



**Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway (Pueblo Room)
Las Vegas, NV 89155
June 21, 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=md3db09d9588bba939279f1cdad1_eba72

Join by meeting number:

Meeting number (access code): 2496 583 1102

Meeting password: nB87vuwXVe3

Tap to join from a mobile device (attendees only)

[+1-408-418-9388,,24965831102##](tel:+14084189388,24965831102) 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 [24965831102@clarkcountynv.webex.com](tel:24965831102@clarkcountynv.webex.com)

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

Join using Microsoft Lync or Microsoft Skype for Business

Dial [24904588970.clarkcountynv@lync.webex.com](tel:24904588970.clarkcountynv@lync.webex.com)

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 anytime.
- 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. June 21, 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 Members: Paul Dixon Chair
(Vacancy)**

Therese Campbell

Jacob Thompson

Dave Talaga

Brian Patterson

John Hiatt

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, Therese Campbell, John Hiatt, Brian Patterson, and Jacob Thompson).
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert term has expired. He stated that at this time a request will be made to put on the BCC calendar after posting expires for either re-appointment or for someone new to be appointed as a new board member in August 2022.
- A quorum was present.

II. Pledge of Allegiance-

- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*) to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.
- (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*) led 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.

- This time is for individuals who do not wish to stay for the entire meeting and would like to speak on matters that are not action items or if they wish to have their comment put on future agenda, they may discuss it now.
- Public Comments: (None)
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby closed.**

IV. Approval of the Minutes for May 3, 2022 CCABMW Meeting. (For possible action)

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member John Hiatt advised motion to approve the meeting minutes for May 3, 2022 as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

V. Approval of the Agenda for June 21, 2022. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted. (For possible action)

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he would like to add the following items: Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*) if she may proceed with the presentation (NDOW's Restoration and Rehabilitation Program) or it can be postponed to the CCABMW August 16, 2022 meeting.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She advised that she would like to defer this matter to the CCABMW's August 16, 2022 meeting and she did not have specific information on this subject matter at this time to properly present the presentation.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that board member Therese Campbell had sent out information to him as well on this item and she will give overall of the articles she submitted when the CAB comes upon this item for discussion.
- Board member Therese Campbell advised to Chair Paul Dixon that she simply emailed the information to him directly and did not email these articles to the other board members.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he would send all articles submitted from Therese Campbell to Secretary Darlene Kretunski to email to the other board members after tonight's meeting.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that in regards to the Recap of the May 6, 2022 Commission Virtual meeting, he advised that former Vice Chair Dan Gilbert attended this meeting and had taken notes but unfortunately Chair Paul Dixon had not received these notes prior to tonight's meeting. He advised that board member Dave Talaga attended the meeting and asked if he would give the update instead.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion of the approval of the agenda for June 21, 2022 as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

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 a 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 advised that he would go around to each board member to see if they had any announcements, correspondence, emails or anything they would like to discuss.
- Board member John Hiatt (Yes): He stated that he feels that higher level of government and the employees at this level are now concerned about the climate change, and drought in the HRB (Humboldt River Basin). He stated it is dry in Nevada and it is predicted by the weather service that drought is entirely within the state of Nevada. He stated precipitation supplies all the water that enters the basin, consequently the variability in climate has significant impacts on the hydrology of the area. He stated there is a 60% chance that it will be a dry winter. He stated the wildlife will be in dire straits for both plants and animals. He stated he wanted awareness due to the massive amounts of monies that will be needed to save these populations to stay alive.
- Board member Therese Campbell (Yes): She advised the articles that she submitted to Chair Paul Dixon were on the subject matter of vegetation and rehabilitation and advised she would forward these articles to the other CAB members. The articles are: Nevada Today “Nevada researchers studying herbicides in hopes of reducing wildlife fuels” University of Nevada Reno; <https://www.unr.edu/nevada-today/news/2021/sagebrush-restoration>
- Synopsis of the article: two researchers (Paul Meiman and Brad Schultz) from the University of Reno (Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources and Extension and Experiment Station units) are studying on two herbicides: Plateau and Rejuvra, that reduced cheatgrass and wanted to further their research to see how the herbicides would work on other plant species that grew with the cheatgrass (native bunchgrasses and forbs, wildflowers). Plateau is using the chemical imazapic and suppresses cheatgrass for 1 to 2 years, Rejuvra is newer and uses indaziflam which has been proven to suppress cheatgrass for multiple years in other Western states. This process done by these researchers to help land managers decide about the usage of these herbicides referring to costs and benefits of using them. The hopes of the researchers is to give these managers this tool to reduce cheatgrass thus allowance of both forbs and bunchgrasses to increase, but did not negatively affect sagebrush plants. The researchers wanted to ensure other parts of the plant community are not affected and if weather is right occur when cheatgrass or other annual grasses decline and to determine whether or not the herbicides have ability to reduce the amount of cheatgrass underneath sagebrush canopies. Cheatgrass invasion is one of the biggest challenges facing natural resource management and managers in the West, the researchers feel that even if its visible some of the unwanted effects from these herbicides may be outweighed by the opportunity to break the cycle of recurring fires that converted thousands upon thousands of acres of rangeland to plant communities that are dominated by cheatgrass. The goal of these researchers is to provide additional information to landowners and land managers about the available tools for the management of the cheatgrass. It is set to begin later this summer for a three year period collaborating with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, NDOW, and Bayer, the maker of Rejuvra. The area being used is provided by Nevada Gold Mines and is 20 to 40 acre test plots and also is being applied aerially. The application applied is either Rejuvra or Plateau or both to determine which works best on cheatgrass with little impact on native

plants. The plan is after applying first application then the tracking will begin over years. If its effective, it will be additional buffer for sites of cheatgrass has pushed out native plants. In these sites it still must maintain presence for seed for these populations of native plants to expand. Native plants are at risk of transitioning to primarily annual grasses will now have a 3 to 6 year timeframe to increase and outgrow the cheatgrass in order to determine vegetation change. Past research took place in the West, not in Nevada and in different environments, and with other chemicals, thus the researchers have expansion on this research to measure impact on ecosystem and climate in Nevada. The new research will: a) give important additional information to managers where the treatments can be best effective for cheatgrass, b) to encourage growth for communities of plants.

- Board Therese Campbell second article: Nevada Today “Off-season cattle grazing to help control fire danger from invasive cheatgrass” University of Nevada Reno; <https://www.unr.edu/nevada-today/news/2022/cheatgrass-fall-grazing>
- Synopsis of the article: Cheatgrass is invasive annual grass invading Nevada rangelands, causing wildlife dangers in Intermountain West. University of Nevada Reno researchers have found that reduction of fire can be done by targeting cattle grazing in dormant growing season making cattle want to graze in that area by attracting the cattle to stations containing protein feed supplements. This significantly reducing the standing fine-fuel biomass by more than 50%, while making room for native grasses to grow, by doing this research it builds and affirms other studies that show dormant season grazing helps control the dominance of cheatgrass. *Bromus tectorum* (non-native cheatgrass) is the most problematic invasive annual grasses, cheatgrass is ecological threats to ecosystems of the Intermountain West and continue to be invasive annual grasses as well, and it covers 11,000 square miles of the Great Basin and is ecologically dominant species on more than 20% of sagebrush steppe. Strategic supplementation provides tool to target cattle grazing at certain locations within the cheatgrass to reduce fine fuel buildup during the dormant season. It is difficult to get animals in one place during spring for long periods to be useful, but cattle during the fall can be together on cheatgrass using supplementation as a tool. By reduction of the amount of cheatgrass fuel carryover may effectively reduce amount of total fuel during the next year’s fire season. If several hundred pounds per acre of cheatgrass can be removed during the fall, through cattle grazing, that is several hundred pounds that will not be added to the upcoming fuel load.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that cheatgrass matures quickly and pulls surface nutrients from plants that are slower in growth impacting the ability of these plants to get water stunning their growth. He stated cheatgrass is invasive and causes fires later in the season and takes away nutrients. He stated just the same as quagga mussels are in Lake Mead, the cheatgrass is a part of the bio mass.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he will get (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) and (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) both these articles as well. He suggested this can be implemented into their presentation (NDOW’s Restoration and Rehabilitation Program) on the CAB’s meeting August 16, 2022.
- Brian Patterson: (No)
- Jacob Thompson: (Yes): He stated that he is doing a teacher event in Carson City, he is teaching a class for the state of Nevada. He advised one of the participant’s works for NDOW and this individual informed him of two great websites that will be helpful. He advised that these websites were developed by NDOW allowing one to do a search based on geographical, species, and if hunting indicates type of weapon that can be used for that hunt, and the odds for tag draws. These two websites are: 1) www.hunt.wildlifenv.com , it gives

options to Explore the map or buy license option. It also has FAQ's (Frequently Asked Questions) and Definitions and gives you a brief synopsis of data gathered and collected by the Nevada Department of Wildlife over the course of a hunt year. Next it had steps on tag application submittal, specialty hunting license resident/non-resident. The next website: 2) www.fish.wildlifenv.com , it is for fishing only, it gives options of Under Buy License, Explore Licenses, Vessel Registration, ALS Decal and Get Certified.

- Board member Jacob Thompson indicated that this is another method of good work performed by NDOW.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised he had dinner at Chair Paul Dixon's home and met with (*Russell Kuhlman, Executive Director of National Wildlife Federation*), they discussed status of wildlife in Nevada giving public clear perception of wildlife in Nevada, and coming up with methods to do so. He stated the discussion spoke on state of sages, which (*Russell Kuhlman, Executive Director of National Wildlife Federation*) advised that this is key to mule deer population as well as allowance of the mule deer for completion of their migration path and a indication of a long term plan for the mule deer. He stated he would like to have (*Russell Kuhlman, Executive Director of National Wildlife Federation*) come and speak at a CAB meeting about the plan.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated (*Russell Kuhlman, Executive Director of National Wildlife Federation*) will be coming to the CCABMW September 20th, 2022 meeting and do possibly a presentation.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby closed.**

VII. Recap of the May 6, 2022 Commission virtual meeting by Chair Paul Dixon: (Informational).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised there are few of the CAB's in other counties in favor of getting NDOW management to do their job and their responsibility with deer herds in Nevada. He advised that Washoe county CAB Chair did a presentation as well, and advised the hunters and ranchers have put together records of their observation and have full knowledge of what the herds are going through and have advised that NDOW management has not listened to them and felt there is a disconnect between many of the CAB's and that they disagree with NDOW's upper management handled their responsibilities. The CAB's were speaking about the number of tags being presented, stating the population of the herd is small, and the exact number seems to be unknown. He stated that (*Tony Wasley, NDOW Director*) stated that when the deer population estimates are done for the current year, NDOW goes back to the previous year and changes those estimates to match the current projection of the population. He stated that this was clearly an admission that the data used by NDOW's model had been indeed tampered with. He stated data from the previous year should not be changed after it was used to project future outcome. He advised that this is a telling admission of dictating his staff on what he wants them to do and how he approaches his duties and responsibilities as the director.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated some people also actually gave suggestions that if hunting of the deer herds would stop, then this would solve the issue of the mule deer population since the herds are small already, and they felt there is no reasoning to why all the large amount of tags are being put out. These individuals stated that they felt the reasoning for NDOW was simply for revenue and not for the protection of the wildlife. He advised the number of deer tags allotted this year has not changed that much from when the mule deer population was at its peak. He stated why is NDOW is continuing to put out tags when they

