



**Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Pueblo Room
Las Vegas, NV 89155
August 16, 2022 (5:30 PM)
Meeting Minutes**

Join the meeting link: (You may also attend online if you wish not to attend in person)
<https://clarkcountynv.webex.com/clarkcountynv/j.php?MTID=me740acd00c53c5ce6ac9adf31203a416>

Join by meeting number:

Meeting number (access code): 2488 749 0383

Meeting password: xQK9Paqie38

Tap to join from a mobile device (attendees only)

[+1-408-418-9388](tel:+14084189388),,[24887490383##](tel:+14084189388) United States Toll

Join by phone

+1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

Global call-in numbers

Join from a video system or application: Dial [24887490383@clarkcountynv.webex.com](https://clarkcountynv.webex.com/j/24887490383)

Also, you may dial: 173.243.2.68 and enter your meeting number.

Join using Microsoft Lync or Microsoft Skype for Business

Dial [24887490383.clarkcountynv@lync.webex.com](https://clarkcountynv.lync.webex.com/j/24887490383)

NOTE:

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The CCABMW members may combine two (2) or more agenda items for consideration.
- The CCABMW may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.
- No action may be taken on any matter not listed on the posted agenda.
- Please turn off or mute all cell phones and other electronic devices.
- Please take all private conversations outside the room.
- With a forty-eight (48) hour advance request, a sign language interpreter or other reasonable efforts to assist and accommodate persons with physical disabilities, may be made available by calling (702) 455-3530, TDD at (702) 385-7486, or Relay Nevada toll- free at (800) 326-6868, TD/TDD
- Supporting material provided to CCABMW members for this meeting may be requested from Secretary Darlene Kretunski at (702) 455-1402 and is/will be available on the County's website at www.clarkcountynv.gov.
- If you do not wish to attend the meeting in person but desire to provide written general public comment or public comment on an individual agenda item, please submit your comments prior to 2:30 p.m. August 16, 2022, to Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNv.gov. Please make sure to include your name, address, the agenda item number on which you are providing comment, and your comment. All comments will be compiled into a document and shared with members of the public body, meeting attendees and on the public body's website.

Board: Paul Dixon, Chair
Therese Campbell
Jacob Thompson
Brian Patterson
Dave Talaga
John Hiatt
(Vacancy)

Secretary: **Darlene Kretunski (702) 455-1402, Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov**
Department of Environment and Sustainability, Division of Air Quality
4701 W. Russell Rd, Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89118

County Liaison: **Marci Henson (702) 455-1608, Mhenson@ClarkCountyNV.gov**
Department of Environment and Sustainability, Division of Air Quality
4701 W. Russell Rd, Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89118

I. Call to Order-Roll call of Board Members for determination of quorum:

If no quorum is present, meeting cannot begin and will be canceled.

- Secretary Darlene Kretunski performed roll call: (Present: Chair Paul Dixon, Dave Talaga, John Hiatt, Jacob Thompson)
- A quorum was present.

II. Pledge of Allegiance-

- Chair Paul Dixon led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Public Comment- This is a period devoted to comments by the general public about items on this agenda. No discussion, action, or vote may be taken on this agenda item. You will be afforded the opportunity to speak on individual Public Hearing Items at the time they are presented. If you wish to speak to the CCABMW about items within its jurisdiction but not appearing on this agenda, you must wait until the "Comments by the General Public" period listed at the end of this agenda. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. Please clearly state your name, address and please spell your last name for the record. If any member of the CCABMW wishes to extend the length of the presentation, this will be done by the Chair or the CCABMW by majority vote.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.

IV. Approval of the Minutes for June 21, 2022 CCABMW Meeting. (For possible action)

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked if the board had comments on the meeting minutes that were put together in great detail by our secretary Darlene Kretunski.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to Secretary Darlene Kretunski that her meeting minutes are fantastic and stated if individuals would like to know what the CCABMW are doing then it is captured in our meeting minutes and the minutes are the best he has had since being on the board now for 15 years.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski thanked Chair Paul Dixon.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve the meeting minutes for June 21, 2022 CCABMW Meeting as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**

V. Approval of the Agenda for August 16, 2022. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted. (For possible action)

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic
- Public Comments:(None)
- Board Comments: (None)
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve the Agenda for August 16, 2022 as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**

VI. CCABMW Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence: (Informational) CCABMW members may present emergent items.

No action may be taken by the CCABMW. Any item requiring CCABMW action will be scheduled on future CCABMW agenda. CCABMW board members may discuss any correspondence sent or received. (CCABMW board members must provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked each board member if they had any announcements, correspondence, emails or anything they would like to discuss.
- Board member John Hiatt: (None)
- Board member Dave Talaga: (None)
- Board member Jacob Thompson: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he has one piece of correspondence in regards to NDOW's new program for volunteers and NGO's reporting their volunteer time. He stated some individuals feel the process to report their volunteer time is becoming entirely way to complex.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised he can provide adequate background on this subject matter.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) why NDOW doesn't have this method electronically where individuals may do so electronically log in these hours from wherever they may be to make this easier. He asked the question was this a method that NDOW will be doing in the near future and if not why? He stated that NGO's are feeling that NDOW is not assisting in making it difficult to report.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the new

program is product of federal audit. He stated that example: if volunteers are riding together and reporting the same mileage thus causing red flags with the match funding component during the auditing process. He stated in Nevada there is payback with match (federal and Pittman Robertson funds). He advised the new way that volunteers are having to report their time is not NDOW attempting to make it difficult it is simply a product of the audit process letting NDOW have accountability for the mileage in a correct fashion and with the new mapping and each individual now has their own timesheet, he reiterated NDOW is not attempting to make this process difficult but have no choice but to do the process in this manner due to these findings.

- Chair Paul Dixon asked if it is possible to have the volunteers time reported electronically to not have individuals fill out separate sheets, why can't there be a map online to input information. He gave example of how his mileage is put in electronically by just indicating a start location and end location and the mileage is calculated and he does not have to drive to and from those locations before he can input information it is electronically calculated, he wanted to know why NDOW cannot have the same method in place.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He indicated that an option that this is being explored. He advised if volunteers are having issues reporting their volunteer work hours they can certainly speak with their assigned volunteer coordinator to either assist with helping the volunteer with reporting the hours or the volunteer coordinator will do it for the volunteer. He stated for now this is the process that NDOW has in place due to the finding in the new fiscal year.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that people need an understanding that the process is due to auditing but he is sure that (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) will be hearing more complaints on this process.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he appreciates the public's opinion and noted that NDOW greatly appreciates the volunteers and depend on their efforts tremendously.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised at this time this item is hereby closed.**
- **F.Y.I.-(NDOW Website) Wildlife Volunteer Program-** The volunteer program is administered by NDOW, Conservation Education division. These volunteers will work with regular full time NDOW staff which includes wildlife biologists, wildlife staff specialists, conservation educators and various others.
- **Requirements for becoming NDOW Wildlife Volunteer-** 18 years old or older, must be willing to give minimum number of hours per year of volunteer time to the various programs and provide their own method of transportation for the volunteer projects and any events.
- **Types of Volunteer Projects:** fish stocking, fish sampling, nesting surveys, check station assistance, angler education, hunter education, interpretation, data entry, guzzler builds, seed collection and office assistance. The volunteer will be asked to report to a certain site to help with a volunteer project or event. Volunteers will be asked to report to field site if the projects or events will occur in the field. Volunteers are needed throughout Nevada, therefore there are a variety of jobs available for volunteers.
- **When are Volunteers Needed?** Volunteers are needed throughout the year, the greatest number of opportunities for volunteers takes place on weekdays, during regular work hours, but NDOW does have opportunities as well outside of regular working hours and on weekends, working hard to provide opportunities to all volunteers. To remain active in NDOW's system, volunteers need to volunteer yearly at least once and submit their volunteer work hours thus the volunteers are considered to be representing NDOW and are to conduct their behavior as a NDOW staff would.
- **To Become a NDOW Volunteer:** Registration is done online. Here are some of the opportunities: (*NDOW Volunteer, Outdoor Education Instructor, Volunteer Game Warden*)

VII. **Recap of the June 23, 2022-June 25, 2022 Commission virtual meetings in Elko by Chair Paul Dixon: (Informational).**

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Commission meeting was held in Elko, Nevada and there was a presentation of the Wayne E. Kirch Award presentation (*award that acknowledges a deserving individual, nonprofit organization, outdoor sports club or business who have achieved significant results toward the conservation, management, or enhancement of wildlife in the State of Nevada during the last calendar year*). He stated the award was presented to Craig Jefferson, who was one of the two individuals to receive this award. The late Ron Lurie was the second recipient of this award and stated the ceremony was very nice. He stated it was also the last meeting for (*Commissioner John Almberg*) who served for a total of six years. He stated he spoke to (*Wildlife Commissioner Almberg*) and his wife before he left his position and what a great job he has done as Commissioner.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised on the Biennial Upland Game Release for Fiscal Years 2022 and 2023 in which the CAB had issues in their June 21, 2022 meeting with the following: 1) The CCABMW wanted to ask NDOW if this is the best environment to be transplanting Sharp-tail Grouse under a drought. 2) The CCABMW wanted to view the numerical range of the number of birds to be transplanted in an area on these requests and for the CCABMW to have clear understanding of magnitude of resources that will be necessary. Chair Paul Dixon stated he was told by (*Shawn Espinosa, Game Biologist, NDOW*) he is responsible for the Upland Game Program) that there would be a total of 15 to 20 female birds that would be transplanted in the Bull Run area is the location where these birds will be placed and it is **microclimate area** (*a microclimate or microclimate is a local set of atmospheric conditions that differ from those in the surrounding areas, often with a slight difference but sometimes with a substantial one*). He stated in this area even in drought years this area receives above average rainfall therefore there is no worry about drought conditions in these area and birds have plenty of food and cover.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that (*Chairwomen Tiffany East*) stated she appreciated the CAB board members asking these difficult questions thus making sure there is knowledge on why this is being done.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Commission Regulation 22-12, 2022-2023 Upland Game and Furbearer Seasons and Bag Limits was reviewed by the Commission and accepted as presented. He advised the only issues where previously that the CAB stated at their meeting that bag limits are low due to drought and the reduction of the population. He stated the Commission did not have issue with the recommendations given by the CAB.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised Commission Regulation 22-05, Amendment #1, 2023 Heritage Tag Vendors and the CAB reviewed and the Commission accepted all the Heritage Vendors with no changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Fiscal Year 2023 Heritage Project Proposals, he stated that all of the proposals listed were accepted as presented and funded.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the Heritage Account Principal Project Proposal (5,390 acres of wildlife habitat throughout Schell and Egan Ranges near Ely, NV) he stated he learned that the Blue Diamond Oil Corporation and Blue Diamond Estates are both the same corporation and have purchased all of the land that was up for sell to build residential estates around Success Loop Scenic Drive and advised that the campground besides (Camp Success) around this location will still be owned by BLM (*Bureau of Land Management*). He stated there were parcels of land owned by this company that will not be for sale.
- Board member John Hiatt asked Chair Paul Dixon if NDOW is going to manage all the individual

sites that individuals were paying for camping around Success Loop Scenic Drive, and payment was supposed to be paid to Eric Strouts back then, he asked Chair Paul Dixon the question if NDOW is going to manage camping in all these individual sites along Success Loop Scenic Drive.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised they will manage the land besides the camping ground in which BLM will help with camping.
- Board member John Hiatt asked the question of it should be managed by Forest Service instead.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the bottom line is anything that is being purchased BLM will assist with the camping grounds.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated this is what was stated by (*Jack Robb, NDOW Deputy Director*) the exact same thoughts. He stated the bottom line is anything that is being purchased BLM will assist with the camping grounds.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised Duck Stamp Request was accepted by Commission as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised Upland Game Bird Stamp Request was accepted by the Commission as presented. He stated the CAB had the following concern in the last CAB meeting on June 21, 2022: *are the results of the Sage Grouse monitoring study being impacted by the fact that the monitoring activities will attract curious ravens who could potentially predate on the nests?* Chair Paul Dixon said it was stated if the area has ravens, before there is counts then they will attempt to haze the ravens while they are doing their counts but this remedy does not work well with Sage Grouse.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that ravens are smart and realize that they are being hazed then there must be something interesting in that location.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that this is a problem but they have no other way of doing their counts. He stated that he did speak up and state maybe using night vision could be used that is less invasive.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that a less invasive action would base upon the fact that ravens have a dislike of green laser lights being aimed on them, it will make the ravens leave.
- Chair Paul Dixon asks if the reasoning behind the ravens wanting to leave when seeing the green light is it due to spectrum of colors they see.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it is not just ravens that do not like the green laser light it is other birds as well that respond in the same manner as the ravens.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He stated he is aware that airline pilots do not like green laser lights as well.
- Board member John Hiatt stated or red.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*) yes or red.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that raven researchers have found that green laser lights will make the ravens leave the area.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that until there is another method in place to do their monitoring and counting this will always be area of tension. Chair Paul Dixon advised Petition –Mr. David Flanders-Use of Air Rifles, he stated there was a large amount of discussion on this action item but the Commission has made the decision to not go further with this. He stated there was a **comment was made that air rifles can be used for small game hunting and this statement is false because it is not in the regulations by Game Warden at the Commission Meeting.** Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Chief Game Warden comments not only made public comments but also was a source of private comments as well back into the department.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised it is illegal for usage of air rifle for small or big game hunting due to not being in regulations. He stated in regulation it states what rifle is used for giving description of center fire or rim fire and combustion and air rifle has none of these components, therefore air rifle are unique therefore there is a need to clean up this regulation to make full knowledge that air rifles are not allowed even for big or small game hunting under the current regulations. He

