165.00	<del>1,750.00</del> <u>2,100.00</u>
5	Sandhill Crane Tag	18.00	65.75
6	(c) Sport Permits		
7	Bear Baiting Permit	\$ 11.00	\$ <del>11.00</del> <u>30.00</u>
8	Hound Hunter Permit	11.00	<del>100.00</del> <u>168.00</u>
9	WMA Upland Game Bird Permit	22.00	<del>22.00</del> <u>50.00</u>
10	Archery Permit	16.50	<del>16.50</del> <u>18.25</u>
11	Muzzleloader Permit	16.50	<del>16.50</del> <u>18.25</u>
12	Salmon Permit	11.00	<del>11.00</del> <u>24.00</u>
13	Steelhead Permit	11.00	<del>11.00</del> <u>24.00</u>
14	Federal Migratory Bird Harvest		
15	Info. Permit	0.00	<del>0.00</del> <u>3.00</u>
16	<del>Handicapped</del> <u>Disabled</u>		
17	Archery Permit	0.00	0.00
18	2-Pole Fishing Permit	12.00	<del>12.00</del> <u>13.75</u>
19	<u>Turkey</u> Controlled Hunt Permit	6.00	6.00
20	<u>Sage/Sharptail</u> Grouse Permit	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>
21	<u>Disabled Hunt Motor</u>		
22	<u>Vehicle</u> Permit	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
23	(d) Commercial Licenses and Permits		
24	Raptor Captive Breeding Permit	\$ 65.75	\$ <del>65.75</del> <u>78.75</u>
25	Falconry Permit	27.25	N/A
26	Falconry Capture Permit	N/A	<del>139.75</del> <u>168.00</u>
27	Jr. Trapping License	5.50	N/A
28	Trapping License	25.00	<del>250.00</del> <u>300.00</u>
29	Taxidermist-Fur Buyer License		
30	5 year license	175.00	N/A



1	1 year license	38.25	<del>439.00</del> <u>168.25</u>
2	Shooting Preserve Permit	329.75	N/A
3	Commercial Wildlife Farm License	137.50	N/A
4	Commercial Fishing License	110.00	<del>220.00</del> <u>265.00</u>
5	Wholesale Steelhead License	165.00	<del>465.00</del> <u>198.25</u>
6	Retail Steelhead Trout Buyer's License	33.00	<del>33.00</del> <u>39.25</u>
7	(e) Commercial Tags		
8	Bobcat Tag	\$ <del>8.25</del> <u>3.00</u>	\$ <del>8.25</del> <u>3.00</u>
9	<del>Lynx Tag</del>	<del>8.25</del>	<del>8.25</del>
10	<del>Beaver Tag</del>	<del>5.50</del>	<del>5.50</del>
11	<u>Otter Tag</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>
12	Net Tag	55.00	<del>55.00</del> <u>65.75</u>
13	Crayfish/Minnow Tag	1.25	<del>1.25</del> <u>3.00</u>
14	(f) Miscellaneous-Other Licenses		
15	Duplicate License	\$ 5.50	\$ <del>5.50</del> <u>6.50</u>
16	Shooting Preserve License	11.00	<del>11.00</del> <u>22.00</u>
17	Captive Wolf License	22.00	N/A
18	(g) Miscellaneous-Other Tags		
19	Duplicate Tag	\$ 5.50	\$ <del>5.50</del> <u>6.50</u>
20	Wild Bird Shooting Preserve Tag	5.50	<del>5.50</del> <u>6.50</u>
21	(h) Miscellaneous-Other Permits-Points- <u>Fees</u>		
22	Falconry In-State Transfer Permit	\$ 5.50	\$ N/A
23	Falconry Meet Permit	N/A	<del>21.75</del> <u>26.25</u>
24	<u>Rehab Permit</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>
25	<u>Educational Fishing Permit</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
26	<u>Live Fish Importation Permit</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>
27	<u>Sport Dog and Falconry Training Permit</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>
28	<u>Wildlife Transport Permit</u>	<u>3.00</u>	<u>3.00</u>
29	<u>Scientific Collection Permit</u>	<u>50.00</u>	<u>50.00</u>
30	Private Park Permit	21.75	<del>21.75</del> <u>26.25</u>
31	Wildlife Import Permit	21.75	<del>21.75</del> <u>26.25</u>
32	Wildlife Export Permit	11.00	<del>11.00</del> <u>13.25</u>
33	Wildlife Release Permit	11.00	<del>11.00</del> <u>13.25</u>
34	Captive Wildlife Permit	21.75	<del>21.75</del> <u>26.25</u>