have complete knowledge that the herd is small, and that these individuals felt that NDOW does not really know the baseline count of all the herds, it is a guesstimate. He stated in some areas there is no count being done. He stated there was even a suggestion of an audit for the finding of NDOW and he was not privy to if that meant all of the funding or just predator funding. He felt it was a unified front calling out on upper management of NDOW on the deer management herds. He stated the CAB levels in the counties were not happy with the manner that NDOW mainly referring to upper management is doing their job performance.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there has already been discussions about The Big Game Season and quotas due to marketable decline in the tags in some areas and in others there were equal or no change in the tag amount. He stated this is problematic due to fly overs in areas such as Area 10, which is wilderness and there may be some deer in this area but hunter's access to those locations does not exist. He stated Area 10 Ruby Mountains in hunting in this particular area, everyone is aware that hunting in the Ruby Mountains is not possible and very limited to many unknown paths.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated there is no confirmation with these fly over herd counts to confirm these totals and no co-witnesses. He stated NDOW will fly over a given area one day and then perform a count, the next day they perform the same count but he feels it can't be accurate because herds can simply migrate to a new area and get counted into the new area as well. He stated there is no justification to state that the numbers obtained during these fly overs is indeed accurate and this bad data is used to be input into the models.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that NDOW went to modeling of herds rather than demand success, and did not have to fly the entire state of Nevada and each unit is broken into polygons and each unit has certain shapes, each year NDOW flies a different polygon in that unit and uses these polygons statistics to drive and receive a number. He stated this is done a lot for population estimates of herds in the West to receive herd numbers. He stated that Utah is at a quarter of a million deer and the state of Nevada is at 70,000 deer. He gave example: Area 261 Clark County into 6 polygons and in this area they do strictly bird population looking at demand and success but they have never flown Southern Nevada.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She stated it is particularly difficult to survey mule deer herd in the Southern region due to being so distributed. She stated that these fly overs could take 8 hours and in this timeframe you could possibly only view a few animals. She stated that NDOW does fly overs for Bighorn sheep and while doing so will attempt to do classification of other species if possible to do so. She stated the process is long and expensive due to increase in fuel now. She reiterated the difficultness to do a fly over when species of animals are distributed.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked that (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) could come back, possibly in the next two meetings to give brief synopsis of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners Mule Deer Enhancement Oversight Committee and the progress being made with this program with Clark County and the rest of the state. He stated that NDOW needs to use the information given from the public from asking the public questions, and the concerns given from the public stance and prioritize and use to address what the needs of the public are regarding the mule deer program and roll this information into NDOW's programs and put it to use.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She stated each county has their own subcommittee and stated she is the head of the Clark County Mule Deer Committee and had her first meeting for this committee incorporating the public and different organizations including NDOW to hear perspectives felt about NDOW management and input in improving NDOW's management using (surveys, citizens, and science) to better

handle the mule deer population.

- Board member Jacob Thompson asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) 1) Are there any documented practices for mule deer surveys? 2) Is the practice that NDOW is currently using the best?
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*): She advised that the Staff Specialist of the mule deer is located in Reno and will visit when needed. She stated that NDOW incorporates methods of geography and habitat, distribution and general population thus giving NDOW the ability to incorporate the best science available. She stated there are other methods available as well, but the best method is aerial survey due to species population distribution and it helps cover the most area as opposed to field surveys or observing from the ground, these methods would not be as effective or timely and financially worth it. She advised NDOW feels this is the best management but will always look for improvement.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) the question if NDOW has looked into FLIR (Forward Looking Infrared) thermal imaging for improvement of the count stats for mule deer, he stated where there is Pinyon Juniper and other plants, making it difficult to properly count species in these areas.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She advised she is unable to answer this question and stated this would be beyond her pay grade, she is unaware if there are any plants that implement the ability to cause visual difficulties.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked board member Dave Talaga that Nevada has state counts and these counts are based on modeling and other data of official amount of mule deer in the state, and that you advised there are individuals that believe the mule deer stats are lower than indicated, what are the numbers that the individuals who believe the numbers are lower basing their numbers from.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised the CAB Chair of Washoe County (*Matt Melarkey*) felt the same on this question as well. He stated these individuals see the mule deer and advise NDOW, but NDOW feels this information is not valid and sticks to their own management approach to obtaining the data. He stated he felt that the ranchers and hunters who are also CAB members were not happy about NDOW management and ignoring their input, they advised NDOW that they are working in the fields daily and see evidence daily and NDOW will not accept their input for the models.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated he does not believe that fly overs are acceptable data collection for determination of accurate count for mule deer. He stated in Nevada when species are stressed and due to this stress move from one area to the next, it is difficult to receive a accurate count. He stated other methodology should be implemented by NDOW, to achieve accurate counts. He stated he felt the most accurate method is the information gathered by ranchers and hunters and individuals who spend time in the wilderness and use their information to co-witnesses the fly overs. He advised this was his take away from the Commission meeting. He stated these individuals (hunters, ranchers and people of the wilderness) are stating NDOW's science is insufficient hence they feel NDOW should talk directly to them to obtain input.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that former Vice Chair John Michael Reese has a ranch with alfalfa which invites mule deer to eat it. He stated Mr. Reese felt he was eyes and ears on the ground and great input for NDOW. He stated Mr. Reese presented NDOW with a presentation of the collaring concept and it was rejected by NDOW, now there is funding which lead to Mule Deer Committees in each counties, and now these committees are currently using the collaring concept to gather migration information. The Nevada Wildlife Coalition is doing

great strides in migration routes (highway, urbanization, mining) these and other aspects are effecting migration routes, the mule deer survived by migrating from winter to summer ranges. The mule deer migration is impacted by drought or other conditions which cause animals to be taken from a place that they could originally survive thus creating dire situations.

- Chair Paul Dixon suggested to (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) to discuss from her colleagues in the other counties the action taken by the counties such as Lincoln, Elko, White Pines or other areas where they hunt but areas such as Pershing, Washoe, he stated unless one lives in those areas they do not hunt, one might obtain a tag in areas such as Esmeralda County or in that direction. He stated prominently hunters hunt in Lincoln, Elko, White Pines and some in Nye.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised there was a discussion on Predation Management but it was approved as is with no changes and the remainder of the meeting was on policies, some of which will be presented in tonight's meeting.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked board member Dave Talaga and (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) that some CAB members of different counties expressed disappointment of NDOW's upper management not receiving their input for the models and asked the question; did they feel the deer count was less or more and what did these individuals want to be different.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised his perception is the belief that there are less deer than NDOW has stated in their stats, being estimated with numbers of 50,000 but the official number given is 68,000, there is no certainty. He stated some believed hunting should stop due to the amount of deer and some of the hunters like to trophy hunt and in the end the census is fewer deer then reported.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) if the mule deer committee is using focus groups for Clark County to give input.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She stated it is the Mule Deer Enhancement Program with subcommittees for each county or county group. She advised the Clark County mule deer program has a meeting approaching and we are asking anyone from the public who would like to be involved to do so by attending the meetings. She stated she just gave a presentation in regards to the survey methods used by NDOW and the health of the mule deer. In the Mule Deer Enhancement Committee, the next meeting is in Clark County, discussing about limiting factors of the mule deer and project proposals individuals are submitting for better survey methods and knowledge of the mule deer herds in Clark County.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) exactly what method are the Mule Deer Enhancement Committee using to solicit these individuals for their input, and asked was this on NDOW's website as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he has sent all of the CAB members the meeting information on the Mule Deer Enhancement Program's next meeting on June 30, 2022, and stated NDOW has this information on their website under Commission Advisory Board listed under meeting dates. He stated he sent this information to all the NGO's to make a determination if they want to participate as well.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski will list the Mule Deer Enhancement Program information and updates on the Environmental and Sustainability, Division of Air Quality website under Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife, the website is: clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/mule_deer_enhancement_oversight_committee.php

- Board member Therese Campbell asked (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) how do individuals go about participating.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She stated individuals just need to show up, and advised she will attempt possible zoom link as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that with the CCABMW having the meeting using both methods (WebEx & In Person Meeting) has been a challenge to do but he stated he feels it is necessary. He gave example: 6 members of the public and two board members are online and the remaining members of the public are here in person along with the remainder of the board members, this reflects that both methods are necessary. He stated that Clark County and Nye County are larger counties therefore both these methods are necessary. He stated when he first started as the Chair, he would hold the CCABMW meetings in many different counties in an attempt to have many people from other counties join but it had to stop due to individuals in Clark County having trouble getting to all the locations that were far away and trying to participate, and inevitably making meetings in Clark County was because this is where the majority of the population meet and having WebEx has taking the place of him having to travel to all those counties, gives all individuals wherever they are or in any county an opportunity to join. He reiterated to (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) that she should use virtual as well as in person for the public is definitely the answer.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue*): He asked the question of what time is the meeting for the Clark County Mule Deer Enhancement Committee.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the meeting is at 5:30 pm.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby closed.**

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

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this presentation is moved to the CCABMW meeting on August 16, 2022.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he will send the articles submitted by board member Therese Campbell to Secretary Darlene Kretunski, and she will work on getting this too the Environment and Sustainability, Division of Air Quality to view as well, the website is: **clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/mule_deer_enhancement_oversight_committee.php**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this will give the board and the public opportunity to have a healthy discussion.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this item is hereby closed, and delayed till the CCABMW's August 16, 2022 meeting.**

IX. General Business/Action Items: Discuss and make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners May 6th and 7th, 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/.

- a. Biennial Upland Game Release for Fiscal Years 2022 and 2023 (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the Department's proposed biennial upland game release plan for fiscal years 2022 and 2023.
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised it was approved with amendment to Columbian Sharptail Grouse to be released in Bull Run Basin in Elko County and notified Elko County CAB of the augmentation and habitat evaluation and raven removal has been done in this area during the rooting season thus increasing survival rates.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised that augmentation may not be good at this time due to dryness and long term drought hence causing new birds the challenge to get along and be successful due to habitat.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked if the entire state of Nevada is under drought or is it just the southern half of the state.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised the drought presently goes through the center part of the state through the middle portion of the state, which is under extreme drought, the rest of the state has a lower category of drought.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated it is monsoon season west of Nye and this area is receiving rainstorms.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised it is not monsoon moisture coming from the Pacific.
 - Chair Paul Dixon reiterated no it is coming from the south monsoon.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated it is going east into Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, with a big atmospheric river coming across the Northern tier of the state and this is what wiped out Yellowstone coming from west. He stated he believes we have not seen this in Nevada.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated that plans are made in advance for this but sometimes atmospheric rivers and habitat change even though planned years ago may not be the right time.
 - Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbett*): He asked are they talking about this year.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated yes the plan releases in 2022.
 - Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbett*): He stated then they already had the birds on board, or are the birds are coming in.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated they have the birds coming in from northwestern Colorado near Craig, Colorado. He stated they are shipping the birds and when the order request is approved, the order request is put in place with Colorado and they will capture and send the birds. He stated he assumes this will be done in late summer or early fall augmentation.
 - Board member Brian Patterson asked Chair Paul Dixon is it one augmentation, or do we know the number of birds.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated correct, it is just one augmentation and the number of birds is unknown. He stated when looking at past augmentations, there were generally 25 to 30 birds and it depends on how many birds Colorado captures. He stated they do not want to state a number and Colorado is unable to produce the number stated. He advised his guesstimate is for the amount of between 15 and 30.
- Board member Jacob Thompson he reiterated when they receive reports from NDOW, it would be helpful if the reports were the numerical range for the releases, and he realizes it cannot be exact, he just wants the best estimates. He stated he understands it is based on many factors, not just the amount of catches done by Colorado or the survival of shipment, this is dangerous for the animals and high risk. He stated having numbers would be very helpful to establish the types of resources being dedicated to the exact number of animals. He stated it is needed going forward in future reports.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that Clark County supports the Biennial Upland Game Release for Fiscal Years 2022 and 2023 as presented with the following recommendations: 1) The CCABMW would like to ask NDOW if this is the best environment to be transplanting Sharptail Grouse under a drought. 2) The CCABMW would like to view the numerical range of the number of birds to be transplanted in an area on these requests for the CCABMW to have clear understanding of magnitude of resources that will be necessary.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

b. Commission Regulation 22-12, 2022-2023 Upland Game and Furbearer Seasons and Bag Limits (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to amend regulations for upland game birds and mammals as well as furbearers for the 2022-2023 season. The regulation may also include modifications to the fall wild turkey seasons for 2022 and spring wild turkey seasons for 2023.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated changes include the new season extended for the normal 9 day period (*October 1, 2022 to October 9, 2022*) with election to recommend a reduction in the Gambel's Quail limit from a daily limit of 10 and possession limit of 30, down to daily limit of 5 and a possession limit of 15. These limits are also reflected in the normal general season as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Youth Rabbit Season's*) will remain the same with the daily bag limit and possession limit are recommended for reduction from daily limit of 10 and possession limit of 30, to a daily limit of 5 and a possession limit of 15. (*This is due to the downward trend and low density of all species of rabbits*) He stated there was also a recommendation to close all Pygmy rabbit season.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Sage-Grouse*) he stated the recommendation was for a 9 day season in these certain hunt units in Elko County (062, 067, 071, 072, 073, and 074) with a daily limit of 2 and possession limit of 2.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there is recommendation of a two day season for hunt units 161, 162 in central Nevada, and hunt units 012 and 013 in western Nevada and hunt units 031 and 051 in north central Nevada with a daily and possession limit of 2 sage-grouse, these units, or groups of units, have Sage-Grouse populations estimated to exceed 1,000 birds and the harvest was estimated to be 5% or less of the estimated fall

population. No special Sage-Grouse Season is being recommended for the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge. He stated these recommended changes represent closure of 18 hunt units compared to those that were open last season, including the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge (hunt unit 033).

- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Dusky, Sooty, and Ruffled Grouse*) that there were no major changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Snowcock*) there were no major changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Chukar and Hungarian Partridge*) it is recommended (*October 15, 2022 –February 5, 2023 pre-season*); Recommended (*October 14, 2023 – February 4, 2024 season*); Daily limit of 6 with a possession limit of 18.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*California Quail*) there were no major changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Gambel's Quail*) recommended reducing the daily limit to 5 quail and possession limit to 15 (This is due to extensive drought conditions in the Mojave Desert ecoregion and low population numbers).
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Mountain Quail*) there were no major changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Pheasant*) there were no major changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*White-tailed Jackrabbits and Cottontail Rabbits*) recommended a reduction in the daily and possession limits from the daily limit of 10 rabbit per day and a possession limit of 30, down to a daily limit of 5 and a possession limit of 15 (This is due to declining trend in rabbit numbers and low densities observed during survey routes). It is also recommended to close all pygmy rabbit seasons due to amount of habitat loss over the past two decades, declining trends and densities observed during recent and ongoing research efforts being conducted by the University of Nevada, Reno and the confirmed presence of Rabbit Hemorrhagic Disease Type 2.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Junior Wild Turkey 2023 & 2024 Spring Hunt 0138*) some modifications to tag numbers are being recommended.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the following are tags for Junior Wild Turkey 2023 & 2024 Spring Hunt 0138: Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area (3 Tags); Moapa Valley of Clark County (3 Tags); Hunt Units 102, 103 & 065 within Elko County (3 Tags); Hunt Unit 115 within White Pine County (1 Tag); Pershing County (2 Tags); Unit 152 of Lander County (2 Tags); Unit 154 of Lander County (1 Tag); Lincoln County (5 Tags).
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Wild Turkey Spring Limited Entry- Hunts 0131 & 0132*) that some modifications to tag numbers are being recommended, there is a recommendation to close the Lyon County Private Lands Spring Turkey hunt down due to low turkey populations and turkeys being potentially baited onto private lands adjacent to the Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area during the spring season.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the following: Wild Turkey Spring Limited Entry-Hunts 0131 & 0132) He stated Elko County Unit 101 Resident Hunt 0131 (5 Tags); Elko County Units 102 & 065 Resident Hunt 0131 & Nonresident Hunt 0132 (1 Tag); Lander County Units 151 & 152 Resident Hunt 0131 (3 Tags); Lander County Unit 154 Resident Hunt 0131 (4 Tags); Lincoln County Resident Hunt 0131 (15 Tags) & Nonresident Hunt 0132 (1 Tag); Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area Only of Unit 203 Resident Hunt 0131 (3 Tags) & Nonresident Hunt 0132 (1 Tag); Moapa Valley Portion of Clark County Resident Hunt 0131(4 Tags) & Nonresident Hunt 0132 (1 Tag); Pershing County Resident Hunt 0131 (10 Tags) & Nonresident Hunt 0132 (1 Tag); White Pine County Unit 115 Resident Hunt 0131 (4 Tags).

- Board member Jacob Thompson asked if it is known whether it is current or semi-current *about the turkey populations* in these units or across the state or any trend data.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised there is no specific data but he stated counts that are in effect are based on spring count not the fall count. He stated in Lincoln County and Moapa Valley there are physical counts done and had ability to show population is stable and growing. He stated the population in Moapa Valley was declining before due to predators such as: *raccoons, possums, and other small predators* eating the turkey eggs or turkey heads from the nest. Once a program was put together to remove these predators from these areas the population has grown again. He stated it was realized, that there was a predator problem due to hunters not seeing any hens which is not normal, the program was started in 2011 in Overton, Moapa Valley area for five years to see success of growth in these areas.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Falconry Seasons*) there are no major changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed (*Furbearer Seasons*) recommending changes to bobcat sealing dates, this change would allow an individual to have a single bobcat per year for taxidermy or tanning purposes to be sealed at any of the NDOW Regional Offices (*Elko, Las Vegas, Reno*). The dates that the regional office sealing are from the Season Opener until the first regularly scheduled sealing date (mid-January).
- Board member Therese Campbell asked the question of what is a sealing date.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist Southern Region*) stated the seals are just metal tags that are applied to hide of a bobcat harvested to match hunting license or hunter. She stated this is to make certain that any pelts, parts, or taxidermy of animals are legally taken. She stated the sealing dates are simply timeframe you are allotted to check in the animal that you have harvested.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked if any person harvests a bobcat, then they automatically have to check in to NDOW to put the seal on the bobcat.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist Southern Region*) stated yes, NDOW does a check on the sex of animal, and age it by taking the tooth of the animals to receive accurate age of the animal. She stated depending on what condition it is received and whether it is just the hide or anything to give NDOW a clear view of the population dynamics that are in place for the animal as to what is being harvested versus even roadkill or incidental take, NDOW needs to know.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked the board about the recommending changes to the sealing date, if it recommended for the timeframe to be longer or shorter.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this will give the ability for someone to harvest and take to NDOW office to receive the seal prior to the normal ceiling dates.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated even if it is 1 cat or 50 cats, you have to do it all at the same time.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that if you do it pre-season to the ceiling date then you can go to the NDOW offices indicated thereafter, it goes by the ceiling dates put in place.
- Board member John Hiatt asked if the NDOW office in Ely is closed.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Ely location is still open.
- Board member John Hiatt asked the question if someone did not have ability to go to office close to them, giving example: if someone lives in Ely than they have to drive to Las Vegas office.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated this is for those individuals who will harvest pre-season, these individuals will have to receive the seal at the three listed locations only (*Elko, Las*

Vegas, Reno) these are the only NDOW locations you can go to pre-season, thereafter when the regular season approaches you can go to the other locations.

- Board member John Hiatt stated it was bizarre.
- Per Chair Paul Dixon's statement in reference of having the ability to take pelt pre-season: **FYI- Taxidermy Pelt Sealing- From the opening day of the bobcat season (Second Saturday in November) until the first regularly scheduled bobcat sealing date in January, any person who wishes to have a single bobcat (1 person per season) sealed for the purpose of tanning or taxidermy may personally present the lawfully taken pelt to any NDOW regional office (Elko, Las Vegas, Reno) and request to have the Departments seal affixed to the pelt, All requirements of NAC 502.347 apply.**
- Chair Paul Dixon discussed bobcat tooth data which helps tell sex, age and there is bobcat ratio for the adult females to adult males given, and the length of season was based upon how many adult kittens there were and how many were harvested. He stated when you harvest a lot of kittens and not adults or harvesting males over females this is what is used for data. He stated bobcats cannot be counted physically therefore they are using guesstimate statistics linking it too knowledge of the populations and as rabbits and small rodents population increase so does the bobcat population and as the small rodents and rabbits population decreases as it is presently, so does the bobcat population. He stated when looking at bobcat seasons, red fox seasons, these seasons are shorten based on kitten rates, and for the red fox otter and beaver, these seasons are shorten over a month due to decrease in population. He gave example that the stats reflect short, medium, long season, previously they were in a long season now we have returned to a medium season for bobcat due to drought and pray animals decrease.
- FYI: *Beaver Mink, and Muskrat: Season Dates: October 1 – April 30; Otter: Season Dates October 1 – March 31; Kit and Red Fox: Season Dates October 1 – Last Day of February; Bobcat: Season Dates Second Saturday in November – Third Sunday in February; Gray Fox Season: Season Dates: Second Saturday in November – Third Sunday in February.*
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich*): She stated her question is from the general public on a question that continues to arise a lot and there is need for clarification, she stated she understood that a citizen cannot remove anything from public land, but trappers can remove wildlife as long as they carry a trapping license, is this correct.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised yes that is correct you have to have a trapper's license, he asked when she was stating citizens cannot move anything from public land, and he wanted to know what "anything" meant.
- Public Comment: (*Annoula Wylderich*): She advised she meant natural resources.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised with natural resources individuals apply for mining permits for mining claims to do mineral collecting, he stated we do have shed collecting for animals in the state of Nevada, (*shed collecting- finding antlers that have been naturally shed by any antler-bearing mammal such as elk and deer*) as well.
- Board member John Hiatt stated rocks and minerals generally they can collect only certain amount of pounds per day.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there are certain areas an individual cannot collect at such as Red Rock.
- Board member John Hiatt stated at BLM land you can collect, he stated I think possibly 20-25 pounds per day of rocks and minerals per person.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised there are restrictions, if one would like to collect more than that amount or stake a certain area then the individual will need to obtain a mining claim. He stated there are certain rules and regulation and that if individuals suspect wrong doing then NDOW does go out and investigate on these matters, and some trappers have been found to not follow regulations. He stated a trap check is 96 hours. He stated this amount of time seems long but trappers are utilizing this amount of time putting out few hundreds of traps in many areas which results in lots of driving time, most trappers 98% or more are following regulations but for the trappers who are not they will be in trouble and get caught and are often turned in by their fellow trappers who do not want to see their rights infringed upon by these hunters that are not following regulations.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich*): She asked Chair Paul Dixon if there was any possibility of negotiations on the trap check time of 96 hours, she stated that other states have indeed reduced their trap check time.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there have been discussions over the last five years but there is a certain time when this discussion comes up but it is not the time yet but it has been a discussion for the last 15 years and the result are, it has never been shorten in the state of Nevada. He advised the legislator has never wanted to push any legislation to shorten the time, this pertains to both democratic and republican in office at the time, the results were the same, no shorten of time for the trap check.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Buris*): He stated he felt Chair Paul Dixon is correct, and there is a predation predator program in effect at Moapa Valley for a while which is increasing the habitat for wild turkey and waterfowl. He stated NDOW is often at times missing the mark by not allowing organizations to come in and do their jobs. He advised as a president of a NGO, there is often conflict to do projects that will help increase the wildlife populations. He stated NDOW continues to give push back on predator management programs and the ability for WMA (Wildlife Management Areas) managers to do their own predator management by lethal means. He feels the quotas are being cut and the new standard by NDOW management which changes yearly is drought and drought again and more drought that is the answer. He feels NDOW could work closer with the NGO's and stated there is money available to be spent and there are groups are arriving all the time looking to spend money. He gave examples: He advised that his NGO just spent \$3,000-\$4,000 dollars on webcams to do some bird surveys. He feels NDOW has a fight every step of the way, therefore to make things easier for everyone, just do their jobs. He stated anytime there is a limitation on a take then there is always reasoning behind these decisions and part of the reasoning is having a group of individuals who are willing to do a job but they are not allowed to do so by NDOW. He stated he understands the regulations but does not agree with the regulation when it states limiting and hunting turkey's on private land section, and we need to begin to close down areas for private land for deer hunting and there is a need to obtain more help from law enforcement and to find long term solutions to fix the population. He stated he feels that NDOW continues to state that they have money to spend but this money is not for us to spend.
- Chair Paul Dixon advises a motion to approve Commission Regulation 22-12, 2022-2023 Upland Game and Furbearer Seasons and Bag Limits as presented.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**
- (The regulation asked by Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich*) about citizens

removing items from public land : **FYI:** regulation for this subject matter is (NRS 321.5973)