stated he did not think that NDOW wanted this to be publicly known but due to the misunderstanding then it is necessary to be known publicly. He stated he was not going to state at the meeting that the Chief Game Warden's comments were not accurate on the subject of air rifle when he testified on record and nobody disagreed and he stated he had discussions after the meeting.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised it is not ANY LEGAL WEAPONS as defined in this state, ANY LEGAL WEAPONS would be defined as bow in arrows, cross bows, muzzleloaders, but the air rifle don't require combustion.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Commission General Regulations 501, NAC 502.385, Tag Transfer was accepted as presented. He stated at this Commission meeting there was little discussion on these action items and all were passed as presented as he stated.
- Board member John Hiatt asked Chair Paul Dixon why is the Commission General Regulation 501, NAC 502.385, Tag Transfer on the CAB's agenda once again.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Commission General Regulations 501, NAC 502.385, Tag Transfer is indeed again on the CAB's agenda tonight and unfortunately there was no supporting material for this action item, the secretary provided supporting materials from NDOW that was previously done so that everyone could reference it. He stated it was brought up again due to individual who has a Heritage Tag and wanted to give it to someone else or extend it for another year, it was not made clear of why this action item was brought forth again and advised he was not able to confirm or deny that these reasons given may be the correct reason. He stated it had to do with the current owner of the Heritage Tag who is requesting with doing something with their tag that is not within the regulations, if this is correct then he will find out at the Commission meeting and stated he has spoken to (*Chairwoman Tiffany East*) as well as (*Commissioner Tommy Caviglia*) and either of them knew the reasoning behind this and he attempted to speak to (*Jack Robb, Deputy Director, NDOW*) but he did not return his phone call after leaving two voice messages.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Commission General Regulation 505, NAC 502.4215, First Come First Served Prevention of Unfair Advantages, passed as presented. He stated there are going forward going to continue to add more requirements and stipulations to help catch a greater amount of people but at the same time not making it difficult to discourage individuals from using the system.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that the Commission General Regulation 507, LCB File No. R045-22 Petition Process, the language was changed based on legal understanding which was addressed in the CAB's recommendation from its June 21, 2022 meeting in which the CAB approved as presented with request asking for clarification on the wording which is ambiguous and needs clarification therefore the burden is not solely on the petitioner to show that they have legal standing. He stated added requirements and stipulations will continue and help in stopping abuse, these methods are baby steps.
- Chair Paul Dixon thanked the CAB for another input on this and stated he was thanked by the Commission as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there was a field trip to the new property that was purchased and they built a picnic area which is the shape of the state of Nevada, they had dinner on Thursday night there and it was very nice. He stated he was able to see from big game to small game at least 20 different animals as well as this area getting usage from people enjoying themselves riding bikes and hiking. He stated normally this property would have been flooded and there is 80% flooding at this property, but due to the drought that was not the case. He stated there was a large amount of hay being used in this area as well.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.**

VIII. Mule Deer Enhancement Subcommittee for Clark County status by Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW (Informational)

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated Erin Wood will be discussing details about the Mule Deer Subcommittee and how everything is going and how individuals can get involved.
- *(Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* stated the process has been at a fast pace, there have been 4 meetings thus far to discuss limiting factors and water related factors which cause limiting factors as well of the mule deer in the southern portion of Nevada. She advised that essentially there will be discussion on some of the concerns with gaps in data of the mule deer and how it is difficult to survey and better methods to obtain this information specifically in Spring Mountains where the density is higher. She stated also addresses impacts of feral horses and burros and climate related, habitat changes and any other water related factors that might be eliminating the persistence of mule deer in Clark County.
- *(Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* She advised that the deadline for submission of project proposals which will be reviewed by the Oversight committee in September 2022. She stated if approved there will be a large amount of trail camera's on display in Spring Mountains and near water sources and high usage areas for documentation to show the presence of mule deer and demographic, age and sex ratios. She stated other information about native competitors such as elk and non-native competitors such as feral horses and burros and their impacts on these water sources, documenting changes in vegetation and water availability through these cameras.
- *(Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* advised this will require the need of many volunteer dependent work for assistance in deploying and maintenance of the cameras. She stated by using these methods it will give increase in opportunity of obtaining information about mule deer in crucial areas such as Spring Mountains. She advised NDOW is looking for projects dealing with spring enhancement projects as follows: 1) **Willow Creek Fencing Project**: This project has been delayed, will need to obtain few resources for this project thus increasing probability of completion of the project and other springs which have been identified by BLM and Forest Services where these projects have been started or are complete but fencing is still required for some of these water resources and excluding fencing for feral horses and burros and cattle, keeping these animals from these water sources. 2) **Removal of Invasive Mullein**: This area is along Level Canyon Road and other areas where the Forest Service has conducted restoration projects. She stated mullein can colonize quickly in disturbed areas, NDOW can assist with the help of volunteers for removal from these areas by hand and mullein is easy to identify. She stated mullein is not palatable and it is invasive because it takes away from other native plants that take a while to grow in these areas that the mullein have taken over. *Mullein- (Verbascum Thapsus), it is known by its upright appearance, fuzzy leaves, and yellow flowers. Mullein is an easy to grow plant and is often seen growing in fields and ditches, because of its ease to grow and spread uncontrollably, it is considered an invasive biennial forb. In Nevada it can be found along roadways up on Mt. Charleston, and some can be found in Cabin Canyon in Gold Butte National Monument.* 3) **Horses and Burros Control Project**: NDOW does not have jurisdiction over any managing

Horses and Burros but keep data on how Horses and Burros impact the land, NDOW gives acknowledgment that they do keep this information therefore NDOW is proposing to support private citizens and NGO's efforts to solicit help for BLM activities of the round ups performed for the Horses and Burros roundups. She stated that she knew board member John Hiatt had been in touch with (*Alan Shepherd, Deputy State Director for Resources, Lands and Planning for the BLM*) and *NGO Group* located in Texas that would like to assist in adoption of Nevada's burros therefore NDOW is giving their support to assist with any efforts to assist with these types of activities, and reiterated that Horses and Burros are impacted the landscape.

4) **Spring Mountain:** She stated that NEPA (*National Environmental Policy Act*) the Final EA for the Spring Mountain Complex was completed this Spring 2022 so the management level was set for the Horses and Burros in three management areas, and there are three management areas in Elko and the population estimation are currently over the AML (*Appropriate Management Level*) hence action needs to be taken by BLM for future of gathering and removal.

- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She advised that proposals have been submitted with an extension of the deadline at this time hence if there is any work requested from the proposals, there will be a discussion with NDOW staff to make sure everything is feasible and correct in regards to the projects and proposals.
- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated the Mule Deer Oversight Committee will meet in September 2022 and approval of project funds should be done after the September 2022 meeting. She stated the **(regular meeting will continue after the approval of project funding)** is done and advised members of the subcommittee or participants please know **(regular scheduled meetings will not take place into after the project funding's have been completed).**
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) if each county has a subcommittee where do we stand with resource allocation.
- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated that there is miscommunication that since the mule deer population doesn't have a large amount of density and the access and demand is lower than some of the northern areas in Nevada but there are crucial areas of mule deer habitat therefore the need is to focus on some of the large higher density areas in the southern section such as Spring Mountain, which is the largest continuous habitat of mule deer population.
- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She advised she will fight to obtain all resources she can be given and whether or not all four projects are accepted, due to the maximum of submissions allotted to only total three submissions but she did four because of the needs. She cannot say for sure that all four projects will receive approval but she will push very hard to have them to get approval. She advised there is no reason for the state to ignore on statewide level this entire region where there is great quality habitat.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that the Oversight Committee will rank each project and are responsible for approval of these projects as well. He advised the ranking is justified by the quality of the projects submitted. He stated once these projects are ranked they fall under tier they are placed into for funding mechanism.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked if the projects that are submitted are these projects for stabilization of the herd or to projects that focus on habitat which will give potential to help the herds or combination of both of these aspects.
- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She advised it is combination of both aspects and stated the biggest assistance would be to get out information to the public and others about

the herds thus showing habitat quality for all wildlife not just mule deer. She advised this shows great justification for proposals.

- Board member John Hiatt that three of the four projects require volunteers from Clark County which this county has more population in this area of the state and asked the question of why any of the projects would not be approved since it is suggested to self-fund these projects.
- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated this factors in the ranking process of approval for the projects.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised we have less than half dozen NGO's in the southern portion of the county and ask the question how is the subcommittee engaging non-traditional NGO's who also perform wildlife activities into becoming volunteers for these formats. He advised three members of the public who would be great volunteers to assist with habitat restoration such as members of the public, would like to volunteer: (*members of the public: Jana Wright, Stephanie Myers*), who would assist in performing habitat restoration, he asked how the subcommittee for NDOW helping with this process.
- (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated this is in the next step of the process of attempting to reach out to different parties, and explained that NDOW is just trying to reach out to large volume volunteer base work is habitat related and can be done by regular individuals who do not have to be sportsmen or anything specific.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that since he became Chairman of the CAB there has been ongoing concern with statements that hunters make stating they give their money and licensing therefore what does the non-license individuals doing, he stated he does not believe the non-hunting community is being engaged as much as they could be in regards to the mule deer enhancement program. He stated he feels this is a great opportunity to engage this community and let it be known that all of the different communities are here for the best interest of the Nevada's wildlife not just the hunters. He advised to (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) that she could use (*members of the public: Jana Wright, Stephanie Myers*) as resource to help to find methods to engage in the non-hunter community more than we are at this moment.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated NDOW works directly with the volunteer coordinator named Michelle and she solicits input from different user groups or the non-hunters of the community. He advised he will gladly send out email to anyone who reaches out to him and would like to participate as a volunteer and NDOW would like to interact different groups and have everyone help with the wildlife.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he feels this is a moment to share with everyone that all individuals involved are interested in the same which is to help the wildlife. He gave example of when both group's hunters and non-hunter groups on both sides of the aisle came together to help assist in a Project in Sunset Park pertaining to fishing and both efforts helped a great deal.
- Board member John Hiatt advised the secret to successful volunteer groups is to have a volunteer coordinator that shows enthusiasm and stays on task. He stated he has been on programs in which the volunteer coordinator had a lackluster attitude therefore turning off volunteers leaving them the desire to not return.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he understands what board member John Hiatt is stating but NDOW's volunteer coordinator personality is one of a happy deposition.
- Board member John Hiatt reiterated that an enthusiastic volunteer coordinator has a great disposition and lets the volunteers know that their efforts are greatly appreciated and makes volunteers aware of scheduling for the next events they are required to attend. He stated this is

what makes for a great volunteer coordinator.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that if there are volunteer opportunities for children to be actively engage in then that would be great, he knows that Overton has a lot of volunteer opportunities for children such as building boxes and things.
- Public Comment: (None)
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby closed.**