1	Fishing Tournament Permit	21.75	<del>21.75</del> <u>25.00</u>
2	Dog Field Trial Permit	33.00	<del>33.00</del> <u>40.00</u>
3	Live Fish Transport Permit	21.75	<del>21.75</del> <u>26.25</u>
4	Controlled Hunt Application Fee	4.50	<del>4.50</del> <u>13.00</u>
5	<u>Fee for Application for the Purchase of Controlled</u>		
6	<u>Hunt Bonus or Preference Points</u>	<u>4.50</u>	<u>4.50</u>
7	Nursing Home Fishing Permit	33.00	N/A

8 SECTION 3. That Section [36-1104](#), Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby repealed.

9 SECTION 4. That Section 36-1104A, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended  
10 to read as follows:

11 36-1104A. SPECIAL BOBCAT OR ~~LYNX~~ OTTER EXPORT TAGS – FEE. The  
12 commission may provide for, and regulate the issuance of, a special tag to be attached to the  
13 hide of any bobcat or any ~~lynx~~ otter legally taken in the state of Idaho. A tag shall be authority  
14 to export bobcat or ~~lynx~~ otter hides taken in Idaho as provided by regulation of the U.S. fish  
15 and wildlife service.

16 The commission may set the price to be charged for such tags, at a cost not to exceed the  
17 fee as specified in section 36-416, Idaho Code, per tag.

18 No export tag shall be issued for any bobcat or ~~lynx~~ otter hide not taken in Idaho.

19 SECTION 5. LEGISLATIVE INTENT. The Legislature recognizes a benefit to the  
20 public from elk and mule deer population monitoring to assess abundance, sex ratios and  
21 juvenile production and from studies to monitor survival and mortality factors of elk, deer  
22 and moose. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Department of Fish and Game continue  
23 to monitor and study populations of elk, deer and moose, including predation by wolves, to  
24 provide this beneficial information.

25 SECTION 6. An emergency existing therefor, which emergency is hereby declared to  
26 exist, this act shall be in full force and effect on and after April 15, 2009.

# Appendix II

## 2009 Idaho Controlled Hunt Statistics

<b>Elk - 2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	40655	13475	33.1%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	3333	638	19.1%
<i>R Extra &amp; Unlimited</i>	1412	427	
<i>NR Extra &amp; Unlimited</i>	11	4	

<b>Deer - 2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	32030	9324	29.1%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	3417	499	14.6%
<i>R Extra &amp; Unlimited</i>	4973	3590	
<i>NR Extra &amp; Unlimited</i>	27	17	

<b>Pronghorn - 2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	15199	1409	9.3%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	600	56	9.3%
<i>R Extra &amp; Unlimited</i>	1167	2143	
<i>NR Extra &amp; Unlimited</i>	44	60	

<b>Moose - 2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	5511	947	17.2%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	477	57	11.9%

<b>Bighorn-Rocky Mt</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	665	58	8.7%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	923	5	0.5%

<b>Bighorn-California</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	357	19	5.3%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	281	3	1.1%

<b>Mt. Goat -2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	500	42	8.4%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	173	4	2.3%

<b>Black Bear - 2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	2617	296	11.3%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	163	19	11.7%

<b>Turkey - 2009</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Choice Applications</b>	<b>Successful Applications</b>	<b>2009 Draw Results</b>
<i>Resident (R)</i>	3434	863	25.1%
<i>Nonresident (NR)</i>	38	12	31.6%

# Appendix III

## 2010 Proposed Idaho Bonus Point Guidelines

# Proposed Idaho Bonus Point System

---

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game is developing the framework of a bonus point system as part of the current controlled hunt drawing process. This system rewards hunters who have applied for controlled hunts for several years and have not drawn a tag. Over time, drawing odds will be lower for first time applicants and those who choose to opt out of the bonus point system. Most western states have a similar system in place. Here are some of the highlights of the draft proposal:

- **Bonus Points are Optional.** Controlled hunt applicants will be entered into the bonus point system each year and charged for a point when submitting an application unless they choose to opt out. Applicants that opt out will only have one controlled hunt application in the random draw regardless of previous points earned.
  