- (This section is in reference of Chair Paul Dixon and board John Hiatt discussing about obtaining mining permits and the regulations: **FYI:** *The only item that has limits on the amount one can collect for personal usage is petrified wood of which you can only collect 25 pounds plus one piece per day not to exceed 250 pounds per year.*
- **FYI-** (<https://minerals.nv.gov>) **What can you collect:** *Gemstones and common rock specimens may be collected for private/personal use and will not be utilized for commercial purposes or bartered to commercial dealers (Commercial production of common rocks on an unclaimed site requires a permit. Also, common invertebrate fossils such as plants, mollusks and trilobites, in reasonable quantities and they may not be bartered or sold. Petrified Wood 25lbs + 1 piece not to exceed 250 pounds/calendar year (may not be collected for commercial purposes, bartered or sold).*
- **FYI- What you cannot collect:** *Saleable minerals, such as sand, gravel, cinders, topsoil and other common varieties of minerals (they must be purchased by prior arrangement with the BLM). Vertebrate fossils such as dinosaurs, mammals, fishes and reptiles and uncommon invertebrate fossils. Cave resources including plant, animal and geologic features.*
- **FYI- Code of Federal Regulations Title 43 8365.1-5 Property and Resources:** *(a) on all public lands, unless otherwise authorized, no person shall: (1) willfully deface, disturb, remove or destroy any personal property, or structures, or any scientific, cultural, archaeological or historic resource, natural object or area. (2) Willfully deface, remove or destroy plants or their parts, soil, rocks or minerals, or cave resources, except as permitted under paragraph (b) or (c) of this paragraph; or (3) Use on the public lands explosive, motorized or mechanical devices, except metal detectors to aid in the collection of specimens permitted under paragraph (b) or (c) of this paragraph. (b) except on developed recreation sites and areas, or where otherwise prohibited and posted, it is permissible to collect from the public lands reasonable amounts of the following for noncommercial purposes: (1) Commonly available renewable resources such as flowers, berries, nuts, seeds, cones and leaves: (2) Nonrenewable resources such as rock and mineral specimens, common invertebrate and common plant fossils, and semiprecious gemstones. (3) Petrified wood as provided under subpart 3622 of this title. (4) Mineral materials as provided under subpart 3604; and (5) Forest products for use in campfires on the public lands. Other collection of forest product shall be in accordance with the provisions of Group 5500 of this title. (c) The collection of renewable or nonrenewable resources from the public land for sale or barter to commercial dealers may be done only after obtaining a contract or permit from an authorized officer in accordance with part 3600 or 5400 of this chapter.*
- **FYI- You can collect in:** **BLM Lands-without valid mining claims; *USFS lands-without mining claims; Department of Defense Lands-unless posted otherwise; *Department of Energy- unless posted otherwise; *ACEC-unless posted otherwise; *US Fish & Wildlife Lands- unless posted otherwise, most are closed; *Bureau of Reclamation Lands unless posted otherwise; *Wilderness & Wilderness Study Areas-unless posted otherwise; *National Conservation Areas-unless posted otherwise.*
- **FYI- You cannot collect in:** *Private Lands-unless you have permission; National or State Parks; State Lands-technically private, contact state lands ; Within boundary of*

*valid mining claims; Developed recreation sites and areas; Department of Defense-if posted no trespassing; Indian Reservations without permission from tribal authorities; Department of Energy Lands- if posted no trespassing; ACEC- If posted no trespassing or no collecting; US Fish & Wildlife Lands- no collecting; Bureau of Reclamation Lands- If posted no collecting; Wilderness & Wilderness Study Areas; - if posted no collecting; National Conservation Areas- if posted no collecting; National Monuments; National Historic Sites; National Wildlife Refuges; **DO NOT TRESPASS- If in doubt call the proper land management agency OR consult with a landmen.*

- **FYI- Definitions:** **Leasable-** minerals that have been removed from acquisition by “location” under the 1872 mining law (oil, gas, oil shale, coal, geothermal resources, potash, sodium, native asphalt, semisolid bitumen, bituminous rock, phosphate, chlorides, sulfates, certain carbonates, borates, silicates, or nitrates of potassium or sodium and related products and Sulphur); **Saleable-** common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumice, cinders and clay that do not possess any specific property giving them a distinct or special value (excluding block pumice, limestone, limestone suitable as a soil additive and gypsum); **Locatable or Hard Rock Minerals-** includes metallic (gold, silver, cinnabar, lead, copper, tin, zinc, nickel uranium, etc.) nonmetallic minerals (fluorspar, mica, certain limestones and gypsum, tantalum, heavy minerals in placer form, and gemstones along with certain uncommon varieties).
- **FYI- Types of claims- *Unpatented Mining Claim-** a claim located on land owned by the federal government. The owner of a valid mining claim or mill site has the exclusive right to use and possess the property for **mining purposes** and to develop and sell the mining products from the same free of any royalty to the federal government as long as: 1. The land was open to location; 2. The location is properly made; 3. A discovery of a valuable mineral deposit is made. 4. The claim is properly maintained through annual filings and/or payments. ***Patented Mining Claim-** a mining claim that has been conveyed to private ownership, it is now private property. ***Lode Claim-** located on lands where the minerals are contained in “veins or lodes of quartz or other rock in place”, in general it means that the deposit being located using a lode claim has to be a mineralized zone held in place by adjoining rock, (*Within 90 days of posting the Notice of Location, file your claim maps and certificates of location with the County Recorder, two copies of claim Map: scale of not less than 500’ to the inch and indicating location of all monuments, description of Township and Range, plus if on surveyed lands, the Section and Quarter Section. Otherwise, course and distance to a readily identifiable artificial landmark customarily shown on a map, size of each sheet must be 8.5” X 14” (legal size) or 24” x 36”). Duplicate Certificates of Location, filed with maps, must contain: name of the lode or vein, name of locator and locator’s mailing address, the date of location, the number of linear feet claimed along length and width from point of discovery and general direction of the lode or vein, the location and description of each corner and how marked, a statement “that the work of location consisted of making the maps as provided in NRS 517.040”. Erect a monument at the “point of discovery” (Today, it’s more likely to be a point of convenience, like midway along the end line and set inside 10-20); Post in or upon the monument a Notice of Location which must contain: Claim Name, Name of locator and locator’s mailing address, Date of location Notice of Lode (NOL) very important, as this starts the clock, the number of linear feet claimed along the length and width from the point of discovery and the general direction of the lode or vein; Within 60 days of*

posting the NOL the boundaries of the claim must be defined by placing valid legal monument at each corner of the claim; Within 90 days of posting the NOL file your claim maps and certificates of location with the BLM and the county recorder along with all fees required by both. ***Placer Claims-** located on “all forms of deposits, excepting veins of quartz or other rock in place, or any deposit that does not qualify as a lode, (Within 90 days of posting the Notice of Location, file your claim maps and certificates of location with the County Recorder, two copies of claim Map: scale of not less than 500’ to the inch and indicating location of all monuments, description of Township and Range, plus if on surveyed lands, the Section and Quarter Section. Otherwise, course and distance to a readily identifiable artificial landmark customarily shown on a map, size of each sheet must be 8.5” x 14” (legal size) or 24” x 36”). Duplicate Certificates of Location, filed with maps, must contain: name of the claim designating it as a placer claim, name of locator(s) and mailing address(es) of locator(s), the date of location, and the number of feet or acres claimed. Erect a at any point along the north boundary of the claim; Post in or upon the monument a Notice of Location which must contain: Claim Name, Name of locator and locator’s mailing address, Date of location NOL (very important, as this starts the clock), The number of feet or acres claimed; If on surveyed land the claim may be taken by legal subdivision and no corner monuments are required; If on surveyed land, within 60 days of posting the NOL the boundaries of the claim must be defined by placing valid legal monument at each corner of the claim; Within 90 days of posting the NOL file your claim maps and certificates of location with the BLM and the county recorder along with all fees required by both. ***Mill Sites-** non-mineral in character and are used for activities related to mining or processing minerals. ***Tunnel Sites-** generally only of historic interest, were used for driving a tunnel for exploring lode deposits.

- **FYI- What If’s-** If you can’t sink a post because of the ground conditions, it may be placed in a mound of earth or stones. If the proper placing of a monument is impracticable or dangerous to life or limb the monument may be placed at the nearest point properly marked to designate its right place.
- **FYI- Plastic/PVC Posts Are Not Valid Monuments:** Found to cause significant number of birds, reptile and insect deaths. 2011 legislation outlawed use of plastic pipe for monuments and required re-monumentation. To limit future deaths, plastic pipe may be removed and laid down.
- **FYI- Forms & Fees-** Forms required can be found on our website at: <https://minerals.nv.gov/Programs/Mining/MiningClaims/> (located toward the bottom of the page) **BLM fees** and forms must be turned into or mailed to the Nevada State BLM office or submitted through the BLM’s Mineral & Land Records System (MLRS) website: ***MLRS:** <https://www.blm.gov/services/land-records/mlrs> ***US Land Management Bureau** 1340 Financial Blvd, Reno, NV 89502 (775) 861-6400; ***County forms and fees** must be turned into the county in which the claim is located, fees vary by county more information can be obtained by contacting the county recorder. ***For more information on staking claims please refer to our website for presentations given by the BLM on this topic, mining claim filing requirements in Nevada, and the Mining Claim Procedures for Nevada Prospectors and Miners SP006. *Land Research-** (what you will need): 1. a map with the Public Land Survey System (PLSS). <https://data-ndom.opendata.arcgis.com/pages/mining-claims> 2. The location of the area of interest.

- c. **Commission Regulation 22-05, Amendment #1, 2023 Heritage Tag Vendors** (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the Wildlife Heritage Committee’s recommendations regarding Heritage Tag Vendor Proposals for 2023 and may take action on the proposals.
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised this is the recommended vendors.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised the following tags: ***Mule Deer (2) TAGS total** to the following: WHIN (Wildlife Habitat Improvement of Nevada & Mule Deer Foundation); ***Pronghorn Antelope: (2) TAGS total** to the following: Pershing County Chukars Unlimited & Wild Sheep Foundation & Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn ***Rocky Mountain Elk (2) TAGS total** to the following: Meadow Valley Wildlife Unlimited & Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU)-Elko ***Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Heritage Tag (2) TAGS total** to the following: Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU) Reno & Wild Sheep Foundation & Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn ***California Bighorn Sheep Heritage Tag (1) TAG total** to the following: Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU) –Reno ***Wild Turkey (5) TAGS total** to the following: Las Vegas Woods & Waters & WHIN (Wildlife & Habit Improvement of Nevada & Meadow Valley Wildlife Unlimited & Pershing County Chukars Unlimited &(SFI) Safari Club International Las Vegas
 - Public Comments: (None)
 - Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve Commission Regulation 22-05, Amendment #1, 2023 Heritage Tag Vendors as presented.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
 - **Motion passes 6-0.**
- d. **Fiscal Year 2023 Heritage Project Proposals** (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about approving up to \$1,513,377.69 for projects submitted for FY 2023 funding from the committee are listed below and may be approved by the Commission.
- **Wildfire- Related Restoration and Seed Purchase (\$150, 000)**
 - **Butler Basin Meadow and Spring Habitat Improvement Project (\$150,000)**
 - **2022-2023 Bighorn Sheep Test and Remove and Monitoring (\$148,500)**
 - **Pole Canyon Conservation Easement (\$100,000)**
 - **2022-2023 Murdock Mountain Mule Deer Winter Habitat Enhancement Project (\$100,000)**
 - **Schell Egan Land Acquisition (\$250,000)**
 - **Nevada Spring Protection Project (\$50,000)**
 - **Warmwater Sportfish Stocking for Large Reservoir Drought Recovery and Urban Fishing Opportunity (\$125,168)**
 - **Morey Bench Mule Deer Crucial Winter Habitat Enhancement (\$40,000)**
 - **Bullwhack Habitat Restoration (\$75,000)**
 - **Corta Fire Habitat Improvement (\$40,000)**
 - **Flint Spring Habitat Restoration (\$40,000)**