IX. Discussion NDOW's Restoration and Rehabilitation Program (*Informational*) The CCABMW will have a 15-20 minute discussion with NDOW about the wild fire restoration in Nevada.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) to give his presentation for NDOW's Restoration and Rehabilitation Program).
- (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the picture that the meeting attendees seen on the screen was from Lincoln County in an area called Canyon Springs Valley. He stated this area has had many wildfires since 2005 and recently 2020 there was another massive fire, this location is the Northern end of the Valley, vegetation is very faint in this area. He advised this has now become focus of one of the many projects for NDOW to help grow revegetation in these areas which the wildfires have happened. He advised NDOW is looking at this from many angles; first asking the question of what type of species are in this location and how can we help these species, he stated cheatgrass is a problem and the area is dry and burnt, lately there have been larger amount of wildfires. NDOW is working on this project to increase the amount of wildlife in these areas and attempt to augment to bring it back to normal level. He stated he contracts out different nurseries in the valley who donate the plants and seeds needed for these areas including around small game guzzlers as well in an attempt to get vegetation back. He stated cheatgrass, and red brome grass are not productive for wildlife and is low in nutritional value therefore once these two types of grass are burnt from the wildlife now NDOW is attempting to get some vegetation and habitat that is meaningful to this area for habitat. He stated this process is not easy due to factors such as: livestock eating in this area, off road erosion and drought which have taken toll on the landscaping. Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) is an annual invasive plant that crowds out native plants in sagebrush range and is not productive to these areas and it is low. He stated NDOW works with Gaming Division and Law Enforcement. He stated wildfires are becoming more frequent in states like California in which Nevada is obtaining all of the smoke from California from these fires. He stated wildfires has a great impact in taking away food from species there, causing water erosion and density, with the projects stating this issue will continue to worsen. He advised that from 1980's to present the wildfires have worsen with it being hotter, drier and lack of rain, and from 2014 there has been three to 10 million of acreage that has burned from wildfires, which have become much more frequent and larger each year, this shows variation depending on the area.
- *Chair Paul Dixon asked (Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* if with monsoon season extension each year is there less fires in Nevada.
- (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated California has by far the worse wildfires in reported history. He stated Nevada has had bad wildfires but in 2005 it was extremely bad with wildfires. He explained technics used to assist with these habitats in these areas are: **seed drilling** (use of drill to plant seeds deep), **aerially seeding** (use of airplane to spread the seeds), **nursery grow outs** (he stated he uses this method, as he indicated previously

he has contracts with nurseries for plant growing and he also has team of contractors on staff that go to areas where he makes certain recommendations (when to plant, type of plants, location to plant) and there is herbicide treatment for red brome grass, cheatgrass, tamarisk grass in order to give the native plants opportunity to grow again in these areas. (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised when NDOW does a project they are looking at type of soil, slope conditions, species that live in these areas, if the area is rocky, just how rocky is it, all of these factors are in place when determining how NDOW will attempt to do the restoration. He showed the attendees pictures of seed drilling, aerially seeding, and pictures of container plants, and herbicide spraying. He stated each county is doing different things and he cannot tell attendees what each county is doing. He stated NDOW as an agency has an approach of looking at what is out there and how they can assist and if NDOW can assist due to limitation factors: (NEPA, or private land, federal land, there is an attempt to form partnerships with other agencies therefore he stated he works closely with Fish and Wildlife Services, BLM, Private Land Owners, City of Henderson as well as a number of NGO's to continue progress and he stated it is difficult in the southern region. He advised for NDOW for the entire region (*southern portion*) which consists of four huge counties, he is the only gentlemen working on restoration efforts with the help of other people therefore he is trying to get it done with the efforts of NGO's and other government entities to get things done. He advised looking at factors of herbicide seeding, timing, the degree of how bad these wildfires are, and when discussing ecological permitting and logistical it simply comes down to area and if NDOW is able to do it. He stated for (*ESR*) which means Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation which is through the Department of Interior, the Forest Service has Burned Area Emergency Response System, both providing funding for the restoration. He stated NDOW provides a large amount of funding for restoration through the avenue of hunting/fishing fees, mostly hunting and habitat conservation fees for payment of NDOW's projects. He discussed the constraints against permitting in regards of going through NEPA and all the land managers to take certain actions. He gave example of the Forest Service and if there was a fire in Spring Mountains up there and he would like to get to that area to start restoration, he will be advised that location it is under Wilderness therefore that is hands off to NDOW and the vegetation must regenerate naturally. He stated no matter how much money he is allotted to do restoration he cannot come in with crews and do any restoration in that location due to constraints, everyone has to go through the federal government process under NEAP to get things done.

- *Chair Paul Dixon asked the question to (Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* if there was any Burn Rehabilitation and Wilderness at all.
- (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he is not stating there is none but what he is implying is there are constraints for NDOW, cannot fly airplane across this location or do mechanical possibly it can be done on the edges of the constraint area in order to handle business in these areas if needed to do so.
- *Chair Paul Dixon ask the question to (Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* if these agencies fly helicopters in the water now.
- (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated yes they do now.
- Board member John Hiatt stated there is absolutely no restrictions about flying planes over wilderness except in the boundary waters which has restrictions. He stated helicopters can be flown with no issues.
- (*Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He asked the question to board member John Hiatt if when flying these planes can aerially seeding.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that native seeds must be used but advised he is now aware

of any such restrictions for completing restoration duties in the wilderness.

- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated ok but gave example of his attempt (NDOW) to work with Forest Services.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that certain individuals working for these agencies may not be aware of the rules. He gave example of Biologist working for Forest Service who was doing aerial service for viewing big game species and he asked the biologist if they would be including horses in this and they advised they could not include them because they could not fly over Wilderness. He stated the biologist did not know that this was not true and they did not need permission to fly over Wilderness the only thing they could not do was land.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*- He stated they just can't land.
- Board member John Hiatt advised no they cannot land.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*- He gave example of how certain agencies have jurisdiction of certain areas, he stated there was a big developer in Montana celebration of his success and decided to land his helicopter on top of a mountain in that area and celebration with eating lobster tails and steak and left the lobster tail debris on the ground in this area. He stated that the debris was later found and tracked to this individual and he was fined heavily for these actions. He stated that was a tough situation but he advised that (BLM) Bureau of Land Management is very supportive of NDOW's programs and 90% of NDOW's work is located on BLM land. He stated NDOW is looking at field assessment, degree of the burns, view of cheatgrass, soil. NDOW is doing Post Treatment Monitoring with photo points of a before/after from beginning to a few years later to see impact made.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Nevada had extreme monsoon season.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He showed chart from headquarters of Reno from 2017 to 2021 which showed (drilling, herbicide, seeding) which was done in the area and the restoration for fires, advised he was not sure if southern region was included in this chart but chart shows 1.21 to 3 million on restoration for fires. He then showed Gold View Area which has restoration sites for both small game and big game guzzlers in which NDOW has come and planted vegetation because this area has had four to five fires which burnt a lot of acreage. He stated his project success depends on the ability to get plants, water, and crews to the location to work. He next showed chart for Mormon Mountains which has large guzzlers and advised that NDOW has four to five projects now and last year in 2021 there were a large amount of volunteer groups and this weekend every weekend there will be volunteer groups and he extended a invite to any individuals who would like to assist in volunteering and he would gladly send out information to these individuals.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised for *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* to please send this information to himself and to the Secretary Darlene Kretunski and we will send out this information to NGO's and other groups to obtain new volunteers. He stated NDOW did 800 plants last year and this year they would like to make 800 to 1,000 plants this year and will be doing volunteer work every weekend, this project will take place every weekend in October 2022.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* what kind of plants are NDOW putting down.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated some of the main plants NDOW will be using are: Moapa Yuccas, Desert Almond, Fourwing Saltbush, Creasoul and these plants provide cover and seeds and coverage for quail and sage grouse and the plants used are very good surviving plants. He gave example of small game guzzlers in Lincoln County in Cave Springs Valley when viewing it shows fires have burnt landscape down to ground and

there are signs of cattle grazing on the plants put in place by NDOW and cattle trampling which causes dryness around the plants. He stated the plant cages which were put in place by NDOW therefore cattle not wanting to reach their heads in these cages because it has some sharp edges, some birds try to pick at plants and some rodents are getting underneath the plant cages and eat the plants. He showed pictures of his crew who helped him were NDOW employees who put plants in place, he showed some of the plants NDOW has planted that he described previously and showed how the plant cage was constructed. He stated that plant gel was used for the plants which goes on the root wall and the gel turns into liquid and holds water and nutrients around the root wall and slowly releases it into the soil over time. He advised that some studies indicate that there is 50% advantage from using plant gel and stated that he purchased tons of plant gel from a company based in California (Santa Rosa) and this company is now out of business.

- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He showed a video to show volunteering planning by guzzler and the video was of himself and volunteers at the location of the Mormon Mountains and stated that an assembly line was built in which plants were brought out and the plants were watered by the water slope then sent to area to be planted. He stated that particular day 150 plants were planted.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* if while doing this projects they see a guzzler that needs repairs do they do the repairs or report it.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that he will report the location and the guzzler number so that they can repair the guzzler but advised that the guzzlers are sturdy and it is rare they need repairs.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated final thoughts are wildfires are becoming worse and the correct seeds and chemicals must be used and he stated that he had to return multiple times to sites to replant and water in hopes of return the next year for these plants. He stated preventable treatment for wildfires are: green strips along roadways to prevent fire from jumping and decreasing chance to ruin even more habitat, increasing partnerships with (NGO's, government) and leveraging resources.
- Public Comments: *(Stephanie Myers)* asked the question to *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* that the slides he showed of Mormon Mountain with the volunteers planting, when was the last time he was onsite and has he been back to this location to check the progress of the plants that were planted and if they are still living and doing well.
- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated he does return to these sites and takes a before/after and monitor these sites and stated the last couple of years have been difficult a lot of plants have died, in previous years there was lots of rain and his success rate was around 90% but recently he stated drought and his success rate is around 25% to 30%. He reiterated that he does return to the sites and if enough time he waters the plants.
- Public Comments: *(Stephanie Myers)* she asked *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* was he able to bring up water to the sites, and he comes back within a week or two to bring back water to the plants. He stated agencies such as BLM after planting they walk away from the plants and has the morale of whatever lives will live but he stated they do not have a great success rate on the plants they planted.
- Chair Paul Dixon thanked *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* for his presentation.
- Chair Paul Dixon thanked *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)* for his presentation.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby closed.**

- FYI- *(Anthony Miller, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region) spoke previously in his presentation about (ESR) Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation & Burned Area Emergency Response System) here is some information found on the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management-* **(ESR) Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation** is done after a wildfire burns through an area. Primary goals include soil stabilization, erosion control and prevention of invasive plant species from becoming established. Emergency stabilization is defined as “Planned actions to stabilize and prevent unacceptable degradation to natural and cultural resources, to minimize threats to life and property resulting from the effects of a fire, or to repair/replace/ construct physical improvements necessary to prevent degradation of land or resources. Emergency Stabilization actions must be taken within one year following containment of a wildland fire. Burned Area Rehabilitation is defined as “Efforts undertaken within three years of containment of a wildland fire to repair or improve fire-damaged lands unlikely to recover naturally to management approved conditions, or to repair or replace minor facilities damaged by fire.”
- FYI-**Burned Area Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR) Plan**- A document that specifies treatments required to implement post-wildland fire stabilization and rehabilitation policies on an individual incident. This plan may be programmatic (prepared in advance and applicable to clearly defined types of incidents and situations) or prepared by an interdisciplinary team of specialists during or after the control of a wildlife fire.
- FYI- **Burned Area Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR) Team**- A standing or ad hoc group of technical specialists (hydrologists, rangeland management specialists, biologists, soil scientists, etc.) that is assigned to prepare an Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan.
- FYI- **Burned Area Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Assistance**- Bureaus will cooperate with other international, federal, tribal, State, or local organizations to provide burned area emergency stabilization and rehabilitation assistance as authorized by a formal signed agreement. Formal agreements shall be made under authorities cited in paragraph 3.2 of this chapter. These agreements may take the form of Interagency Agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, Cooperative Agreements, mutual aid agreements, compacts, or contracts. Bureaus may provide assistance, when authorized by the President, to any State and local government for management of wildland fire officially declared as a disaster. There will be no billing or reimbursement between bureaus of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture for personnel and other resources involved in burned area emergency stabilization and rehabilitation team deployment.
- FYI- **Emergency Stabilization**- Planned actions taken during or soon after a wildland fire to stabilize and prevent unacceptable degradation to natural and cultural resources, to minimize threats to life or property resulting from the effects of a fire, or to repair/replace/construct physical improvements necessary to prevent degradation of land or resources. **(C)Emergency Stabilization** (1) Emergency stabilization actions will be based on an ESR Plan developed immediately post-fire, or in a supplement plan, except where programmatic plans are already in place. The programmatic plans are generally written by a field office unit and include an environmental assessment, and are developed at the landscape level with public input. The decision to develop the programmatic plan is based on size and diversity of the ecosystems involved, fire history, resource values, and resource management objectives and decisions in land use plans. For multi-agency fires, joint planning is encouraged. The development and implementation of an ESR Plan and its associated treatments are the responsibility of the local Agency Administrator. (2) The costs and magnitude of emergency stabilization actions should be commensurate with threats to life, property, or resources as documented by a cost-risk

analysis. **(3)** Emergency stabilization projects are unpredictable, requiring funding on short notice. Allowable actions are those required to: **(a)** Prevent or mitigate threats to human health and safety or property, including roads and trails. **(b)** Stabilize soil to prevent or mitigate loss or degradation of productivity. **(c)** Stabilize watersheds to prevent unacceptable downstream damage on and off site, including significant erosion or mass wasting. **(d)** Minimize unacceptable deterioration of water quality. **(e)** Protect emergency stabilization treatments, utilizing fencing, patrolling, or other measures. **(f)** Stabilize and prevent unacceptable degradation of historic properties listed on or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, or Federal and State listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat. **(g)** Establish or reestablish native species to prevent or minimize the establishment of non-native invasive species, and facilitate long-term ecosystem restoration goals stated in land management plans. Such actions will be specified in the emergency stabilization section of the ESR Plans only when immediate action is required, or when there are clear precedents and such actions are a routine element of all ESR Plans within similar vegetation types. Otherwise, ESR Plans may contain a rehabilitation section that outlines the general need for such actions, but defers specific actions until post-fire rehabilitation needs assessments are completed.