- **Bonus Point “Squared” System.** Controlled hunt applicants will receive one bonus point if not drawn on their first-choice hunt during the first drawing for a particular species. In the following year, the number of points would be “squared” to determine the number of chances the hunter has to draw for that species. This gives first-time applicants one chance in the draw but an applicant with 5 points for a given species will have 26 chances (5X5 plus this year’s application). The drawing equation for points will be:

$$\mathbf{P=B^2 + 1}$$

Where “P” is the number of chances in the drawing, “B” is the number of bonus points which will be squared, and 1 is the current year’s application. For example:

Year	Bonus Points (B)	Bonus Points Squared (B <sup>2</sup> )	Current Application	Total Chances Entered in Drawing (P)
Year 1	0	0	1	1
Year 2	1	1	1	2
Year 3	2	4	1	5
Year 4	3	9	1	10
Year 5	4	16	1	17
Year 6	5	25	1	26
Year 7	6	36	1	37
Year 8	7	49	1	50
Year 9	8	64	1	65

- **Group Applications** will have their points averaged (total points of all hunters in the party, divided by the number of hunters) and rounded to the closest whole number. Bonus points are then squared by species category, resulting in the number of chances that an individual hunter or hunt party will receive in that drawing. The average points will be rounded as follows:
  - Average ≥.50 round up to the next whole number.
  - Average ≤.49 round down to the next whole number.

- **First-choice Only.** Bonus points can only be used for the first-choice during the first drawing period. Those unsuccessful in drawing a tag on their first-choice hunt will be entered in the second-choice hunt drawing if applicable and will only be entered into the drawing one time.
  - Bonus points will not be used or accumulated for
    - second drawing
    - leftover sales
    - unlimited controlled hunts
    - extra tag controlled hunts
  
- **Opting Out with Points.** Applicants that opt out will only have one controlled hunt application in the random draw regardless of accumulated points from previous years. Those who opt out one year do not accumulate more points but do not lose points. Points are reset to zero when a hunter draws a first-choice tag for that species or fails to apply in two consecutive years for a bonus point.
  
- **Point-Only Option.** Applicants may select the point-only option rather than apply for a tag for their first-choice. When applicants select a point-only as their first-choice, they can select a controlled hunt for their second choice or leave the second choice blank. For example, a hunter may apply for a point-only as the first-choice hunt and an unlimited controlled hunt as a second-choice hunt on an application.
  
- **Any Controlled Hunt Species.** Bonus points will be accumulated for each controlled hunt species and by season. For example, points accumulate separately for:
  - Spring bear, fall bear, spring turkey, fall turkey, moose, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep, mountain goat, deer, elk, pronghorn
  
- **Trophy Species Restriction.** Trophy species include moose, bighorn sheep, and mountain goats. Controlled hunt rules restrict the applicant to only one trophy species controlled hunt application per year. Additionally, those applying for a trophy species tag may not apply for deer, elk, and pronghorn controlled hunt during the same year.

These rules will remain the same with the following changes or additions for bonus point applications:

- Hunters applying for a moose, bighorn sheep, or mountain goat controlled hunt tag may apply for a point-only option for other trophy species the same year. For example, a hunter applying for a moose tag may also apply for Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep, and mountain goat bonus points.
- Secondly, hunters applying for a moose, bighorn sheep, or mountain goat controlled hunt tag may also apply for a deer, elk, and pronghorn bonus point the same year.
  
- **Wait Period.** Under current controlled hunt rules, if a hunter draws an antlered deer or elk tag on a controlled hunt, they must wait one year to apply for the same species. Similarly, if a hunter draws a trophy species tag, they wait two years before applying again for that species (if they do not harvest). Under this proposal, waiting periods will not apply if a hunter applies for the point-only option. For example:

- Hunters drawing an antlered deer or elk controlled hunt tag may apply for a deer or elk point-only the following year.
- Hunters drawing a trophy tag and not harvesting may apply for a point-only for the same species the following year.
  