- **Toner Spring Habitat Restoration (\$75,000)**

Heritage Proposals Submitted by Others

- **Survey and Maintenance of existing big game guzzlers (\$40,000)**
- **Duck Creek Aspen Restoration (\$50,000)**
- **The interaction between restoration, foraging ecology, and mating behavior in Greater Sage-Grouse (year 3) (\$38,370)**
- **White Pine County Mastication and Brush Treatments (\$41,339.69)**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Commission has the ability to take an amount greater than the interest if needed, if it is beyond interest the Commission will view the amount that will go against the principal.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this year approval amount is \$1,513,377.69 for projects for FY 2023.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the top proposals listed were submitted by NDOW only, and advised that there is enough funding in the Heritage account to cover all of these projects.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the purpose of the Schell Egan Land Acquisition is to purchase approximately 5,400 acres of land from Blue Diamond Ranches. The property is split between Duck Creek Basin in the Schell Mountains and the Egan Range. The property consists of holdings with the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands, located in White Pines, Nevada. The property is within Hunt Units 111 and 221.
- Board John Hiatt stated there are several small parcels, if familiar with Cave Lake and the road that goes to Success Summit, there are signage stating private property and asking to stay out or pay a fee to park on this private property with a phone number for the contact person to speak too. He stated all of these parcels are owned by gentlemen named (*Sprouse*), who ran a sheep business. He advised this gentlemen decided to sell his parcels and retire. The others who owned the parcels as well, and knew if this gentlemen (*Sprouse*) sold to developer or real estate agencies they realize they were going to suffer if this happened therefore they all came together and purchased this land to make public land. He stated this opportunity solved the issue of all of the small portions of land and stated this brought up public domain and solves issues with the wildlife as well. He stated this has his support this acquisition.
- Board Therese Campbell asked board member John Hiatt was he referring to the Egan Land Acquisition.
- Board member John Hiatt stated yes. He stated this is an issue for many people who have been coming to this area in past and present and do not understand why now they are having to pay for parking and cannot understand why now is this area which is private property; why would they have to pay now. He stated this area was private property back then but this individual owner just did not enforce it, and if all of these parcels were to be sold to real estate development or a person who wanted to sell off lots, this would be a disaster for wildlife. Companies who are entrepreneur who would try to maximize the dollar value would definitely have a negative effect on the dollar value on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the Heritage is donating \$250,000 and then over 4.5 million dollars is being raised elsewhere. Chair Paul Dixon asked board member

John Hiatt the question if NDOW giving business of purchasing around the state when does it stop.

- Board member John Hiatt stated if NDOW wanted to donate to the BLM or Forest Service then they may do so. He stated the potential damage of these parcels being sold to creative entrepreneur who would try to maximize the dollar value on these things would definitely have a very negative effect on the dollar value on this. He stated this is a defensive move on the part of NDOW.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated when looking at his annex map in this area there are two different entities called: 1) Blue Diamond Oil Corporation 2) Blue Diamond Estates, and stated these are two entities and wanted to know which entity belongs to which parcels.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that when he spoke with (*Jose Noriega, District Ranger, Ely*), he stated these parcels were owned by ranchers and thought maybe these entities of names were left from time that (Sprouse) had it.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that the majority of this property that was stated the area where individuals like to rest and camp is classified as Blue Diamond Oil Corporation. He stated there are other connecting parcels and the other parcels are adjacent are Blue Diamond Estates, he advised he is not certain if this is one of the same entity.
- Board John Hiatt stated he believes this is one of the same but with no certainty.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked board member John Hiatt how many of these parcels have water which they would be developable versus parcels that have no water, which would be more difficult to develop.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated most of these parcels fall along Steptoe Creek.
- Board member John Hiatt stated there is water really close if not right there.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated there is water all over all of these parcels.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He stated all the way up from East Creek all the way up to the Timber Lake there is nothing but water. He advised that both entities discussed are separate and stated he knows because he called on property in that location and it was separate entities. He stated there is two to three acres parcels along Blue Diamond to Duck Creek access all the way to Timber Creek Area.
- Board member John Hiatt stated most of those parcels were privatize many years ago.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that almost all the land adjacent to the road or on both sides of the road is private which he stated is 33 miles.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked the CCABMW board members if they had any concerns about any of these projects.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that NDOW has enough money to take care of all of these projects if they agree upon them unless there is a concern.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated she read literature on the Heritage Foundation but asked Chair Paul Dixon for clarification on the question: if the Heritage foundation is completely privately funded by NGO's or individuals or is it funded by the state's general fund.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Heritage account comes from, all the proceeds from tags sold (elk, mule deer, pronghorn, and wild turkey). He stated originally the rule was that the money could only come from the interest against the account, but the account grew over 7 million dollars, soon there were concerns about the amount this account grew too therefore the decision came about that the interest

could be spent. He reiterated that the only funds coming into the Heritage funds are from Heritage tags.

- Board member Therese Campbell asked the question again if this was considered to be privately funded.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that it is funded by sportsmen and by Heritage tags and there is no tax payer funds that are included in the funding only proceeds from the Heritage tags sold.
- Board member Therese Campbell advised a lot of these projects are on public land and involve BLM or other government agencies and asked the question of how this works when it is privately funded but doing projects on public land.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated the sportsmen and hunters are footing the bill for everyone.
- Board member John Hiatt asked if he could give further clarification on this; he advised NDOW and the state can manage wildlife not the land, the land is managed by BLM and some Forest Service land which is owned and managed by the federal government therefore the federal government can manage the habitat but legally they cannot manage the wildlife. He stated one must deal with the agency that manages the land in order to deal with the wildlife, this is the reasoning when you see projects done on public land in corporation of different federal agencies that are the owners of these lands. He advised it cannot be done another way.
- Board member Brian Patterson gave example: NDOW sells 14 tags and puts it up for auction just recently the elk tag brought in 200,000 dollars, and stated 2 tags normally brings over 100,000 dollars and these wealthy individuals who are purchasing these tags are giving back to both the state and the wildlife hence helping pay for these different projects. He advised no matter which way you view it, these studies or habitat restoration are being funded by wealthy sportsmen.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated she understands there are studies and land acquisitions but the mission statement for the Wildlife Heritage states monies in the accounts (*foundation account or state general fund*) and it states these funds must be used by the department (NDOW) as indicated in the mission statement and made notations frequently that funds would be used to enhance primarily mule deer habitat and Sage Grouse habitat but it excluded less desirable wildlife and game animals as stated in the wildlife trust account. She stated she felt both NDOW and the Heritage Tags, the mission statements do not align together and are not in agreement.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he is unsure if these two statements have to be align together.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated she has concerns about Wildlife habitat restorations which most are using chains, other methods for removal of Pinyon and Juniper into areas to encourage sagebrush growth, which she stated she has no issue but the goal is to enhance the habitat for certain animals but instead going into public lands using private funds with the goals of enhancement for their desired animals. She stated this is what she understood from this literature.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he feels board member Therese Campbell is right the Heritage is funded by seven species of animals and the project that these individuals donate to (the tags purchased) are solely for that species of animal for enhancement to habitat. He stated that Congress passed a wildlife bill and this bills deals with all 782 species in the state of Nevada. He stated to board member Therese Campbell the Wildlife bill that was passed would take care of all of the issues she spoke on

and the Heritage tags is solely to be purchased to deal with a specific species and protection for these species. He stated the budget is from licensing fees and fees are matched from Pittman and Robertson and Dingell-Johnson therefore giving limitations on how many of the 782 different species in Nevada they are allotted to deal with.

- Board member John Hiatt stated that board member Therese Campbell previously mentioned Pinyon and Juniper but there is a need to understand that habitat is not species specific therefore when this is addressed and fixed it will work for all the species or for many species. He stated there is something called Stage 3 Pinyon Juniper Woodlands, all of these phases are defined by the amount of underscore present, in Stage 3 there is essentially no underscore meaning, no grasses and no shrubs simply Pinyon trees and Juniper trees and also the pinyon mouse, these species do well in this environment because not many species do well in this environment such as deer, elk, Pinyon Jays and predators. He stated many species need grasses and forbs and shrubs. He stated if we go back to (*early seral state-initially dominated by grasses, forbs and shrubs*), this may eventually come back as Pinyon Juniper trees. He reiterated that by going into the early seral stage will provide much diversity of wildlife. He stated if this area is just left alone with no disturbance and no fires you will have state of plants that do not support much diversity of wildlife and will result in bare ground taken over in the end by cheatgrass. He stated the landscape seen now is functioning as a disturbance regime. He reiterated that no disturbance over long portions of time in any ecosystem results in depauperate system, having few dominant species which will not support a wide variety of wildlife or plants.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated she still has concerns from the description of actions that are being planned, she advised that she feels that a large amount of money is being spent to enhance habitat for some wildlife and not others.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the write ups are not the best and do not have enough description, he stated the average person who is not from the state of Nevada would look at the information and have a difficult time attempting to decipher exactly the meaning of this information. He stated this was seen previously with the literature on the Predator Management Plan, that he felt could have been written better, therefore he feels individuals should familiarize themselves with each project and unfortunately the description given on the literature does not always give enough detail of what exactly is going to be done on each project.
- Board member Therese Campbell advised that there is a lot of the literature in regards to using chaining and hands on methods.
- Board member John Hiatt stated for a large number of the projects it indicates chaining and there are many ways for this to be done but it depends on soils that determines if it will work or not and if it is done poorly then you will receive a poor result and if done properly then you will receive a great result. He stated these projects need to be site specific and take into consideration best practices for the area. He gave example of a masticator usage and stated there are different types of masticator and the wood can be cut into either big or little portions giving different results which work better for different species and different goals needed and stated question needs to be asked what type of masticator is being used.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised 2011, the Heritage Proposal that was put together back then consist of simply one page as opposed to now today the proposal has budgets and maps of the exact location of the projects and great description of what is being

done. He stated it could always be better, always.

- Board member Therese Campbell advised that she wanted it stated on the record that she does indeed have some concerns and stated maybe at the next meeting this can be revisited these projects for more detailed discussed.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated an example with the project (*Wildlife Related Restoration and Seed Purchase*) where the project is about seed purchases, he gave this example to state that these projects sometimes are trade off to start helping one species with a project but in the end you are helping many other species as well, doing this for the greater good of all animals.
- Board member John Hiatt stated the board needs to take a field trip on some of these matters soon.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbett*): He asked the question was there matching funds that go along with the Heritage funds.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated yes.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked the question to Chair Paul Dixon if the funds that match the Heritage tag funds, do these matching sources come from other private sources.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised no these funds typically come from Dingell Johnson.
- Board member John Hiatt stated they come from the government generally.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated and Pittman Robertson.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated yes. He stated because these projects are non- lethal and they are habitat improvement projects, therefore this is what the funds were developed for because when you are doing these types of projects the habitat improvement it is habitat improvement for all types of species not just certain species in general.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Buris*): He stated as the President of WHIN (Wildlife Habitat Improvement of Nevada) largest NGO's that provides Heritage funds to NDOW, he has some concerns about the listing of projects. He stated the (*Schell Egan Land Acquisition*), he asked the question of who is the owner or it might be a private entity on this because NDOW is giving portion of the land to whoever owns this land, and he stated that sportsmen provides the Heritage funds through big game and draw tags that would otherwise be unable to draw and the sportsmen take out a certain number of tags to give out for these Heritage funds. He stated now there is a project of warm water fish stocking that needs funds of \$125,000 to service urban environment but NDOW do not give anything into the heritage funds and he has concerns, he stated when looking at what WHIN heritage tags sold for and what it has in past historically been sold for there was a significant loss. He stated the loss was about 50% due to one reason which is NDOW management deciding that management of the big game species need not be a priority any longer and stated the list of projects does not address big game management and advised that if it continues like this, he knows factually that his number one buyer of the heritage tag that each year raises the cost to record number each year will stop his bidding when reaching the total of \$50,000 due to lack of management by NDOW of their species. He stated he needs to see more big game specific projects and advised collaring projects are a great idea and now there is discussion that fly overs to receive an active management number, and his NGO of WHIN was the last one to do a collaring project with the feeling that it was an important piece of information. He stated he feels that NDOW has turned away from doing any collaring projects with