Treatment specifications developed from these assessments may be funded as a supplement to the ESR plan, for up to two growing seasons after fire control. **(4)** Emergency stabilization activities must be compatible and generally consistent with approved land use plans and can include: **(a)** Replacing or repairing facilities essential to public health and safety and replacing or constructing fences or other structures necessary to protect emergency stabilization projects or to prevent further degradation of natural and cultural resources during the project period. **(b)** Physical structures and devices to slow the movement of soil and water downslope, such as check dams, culverts, silt fences, log erosion barriers and straw wattles, erosion cloth and soil netting, etc. These treatments are primarily temporary measures that do not generally require maintenance or are removed after objectives have been met. **(c)** Conducting habitat damage assessments for threatened, endangered, and other special status species to identify mitigation requirements. Damage assessments and treatments are limited to species that are known to be detrimentally impacted by wildland fire, or those for which there is reasonable expectation of detrimental impacts. Also, there must be reasonable expectation that the detrimental impacts can be mitigated. The scope and cost of mitigation should be the minimum necessary to alleviate significant threats. **(d)** Seeding or planting of shrubs, forbs, and grasses to prevent critical habitat for federal listed threatened or endangered species, or other special status species, from being permanently impaired, or to prevent erosion or mass wasting. **(e)** Seeding or planting of shrubs, forbs, and grasses to facilitate the natural succession of vegetative communities that were largely composed of native species before the fire, but which would likely be subject to immediate and aggressive invasion of non-native invasive species after the fire. **(f)** Seeding or planting trees, only if such actions have been demonstrated to be cost-effective in meeting project objectives of stabilizing watersheds to prevent downstream damage on and off site. **(g)** Use chemical, biological or mechanical treatments necessary to minimize the establishment or re-establishment of non-native invasive species within the burned area. **(h)** Monitoring and patrolling necessary for public safety and natural and cultural resources protection, if such activities cannot be accomplished within existing capabilities and by shifting priorities. **(i)** Covering, camouflaging, cleaning, burying, or reinforcing historic properties to prevent erosion, weathering, movement, and looting. **(j)** Assessments may be conducted to assess damage to documented historic properties or those discovered in the course of treating known properties. **(5)** ESR planning team activities are an integral part of wildland fire incidents. They are governed and supported by the same wildland fire incident mobilization,

resource availability, training, qualifications, and incident business management procedures as other aspects of the incident. **(D)Rehabilitation** (1) Post-fire rehabilitation projects implement the types of long-term actions that have already been identified in approved land management plans. The purpose of rehabilitation is either to emulate historical or pre-fire ecosystem structure, function, diversity, and dynamics consistent with approved land management plans, or if that is infeasible, then to restore or establish a healthy, stable ecosystem in which native species are well presented. Rehabilitation actions must be related to damage or changes caused by a wildfire fire, and cannot include constructing facilities, or implementing desired conditions that are unrelated to the wildland fire event. Rehabilitation cannot be funded for prescribed fire projects in which fire behavior was within presentation. Rehabilitation actions may be planned and funded only for projects that were declared wildland fires because fire behavior exceeded **prescription**. Rehabilitation may include actions to: **(a)** Repair or improve lands unlikely to recover naturally from wildfire fire damage by emulating historical or pre-fire ecosystem structure, function, diversity and dynamics consistent with existing land management plans. **(b)** Restore or establish a healthy, stable ecosystem even if this ecosystem cannot fully emulate historical or pre-fire conditions. **(c)** Tree planting is limited to: **(i)** Facilitating the succession and stabilization of forest ecosystems. **(ii)** Re-establishing habitat for federally listed threatened or endangered species, or other special status species. **(iii)** Reintroducing or reestablishing native tree species and seed sources lost in a stand replacement fire. **(iv)** Regenerating Indian trust commercial timberland identified in an approved Forest Management Plan, and that a certified silviculturalist has determined will not naturally regenerate for more than 10 years after the fire. **(d)** Repair or replace fire damage to minor operating facilities (e.g., campgrounds, interpretive signs and exhibits, shade shelters, grazing fences, wildlife guzzlers, etc.). Rehabilitation may include the planning or replacement of major infrastructure, such as visitor centers, residential structures, administration offices, work centers and similar facilities. Rehabilitation does not include the construction of new facilities that did not exist before the fire, except for temporary and minor facilities necessary to implement burned area emergency stabilization and rehabilitation efforts. (2) The rehabilitation section of the ESR Plan may contain: **(a)** A discussion demonstrating how the specifications are consistent and compatible with approved land use plans, and how the proposed actions are related to damage or changes caused by the wildland fire. **(b)** Provisions and monitoring and evaluation of treatments and techniques, and a procedure for collecting, archiving, and disseminating results. **(c)** Clear delineation of funding and responsibilities for implementation operation, maintenance, monitoring, and evaluation throughout the entire life of the project, including ESR actions and follow-up actions beyond three years that may be necessary to ensure the effectiveness of initial investments.

- **(ESR) Plan-** ESR Plans will contain one section listing emergency stabilization specifications, and another section listing long-term rehabilitation specifications (if applicable). If rehabilitation needs are unknown, the ESR plan may contain specifications for conducting assessments that will be used to later define rehabilitation needs. Generally, emergency stabilization and rehabilitation activities are prescribed only within the perimeter of a burned area. Acceptable treatments outside a burn perimeter could include such things as emergency stream channel work to protect structures, roads, and other improvements from flood damage.

X. General Business/Action Items: Discuss and make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners August 19th/August 20th, 2022 meeting agenda, as well as additional items brought forth to the CCABMW from the public for discussion.
CCABMW agenda and support materials are available upon request to Secretary: Darlene

Kretunski (702) 455-1402 or email: Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov. The final Commission agenda and support at http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Agenda/.

- ***** Chair Paul Dixon stated before getting started on the policies he wanted to discuss in the manner in which he would be addressing the policy changes for tonight’s meeting, he stated that the Commission submitted as supporting material a summary sheet on the policies. Chair Paul Dixon advised that he will read through the policies as a group and then vote on each policy together, unless there is a concern about a specific policy then at that time he will separate off the policy for a discussion on these concerns.**
- a. **Tag Transfer/Deferral Request (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a request for Heritage Tag Transfer pursuant to NRS 502.104.
 - Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that this action item was due to an individual asking for assistance on his particular situation, this individual is a Heritage tag holder who is unable to go into the field therefore they need to either transfer to another person or referral the exact reason will not be known until the Commission meeting on this matter therefore the exact reasoning is unknown.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised this matter should be tabled due to not having supporting material for review and discussion on this action item.
 - **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby tabled.**
- b. **Commission Policy 3- Appeals (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 3, Appeals.
 - Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised the Commission heard this policy in May 2022 for the first time and was updated and had clarifying statements and is now under consideration for adoption. He advised the policy is short and there is no suggestion stating any major changes made.
 - Board Comments: (None)
 - Public Comments: (None)
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 3-Appeals Policy as presented.
 - Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
 - **Motion passes 4-0.**
 - *FYI- Policy-It is the policy of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (the Commission) to follow the procedures prescribed in NAC 501.140 through 501.190 for conducting appeal hearings.*
 - *FYI- Purpose- The purpose of this policy is to guide the Commission in the appeals process and the conduct of hearings.*
 - *FYI- Procedure- Upon receipt of an appeal, the Department will inform the appellant of the Commission’s authorities for providing relief to include the Commission’s lack of authority to overturn any pleadings or convictions from the court of competent jurisdiction. The Commission is acting in its quasi-judicial capacity and will determine appeals within their authority based on information presented for the hearing only and as prescribed in statute and*

regulation. Commissioners will not engage in discussion with the appellant, or about the appeal with anyone, including Department personnel or any other person regarding the facts or circumstances associated with said appeal. Commissioners will decide an appeal based solely on information presented at the hearing including any pleadings or other documents submitted by the parties, and as prescribed in statute and regulation. Information about appeals will only be distributed to the Commission and appellant prior to the hearing. All non-confidential information will be available to the public at the hearing. The Commission will not take public comment on appeals. County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) members will not communicate with the Commission members concerning appeals. The policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

c. Commission Policy 4- Petition Process and Adoption of Regulations (For possible action)

The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 4- Petition Process and Adoption of Regulations.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it was introduced in May 2022 and the policy was updated for clarification and is to be voted on by the Commission and after careful review he stated he did not see anything that showed any changes.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 4-Petition Process and Adoption of Regulations as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Policy-It is the policy of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners (the Commission) to accept input on proposed regulations, seasons and bags.*
- *FYI- Purpose- To guide the Commission and inform all parties of their responsibilities and opportunities for input on proposed regulations, seasons, and bags; their opportunities to comment on proposed regulations and opportunities for new regulations.*
- *FYI- Procedure- (1). (**Input on Proposed Seasons and Quotas aka Commission Regulations or CR's**)- County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) or members of the public may provide input to proposed seasons and bags via letter, email, fax, phone, or in person at a Commission meeting. Since NRS 501.260 to 501.325, inclusive, establishes a process for county advisory boards to manage wildlife to solicit and evaluate local opinion for wildlife management and to submit recommendations to the Commission for seasons, quotas, hours and regulations, individuals are encouraged to initiate requested changes or make recommendations through their local CABMW. Letters should be addressed to the Chair in care of (c/s) Secretary of Wildlife Commissioners, Nevada Department of Wildlife, 6980 Sierra Center Parkway, Suite 120, Reno, Nevada 89511. Contact by phone 775-688-1500, or fax 775-688-1207 or email wildlifecommission@ndow.org. The input must contain the Commission regulation number for an existing regulation, the intent or purpose of a new or amended regulation, and the suggested seasons, quotas, or language for the special regulations. Such requests for a new or amended Commission regulation will be placed on the agenda for the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting for discussion but may not receive final action to adopt or deny until the regularly scheduled meeting for that type of season, quotas, or special regulation. To be considered for the upcoming hunting season, the suggestions must be sent prior to the season-*

setting meeting. The input must contain the author's name, address, and phone number, at a minimum. (2). (Input on Proposed Permanent Regulations aka Commission General Regulations or CGRs) NRS also permits CABWs or members of the public to provide input on proposed regulations (in conjunction with a current rulemaking process) via letter, email, fax, phone, or in person at the Commission meeting. Input should be in the same format as stated above and must contain the same identification information as above. Individuals are encouraged to initiate these changes through the county in which they reside. (3). (**Suggesting Changes to Regulations Not in Conjunction with Current Rulemaking**) NRS 233B.100 permits any individual to petition the Commission for filing, amending, or the agency and following the agency's prescribed process. A petition is required to change or amend permanent regulations that are not in conjunction with a current rulemaking process. If accepted by the Commission, the rulemaking process will begin, legal entities will assist in drafting proposed language, which then will be placed on future agendas for workshop and then a vote (on separate days). This is a lengthy process. (**Petitioner Responsibilities**) – The petition form must be complete, conforming to NAC 501.195 and petitioners should be prepared to submit complete documentation in support of the rule changes that are being proposed. If the petition form is not substantially complete, it may be returned to the petitioner indicating the deficiencies, and not placed on a Commission agenda. The petitioner may resubmit a revised form that completely answers the questions. Petitioners should contact staff in the pertinent Division for assistance with the process or clarification related to the information that is suggested. The petitioner should attend the Commission meeting and make a presentation with background material. Petitioners should be aware that the following requests generally are disfavored absent compelling new information: reconsideration of rules that have been petitioned and denied in the preceding 5 years. (**Staff Responsibilities**) In the event the Department determines that the Commission does not have the statutory authority needed to adopt, file, amend or repeal a permanent regulation, the Department will notify the petitioner in an effort to let the petitioner retract or revise the petition. (**CABMWs and Public Input**) CABMW members and the public will have full opportunity to provide input before a vote is taken by the Commission, during the public comment period after the petitioner and staff presentations. Due to the nature of a live hearing, CCABMWs will not receive sufficient information before the hearing on the petition to make a recommendation. CABMWs and public will have opportunity for input after a petition is accepted but before any action takes place to implement the request. (**Commission Decision-Making**) With petitions, the question for the Commission is solely whether to begin a rulemaking process. Any decision to accept, deny, or modify the petition will be made based upon all of the information placed in the record at the time of the hearing; that includes the information presented by the petitioner, staff analysis, and public comment. The Commission must follow procedures for petitions outlined in NAC 501.195. The policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

- d. **Commission Policy 21- Game and Furbearer Management Plans (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 21-Game and Furbearer Management Plans.
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised it was introduced in May 2022 and he stated it reflects grammatical and management practices with clarification (that plans will be viewed on a 10 year schedule).
 - Public Comments: (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region): He stated he believed the key word in the sentence is “as needed”.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised yes it is the plans will be viewed on a 10 year schedule or as needed.
 - Board Comments: (None)
 - Public Comments: (None)
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 21-Game and Furbearer Management Plans as approved.

- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose-The Board of Wildlife Commissioners (The Commission) is charged in Nevada Revised Statute to provide broad level policy guidance to programs within the Department of Wildlife. The Policy is designed to provide that broad policy for the development of big game, upland game, waterfowl, and furbearer management plans.*
- *FYI- Policy-The Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners develops broad policies related to the conservation, restoration, maintenance, and utilization of Nevada's game populations. This guidance serves as the basis for species-specific management plans developed by the Game Division in cooperation with other departmental personnel. Management plans shall contain elements that: (a) document available information on each species and their critical seasonal habitats and implement efficient, accurate, and objective programs to obtain herd and habitat inventory information. (b) outline strategies to assess the current status of big game habitat and the use of that habitat, identify challenges to habitat and habitat use, and prescribe management actions and research that benefit game and fur-bearer populations; (c) recognize that game and furbearers may come into conflict with other land uses such as agriculture and develop strategies to eliminate or minimize conflicts. If impacts are unavoidable develop appropriate mitigations; (d) provide a range of biologically feasible alternatives for the management of habitat, herd size, and harvest strategies for game and fur-bearer species, as well as the preferred alternatives on the basis of the best available science; (e) maintain, and whenever possible, increase the quality of critical seasonal habitats in cooperation with private landowners, federal land management agencies, and other entities; (f) implement predator control to reduce mortalities and increase recruitment whenever predation may have negative impacts on meeting game and furbearer population objectives; (g) document wildlife disease impacts and outline mitigation strategies to reduce those impacts whenever and wherever feasible.*
- *FYI- **Management plans will be reviewed on a 10 year schedule, or as needed, by the Commission and departmental personnel will apprise the Commission of successes, shortcoming, and changes in direction. The Division will apprise the Commission of the best biological information available, any social, economic, or political impacts that management strategies are likely to have and shall advise the Commission of alternatives that might address these impacts. Whenever Division recommendations are based on considerations other than biological data, those considerations will be fully explained to the Commission. If management plans conflict with federal, other state, or local planning efforts or policies, and if these conflicts are likely to have adverse impacts on game resources, the Division will notify the Commission at the earliest possible date as to the herds affected. The Department also will outline any alternative remedial measures available to the Commission and the Department which might be taken to minimize or eliminate these impacts. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.*

e. Commission Policy 22-Introduction, Transplanting, and Exportation of Wildlife (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 22 – Introduction, Transplanting, and Exportation of Wildlife.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it was introduced in May 2022 with updates to grammatical and management practices. It was updated to determine if predator control is a necessity prior to transplants and this policy will not have consideration for adoption. (*Transplant- the act of releasing endemic wildlife species into habitat not currently occupied by the species for the purpose or intent of creating self-sustaining populations in the wild state*).
- Chair Paul Dixon advised in previous there was no evaluation when doing predator removal but updated wording is stating for evaluation prior to predator removal. He stated this question was probably from non-sportsman and not a sportsman in wanting to know if there

- is really a need for predator removal prior to transplant.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he felt the change was good on this action item.
 - Board Comments: (None)
 - Public Comments: (None)
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 22-Introduction, Transplanting, and Exportation of Wildlife as presented.
 - Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
 - **Motion passes 4-0.**
 - *FYI- Purpose- To establish policy on the introduction and reintroduction of wildlife into the State and exportation of same out of the State as guided by NRS 501.181.*
 - *FYI- Procedure- Due to the relative low densities of terrestrial wildlife populations and limited diversity of faunal species in Nevada, the Department shall administer sound wildlife management and restoration programs by: **(Reintroduction)**: of native wildlife onto former or historic areas of distribution within the State, when the habitat requirements of such species are adequate. **(Introduction)**: of endemic non-native wildlife where suitable vacant habitat may exist, and where conflicts with native or existing endemic non-native wildlife would not occur or have only a minimal effect. **(Augmenting)**: native endemic, non-native, or exotic wildlife when it is determined that populations are at low density, or in the event of a die-off, augmentations can support the recovery of a population. **(Stocking)**: native, endemic non-native and exotic terrestrial wildlife species for the appropriate use and aesthetic enjoyment of the people of the state if conflicts with existing native or endemic non-native would not occur or have only a minimal effect.*
 - *FYI-The Department shall prepare a two-year plan to coincide with biennial work program periods for big game reintroductions, introductions, and augmentations. This plan shall be prepared in close cooperation with the appropriate land management agencies and private partners. This plan will be presented to the Nevada Board of Commissioners (the Commission) for approval. The Department shall prepare a two-year plan to coincide with biennial work program periods for upland game, migratory game birds, or furbearer reintroductions, introductions, or augmentations. This plan will be presented to the Commission for approval. Once approved by the Commission, big game releases will occur as soon as practical considering budget, manpower and animal availability. Sites will not be re-submitted for public review and Commission approval unless the Commission specifically finds that compelling circumstances have arisen and requires that the site(s) be reevaluated, or unless a release has not been accomplished after two biennial periods (four years). Once approved by the Commission, any material changes in the Big Game Release Plan must be presented to and approved by the Wildlife Commission. Prior to transplants, the Department will determine if predator control is necessary. If it has been determined that predator control is necessary, it will be accomplished by Wildlife Services or another appropriate entity before and after a transplant occurs. The Department will seek concurrence of the appropriate land management agency or private partner when necessary and may enter into a cooperative agreement to define the action to be taken. The Department will cooperate with other states, countries and First Nations, within their respective constraints, to meet their objectives to re-introduce or introduce wildlife by providing animals from Nevada for export whenever it is in the best interest of the resource and the people of the State. The Department will comply with all existing importation and exportation regulations. Any introduction or reintroduction of wildlife into Nevada, or exportation of wildlife from Nevada by persons or entities, public or private, other than the Department shall comply with Commission regulations and must receive the written consent and approval by the Department prior to the attempt. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, modified, or repealed.*

f. Commission Policy 24- Hunting Opportunities among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groups (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 24-Hunting Opportunities among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groups.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this was heard by the Tag Committee in which the committee made some changes to Section 2 and Section 3.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated changes: **Section 2: Apportion of desired harvests in various weapon classes is based on demand from previous years for the standard hunt units (success, demand, process). Section 3: Apportion the desired junior harvest of 25% junior hunters, (a) junior hunters will be divided into Any Legal Weapon class and (Archery, Muzzleloader combination to allow for increased junior participation. (b) Junior deer tags will be considered antlered deer tags except in areas that have open antlerless deer hunts, where they will be considered either-sex tags. (c) Junior can apply for five years and be awarded three tags before the age of 18.**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the change is once the individual is awarded a tag for the total of three times even though the person is a junior, you may not apply any longer for the Junior Hunt.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised previously Jr. Hunts were any sex and now it is any areas that have an open doe hunt.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised that he wanted to give clarification on Section 3: he stated he was derived meaning the language from the tag committee. He stated this policy is currently going through the LCB process and they give clarification for the language regarding spike elk to become broader to youngster bulls and stated according to NAC definition it states no more than two points above the ears because it is not going to be true spike and it is younger age class bulls. He stated also they are trying to see if party hunt takes place it will have two tag minimum. He stated in areas where there are party hunts such as mule deer, cow bulls, horns shorter than the ears pronghorns NDOW will try to incorporate this language even in areas where there is low quotas they will be ranked by the areas where there is a reduction of quotas based on the season setting this is how these areas can be rectified due to the concern during Commission meeting.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the reasoning of attempting to define spike young class with the bull elk is because extreme aggressive control of the elk herds by removal of cow elk. He

stated the bull to cow ratio is between the numbers of 85 to 100 hence there is overpopulation of males and he feels this is why there is a need to boot younger class males out of the system.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated Chair Paul Dixon is correct in his thought process with the artificial inflation of the bull ratios with aggressive cow harvests and this is with the management plans to have certain amount of elk in these areas. He stated in all actuality the only way to contain the bull ratio at the desired number is to be aggressive with the harvests therefore the spike harvests assist with that but this policy is more for clarification of the language. He stated in the NAC it states no more than two points above the ear NDOW is going through the process for clarification and instead of a spike bull its younger class bulls, realizing that people are harvesting potentially three or four points with the objective on yearly bulls.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris*) - He stated he opposes limiting youth hunts, and feels the youth have been limited enough already and feels that the youth do not receive the same opportunity as adults receive and it is more difficult for the youth to harvest animals and the youth are given only three opportunities then it is final is a bit hind sighted. He stated the youth are the future and once these youths are out youth stage there may be timeframe of six to seven years before they again draw a tag therefore he stated by the limiting of three tags only these youths will probably never return to the sport of hunting again. He stated the issue that will exist is hunting is used for proper way for conservation management therefore by going this avenue there is a loss of opportunity by losing all of the youths.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked Chair Paul Dixon to explain what the concerns from public comments made by (*Brian Burris*), Chair Paul Dixon explained his concerns were as follows: his comments were pertaining to section 3(b) and 3(c) that they should be allowed to harvest any sex at any time and not just in areas which are just for doe hunt, and draw five years as a youth because he feels the youth are our future hunting populations and not discourage these youths with these changes to not to hunt.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated policy change is juniors can apply for five years and apply for five tags if they are drawn and when this tag was drawn it was for any sex but now the policy is only for any sex only in areas that have a designated doe hunt.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated also the change is in the language involving archery and muzzleloader.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that Any Legal Weapon added archery and muzzleloader.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that archery and muzzleloaders are in Any Legal Weapons and are not breaking apart due to both of these have lower success rates. He advised that the Tag Committee makes up a large amount of the language and is involved with this, in the past the demand of junior tags was determined on the amount of tags that NDOW had available and the amount of tags and now this amount has far exceeded and is now doubled hence influencing the present approach that is being taken by this current language.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised by adding archery and muzzleloader this will give the youth more tags and opportunities but the success will be less than rifle therefore more hunter opportunities but with the same harvest objectives.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the number he is concern about as NDOW is the tag allocation and portion, he stated its 25% of the harvest that goes to juniors not necessarily 25% of the tag allocation.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised this is what he needed to have knowledge on.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it is 25% of the desired harvest. He stated the formula for allocation is combination of three year average for success rate with the demand success formula is how this is achieved.

- Board member Dave Talaga asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) how much would this increase the probability.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it will be highly variable depending on the unit and depending on the previous year success rate, at this time he does not have this number of the increase in front of him but he stated junior hunts do run high success rate depending on the unit, in the 50- 60's but for the muzzleloader and archery hunts it would be lower and still providing more opportunities while still allowing Any Legal Weapon opportunities but with less tags.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated he thinks what public comment by (*Brian Burris*) is stating that NDOW is attempting to manipulate the tags, maybe not using the word manipulate.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated as (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) there are 2,500 juniors applying for tags and 2,600 tags to give, then it went to 2,800 juniors applying and only 2,600 tags next it went to 3,000 applicants for 2800 tags, now its 4,500 applicants for 2800 tags, therefore in order to give all of the applicants a opportunity, it must be done by doing this in different weapon classes now and the youths will still not all receive a tag but once again more tags will go out and by limiting the years applicants can apply as junior three years as opposed to five years as a junior this gives other juniors an opportunity because the others are taken out of the pool.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated not making this complicated making the youth not want to go out hunting. **(The remaining audio for his public comment is impenetrable).**
- Board John Hiatt stated it depends on which tag the youth are applying for these categories, he stated he understands to spread out tags into different classes therefore guarantee more tags for hunting. He stated without knowing what tags youths are applying for it makes it difficult to state what effect these policies are going to have.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the effect this will have will be success and the demand of archery and muzzleloader are different and this means more tags and no increase in harvest. He stated if junior does archery hunt as opposed to rifle hunt the rifle obviously has a greater success rate. He stated he liked public comment by (*Ron Stoker*) stating he supports not having any sex but only a doe hunt with any sex in areas that have doe hunt and the question resurfaces in which public comment by (*Brian Burris*) in which he asked the question of should we live in opportunity in the state of Nevada stating only a tag can only be drawn three times or keep it at drawing all five years as a Junior. Regardless he stated it is just like the adult system and even adding all weapon classes there is still a large amount of people still not drawing a tag. He stated in general the likely hood of requesting a tag in your favorite area the youth will probably only draw a tag one or two times as opposed of putting in an area that is less desirable, then obviously your chances of drawing a tag increase drastically, therefore he is not certain that by limiting the amount of people who can apply will change this.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated what is being accomplished by not giving an extra two tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he has no problem with adding other weapon classes but feels chances are limited already by number of people applying already unless hunting in places less desirable.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised removal of section: **(c) Junior can apply for five years and be awarded three tags before the age of 18.** He asked Chair Paul Dixon if what he was stating is for (c) to be changed to reflect to be awarded five times instead of three.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised what he is stating is that (c) should be unlimited as long as you are junior you should be able to apply for a tag and if these juniors are willing to go to area

less desirable and apply for classification that is less desirable to obtain a tag then they should be able to do that as well. He stated it must be spread out even to less desirable locations, if not then some juniors will not be given a tag or opportunity. He stated he understands what they were trying to do but does not believe it can be achieved by **(c) Junior can apply for five years and be awarded three tags before the age of 18.** He stated most youth hunt with rifle.