- **No Transfers.** Points are issued to the original purchaser only, and cannot be sold or transferred to other hunters.
  
- **Unclaimed Tags.** Hunters that draw a controlled hunt tag using their bonus points but fail to purchase the controlled hunt tag by the time specified in Commission rules, thus losing the tag, will have their points reinstated.
  
- **Age Eligibility.** Age restrictions for controlled hunt applicants apply to bonus point applicants.
  
- **Cost.** Controlled hunt applicants must purchase an Idaho hunting license and submit a nonrefundable application fee with each application. Under this proposed system, a bonus point application fee will be an additional fee for applicants that do not opt out.
  - Resident hunting license is \$12.75, nonresident hunting license is \$154.75
  - Controlled hunt application fee is \$6.25 for residents, \$14.75 for nonresidents
  - Bonus Point application fee is \$6.25 for residents and nonresidents



# Appendix IV

2005 Controlled Hunt Drawing Survey



**IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

600 S Walnut / PO Box 25  
Boise, Idaho 83707-0025

Dirk Kempthorne / Governor  
Steven M. Huffaker / Director

## **CONTROLLED HUNT DRAWING SURVEY RANDOM SAMPLE**

Dear Hunter,

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game strives to provide reasonable opportunities to obtain controlled hunt permits for all hunters. Each year the Department hears concerns from hunters about the controlled hunt drawing process. The Idaho Fish & Game Commission is interested in hearing your opinions about some potential changes to address these issues brought up by other sportsmen.

Please complete the attached survey and *return by October 15th*.

Your responses will be kept confidential and used by the Commission as they consider changes to Idaho's controlled hunt drawing process.

I thank you in advance for your timely response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Steven M. Huffaker".

Steve M. Huffaker  
Director

You can also enter the information on the IDFG on-line questionnaire (IDFG web site).

Random Survey version: <http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/apps/surveys/ch/index.cfm>

Public Survey version: [http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/apps/surveys/ch/ch\\_survey.cfm](http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/apps/surveys/ch/ch_survey.cfm)

### **RANDOM SURVEY**

**QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO 1600 HUNTERS on 9/13/2005**

Randomly selected from 72,000 hunters applying for controlled hunts in 2005.

-- Deer, Elk, Antelope, Moose, Bighorn Sheep, Mountain Goat, Bear, and Turkey

A follow-up letter and a postcard were sent if response not received.

Hunters could mail back the questionnaire or enter the results on-line

1043 responses were received (65% return rate) as of 11/10/2005



# CONTROLLED HUNT DRAWING SURVEY

## Section I

To help the Department better understand your responses to the survey, we need to know a little about your experiences with controlled hunts.

*Q1. Please check which controlled hunts you have applied for in Idaho during the past 3 years:*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antlered Elk       | <input type="checkbox"/> Antlerless Elk   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antlered Deer      | <input type="checkbox"/> Antlerless Deer  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antlered Moose     | <input type="checkbox"/> Antlerless Moose |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pronghorn Antelope | <input type="checkbox"/> Bighorn Sheep    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mountain Goat      |   |

	Antlered Elk	Antlerless Elk	Antlered Deer	Antlerless Deer	Antlered Moose	Antlerless Moose	Pronghorn Antelope	Bighorn Sheep	Mountain Goat
#APPLIED	507	515	494	217	123	35	239	40	19
%YES	49	49	47	21	12	3	23	4	2

*Q2. Please check which controlled hunts you have drawn a permit for in Idaho during the past 3 years:*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antlered Elk       | <input type="checkbox"/> Antlerless Elk   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antlered Deer      | <input type="checkbox"/> Antlerless Deer  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Antlered Moose     | <input type="checkbox"/> Antlerless Moose |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pronghorn Antelope | <input type="checkbox"/> Bighorn Sheep    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mountain Goat      |   |

	Antlered Elk	Antlerless Elk	Antlered Deer	Antlerless Deer	Antlered Moose	Antlerless Moose	Pronghorn Antelope	Bighorn Sheep	Mountain Goat
#DRAWN	153	377	161	176	33	12	52	3	3
%YES	15	36	15	17	3	1	5	0.3	0.3
%DRAWN (Q2/Q1)	30	73	33	81	27	34	22	8	16