the mule deer therefore his concerns are the amount being spent 1.5 million without addressing the route problem. He stated we as NGO's don't raise this money and the individuals who are purchasing these tags do not purchase these tags if they are not going to be successful with the harvest and this is being seen. He advised there was a record elk tag this year and every other tag seemed to have declined this year. He stated if he gave NDOW 150,000 as opposed to 75,000, the requirement is for NDOW to do active management to where sportsmen who are paying to continue to pay by getting projects that address big game management, specifically mule deer. He stated he realizes that NDOW wants to do predator management but they are missing the point that if they want these funds to continue to come in then they must start doing big game management projects as well. He stated this is a political game and it needs to stop with the politics and start with wildlife management.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Brian Buris*) that the mule deer committees are giving recommendations for collaring programs and he feels that these proposals were not given in time this year but he definitely feels they will be ready for next year with a significant amount of counties requesting Heritage funds to do collaring programs in their respective counties. He stated it will be collaring projects with the study of migration. He stated the amount of money that was passed in the H.R. 2773, Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2022 would match the operational budget in place now and there could be that discussion to give half to species listed for the projects with the other going to sportsmen's projects addressing big game management but at this moment the allotted budget deals with all species in the state.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, Sportsmen*): He stated he was watching program where they showed states such as North Dakota and South Dakota, Iowa and Nebraska, these states have been doing their own collaring projects for many years now. He advised the results are stable population which is correctly managed, what is wrong with our state (Nevada).
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he feels that Nevada is not like those other states in the aspect that it is driest state in the nation and with Reno and Clark County being the highest and the other counties have smaller populations and a vast amount of the state is uninhabited as opposed to other states where the population is spread all over due to water and resources surrounding them as opposed to our state has that vast amount of resources of mining and minerals around it.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that if there were more water then there would be more population in a lot more areas in Nevada but there is only populations where there are water sources.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue*): He stated the state of Nevada should still be using the collaring methods no matter what and have the ability to activate an account that can check both migration predators as well.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue*): He wanted to know why NDOW passed on the previous collaring program that Michael Reese (previous Vice Chair) has asked to be implemented even though it would have been fully paid for by NDOW.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this program was not utilized because by (*Jack Robb, Deputy Director NDOW*) it was premature by the resources supported by NDOW and NDOW was not going to use these funds to support this program due to their presumption that it would not be successful therefore it was rejected. He stated it was approved prior to the Commission meeting and when it was put before the Commission and it was denied. He stated going forward there needs to be no

politics involved in these issues.

- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated he appreciated board member John Hiatt explanations on early seral state and junipers and advised that by fixing one habitat then it will fix for all the other habitats. He stated as a business owner he looks at the wildlife banquets that he assists with (*Brian Buris*) as a business venture. He stated when individuals spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, these individuals are investors and as investors they have expectations of receiving something from their investments with a clear view of their expectations by exactly what they have spent their funds on therefore if there are any other groups or organizations that choose as well to spend their money then they can choose as well where it is spent. He stated he wanted to send an invite for future banquets, to any CAB member who has not had the pleasure of attending a wildlife banquet, he will gladly buy a ticket for them to have this experience.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, Sportsmen*): He addressed his question to board member Therese Campbell and asked was she confused in what the Heritage tag funds were being used for.
- Board member Therese Campbell advised that she was not really confused it was more concerned.
- Public Comments; (*Nick Gulli*): He asked board member Therese Campbell is her concern. (interrupted)
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Nick Gulli*) to please address all questions directly to the board not to board member Therese Campbell directly, he reiterated that he would like the line of questioning to go to the board first and after then board member Therese Campbell could answer the questions.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He apologized and continued his line of questions; he advised that seven species have been identified and became commodities of the state and these species are no different than minerals which are commodities, and stated if she feels that sportsmen are making money to go out and harvest animals then she is looking at this issue with passion, and that is not what we are doing. He stated as spoken by Mr. Stoker earlier, the sportsmen bring in more revenue to the state than any other organizations by banquets, licensing and he challenged her to find another organization that bring in as much revenue than sportsmen. He stated that not all sportsmen want to kill but it is done to save species habitat and animals that they hunt and eat. He stated please bring in some revenue and next challenge NDOW to spend those funds correctly and he feels as a member of the public, himself and others are not happy with the manner of spending NDOW is doing with these funds. He reiterated and asked board member Therese Campbell was this her concern with the seven species.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated no, she has concerns with Heritage projects using privately raised funds to change and enhance for projects that impact wildlife and plants on public lands and some of these projects are targeting enhancement for specific favored species such as deer for example and stated in an article she read it discussed the removal of Pinyon Juniper is because it is a favorite habitat of the mountain lions therefore removal was necessary if you would like a deer population to increase. She stated when speaking that all habitat projects benefits all species not so much with this example. She stated her concern again is privately funding on public land to certain species over others.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the H.R. 2773, Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2022 will forever change the management of wildlife in all 50 states in the United

States and until this law is done the sportsmen will always foot the bill and with the general public asking to have an opinion of bills that are supported by sportsmen by large portions. He reiterated that all of the funds come from sportsmen and matching funds from Dingell Johnson. He stated until other sources of revenue come into play there will always be this issue involved.

- Board member Therese Campbell stated there are many organizations in Nevada and around the US such as (Friends of Wetland Park, Friends of Red Rock Canyon, Sierra Club, The Nature Conservancy) and she feels that it is not as if the non-consumptive activities are necessary that no one is paying for these projects and a lot of these groups that are somewhat working toward the same goals. She feels that this clearly shows that it is simply not just sportsmen who are funding wildlife enhancement projects or protect the land and habitat.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised when stating the word sportsmen he stated that Pittman and Robertson and Dingell Johnson are exercised taxes on sporting goods and there is large amount of sportsmen and sportswomen who are not consulted and buy sporting goods and sporting merchandise that get taxed which go into the fund as well and a large portion of the monies that are going into this funds are from individuals who are not consulted.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that this list of projects NDOW is involved and there are other projects that are funded and do not involve NDOW and are about habitat restoration and improving health of land that is being funded, some are by federal government and many other funding's with the goal of improving habitats in Nevada.
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to accept Fiscal Year 2023 Heritage Project Proposals as approved.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion Passes 6-0.**
- **FYI:** *The Project is located approximately 9 miles east (Schell Range) and 13 miles south (Egan Range) of Ely, in White Pine County, Nevada, it is located on private lands surrounded by National Forest System (NFS) land in the Humboldt Toiyabe Ranger District and Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Bristlecone Field Office, The Schell Egan Land Acquisition would permanently protect approximately 5,400 acres of private land within the Schell and Egan Mountain Ranges. The proposed land acquisition will allow conservation of crucial mule deer and elk summer and transition habitat and will serve as important sagebrush, grassland and riparian habitat for mule deer, elk, and several species of conservation priority, including the greater sage-grouse. This project will allow the protection of core mule deer in White Pine County. Improving and maintaining critical habitats for this population increases the likelihood that mule deer will persist in sustainable levels. This project, and it's on the ground benefits aligns well with mission and objectives of the intended use of Wildlife Heritage Trust Account as defined in NRS 501.3575. The vegetation communities within the property are generally defined by highly productive mid-elevation shrub communities mixed with aspen and mahogany stands at the lower elevations are comprised of sage-steppe vegetation, with varying degrees of pinyon/juniper encroachment. Given that the property consists of inholdings within the FS and BLM the acquisition of the property would allow the protection of important season habitats and transitions ranges for mule deer and other wildlife species.*
- **FYI- (Chair Paul Dixon discussed the Wildlife bill H.R. 2773, Recovering**

America's Wildlife Act of 2022): the following article address this bill “ U.S. House passes a major wildlife conservation spending bill” (June 14, 2022), website: <https://www.npr.org/2022/06/14/1105007255/us-house-passes-wildlife-conservation-spending-bill> Synopsis: *A bill to conserve endangered species- from the red-cockaded woodpecker to snuffbox mussel- was passed by the U.S. House. The Recovering America's Wildlife Act would create an annual fund or more than \$1.3 billion given to states, territories and tribal nations for wildlife conservation on the ground. While threatened species have been defined and protected under the Endangered Species Act since 1973, the law does not provide robust funding to proactively maintain their numbers. The effort comes as scientists and international organizations sound the alarm about accelerating species decline. In the United States, there are more than 1,600 endangered or threatened species, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, but state agencies have identified more than 7 times that number in need of conservation assistance in their wildlife action plans. The bill would amend a 1937 law, the Pittman-Robertson Act, which was passed in response to dwindling game and waterfowl species. That law allows states to tax hunting supplies to pay for wildlife and habitat restoration, but that money is not enough to do the same for non-game species, according to the Pew Charitable Trusts. The act would also invest more in conservation than the existing program for threatened non-game species, called the State Wildlife Grant Program, which awarded states a total of \$56 million this year. The bill would require that 15% of all conservation money go to restoring populations of federally-listed endangered species.*

- e. **Heritage Account Principal Project Proposal (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the Schell-Egan Acquisition Heritage Account Principal Project Proposal from the Department. The Department is asking for additional funds from the Heritage Account Principal balance to acquire 5.390 acres of wildlife habitat scattered throughout the Schell and Egan Ranges near Ely, NV.
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that in previous action item (d) Fiscal Year 2023 Heritage Project Proposals, the CAB already agrees with the Schell Egan Land Acquisition, and agrees with the Heritage funds going to this project.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised motion to approve Heritage Account Principal Project Proposal as approved.
 - Board member Brian Patterson asked the board to put in the motion clarification in asking which entity will purchase this land or will it be both.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised motion of board member John Hiatt to approve Heritage Account Principal Project Proposal as approved with clarification in regards too: Is it Blue Diamond Oil Corporation or Blue Diamond Estates or both that the land will be purchased from, both companies own land in that area.
 - Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
 - **Motion Passes 6-0.**

- f. Duck Stamp Request (For possible action)* The CCABMW Board will review. Discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about approving up to \$102,000 for projects submitted for FY 2023 funding from the Duck Stamp Account.
- Western Complex WMAs Habitat Improvements (\$15,000)
 - Western Complex WMA Water Control Repair (\$15,000)
 - Carson Lake and Pasture Infrastructure Improvements (\$25,000)
 - Licking Ranch WMA Improvement Project (\$12,000)
 - Fall Flights Wetland Conservation Support (\$35,000)
 - Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that the total of these projects are \$102,000 and the matching funds total of 127,000 dollars and account balance of previous obligations equal 236,000 dollars.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised there will be 40% of this account spent for these proposals, he stated there is a write up on each proposal with Wildlife Heritage Account Proposal Forms (information on this form- Person submitting proposal/project manager, organization/agency, project information (project title, state fiscal year funds are needed, amount, purpose of project, detailed description of project and rationale, project start and end date on which project they are doing, some new things added to the proposals then in the past.
 - Public Comments: (None)
 - Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve Duck Stamp Request as presented.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
 - **Motion Passes 6-0.**

- g. Upland Game Bird Stamp Request(For possible action)* The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approving up to \$327,200 for projects submitted for FY 2023 funding from the Upland Game Bird Stamp Account. The specific Upland Game Bird Stamp projects that may be approved at listed below:

- Corta Fire Habitat Improvement (\$17,250)
- Corners for Quail (\$25,000)
- Key Pittman Wildlife Food Plots (\$7,500)
- Greater Sage-Grouse Statewide Monitoring (\$29,370)
- Upland Game Translocation and Monitoring (\$13,400)
- Licking Ranch WMA Improvement Project (\$30,000)
- Overton WMA Food Plots (\$10,000)
- Big Lake Pinyon Juniper Removal-Cleanup (\$5,000)
- Rangeland Restoration for Greater Sage-Grouse (\$20,000)
- Western Complex WMAs Water Control Structure Repairs (\$15,000)
- Western Complex WMAs Habitat Improvements (\$10,000)
- Effects of Mineral Development on Greater Sage-Grouse (\$47,500)
- B-State Sage-Grouse Monitoring (\$25,000)

- Soil Herbicide Monitoring (\$12,180)
- Butler Basin Meadow and Spring Habitat Improvement Project (\$40,000)
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised when the wording on Effects of Mineral Development on Greater Sage-Grouse, when stating mineral development means new mines that will be coming into the State of Nevada which are very large.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that all of these projects total the \$327,200.
- Chair Paul Dixon read off the report: *Balance in the Account at Start of FY 2022- \$253,491.01; *Plus Estimated Revenue Accrued During FY 2022- \$375,246.39; *Less Estimated Total FY 2022 Expenditures- \$147,893.23; * Less Estimated Administrative Costs (10% of Revenue)- \$37, 524.64; * Estimated Balance at End of FY 2022/Start of FY 2023 \$443,319.53; *Plus Estimated Revenue to be Accrued During FY 2023- \$375,246.39; *Less Estimated Administrative Costs (10% of Revenue) -\$37,524.64; *Less Proposed New Project FY 2023 Expenditures- \$207,200.00; *Estimated Balance at End of FY 2023- \$573,841.28; *Less Remaining Obligations on Previously Funded Projects \$353,901.51; *Account Balance Less Previous Obligations- \$219,939.77 (Notes: The budget information in this table is preliminary and subject to change. The amount of Upland Bird Stamp revenue accrued during FY 2022 was not available when this report was prepared; therefore, the FY 2021 revenue number was used for both FY 2022 and 2023.)
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that some of these projects were augmented by Heritage tags as well.
- Board member John Hiatt asked the question in regards to B-State Sage-Grouse Monitoring with a description of locating nest, setting up and monitoring the nest, if there is raven who sees the set up they out of curiosity will due their due diligence to see what is being done then go after that nest. He stated he is concerned about this process creating predators to act due to attracting the ravens to this location our of being curious and investigation therefore leading to higher rate of predation on sites that are being monitored as opposed to one's that are not being monitored.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked the question is this cameras located by these nests, what is the act being performed when they state monitoring.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that camera are in place and checked periodically and check progress and take measurements of vegetation in order to describe the area and by doing so it will attract the raven to find out what is being done in that location therefore the ravens will mess with the nest.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated that ravens would go to find

out what is happening due to the ravens association that people around a location means there is food.