- Board member Dave Talaga stated again he does not see a point for section (c) and thinks it should be removed. He stated he doesn't feel there is any impact with this section if juniors apply for all five years.
- Board member John Hiatt stated if the idea is to give out tags to the different weapon classes that are not successful or with the assumption of going to areas with little success rate and difficulty to get too, if the child is obtaining more tags but is not harvesting any animals but still retain the same level of enthusiasm as if he did harvest once in a while.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member John Hiatt if the youths would be willing to apply for a tag in those areas if they don't want in those areas.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he is certain the youths would like to hunt in those areas but after repeated amount of failures as the level of enthusiasm falls due to not harvesting over and over then they feel it was waste of time.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that when he was a youth it was not so much about the harvest but about the memories he has of hunting with his father. He feels that others who hunt with their kids it's the time.
- Board member John Hiatt asked the question of the parents who are hunting with their kids and no success are these parents going to be able to keep the enthusiasm going for their kids.
- Chair Paul Dixon agreed with John that there are going to be some people that feel the way he feels but overall people that want these experiences with their children of harvesting animals is part of this experience and share this and build with generations of people that have that same hunting tradition and define what it means to hunt and to do conservation in the field.
- Board member Dave Talaga states at the very least this supports an opportunity that did not exist before.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there will be success in muzzleloaders because of parents who want to teach their children these techniques.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated changes are the adoption of desired harvest of various weapon classes based on demand from previous years for standard hunt units, and asked question to *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* is this the standard demand for success rate correct.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated the new language is just for cleaning up purposes.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 24- Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groups as presented with the recommendation to omit paragraph 3 (c) **Junior can apply for five years and be awarded three tags before the age of 18.**
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose- To establish hunting opportunities for the various weapon classes and hunter groups.*
- *FYI- Policy- It is the policy of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve the harvest levels for big game species based on the various weapon classes and hunter groups' relative demand for hunting opportunity and hunter success rates.*

g. Commission Policy 25- Wildlife Damage Management (For possible action) The

CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 25- Wildlife Damage Management.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the policy has a vast amount of removal of language.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if the education program dealing with pest and rodent control and stated this has now been stricken from this policy.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated there is large amount of language that maybe is strictly adhering too is his understanding. He stated he has had numerous conversations with the staff specialist and the recommendation at this time is this policy will receive a third reading.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that NDOW shall prepare a wildlife annual management damage incentive plan done yearly and he stated it was prepared by Pat Jackson previously. He asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if this would be stricken or is this going forward still going to be done because he saw no replacement it was simply gone.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he will need to speak to Pat Jackson to discuss his thought process on some of the language that has stricken.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that these changes such as euthanizing bears because they pose public health and safety issue but we are no longer going to do this, he stated that these changes listed seem very dramatic.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated NDOW still has projects such as Project 37 and Project 38 which are removal of coyotes and mountain lions and stated the park process is still in place.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that even if the park process is still in effect the policy process is still in place making people remain silent and asked the question does the language offend individuals who are anti-predator removal therefore removing predators BUT still doing the process. He stated policy is put in and states specific of what is being done and it backs up the portion of the predator removal or if taken out the policy it is suggesting that it is still being done, therefore he feels the removal has taken usual things out. He stated he does not understand the reasoning for the removal of the language that has been removed and at this time he does not feel the CAB should take any action on this matter.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) stated predator removal is being taken out in this area but not that area, this does not make sense. He stated he will not spend time trying to assume why these changes have been taken out instead ask that more information to be given to state why the removal of these changes. He stated it is difficult to make a decision on this when you do not know the reasoning of the removal of these change.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is removal of 50%.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he feels there will be discussion on this further.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he has comments and questions on this policy primarily what is the reasoning behind the removal of the language and stated these removals make no sense to him.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he is in agreeance with board member Jacob Thompson as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to not accept the changes to Commission Policy 25 Wildlife Damage Management as presented, the CAB does not support and disagrees with the motivation in this policy due to lack of understanding the removal of the changes and it is justified.

- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0, with the following recommendation: the CAB does not accept nor supports this policy as presented, and disagrees with the motivation for removal due to lack of understanding on the changes and no justification given.**
- *FYI- The following language was removed: (Please view NDOW's website to see the complete version of Commission Policy 25- Wildlife Damage Management)*
- **Removal of Language:** Extension and educational efforts will be encouraged to assist private citizens in animal husbandry practices, property protection or human activities to minimize the vulnerability of loss, damage, or injury to livestock, pets, private property, or human health and safety.
- **Removal of Language:** The Department shall prepare an annual wildlife damage management plan outlining proposed actions needed for the management of wildlife and, upon approval of the Commission, recommended that a sufficient amount of funding annually be forwarded from the Wildlife Account in the State General Fund to the state predator animal and rodent commit (PARC) for wildlife damage management work as provided in Chapter 567 of NRS.
- **Removal of Language:** The Department shall conduct an evaluation of the potential needs for wildlife damage management activities in conjunction with preparing release proposal for big game, upland game, and migratory birds. These evaluation shall be included in each site specific release proposal in the draft biennial big game and upland game migratory bird release plans.
- **Removal of Language:** Wildlife damage management of major mammalian predators including coyotes, bobcats, mountain lion, and black bears, shall be directed towards specific geographic areas of the state where a predation problem has been documented by the Department of Wildlife or Wildlife Services. Within those documented areas, management and control efforts shall be undertaken to minimize livestock, pets, or natural resource losses that may or are about to occur through predation. In the event that any of the aforementioned major mammalian predators poses a legitimate immediate threat to human health and safety, based on the professional judgment of Department of Wildlife or Wildlife Services personnel, those animals shall be killed.
- **Removal of Language:** Employ wildlife damage management methods which are selected on the basis of the species involved, utilizing currently approved methods in the proper mix according to the needs. **Removed Language from the sentence:** These methods may include aerial hunting, M 44 devices, trapping, snares, denning and registered pesticides.
- **Removal of Language:** Department, upon issuance of a depredation permit and with the aid and cooperation of the complainant, may take all available professional and economically feasible measures to alleviate or lessen the depredation or safety problem.
- **Removal of Language:** NRS 503.595 provides that after the owner or tenant of any land or property has made a report to the Department indicating that such land or property is being damaged or destroyed, or is in danger of being damaged or destroyed, by wildlife, the Department may, after thorough investigation and pursuant to such regulations as the Commission may promulgate, cause such action to be taken as it may deem necessary, desirable and practical to prevent or alleviate such damage or threatened damage to such land or property.
- **Removal of Language (ONLY IN RED):** The Commission has adopted regulations authorizing the Director or his designee to issue wildlife depredation permits. **Specific permit programs include:** An annual wildlife depredation permit may be issued to the State Supervisor, U.S. Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services, to kill mountain lion, common raven, black bear, **and/or bobcat or others as needed** causing or potentially causing a loss of private property, natural resources, or representing a threat to human health and safety.

- a) Any report of natural resources, livestock, or pet loss, or threat to human health or safety received by the Department shall be forward immediately to Wildlife Services for action in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.
- Upon a receipt of a report from a property owner or the Department indicating that a mountain lion, black bear, or bobcat is causing or about to cause damage to private property or poses a threat to human health and safety, the permittee shall conduct an on-site investigation. If the results of the investigation support the complaint, the permittee may kill the animal. If the permittee cannot determine if the complaint is valid, he shall notify a representative of the Department, who shall conduct a joint investigation to make the final determination.
- **Removal of Language:** The permittee shall salvage and give the hide and skull of mountain lion, black bear or bobcat killed under the authority of a permit, to the Department within 72 hours.
- **Removal of Language:** An annual wildlife depredation permit may be issued to State Supervisor, Wildlife Services to kill the minimum number of game, furbearers, protected or unprotected wildlife species as necessary to control threat or damage to and property or to human health and safety.
- **Removal of Language:** The Department may issue permits authorizing the hunting or killing of coyotes and bobcats from an aircraft.
- **Removal of Language:** The Department may issue permits consistent with federal law to take bald eagles, golden eagles, ravens, or other birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, whenever it determines that they have become seriously injurious to wildlife or agriculture or other interests that the injury can only be abated by killing some of the offending birds.
- **Removal of Language:** The State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee shall enter into agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture covering cooperative control of crop destroying birds in addition to predatory animals and rodents to assure maximum protection against losses of livestock, poultry, game birds, animals and crops on a statewide basis. The State Department of Agriculture in accordance with NRS 555.010 and 555.021 responds to complaints involving vertebrate posts that are injurious to agriculture or public health.
- Public Comments (None)
- *FYI- Purpose- To inform the public and guide the Department of Wildlife in actions relating to Wildlife Damage Management. In accordance with NRS 501.181, the Board of Wildlife Commissioners shall establish policies for the protection, propagation, restoration, transplanting, introduction and management of wildlife in this state. Further, the Commission shall establish policies for areas of interest including wildlife damage management.*
- *FYI- Policy- (1). Wildlife damage management shall be undertaken to minimize wildlife related losses to private or natural resources without endangering the existence or natural role of offending wildlife species in the ecosystem. (2). The Commission supports continued federal leadership in wildlife damage management because of the national need for development and use of more efficient and humane control methods. (3). The Commission recognizes the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services, as the authority for predatory and nuisance wildlife damage management under cooperative agreement with the Department of Wildlife, where the Department of Wildlife is active participant in documenting the need for wildlife damage management programs, in planning and execution of those programs, and in enhancing public understanding of those programs. (4). Initiate wildlife damage management efforts using the best scientific and biological information available. (5). Direct wildlife damage management efforts including sport hunting and trapping, whenever possible, to prevent damage to resources or threats to human health and safety before it occurs in specific areas*

known to be recurring problem areas, or to alleviate damage as soon as possible after it occurs. (6). Direct wildlife damage management efforts at the offending animal or localized offending species population in so far as possible, and feasible. (7). Employ wildlife damage management methods which are selected on the basis of the species involved, utilizing currently approved methods in the proper mix according to the needs. (a) Pesticides must be federally and state registered, applied only by certified applicators, and should only be used in those proactive or reactive preventative damage management operations where its use and delivery system represent a selective, effective and efficient method of control. (b) Aerial hunting will be conducted only under authorization of the Department of Wildlife through issuance of an aerial depredation permit, limited to bobcats, coyotes and ravens. Such permits shall be issued only to Wildlife Services or to landowners or tenants land or property that are being damaged by wildlife. (8). An annual wildlife depredation permit may be issued to the State Supervisor, U.S. Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services, to kill mountain lion, black bear, or bobcat is causing or about to cause damage to private property or poses a threat to human health and safety. (a) Any report of natural resources, livestock, pet loss, or threat to human health or safety received by the Department shall be forwarded immediately to Wildlife Services for action in accordance with subsection (b) of this section. (b) Upon receipt of a report from a property owner or the Department indicating that a mountain lion, black bear, or bobcat is causing or about to cause damage to private property or poses a threat to human health and safety, the permittee shall conduct an on-site investigation. If the results of the investigation support the complaint, the permittee may kill the animal. If the permittee cannot determine if the complaint is valid, he shall notify a representative of the Department, who shall conduct a joint investigation to make the final determination. (c) Upon receipt of a valid mountain lion, black bear or bobcat complaint from an individual landowner or tenant, the Department may issue a limited permit to the owner to pursue and kill an animal that is in the act of killing his livestock. (1) The permittee shall notify a Department representative within 72 hours after killing a mountain lion, black bear or bobcat and shall salvage the hide and skull and give same to the Department of Wildlife. (d) Furbearers may be taken or killed at any time in any manner, provided an individual or entity first obtains a permit from the Department. The Department or their agents are authorized to enter upon the lands of a landowner and remove beaver or otter for the relief of other landowners and the protection of the public welfare. (e) The Department may issue a wildlife depredation permit to a landowner if needed for the prevention or alleviation of damage to standing or stored agriculture crops. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

h. Commission Policy 26- Managing Rocky Mountain Elk, Population (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 26- Managing Rocky Mountain Elk population.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this was heard by the Commission in May 2022 and is up for consideration of adoption therefore he stated he sees nothing that the CAB needs to do on this action item at this time. He stated there was no need for the CAB to make recommendations on this policy.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 26- Managing Rocky Mountain Elk Populations in Nevada as presented.

- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose-The Nevada Department of Wildlife will manage elk populations for the benefit of the public by maintaining healthy elk herds and habitats on which they depend. Management decisions will consider specific wildlife health concerns like chronic wasting disease. Pioneering elk populations will be managed in consideration of established land use plans, private land impacts, public review, and concurrence by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (the Commission).*
- *FYI- This policy is established to guide the Department and inform the land management agencies, private land interests, and the public on the management of elk and pioneering populations. The Department will conform to existing Commission Policies and the Nevada State Elk Species Management Plan. The Department will comply with pertinent Nevada State laws and Federal regulations concerning importation and release of wildlife, including elk. The Department will include all reasonably anticipated potential elk pioneering sites located immediately adjacent to planned elk releases in future planning processes. The public and private industry recommendations for these potential pioneering sites will be considered. The Department will monitor potential habitat for pioneering elk populations. If, in the best professional judgement of the Department, an elk population successfully colonizes previously unoccupied habitat, the Department will apprise the Commission and recommend an appropriate course of action giving due consideration to private land interests and public access.*
- *FYI- (Actions recommended may include): Approval of the colonization with acceptance from the land management agencies and public being sought by the Department. Disapproval with elimination of the pioneering elk population being initiated through actions deemed appropriate by the Department and Commission. The Commission will retain ultimate authority on the course of action to be taken following identification of successful elk colonization. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners. By Order of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners in Regular Session.*

i. Commission Policy 27- Protection of Wildlife (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 27- Protection of Wildlife.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is a third reading on this policy, it is under the consideration of a second reading and that there is change in language on #9 as follows: *(Commission recognizes wolf sightings will continue in Nevada. Like other predators, the Commission supports management of wolves if they are determined to be negatively impacting other wildlife species, and may oppose a population of wolves).*
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that as long as the wolf population stays under control with no impact to wildlife then there will be no need for any additional regulations put in place. He stated he feels that removal of animal should be done when they are predators and only when they are causing harm to a resource or livestock and they need protection due to this factor. He stated there were wolves in Nevada historically and prehistorically and they are not uncommon in this state and have just eradicated. If there is a need to control species in an area then he stated small wolf pack will handle this duty extremely well and stated it can take

care of coyotes as well, and it may lead to other issues.