*Q3. Please indicate which other states listed below you have applied for an elk, deer, pronghorn antelope, or moose controlled hunt during the past 3 years:*

- |                                  |   |                                     |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Montana | <input type="checkbox"/> Wyoming        | <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oregon  | <input type="checkbox"/> Washington     | <input type="checkbox"/> California |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arizona | <input type="checkbox"/> New Mexico     | <input type="checkbox"/> Utah       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nevada  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other State(s) |                                     |

	AZ	CA	CO	MT	NM	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Other
YES	37	20	38	55	27	49	50	46	20	77	24
%YES	4	2	4	5	3	5	5	4	2	7	2

*Q4. How many hunters under 18 years of age have you applied with on a group application for a controlled hunt during each of the past 2 years?*

Number of hunters under 18 years of age you applied with in 2005 = \_\_\_\_\_

Number of hunters under 18 years of age you applied with in 2004 = \_\_\_\_\_

	COUNT	% NON-ZERO	MIN	MEAN	MAX	MEDIAN
#YOUTH APPLIED, 2005	1043	11	1	1.4	5	1
#YOUTH APPLIED, 2004	1043	10	1	1.5	6	1

## **Section II**

Currently Idaho uses a random drawing process for controlled hunt applicants. Every applicant has the same chance of drawing a permit. Typically, hunters draw in proportion to the drawing odds. For example, an applicant who applies for a controlled hunt with a 20% chance of drawing is predicted to draw 1 permit every 5 years. However, because the drawing is random, some applicants draw more or less often than predicted by drawing odds. The Commission wants to know how satisfied you are with Idaho's current controlled hunt drawing system.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about Idaho's controlled hunt drawing system:

*Q5. I am satisfied with the current controlled hunt drawing system.*

			Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	MEAN
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	17
#RESPONSES	1043	17	201	230	218	219	158	2.91
PERCENT			20	22	21	21	15	

*Q6. The current system favors some applicants over others.*

			Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	20	127	185	391	141	179	3.06
PERCENT			12	18	38	14	17	

*Q7. Unsuccessful applicants should receive increased chances of drawing in future drawings.*

			Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	15	455	271	121	56	125	2.15
PERCENT			44	26	12	5	12	

### Section III

The Department has evaluated various controlled hunt drawing systems used throughout the western states. The Commission has indicated an interest in a Bonus Point system and would like your opinion before considering it for use in Idaho.

In a Bonus Point system, points are awarded to each unsuccessful applicant and are used to increase the number of chances in future drawings. A Bonus Point system **does not guarantee** an applicant will draw a tag in their lifetime. However, chances of eventually drawing can be improved for persistent controlled hunt applicants in relatively easy to draw hunts (more than 10% chance of drawing a permit). In high demand hunts (less than 10% chance of drawing), a bonus point system will only marginally improve an applicant's chance of success. Below are two examples illustrating differences between Idaho's random drawing and Nevada's Bonus Point system.

EXAMPLE #1 (more than 10% chance of drawing): Antlered deer hunt with 1085 applicants for 281 permits

<u>Year</u>	Random Draw (Idaho)	Bonus Point System (Nevada)	
	<u>Chance of Drawing</u>	<u>Bonus Points</u>	<u>Chance of Drawing</u>
1	26%	0	10%
2	26%	1	23%
3	26%	2	42%
4	26%	3	60%
5	26%	4	71%
6	26%	5	75%

*Note: This is only an example and actual chances of drawing will vary.*

EXAMPLE #2 (less than 10% chance of drawing): Antlered elk hunt with 961 applicants for 41 permits

<u>Year</u>	Random Draw (Idaho)	Bonus Point System (Nevada)	
	<u>Chance of Drawing</u>	<u>Bonus Points</u>	<u>Chance of Drawing</u>
1	5%	0	2%
2	5%	1	2%
3	5%	2	6%
4	5%	3	9%
5	5%	4	12%
6	5%	5	12%

*Note: This is only an example and actual chances of drawing will vary.*

In Idaho, a bonus point system should improve an applicant's chance of eventually drawing in most moose, pronghorn antelope, antlerless elk and deer controlled hunts, and low demand antlered elk and deer controlled hunts. The chance of drawing mountain goat, bighorn sheep, and high demand antlered elk and deer hunts would only improve slightly with a bonus point system.