- Board member John Hiatt advised that it needs to be noted that this is affecting the results and that the results would be different if there were no monitoring.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, Sportsmen*) He stated he noticed from the duck stamp report Licking Ranch WMA Improvement Project, he wanted to know the location of this.
- Board member John Hiatt indicated Troy Peak just south of Railroad Valley.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that after the meeting on Thursday, June 23, 2022, 2 hours will be used to take a field trip to Battle Mountain, then proceeding to Licking Ranch WMA improvement Project as well as ending the trip in Elko.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised \$130,000 was used to purchase Licking Ranch from the Heritage Tag funds.
- Public Comments: (Mark Transue): He stated he does not care where the funds come from.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that he has concerns that Sage Grouse monitoring may impact the results and the results, and they have been prejudicing the results by the manner in which the monitoring was done.
- Board member John Hiatt advised motion to approve Upland Game Bird Stamp Request as presented, with the following concern raised: 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 seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

h. Petition-Mr. David Flanders-Use of Air Rifles (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a petition to allow Air Rifles to hunt.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there was no backup material submitted for this action item by NDOW but he put it on the agenda for a discussion.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is a petition submitted by Mr. Flanders for usage of Air Rifles for hunting and stated there are lots of new air rifles out now such as the Gamo air rifle. He stated these are as powerful as 22 short shooting pellets out of these rifles at speeds of 1400 to 1700 **fps** (*feet per second*) measuring the muzzle velocity of pellets as it leaves the barrel
- Board member John Hiatt advised he was told that a gentlemen had one that would shoot 2,000 to 3,000 **mps**. (*Micro pistol sight*) and this gentlemen interest is shooting things at 1,000 yards for practice.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated the gentlemen Mr. David Flanders who brought forth this petition is using this for hunting. He stated he is unsure what one would hunt with air rifles. He stated he is unaware what one would hunt with air rifle other than small game.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the board cannot adequately have a discussion without having support material to know exactly what this entails.
- Public Comments: (Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region): He stated this topic has recently been under discussion in his division of NDOW. He stated Arizona allows air rifles to hunt big game. He stated the caliber is a .35 with a comparison to a 38 or approximately up to a .50 caliber which is a 50 caliber and in his experience the fps (feet per second) on these would be equal to a high powered rifles and these are popular in Europe based upon issues to get regular firearms. He stated the negatives he has read about the air rifles are trajectory of the shots used are not aerodynamic based upon design in order to contain all compressed air in the rifle therefore depending on the yardage there is loss of projectile very easily. He stated there is concern with **wounding loss** (*the number or percent-age of animals that are shot but not retrieved*) with the air rifle, and he is unaware how long Arizona Game and Fish will have this in their regulations but air rifles do a lot for hunting big game.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he was unaware of this, he was aware that there was up to 22 caliber with air rifles he had no idea that air rifle shot larger caliber.
- Public Comments: (Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region): He stated yes it has gone beyond 22 caliber.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he has seen hippos shot with air rifles and stated he is all for hunting big games but he is not really for air rifle in the field.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is perfect for poaching.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated they are quiet and lethal.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised the key is regulation because any gun is problematic if individual behind the gun is not educated on the gun and its performance and take shots that should not be taken. He stated it is a matter of hunters doing what they should do at the right location. He reiterated it comes down to regulation. He stated he is not against air rifles being used to hunt but it will require regulations to make this situation viable.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he would need to have more knowledge on the specific wording on the petition and agreed with board member Dave Talaga stated that this is possibly feasible but that depends on the regulations in place on this. He stated he could see drawbacks and the control of these drawbacks due to regulations. He stated he will need to see the petition itself first.
- Chair Paul Dixon explained the process by stating if the Commission accepts the petition then NDOW will be empowered to write a draft of the regulations, the draft will come to CCABMW to discuss and make recommendations asking the real question does the CCABMW support air rifles for hunting or is this just trending.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Dave Talaga that this is either the CCABMW is in support a petition to use air rifles for hunting and regulations will be written and the board will review or the board does not support air rifle hunting and do not recommend that they write regulations of air rifles.
- Board member John Hiatt advised motion to support NDOW pursuing regulations for

air rifle hunting. He stated he imagines that air rifles have artistic trajectory that is enormous due to not being air dynamic bullets therefore it's a lot of practice and one would probably need to be closer therefore how would you regulate and tell someone they need to practice before they go to shoot. He stated he realizes that people who have high powered rifles do not practice and they mess up as well. He stated my point is not to add one more degree of complexity to things.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised he would like the board to vote if they support on this matter or not giving a recommendation that is independent of the regulations that will be coming out soon.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated in Nevada air rifles are considered firearms and other states they are not but where this would come in to play is with convicted felons, not an issue in Nevada but in researching in other states some individuals are owning air rifles and they are high powered rifles.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated there is a lot of misinformation or maybe not enough information to have clear understanding but when you google states that allow air rifles for hunting airgunsporting.com pops up, or pyramydair.org pops up as well with maps and it indicates that in Nevada the hunting of multiple species, nuisance species and small game species is allowed currently to hunt with air rifles.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he would have to look at the regulations more closely but would consider any unprotected species a bylaw for air rifles and for small game one would have to go into the definition of that due to strict regulations regarding hunting of small game therefore from his knowledge there is no regulation that allows air rifles to hunt small game. He reiterated this is something that needs to be looked into more closely. He stated coyote unprotected game absolutely.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised small game is indicated on this search as having its own category and is allowed.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated a 25 caliber pelt gun is around 900 fps, 30 caliber is in the same area, what one is looking at is the energy of the handgun therefore we are looking at 25 to 35 caliber and the range, and it comes down to the hunter taking ethical shots but it is definitely lethal but more accurate than a handgun.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Buris*): He stated this must be viewed upon logically and he has heard that air rifles will not be effective but there are: (1) 50 caliber air rifles that are now have a velocity of 1,100 fps (2) He stated there are other weapons that have the same disadvantages. He stated if you will disallow air rifles due to limited range and limited terminal velocity then we must outlaw archery hunting. He stated now hunter must obtain animal at 25 to 50 yards. He stated 50 yards is very long shot for archery hunter. He stated he feels this weapon air rifle will do exactly what it is designed to do therefore 50 caliber air rifle is the same bullet design as 50 caliber muzzleloader but velocity level is different this means same aero dynamic pattern. He stated it is definition of regulations where the air rifle fits into the correct category or limit specifications and in many states there is a minimum and performance at a certain distance to make firearm legal for hunting. He stated this is the reason of why 22 cannot be taken out and hunt big game because: (a) it would not work; (b) it does not meet the minimum requirements of usage for that weapon. He reiterated this is about

regulation and making it fit where it is suppose to fit. He stated you stated the air rifle is quiet and perfect for poachers, he stated so is a silencer and there are already things in place now that have all the drawbacks of an air rifle and he feels this is simply another tool for a hunter who wants to hunt. He stated the air rifles have come a long way and are not what they were in past like in your childhood with the babe gun, these are purpose built hunting rifles with a cost ranging from \$1,500 to \$5,000 for each rifle. He stated he feels it should not be shut down because it would show being one sided until we know where this should fit and see regulations with it and at that time we can make a decision for support or not.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, hunter*): He stated to (Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region) that people may use a cross bow to hunt under Any Legal Weapon Season for big game.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the hunters can but this depends on stipulations based off their abilities to hunt.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He stated so it is based off the physically challenged people and stated he could go to archery shop and purchase cross bow but I cannot use it for big game.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated you may purchase a cross bow.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that one must have a medical condition that states that the hunter cannot use general archery. He reiterated stating the only way the hunter can use cross bow is if the hunter has a physical impairment.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He stated he has knowledge that other states do let hunters use a cross bow under Any Legal Weapon Hunts but Nevada is not there yet on this matter. He stated as (*Brian Buris*) spoke earlier and he agrees why limit the enthusiast on their choice of the weapon they would like to use instead focus on the species that they are allowed to hunt maybe looking at turkeys or predator species at first to see how this works. He stated the technology is there and a hunter could go out and effectively hunt elk or deer so we should look at species specifications for the cross bow.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to Chair Paul Dixon that we must give nods to technology for growth. He stated fair chase using today's technology and stated there is none due to technology eroding the idea of hunting and this definition of fair chase will be different today than it was in the past 20 years therefore we must adapt to technology and he feels the air rifle is a great instrument for hunting whether it is for non- regulated species such as a coyote or even harvesting a deer it can be done efficiently. He stated he feels we need to draw lines on what type of technology will be used due to the fact that technology will continue to grow. He gave example of looking at bows that are used today the technology is good that they have speed of 300 fps and in past maybe 25 years ago the speed was not anywhere close to that. He reiterated that one must be careful of where they draw the line on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that in the state of Nevada using a scope that tracks and allows the firing of a gun at moving target without aiming is illegal and night infrared vision usage is also illegal and cannot put a scope on a muzzleloader due to it not creating fair chase and the usage of cross bows has its limitations therefore what is lost by not allowing to have usage of air rifles in this state and he feels it will not be a lot.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli*): He stated he wanted to clarify that NRS does allow usage of cross bows for big game starting Any Legal Weapon Hunt Seasons.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He asked what NRS is (*Nick Gulli*) viewing on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this can be discussed once the regulation is found.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he does not agree with air rifles.
- Board member Therese Campbell advised she will abstain.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised motion to approve of supporting NDOW of pursuing regulations for air rifle hunting.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 4-1-1.**

i. Commission General Regulations 501, NCA 502.385, Tag Transfer (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502.385 that would allow the transfer of a game tag to a non-profit organization and determine status of the transfer of a game tag to a non-profit organization and determine status of the tag if the Department is notified of the tag holder's death. This regulation was created after the passage of Assembly Bill 89 of the 81st Legislative Session.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised there were minor changes to wording and removed certain things.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue*): He stated to transfer a game tag to non-profit organization he gave example that there was a gentlemen in his group and he passed away but donated his tags to his organization.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a NGO can donate to a non- profit organization. He stated the tag can be transferred but not sold.
- Brian Patterson advised Chair Paul Dixon to view page 5: **#9(c) That no monetary trade or exchange of goods will be taken or given by the organization, a person or family member of a person represented by a qualifying organization or a person wishing to transfer his or her tag.**
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised motion to approve Commission General Regulation 501, NCA 502.385, Tag Transfer as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