- Board member John Hiatt advised that in Northwest Spain that the population there has an estimation of 300 wolf packs which have a diet of 95% feral horses. He stated the population feels strongly for protection of the wildlife including the wolves and the horse levels being well maintained at a reasonable level. He stated he gave this example to state that the wolves are the only predator that put a damper in the horse populations therefore he stated that horse advocates that believe in the cycle of life with wildlife should not complain when nature takes its course.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he feels that in future the department will put forth regulations to manage the wolves in this state.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated he feels that #9 the wording is not correct: **The Commission recognizes wolf sightings will continue in Nevada. Like other predators, the Commission supports management of wolves if they are determined to be negatively impacting other wildlife species, and may oppose a population of wolves.** He stated that the last portion stating may oppose a population should be worded differently.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that if board member Dave Talaga has any suggestions on different wording for that section then please let him know.
- Board member John Hiatt agreed in that sentence in the last section may oppose a population of wolves, he feels this is eradicating all wolves therefore he stated this is not how a good management of wildlife works by getting rid of an entire class of animals, normally it is killing of individual animals that are causing the problem. He stated in other states where they have wolf population this is not how management of wildlife is handled or it was handled by the federal government. He stated it should be individual animals' not entire pack.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated adding onto section #9 on the end of the sentence (**will institute population control**) then stated (**will consider population control**) as the final verbiage instead as the additional addendum to the sentence.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that Commission Policy 27- Protection of Nevada Wildlife to be accepted as presented with additional wording on (9) the last sentence to add onto the end at that point (will consider population control.)
- Board Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose- It is the duty of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (the Commission) and the Nevada Department of Wildlife (Department) to establish policies and adopt regulations necessary to the preservation, protection, management, and restoration of wildlife and its habitat.*
- *FYI- Policy- (1) Wildlife, including wild animals, wild birds, and fish within the State of Nevada are held in the public trust by the State of Nevada and shall be preserved, protected, perpetuated, and managed. (NRS 501.100, #1 "Wildlife in this state not domesticated and in its*

natural habitat is part of the natural resources belonging to the people of the State of Nevada”). (2) Nevada’s law and policy includes providing includes providing Nevada citizens (and others permitted by law) accessibility to wildlife for their shared recreations. (3) The Department in conjunction with the Commission has the authority, power and duty to administer and carry out the State of Nevada’s wildlife policy consistent with state law. (4) Wildlife management under this policy includes, but is not limited to; maintaining healthy populations, balancing predator and prey relationships, providing hunting and recreational opportunities for game species, and addressing conflicts between wildlife, people, and businesses. (5) The federal government retains public trust and management authority for specific types of wildlife, such as certain migratory birds under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and federally listed species under the Endangered Species Act. The federal government retains regulatory authority over feral horses and burros pursuant to the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971, as amended. (6) Native and introduced wildlife species generally benefit from the diligent protection, management and research provided by the Department. State management responsibility, through collaboration among other states and the federal government, generally provides local communities with a greater voice while considering the biological implications for the species management. (7) To extent practicable, the Commission will work with the Department to obtain and maintain state management authority of those species that reside within Nevada. Further, the Commission and Department will collaborate with the federal government to ensure that the social and biological concerns unique to Nevada are considered as part of any wildlife management activity for those species under federal management authority. (8) The Commission and Department will work collaboratively with private, local, state and federal partners to obtain and maintain state management authority of those species that reside within Nevada. (9) The Commission recognizes wolf sightings will continue in Nevada. Like other predators, the Commission supports management of wolves if they are determined to be negatively impacting other wildlife species, and may oppose a population of wolves.

j. Commission Policy 28- Transparency on Quota Setting(For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 28- Transparency on Quota Setting.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this policy is up for adoption and discusses for transparency to share with the public all actions that are taken by Commission, CCABMW, and the department with the public.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 28- Transparency on Quota Setting as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion Passes 4-0.**
- *FYI: Purpose-To develop transparency of information to provide with the public and CAB*

on ways of determination of huntable population and quotas for ungulates.

- *FYI: Policy- It is the policy of this Commission to provide to the public and County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife all scientific information relied upon by the Nevada Department of Wildlife to enable them to submit recommendations to the Commission for the establishment of regulations.*

k. Commission Policy 29-Elk Arbitration (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting changes to Commission Policy 29-Elk Arbitration.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that policy 29 is up for adoption and is in arbitration by individuals who do not receive the correct count to receive their Elk Incentive tag. He stated it is long record keeping process which is formula based.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the process is formula driven and gives account of hours utilized on the property and factors in numbers of different tags with population estimates and many other factors as well to formulate the equation. He stated any individual can go through this arbitration process.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 29- Arbitration Process for Applicants Dissatisfied with Elk Incentive Tag Awards as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose- The purpose of this policy is to inform the public and guide the Nevada Department of Wildlife (the Department) in actions relating to any award of Elk Incentive Tags. This policy complies with NAC 502.42283 (modified June 28, 2016 by LCB File No. R031-15).*
- *FYI: Policy-It is the policy of the Commission to provide an incentive to landowners that choose to provide habitat for elk on private lands, to provide a fair and equitable distribution of incentive tags for those landowners that choose to participate in this program and provide those cooperators that participate in this program with a means by which they may seek arbitration to any award of tags that they perceive the Department made in error.*

l. Commission Policy 51- Wayne E. Kirch Conservation Award (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting changes to Commission Policy 51-Wayne E. Kirch Conservation Award.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this policy was heard in November 2021 and also again in March 2022 Commission meetings and again for the first time in May 2022 and it is up for adoption. He stated this is to give policy to Kirch award.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Policy 51- Wayne E. Kirch Nevada Conservation Award as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- To establish a policy for the administration of the Wayne E. Kirch Nevada Wildlife Conservation Award.*

- FYI- Policy- (1) The Wildlife Commission's Wayne E. Kirch Nevada Wildlife Conservation Award** is presented annually to bestow a richly deserved honor on the individual, nonprofit organization, outdoor sports club or business that has shown outstanding achievement and significant results in the conservation, management or enhancement of wildlife in the State of Nevada during the calendar year preceding the award. Two Board of Wildlife Commissioners, to be named by the Chairman, will be represented on the Kirch Award Committee. **(2) Nominations Schedule:** Nominations for the award will be printed each August and mailed out September 1 to all County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW), the agency's established sportsman's directory list, the wildlife commissioners, and all agency offices. A press release to announce the award will be sent out statewide. Nominations will be accepted until November 15 of the current year at 5 p.m., and judges will receive nominations for review by December 1. The judging panel must review nominations and return ratings sheets to Department staff by December 15 of the current year. Staff will report to the Kirch Award Committee at the earliest date possible as to the outcome of the award and to determine whether a tie-breaker is needed. **(3) Judging Panel-:** The recipient will be selected by a judging panel made up of two wildlife commissioners, Department staff assigned to the Kirch Award Committee, and Marlene Kirch, daughter, or other appointed family member of former commissioner Wayne E. Kirch. In addition, four judges representing CABMWs or outdoor groups will be selected biennially by the Habitat Division, Game Division, Diversity Division and Fisheries Division Administrators. Each judge will independently rank the nominees and provide a final ranking sheet to the Department staff. Any tie breakers will be decided by the two Wildlife Commissioners serving on the Kirch Award Committee and Department staff. Any tie breakers will be decided by the two Wildlife Commissioners serving on the Kirch Award Committee and Department staff assigned to the Kirch Award Committee. The award will be presented to the selected candidate at the next Wildlife Commission meeting held closest to the recipient's home. **(4) Judging Criteria:** Selection of the award winner will be made solely from the official Conservation Award nomination form. The following criteria will be considered in evaluating nominees: **(a)** Time and depth of commitment to conservation, management, or enhancement of wildlife in the State of Nevada during the current calendar year. **(b)** Influence of the person/project on the public and in presenting positive public relations in regard to wildlife conservation in Nevada. **(c)** Quantity and quality of measureable results for wildlife conservation. **(d)** Obstacles, difficulties and personal sacrifice involved in meeting wildlife conservation goals. **(5) Type of Award:** The perpetual award is a plaque made of wood and bronze to which each year's recipient's name will be added. The perpetual award is permanently installed in the lobby of the Department. In addition, each annual recipient will receive a small version to commemorate the award. The perpetual plaque and annual awards will be sponsored by Marlene Kirch or other appointed family member of their choosing, in her father's name, in perpetuity. **(6) Publicity:** An announcement of the availability of nomination forms will be made each September. Announcements will be emailed statewide to sportsmen/outdoor retail stores. An email notification of the announcement will be sent to NGO's and Conservation Partnerships for their review and dissemination to members. The Conservation Education Division will air information through the Nevada Wild Podcast, as well. A statewide press release acknowledging the award recipient and their contributions on behalf of wildlife conservation will be prepared and sent out after the announcement of the award. **(7)** All costs for printing and any other administrative costs of the Kirch Award are to be paid out of the commission budget. **(8)** Copies of the Wayne Kirch nominations will be retained by Nevada Department of Wildlife and/or a permanent repository preserving the history of the Nevada Department of Wildlife and the wildlife of Nevada. Certificates of appreciation should also be sent to nominees. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

m. Commission Policy 60- Water Application Guidelines(For possible action) The

CCABMW Board will review discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting changes to Commission Policy 60- Water Application Guidelines.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is a first reading that there is removal of language such as drastic instead using the word significant impact.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the board took out the following wording in red only: The Board of Wildlife Commissioners recognizes the economic value and benefits of **long established** agricultural development resulting, in part, from the use of drilled wells and free-flowing artesian wells. The Board will endorse legislation to control the drilling and pumping of new wells that cause detrimental effects on **wildlife and habitat resources, existing wells and free flowing springs that provide agricultural and wildlife benefits.**
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the last sentence stating about agricultural and the CAB does not make recommendations on agricultural.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that this is complicated because agricultural water is beneficial to wildlife.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked the question to Chair Paul Dixon of since the board will endorse legislation for controlled drilling and pumping of new wells therefore why does it have to be endorsed and not simply studied.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that for a large amount of mining operations especially lithium mining require a great deal of water resources that there is no impact to by pumping shallow ground water to springs in the area does not impact the wildlife.
- Board member Dave Talaga again stated why is it worded in this manner.
- Board member John Hiatt stated because state engineer regulates water rights and water rights applications and the old rights were either endorse or oppose.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated it should be wording to study the legislation.
- Board member John Hiatt it is not legislations it is applications by other individuals to appropriate the state's water. He stated there are only two options for water applications for third parties which are support or oppose.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated it says "legislation".
- Board member John Hiatt stated that it is incorrect and should be applications and the title is about water application and guidelines. He stated there needs to be clarification due to the difference between application and legislation.
- Public Comments:(None)
- Board member John Hiatt advised to accept Commission Policy 60- Water Application Guidelines with the additional language of a request for clarification of the discrepancy between the title of the policy (Water Applications) and language specifically regarding the word application versus legislation to clarify the wording in the last sentence. **(Last sentence: The Board will endorse legislation to control the drilling and pumping of new wells that cause detrimental effects on wildlife and habitat resources.**
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- Motion passes 4-0 with clarification of the discrepancy between the title of the policy (Water Applications) and language specifically regarding the word application versus legislation to clarify this wording in the last sentence: The Board will endorse legislation to control the drilling and pumping of new wells that cause detrimental effects on wildlife and habitat resources.
- *FYI- Purpose- The Board of Wildlife Commissioners shall establish policies necessary for the preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife and its habitat and shall utilize its authority to carry out a program for conserving, protecting and propagating native fish, wildlife and other vertebrates and their habitats.*

- *FYI- Policy- The board of Wildlife Commissioners does hereby establish the following policy to provide for the preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife and its habitat: (1) The Director, Department of Wildlife, to the maximum extent practical, shall review water applications submitted to the State Engineer for the appropriation of waters to determine the impact on wildlife and its habitat. (2) If it is determined by the Director that granting the application would threaten or cause significant impacts to wildlife and habitat resources, the Director shall, within 30 days from the date of protest against granting the application, setting forth with reasonable certainty the grounds of such protest. (3) The Director shall advise the State Engineer and the applicant that such protest will be withdrawn if, in his opinion, adequate safeguards are provided for wildlife and its habitat. The Board of Wildlife Commissioners recognizes the economic value and benefits of agricultural development resulting, in part, from the use of drilled wells and free-flowing artesian wells. The Board will endorse legislation to control the drilling and pumping of new wells that cause detrimental effects on wildlife and habitat resources. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.*

n. Commission Policy 61- Water Rights (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting changes to Commission Policy 61- Water Rights.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is a first reading on this action item.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised under section #4 (d) there was addition added to the language: *In addition, work to protect, conserve and enhance riparian areas, meadows, wetlands, and other habitats associated with water resources that provide valuable habitats for wildlife.*
- Board member John Hiatt stated that normally individuals do not apply for water rights, it typically means having lake or some source of water around them to have water rights if they have reservoir or springs and seeps around them and this is stating consideration to have water rights.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member Dave Talaga advised a motion to accept Commission Policy 61- Water Rights as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose- The Board of Wildlife Commissioners shall establish policies necessary for the preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife and its habitat and shall utilize its land management authority to carry out a program for conserving, protecting and propagating wildlife and their habitats. Water is essential for the existence and survival of fish and most species of wildlife, and in Nevada's arid climate, water is the key to the*

distribution and population abundance of the State's fish and wildlife resources. The purpose of this policy is to guide the Department of Wildlife in securing water for the preservation, maintenance and enhancement of wildlife and their habitats. The provisions of this policy are in complete accord with Nevada water law, and will not impair any vested, permitted or certificated rights for the use of water.