*Q8. How acceptable would it be for the Department to implement a Bonus Point system for controlled hunts?*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	24	344	275	140	82	178	2.48
PERCENT			34	27	14	8	17	

For a Bonus Point system to be most effective in improving the chance of drawing, the total number of bonus points allocated to all applicants needs to be minimized. In other words, fewer total bonus points in each controlled hunt drawing increases an individual’s chance of drawing. Some states allow applicants to receive bonus points without applying for controlled hunts (e.g. “purchasing points”, earning points for completing hunter’s education, doing volunteer work, etc.). “Purchasing points” allows a hunter to buy a bonus point annually without being entered into a drawing for a controlled hunt.

*Q9. If the Department implemented a Bonus Point system, how important would it be for you to “purchase points” without applying for a controlled hunt?*

			Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimport.	Very Unimport.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	38	73	105	216	112	499	3.85
PERCENT			7	10	21	11	50	

**Section IV**

If a bonus point system is adopted in Idaho, the Department would contract with a private company to implement and maintain the program. Estimates from other states indicate approximately \$550,000 dollars will be needed annually. The Department is considering two funding options: 1) increase nonrefundable controlled hunt application fees, or 2) allow controlled hunt applicants to voluntarily pay for their bonus points. With a voluntary pay system, only those applicants paying the extra fee would receive bonus points.

*Q10. How acceptable would it be to increase nonrefundable controlled hunt application fees from \$6.25 to \$11.25 to implement a Bonus Point system in Idaho?*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	14	154	180	94	156	445	3.54
PERCENT			15	17	9	15	43	

*Q11. How acceptable would it be if the Department implemented a **voluntary** Bonus Point system? Only applicants paying an increased nonrefundable controlled hunt application fee of \$11.25 would receive a bonus point.*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	14	233	175	108	100	413	3.28
PERCENT			23	17	10	10	40	

*Q12. If the Department implemented a **voluntary Bonus Point** system, would you participate?*

- Yes
- No
- Undecided

	TOTAL	BLANK	Yes	No	Undecided
COUNT	1043	15	405	356	267
PERCENT			39	35	26

## **Section V**

The Department is evaluating other possible changes to the controlled hunt drawing system to improve drawing odds. These changes decrease the number of applicants for each hunt and increase your chances of drawing.

Please indicate how acceptable each of these changes would be to you.

Allowing hunters to only apply for a single species (as it is now for moose, mountain goat, and bighorn sheep) would increase chances of drawing for deer, elk, and pronghorn antelope controlled hunts. Applicants would only apply for one species.

EXAMPLE: In 2005 3,163 applicants applied for 450 antlered deer permits in Unit 54 (14% chance of drawing). Of these applicants 2,492 also applied for elk and 1,037 also applied for pronghorn antelope. If applicants were restricted to only applying for a deer, elk, or antelope – it is estimated that the chance of drawing an antlered deer permit in Unit 54 would be approximately 22%.

*Q13. How acceptable would it be to limit controlled hunt applicants to one elk, one deer, or one pronghorn antelope?*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	23	247	170	146	149	308	3.10
PERCENT			24	17	14	15	30	

Some antlered elk (e.g. Unit 11) and deer (e.g. Unit 45) hunts have very low chances (less than 5% chance of drawing). Limiting applicants to only apply for these types of hunts, similar to moose, mountain goat, and bighorn sheep (e.g. only apply for one species), would increase your chance of drawing.

EXAMPLE: In 2005 2,556 applicants applied for 50 late-season antlered deer permits in Unit 45 (2% chance of drawing). Of these applicants, 2,224 also applied for elk and 1,193 also applied for antelope controlled hunts. If applicants were restricted to only apply for one species in high-demand hunts, it is estimated that the chance of drawing an antlered deer permit in Unit 45 would be approximately 4%.

*Q14. How acceptable would it be to limit very high demand antlered elk and deer hunt applicants to only one species?*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	11	296	217	163	116	240	2.79
PERCENT			29	21	16	11	23	

Currently, antlered deer and elk hunts have a 2-year waiting period for successful applicants. Increasing the waiting period would provide some increase in your chances of drawing. After successfully drawing an antlered deer or elk hunt, applicants would have to wait 5 years to apply.