- j. Commission General Regulation 505, NAC 502.4215, First Come First Served Prevention of Unfair Advantages (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting NAC 502.4215 that would allow for the suspension of a person from the First Come First Serve program attempting to create unfair advantage to obtain a big game tag.
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised this is simply clean up language going from words such as may to shall making it stronger language in reference to the license. He advised if they are caught then they will not be able to apply for tags for the remainder of the season and will be suspended from the First Come First Served process indefinitely.
 - Public Comments: (None)
 - Board member John Hiatt advised motion to approve Commission General Regulation 505, NAC 502.4215, First Come First Served Prevention of Unfair Advantages as presented.
 - Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
 - **Motion passes 6-0.**
- k. Commission General Regulation 507, LCB File No. R045-22-Petition Process (*For possible action*)**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised this is clarification on some parts of NAC detailing petition process. He stated the explains how this goes in to the Department NDOW and is viewed next it goes to the Commission and next to CCABMW for approval and now there are minor changes based on LCB comments that came back for cleanup.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised that he feels that this was written by lawyers for lawyers.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated absolutely it was written by the LCB.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated it states that if you are going to submit a petition then the petitioner must include the legal authority to be able to submit the petition. He stated most average citizens have no clue on how to submit the legal authority on submission. He stated this is lawyer talk and if a citizen would like to submit a petition then they should be able to do so.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked board member if he was sure this is referring to the petitioner or Commission to submit the legal authority on submission.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated it is his understanding that the petitioner is the person who needs to submit the legal authority telling the Commission.
 - Board member Brian Patterson advised maybe the legal authority is the resident of the state.
 - Board John Hiatt stated to board member Brian Patterson if this were the case then why would they just not state this.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated is this designed to address a problem where the board has been petitioned to a large amount of issue where they do not have the authority to deal with therefore they have put in this information to state (petitioner must include the legal authority to be able to submit the petition). He stated that is the only thing that would make sense.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated that it may be coming from another state and the Commission does not have the legal authority to do so.
- Board member John Hiatt stated this is the reason of why the Commission has attorneys.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he feels it is put in place to stop nonsense petitions that are not in their legal authority to do so therefore stopping a large amount of petitions coming in that are not on their legal authority to do so.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that an individual should not be attorney or familiar with the laws in order for submission of a petition.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Buris*): He agrees with board member John Hiatt and he feels this is stating that the petitioner has to have legal standing in order to submit the petition. He stated if this is the case then this needs to be avoided and as NGO he will often submit petitions to the Commission and in a lot of these matters they do not have legal standing to do so therefore a statement such as this will limit himself as a NGO and others from filing causing a very big concern from a public standpoint. He stated he feels this needs to be verification before moving forward on this action item.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **Section 1. NAC 501.195 #3. As soon as practicable after receiving a petition, but not later than 20 days after the date on which the petition was received by the Commission, the Department shall: (a) Review the petition to determine whether there is legal authority for the proposed adoption, filing, amendment or repeal of the permanent regulation; and (b) Forward to the Commission the petition and the recommendation of the Department whether to deny the petition or initiate regulation-making procedures taking into consideration the legal authority of the Commission.** He stated when he reads these sections it clarifies making recommendations to the Commission to whether to deny the petition or make rule making hence the Department takes into consideration the legal authority of the Commission. He stated he feels after reading this section it is referring to the Department who has to make the legal authority not the individual who is filing the petition.
- Board member Therese Campbell advised she thinks his assessment of the language is correct and thinks the same. She feels it is stating if the petition submitted have the jurisdiction to be handled by the Commission or NDOW have legal authority for.
- Chair Paul Dixon reiterated and read the statement again: **the Department (a) Review the petition to determine whether there is legal authority for the proposed adoption, filing, amendment or repeal of the permanent regulation; (b) Forward to the Commission the petition and the recommendation of the Department whether to deny the petition and the recommendation of the Department whether to deny the petition or initiate regulation-making procedures taking into consideration the legal authority of the Commission.** He stated this means the department is taking this into consideration.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that was not what he read when he read it online and that is not what he read and the very first section was in reference to having legal authority basically the individual who was petitioning had to tell the Commission why they had authority to handle this and stated he feels this means the burden was solely on the petitioner.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated this has nothing to do with the petition is received by the Commission then they will give to the Department then the Department has to tell the Commission if they have proper standing based on legal authority to commission.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised he has located the section that board member John Hiatt is referring too when he stated he saw different on line, he stated it is under Section 1. (b) The person who wishes to adopt the petition it states must include a statement detailing reason and legal authority for the adoption filing or appeal the permanent regulation which he feels to him backs up what board member John Hiatt was stating and makes it clear that the petitioner must provide a reason for the filing and that the reasoning falls under the legal authority of the Commission.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised but in the end the Department will make that decision on whether or not the petition has legal authority looking under Section 2 & 3 NAC 501.195 is hereby amended to read as follows: **#2. Upon receipt of a petition requesting the adoption, filing, amendment or repeal of a permanent regulation pursuant to subsection 1, the Commission will refer the petition to the Department to obtain from the Department a recommendation on whether to deny the petition or initiate regulation-making procedures, taking into consideration the legal authority of the Commission. #3. As soon as practicable after receiving a petition, but not later than 20 days after the date on which the petition was received by the Commission, the Department shall: (a) Review the petition to determine whether there is legal authority for the proposed adoption, filing, amendment or repeal of the permanent regulation; and (b) Forward to the Commission the petition and the recommendation of the Department whether to deny the petition or initiate regulation-making procedures; taking into consideration the legal authority of the Commission.**
- Jacob Thompson stated he agrees.
- Board member John Hiatt stated this places a burden on the petitioner.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that an attorney could state that there is no legal description here and no citation of any NAC or NRS therefore it can just be thrown out.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there should be clarity on this.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated it is ambiguous at the least.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised he will abstain.
- Board member John Hiatt advised motion to approve Commission General Regulation 507, LCB File No. R045-22 Petition Process as presented with the following recommendation: The CCABMW feels that the wording in 1 (b) is ambiguous and needs clarification therefore the burden is not solely on the petitioner to show that they have legal standing.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-1.**

X. 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: (*Fred Voltz*): He stated he wanted to react to several comments stated tonight and advised some are incorrect and promotes a narrative that is not accurate. 1) He stated the dry weather we are having in Nevada suggest that we should dramatically reduce killing quotas and if we were being more prudent about this matter, then there should be a cease on hunting, trapping, and fishing until change of weather conditions for the recovery of our wildlife. He stated this is not about hunter convenience or opportunity and success which has been the tenor of most comments in tonight's meeting. 2) He stated secondly CAB's are required to show up statutorily on Commission meetings on a regular basis, and the CAB does not do so on a regular basis. He stated there is a small number of CAB's that actually do show up including Clark as one of them at each and every Commission meeting. He stated it would seem wise to suggest to the Commission that if a CAB cannot show up and it is not done for several meetings in a row then it should just be disbanded altogether. 3) Guesstimates may be the best methodology since there are no census takers therefore the criticism of the fly overs may be generated on nothing because there will be no census takers down on the ground attempting to measure and count every single wildlife species member for the state. Lastly anecdote information from wildlife killers and ranchers should not be dismissed due to lacking facts. These individuals are not gathering information it is based on wherever they happen to be it is not based on science it is gut reaction much driven by their needs to kill the wildlife not to save it. He stated he would like to suggest that there will be notice given to the public of the mule deer committees by counties, he stated he took a look at the NDOW website and the meeting for the Mule Deer Committee on June 30, 2022 was not listed on their website, the only listing was for June 22, 2022 for the Oversight Committee. He stated the primarily purpose of NGO's is to keep the numbers of the species to continue to increase to have more species to kill, not for beneficial stance to the wildlife species. He stated the NDOW predator program has not been successful even with the 80% requirement to spend monies on lethal predator programs and this really needs to end. He stated there are provisions in the Nevada Constitution stating a right to trap. Public safety, non- target species deaths and endangered species deaths are higher priority than hunter convenience or opportunity and success. He stated collaring projects are dangerous to animals when these animals are caught in the collars and or unsuccessfully attempting for removal of these collars out in the wild. **(Time expired)**
- Public Comments: (*Brian Buris*): 1) He stated the NGO's are not out to save

animals to kill these animals. He stated his NGO supports other NGO's that have absolutely truly nothing to do with hunters and one of the NGO's that is being supported by his organization is anti-trapping. He stated the ignorance when people do not educate themselves on subject matter should actually go on public notice. 2) He stated the sportsmen do support wildlife and stated his banquet by his organization solely will place \$40,000 into wildlife habitat restoration alone. He stated this is \$40,000 dollars that would not come from any other area therefore to suggest that this is done to for the sole purpose of killing animals, he stated in his wildlife organization 1 out of 50 actually drew a tag this year. He stated if the sole purpose is to just kill animals using this word to drive up emotions then obviously we are not doing a very good job. He stated this Commission have certain individuals on it that want to simply drive the narrative based on emotions. He stated wildlife management is not ran by emotions, wildlife management is run by science, there are hunters and ranchers in the field daily and he has individuals that run the same range yearly, in the same location and visually see the decline in populations of species therefore to state that hunters have no clue and are simply reporting what they want to see, these hunters are in this environment year after year. He stated if the hunters see 100 deer one year then the next year at the same location see only 10 then they will know there is an issue. He stated there is another issue with the management of NDOW not appropriately doing their jobs he stated that he just opened up the Waterfowl Seasons, the regulations for this season were approved by the CAB and the state board approving the Mexican Duck and Mallard Hen combination with two birds in this section, regardless of species now he stated he can only have due to the regulations he can only have possession limit of only two birds, not six birds as he would like and should have. He stated we spend too much time on emotional drama about moral aspects of right and wrong. He stated our NGO's do more support in the state of Nevada then any of these anti hunters claiming to have morale superiority to us. He stated the comment that plants are wildlife is one of the most ignorant comments he has heard in his life. He stated we should back away voting with emotions and attempt to write regulations and get back with the scientific aspects of this. **(Time Expired)**

- Public Comments: (*Ross Stoker*): He stated that he has appreciation for everyone's passion on the subject of our wildlife and we all love the wildlife but some of the comments made by individuals were hurtful due to his time and talents spent helping make the wildlife better. He stated as he has said before he works more time toward the wildlife then he does at his full time job. He stated if anyone does not agree with his methods of helping the wildlife and advised he has worked along next to board member John Hiatt as well and he offered to have these individuals come to him and shake hands and they can work together for the wildlife and figure things out, but to say hurtful things it is not the way. He advised (*Mr. Voltz*) if he went out to lunch he is sure they could figure out things as well. He stated if we must

fight with words less be productive and get things done.

- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers*): She stated that she nor (*Mr. Voltz*) are not anti-hunting. She stated one of the most important things (*Mr. Voltz*) stated was this requires more attention from the CAB and herself is the problem of drought. It really needs to effect the limits and seasons and somehow it does not seem to be getting through.
- Public Comments: (*Jana Wright*): She stated her comment is how the meeting is being run, there seems to be a lot of back and forth conversation and going off the topic of the agenda, it makes me cringe and she feels that this meeting needs to be gather the meeting in a bit Mr. Chair.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated ok, comment taken. He stated the next meeting with be on the NDOW's Restoration and Rehabilitation Program and what is being done and the impact of how complicated it is to do due to drought, with a great discussion on both sides of the fence. He stated that he will make sure that there is more methods to get out the information on the Mule Deer Committee and their meetings and agendas to a wider audience. He advised he gave this information to NGO's and to his board members as well. He stated besides these methods he did not know how else to spread this information.
- **FYI- The secretary has listed the Mule Deer Committee Agenda, and PowerPoint presentations submitted from the meetings and the minutes on the Department of Environment and Sustainability website to view: https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/mule_deer_enhancement_oversight_committee.php**

XI. Authorize the Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its next June 25/26, 2022 virtual meeting in Elko, Nevada (*For possible action*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion to prepare and submit recommendations from tonight's meeting on June 21, 2022 to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration for their June 24th & June 25th 2022 meeting.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

XII. The next CCABMW Board meeting is scheduled for August 16th, 2022 in the Clark County Government Center (Pueblo Room) 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155. This meeting will be in support of the August 19/20, 2022 Commission meeting in Tonopah, NV.

XIII. 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: Clark County Environment and Sustainability:

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