- *FYI- Policy- The Board of Wildlife Commissioners does hereby establish the following policy to provide for the preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife and its habitat: (1) **Instream Flow**- It is the policy of the Commission to achieve, through all available means, adequate instream flows to maintain existing fish life and aquatic ecosystems. Whenever water becomes available, the Department shall, subject to a determination of need, and available manpower and money, apply for and/or purchase such waters for the benefit of fish and wildlife. (2) **Minimum Reservoir Pools**: It is the policy of the Commission to achieve, through all available means, the maintenance of minimum reservoir pools necessary to support viable fish populations. The Department shall, whenever the opportunity arises, enter into negotiations with private reservoir owners to secure cooperative agreements for public fisherman access and minimum pools. The Department shall work through the federal land management agency's permitting process to ensure permit stipulations for the maintenance of public access and minimum pools on all new reservoirs constructed wholly or partially on public lands. (3) **Wetlands**: It is the policy of the Commission to maintain, through all available means, the maximum possible acreages of viable wetland habitats in Nevada. Whenever water becomes available, the Department shall, subject to available manpower and money, apply for and/or purchase such waters as are necessary to maintain existing wetlands for the benefit of fish and wildlife. (4) **Springs and Seeps**: It is the policy of the Commission to ensure, through all available means, that wildlife have access to the water from springs and seeps necessary to maintain existing and anticipated distributions and population levels. The Department shall, subject to available manpower and money: (a) File applications for permits to appropriate the necessary water to support existing and anticipated wildlife populations on all springs and seeps of significant value to wildlife and where appropriated water is available. (b) File joint applications, where appropriate, to obtain the amount of water needed for maintenance of wildlife populations. (c) Develop procedures to implement the provisions of Chapter 533 of NRS to ensure wildlife access to appropriated waters. (d) Work cooperatively with private water right holders and public land management agencies to ensure that sufficient water from springs and seeps is available for wildlife. **In addition, work to protect, conserve and enhance riparian areas, meadows, wetlands, and other habitats associated with water resources that provide valuable habitats for wildlife.** (e) File protests with the State Water Engineer on those applications for waters of significant value to wildlife and where the proposed use of the water will deny wildlife access thereto, and where all other avenues of ensuring wildlife access to such waters have been exhausted.*

- o. **Commission Policy 66- Management and Use of Wildlife Management Areas (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting changes to Commission Policy 66- Management and Use of Wildlife Management Areas.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is a first reading and there is change in policy pertaining to easements as follows: *Easements: Acquisition of conservation or access easements from willing private property parties that support important wildlife habitat or access will be considered when opportunities are presented. Easements keep private lands in private ownership but provide opportunity to prioritize wildlife values or ensure access.*
- Board member John Hiatt advised that this requires the cooperation of the private land

owner willing to give up their easement for period of time with perpetuity with questions revolving around ownership of the easements and responsibilities of inspection and certification and making sure to meet the requirements. He stated that he support this.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised he supports this as well.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised a motion to accept Commission Policy 66 – Management and Use of Conservation Lands and Wildlife Management Areas as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**
- *FYI- Purpose- The primary purpose of this document is to provide policy-level guidance to the Nevada Department of Wildlife in the development of site specific operational plans for **NDOW owned conservation lands and individual wildlife management areas (WMAs) in the State of Nevada.***
- *FYI- Policies- In order to address the current and future needs of the fish and wildlife resources, and the publics that utilize these resources, the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners does hereby establish the following policies to provide for the preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife and its habitats on State owned or controlled lands and WMAs: **Priority Uses:** The primary objectives governing the management and use of WMAs must necessarily be linked to the purposes for which the areas were purchased, particularly from a Federal Aid or other funding source perspective. Based upon this premise, priority management for the following listed WMAs will be directed toward wetland development and waterfowls activities, including the use of these areas as public shooting grounds, with all other uses being secondary: Argenta, Carson Lake, Mason Valley, Scripps, Fernley, Humboldt, Alkali Lake, Franklin Lake, Overton, Key Pittman, Steptoe Valley, and Wayne E. Kirch. Using similar justification and rationale as described above, the following listed area will receive priority management for fisheries-related programs: Bruneau River. It is the intent of the policy to maximize available opportunities for all fish and wildlife uses within the WMA system, after consideration of the primary uses described above and with limits posed by provisions of the Endangered Species Act, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and other similar state and federal legislative mandates. **Multiple Uses:** Because of the limited availability and subsequent high demand for wetland-related resources in Nevada, all WMAs purchased with Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration funds shall be developed, maintained and managed primarily for wetland values. In the same manner, all WMAs purchased with Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration funds shall be developed, maintained and managed primarily for fisheries-related values. The maximum recreational or other public use will be pursued whenever and wherever feasible, but with the limits posed by the above reference priorities, within habitat capabilities, and may be limited by budget constraints or regulations applicable to lands purchased using Federal Aid. Hunters and anglers benefit from the fish and wildlife on the WMAs and conservation lands and as such, shall continue to be included in the future management and use of the properties. Properties are also available for educational, scientific, aesthetic and other uses such as bird watching, nature trails, educational pursuits, scientific endeavors and will be encouraged whenever and wherever possible. The scope of activities, number of visitors and/or visitor days, and conflicting uses will be managed or limited to protect the associated natural resources, to maintain an optimum recreational experience and to provide for public safety. **Water Rights:** Whenever water becomes available, the Department shall, subject to available manpower and money, apply for and/or purchase such waters as deemed necessary to maintain existing wetlands and/or develop new wetlands necessary for the*

preservation, maintenance and enhancement of wildlife and their habitats on WMAs.

Land Acquisition: *In concert with public input provided as part of the inventory portion of the Strategic planning process, objectives developed in the Strategic Plan, and in accordance with policies established under the Conserve Nevada Bond program, the Department will continue to pursue a land acquisition program that meets the needs and desires of the public, and provides for the preservation, protection, and restoration of wildlife and their habitats within the WMA system.*

Wetlands Management: *An overall goal of no net loss of wetlands and the enhancement of wetland quantity and quality are the long-term wetlands management objectives on WMAs purchased with Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration funds. Comprehensive strategies for protecting and enhancing wetlands will be developed for each WMA using the Geographical Information System (GIS) natural resource inventory. The condition of present water delivery facilities will be reviewed, and improvement projects developed where needed on WMAs to increase efficiency of water delivery and promote water conservation.*

Vegetation Management: *Strategies to promote vegetation that is of maximum value to waterfowl and other migratory birds will be developed through water level manipulation, prescribed burning, grazing, herbicide applications and other means in an effort to meet plan –specific objectives on each WMA. Procedures will also be developed to control and eradicate invasive and undesirable plants such as tamarisk and white top. Upland habitats on WMAs will be managed to maximize biodiversity, which may also require periodic vegetative manipulation.*

Public Access: *Appropriate road and trail systems will be established and maintained within each WMA to insure adequate public access to the resource, recognizing however, that some seasonal road closures may be necessary to protect the resource, and/or enhance the recreational experience. Roadways, parking areas and other vehicular control measures will be adequately signed to insure public compliance.*

Camping: *Although camping is recognized as an important part of the outdoor recreational experience, and that overnight and/or day-use facilities may be needed at some WMA locations, the Department of Wildlife is not in the camping business simply for the sake of camping. Facilities will therefore be provided only in those areas where there is an expressed demand by resource users, and only to specifically meet the identified needs of the users. On those WMAs where improved camping facilities are deemed necessary to address the needs of the general public, and the development of such sites are compatible with fish and wildlife management objectives of the area, the Department of Wildlife shall work in cooperation with the Division of State Parks to provide upgraded camping facilities through the use of site-specific Memorandums of Agreement.*

Boat Ramps: *Recognizing that boating access is an important component associated with recreational opportunity at many of the WMAs adequate boat ramp facilities will be provided for launching medium to small boats on reservoirs and ponds where appropriate.*

Grazing Practices: *It is recognized that livestock grazing frequently provides a viable and cost-effective management tool for enhancing habitat conditions for certain species of wildlife, and livestock grazing may therefore be utilized periodically on some WMAs or conservation lands to meet area-specific plan objectives.*

Farming Practices: *It is recognized that agricultural production of farmland crops is an extremely beneficial asset to many species of wildlife, particularly some species of migratory birds, and that such practices add to the biodiversity of wildlife in Nevada. Although the major focus of the WMA program will be directed toward developing, enhancing and maintaining natural wetland systems, farming may be initiated on some areas to meet site-specific management area needs. Because of the high cost of farming for agricultural products, a cost benefit analysis will be one of the factors used in determining whether or not an area will be farmed.*

Funding Sources: *The ownership, maintenance and management of real property, particularly land and*

water, is an expensive program component of fish and wildlife management. The current WMA system provides both direct and indirect benefits to the general public through habitat and migratory bird protection. It is the intent of the Commission to encourage the Department to explore broad and diverse funding opportunities to fund the WMAs for the benefit of all citizens. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

XI. Comments by the General Public- A period devoted to comments by the general public about matter relevant to the CCABMW's jurisdiction will be held. No vote may be taken on a matter not listed on the posted agenda. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. If any member of the CCABMW wishes to extend the length of a presentation, this will be done by the Chair or the CCABMW by majority vote.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris*): He stated as the NGO he sees now that due to the audit that now the burden of showing the proof of mileage on his volunteers and he stated it is already a hard task to find volunteers. The new requirements put in place is simply too much to ask of these volunteers. He stated NDOW should use their staff that they are already paying to be at these projects and have them do their jobs. He stated it is not fair to place such a burden on these volunteers and NDOW needs to step up and do their job and help the NGOs on this. He stated that since attending the Mule Deer Committee meeting it has become apparent to him that NDOW's standard policy is to have a problem for every solution. He stated as a NGO he is tasked with coming up with solutions not creating problems. He stated there would be appreciation to NDOW if they too did the same thing as well.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He stated he volunteers twice weekly and he understands why there was a policy change due to the audit from the federal government and if volunteers go to four different stops then they must attempt to figure out the mileage between all of these locations making it very cumbersome and frustrating especially for the older volunteers. He advised he had to go onto an Annex Map in order to calculate his mileage and stated he pays for the service and ask does he ask NDOW for his money back because this service comes at a cost yearly of \$99.00.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.**

XII. Authorize the Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its August 19, 2022 and August 20, 2022 virtual meeting in Tonopah, Nevada (*For possible action*)

- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to prepare and submit any recommendations from tonight's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for the next meeting on August 19, 2022 and August 20, 2022 virtually in Tonopah, Nevada.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-0.**

XIII. The next CCABMW board meeting will be scheduled for **September 20, 2022 at Clark County Government Center (Pueblo Room) 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas. This meeting will be in support of the September 23, 2022 & September 24, 2022 Commission meeting in Las Vegas, NV.**

XIV. Adjournment.

POSTING: The agenda for this meeting was legally noticed and posted at the following locations:

- Nevada Department of Wildlife: 3373 Pepper Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89120
- Clark County Government Center: 500 Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89108
- City of Henderson: Henderson City Clerk: 240 S. Water Street, Henderson, NV 89015
- Laughlin Regional Government Center: 101 Civic Way, Laughlin, NV 89028
- Moapa Valley Community Center: 320 North Moapa Valley Road, Overton, NV 89040
- Mesquite City Hall: 10 East Mesquite Boulevard, Mesquite, NV 89027
- Boulder City: Boulder City Hall, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, NV 89005

ONLINE:

https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/advisory_board_to_manage_wildlife.php