EXAMPLE: In 2005 the chance of drawing an antlered deer hunt in Unit 40 was 6%. With a 5-year waiting period, the chance of drawing a permit is estimated to be approximately 10%.

*Q15. How acceptable would it be to increase the waiting period after drawing one of these hunts to 5 years before hunters are again eligible to apply for an antlered hunt of the same species?*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	9	145	144	124	199	422	3.59
PERCENT			14	14	12	19	41	

Some states charge higher fees for special hunting opportunities (“trophy” hunts). Charging higher tag/permit fees could reduce the number of applicants in very high demand controlled hunts.

*Q16. How acceptable would it be to charge higher tag/permit fees (at least \$100) for very high demand hunts for antlered elk and deer?*

			Very Acceptable	Somewhat Acceptable	Neutral	Somewhat Unaccept.	Very Unaccept.	
	TOTAL	BLANK	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN
COUNT	1043	8	137	129	103	153	513	3.75
PERCENT			13	12	10	15	50	

**Section VI:**

We understand the following information is personal and optional for you to provide. However, this information is useful to help us determine whether this survey represents all sportsmen who hunt in Idaho. We will not share this information with any other agency or organization.

*Q17. Which category includes your present age? (check one)*

- younger than 20 years old
- 20 – 30 years old
- 31 – 40 years old
- 41 – 60 years old
- older than 60 years old



	TOTAL	BLANK	<20 yrs	20-30 yrs	31-40 yrs	41-60 yrs	>60 yrs
COUNT	1043	16	81	122	187	458	179
PERCENT			8	12	18	45	17

Q18. Are you a resident of Idaho?

- No  
 Yes

	TOTAL	BLANK	No	Yes
COUNT	1043	0	125	918
PERCENT			12	88

Q19. What is your gender?

- Male  
 Female

	TOTAL	BLANK	Male	Female
COUNT	1043	13	884	146
PERCENT			86	14

Q20. How many years have you hunted in Idaho? (Please enter number) \_\_\_\_\_ Years

YEARS HUNTED IN IDAHO	COUNT	% NON-ZERO	MIN	MEAN	MAX	MEDIAN
RESIDENT	918	95	1	22.8	75	20
NONRESIDENT	125	83	1	8.6	35	6

Q21. In what type of community do you live?

- Large city (more than 50,000 people)  
 Small city (10,000 – 50,000 people)  
 Small town (less than 10,000 people)  
 Rural

	TOTAL	BLANK	Large City	Small City	Small Town	Rural
COUNT	1043	18	261	190	243	331
PERCENT			25	19	24	32

Q22. Which of the following best describes your total family income before taxes in 2004?

- less than \$20,000  
 \$20,000 - \$40,000  
 \$40,001 - \$60,000  
 \$60,001 - \$80,000  
 \$80,001 - \$100,000  
 more than \$100,000

	TOTAL	BLANK	< \$20K	\$20-40K	\$40-60K	\$60-80K	\$80-100K	> \$100K
COUNT	1043	100	78	237	244	187	74	123
PERCENT			8	25	26	20	8	13

Q23. Are you a member of any hunting, conservation, or sportsmen's organizations?

- No
- Yes

	TOTAL	BLANK	Yes	No
COUNT	1043	29	345	669
PERCENT			34	66

If "Yes", please list the organization(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Additional comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you for completing this survey.  
We appreciate your help as we evaluate possible changes to Idaho's controlled hunt  
drawing system.***

# Appendix V

## 2010 Public Comment Summary

## Comments from 2010 Bonus Point Questionnaire

### Q1: Do you support making the bonus point optional

#### Yes-I support making Bonus Points optional (59%)

- People should be allowed to decline
- I like to make my own choices
- No additional fees unless by consent
- Only fair to have a choice considering the cost
- Why not if applicants do not accumulate points
- Make it opt-in, by default they do not accumulate points

#### No-I do not support making Bonus Points optional (38%)

- Unnecessary feature-keep it simple, everyone adhere to the same rules
- Optional is confusing-nothing to gain from opting out
- Those who opt out would be at an unfair advantage
- Should not have to pay an additional cost, automatically get a bonus point if unsuccessful
- Creates additional workload on staff, less errors in record keeping

### Q2: Do you support using the bonus points only in the first choice drawing?

#### Yes-I support (62%)

- I do not support bonus points, but if there is a bonus point system then it should only apply to the first choice drawing
- Yes, bonus points should only apply to the first choice drawing, there are no high quality tags available as second choice anyway

#### No-I do not support (35%)

- I do not support the bonus point system
- No, I do not support bonus points only in the first choice drawing. Idaho Fish and Game should apply a system where second choice (and subsequent choice) hunts are considered in the first drawing, like they do in Nevada
- Bonus points should be integrated in all drawings
- Hunters should have a choice of when their points are applied

**Q3: Do you support applying for a point in the years that you do not apply for a specific hunt?**

**Yes-I support (44%)**

- Hunters need the chance to build points when they are unable to hunt
- License should not be required to purchase points
- Increases Dept income
- Only award points when applying for a hunt
- Purchase points for Trophy species only
- Should be able to purchase points for other species when I apply for a hunt
- Helps keep drawing odds reasonable if hunters apply for a point rather than applying in hard to draw hunts to gain a point

**No-I do not support (53%)**

- You should only get a point when applying for a tag
- All these extra points will contribute to point inflation
- Purchasing points means that young hunters or first time applicants will have no chance
- Points only for specific hunts and specific species- not general
- Purchasing points is all about money
- Shouldn't have to buy a license to purchase points

\*One person said no to purchasing points except for [deployed military personnel](#)

**Q4: Do you support this approach of accumulating points during a waiting period?**

**Yes-I support (37%)**

- I support purchasing points if there is a waiting period, however I feel that the bonus point system negates the need for a waiting period
- I support purchasing points during waiting periods, it provides Idaho Fish and Game a new source of revenue
- I support purchasing points during waiting periods, and feel waiting periods should be longer

**No-I do not support (61%)**

- I do not support any bonus point system. Current system is good
- I do not support accumulating points during waiting periods, waiting will improve odds for other hunters

- I do not support accumulating points during waiting periods, this is just a money making plan for Idaho Fish and Game
- I do not support accumulating points during a waiting period, it will turn hunting into a rich man's sport
- I do not support accumulating points during waiting periods, and the waiting periods should be longer

**Q5: Do you support this approach of accumulating bonus points for all other species in the same year?**

**Yes- I support (42%)**

- Allows a person to accumulate bonus points for a one-per-lifetime hunter without giving up opportunity for deer/elk/antelope
- Not for trophy species; points should be a reward for applying every year, not just shelling out cash
- Price for a trophy species bonus point should equal price for a tag

**No- I do not support (55%)**

- Hunters should be able to accumulate points only for the hunts they apply for; if everyone can buy points, the system won't improve odds for anyone—especially for trophy species
- Allow hunters to accumulate only 1 point/year
- Unfair to kids and others just getting started in hunting
- This caters to the wealthy who will buy points for all species every year
- Keep trophy species separate and allow lifetime accumulation for trophy species points that go to zero when any one-per-lifetime tag is drawn
- Violates concept that every hunter has equal opportunity
- Unfair to resident hunters, who (unlike many non-residents) do not or cannot afford to apply to many states every year

**Q6: Do you support the bonus point system that is described here?**

**Yes-I support (56%)**

- Get points only for the particular species or the hunt in which you apply
- Get points only for trophy species (moose, sheep, mt. goat)
- Many support only if youth chances are protected, usually supporting a ratio of bonus point tags to random-draw tags (i.e. 80% BP:20% RD)

- Many comments from non-residents that they will begin applying to Idaho if BP is implemented
- Some support only if points cannot be bought, which avoids benefitting only rich people
- Although many BP supporters favored being able to buy points, the prevalence appeared to be opposed
- Many comments that IDFG needs to be sure general hunting opportunities are maintained
- For those writing a resident/non-resident opinion, about an even split between support for residents only and support for non-residents only

### **No-I do not support (43%)**

- All applicants should have the same chance; I like the current system where everyone has the same chance to draw
- Bonus points will have a negative effect on the younger generation
- It takes several years to become competitive; Idaho has some of the best drawing odds around under the current system
- Becomes too expensive; turns hunting into a rich man's sport
- Enjoy general hunting opportunity in Idaho, trend will be for more controlled hunts which is the opposite direction