



**Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife  
Government Center  
500 S. Grand Central Parkway (Pueblo Room)  
Las Vegas, NV 89155  
April 30, 2024 (5:30 PM)  
Meeting Minutes**

**Join the meeting link: (You may also attend online if you wish not to attend in person)**

**Join from the meeting link:**

To access the meeting type in the following link:

[https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment\\_and\\_sustainability/ccabmw\\_meeting\\_11-11-2020.php](https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/ccabmw_meeting_11-11-2020.php)

1. Scroll down to the All-Meetings Section and “[Click here to join the meeting.](#)”

## Microsoft Teams meeting

**Join on your computer, mobile app, or room device.**

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 267 924 372 232

Passcode: kCA9F9

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

**Or call in (audio only)**

[+1 725-696-5982,493755650#](tel:+17256965982,493755650#) United States, Las Vegas

Phone Conference ID: 493 755 650#

### **NOTE:**

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The CCABMW members may combine two (2) or more agenda items for its consideration.
- The CCABMW may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.
- No action may be taken on any matter not listed on the posted agenda.
- Please turn off or mute all cell phones and other electronic devices.
- Please take all private conversations outside the room.
- With a forty-eight (48) hour advance request, a sign language interpreter, or other reasonable efforts to assist and accommodate persons with physical disabilities, may be made available by calling (702) 455-3530, TDD at (702) 385-7486, or Relay Nevada toll- free at (800) 326-6868, TD/TDD
- Supporting material provided to CCABMW members for this meeting may be requested from Secretary Darlene Kretunski at (702) 455-1402 and is/will be available on the County’s website at [www.clarkcountynv.gov](http://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. April 30, 2024, to [Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov](mailto: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.

CCABMW Members: Paul Dixon, Chairman  
Dan Gilbert, Vice-Chairman  
John Hiatt  
Jacob Thompson  
Dave Talaga  
Brian Patterson  
Alexander Harper

SECRETARY: Darlene Kretunski (702) 455-1402  
EMAIL: [Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov](mailto:Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov)  
Department of Environment and Sustainability  
4701 W. Russell Road, Suite 200 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89118

COUNTY LIAISON: Marci Henson (702) 455-1608  
EMAIL: [Mhenson@ClarkCountyNV.gov](mailto:Mhenson@ClarkCountyNV.gov)  
Department of Environment and Sustainability  
4701 W. Russell Road, Suite 200 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89118

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

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

- Present: (Present: Chair Paul Dixon, Vice Chair Dan Gilbert, Alexander Harper, Brian Patterson, Dave Talaga, John, Hiatt, Jacob Thompson).
- **A quorum was present.**

**II. Pledge of Allegiance**

- **Chair Paul Dixon led in the Pledge of Allegiance.**

**III. Public Comment-** This is a period devoted to comments by the 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 first and last name for the record. If any member of the CCABMW wishes to extend the length of the presentation, this will be done by the Chair or the CCABMW by majority vote.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comment: (None)
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this matter is hereby closed.**

**IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 5, 2024, CCABMW Meeting (For possible action).**

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised motion to approve the minutes from the March 5, 2024, CCABMW meeting.
- Board member Alexander Harper seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0. (Board member Jacob Thompson was not present for this vote).**

**V. Approval of the Agenda for April 30, 2024. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted (For possible action).**

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve the Agenda as presented for the April 30, 2024, CCABMW meeting.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0. (Board member Jacob Thompson was not present for this vote).**

**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.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert: He stated he is excited in making history when applying for the quota.
- Board Member Alex Harper: (None)
- Board Member John Hiatt: (None)
- Board Member Dave Talaga: (None)
- Board Member Brian Patterson: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon: (Yes): He stated the Las Vegas Woods and Waters Club is holding their 32<sup>nd</sup> Annual Sportsman of the Year Awards Banquet on Saturday, June 1, 2024. It will be held at the Gold Coast Hotel and Casino-Nevada (*Ballroom*) and doors will open at 5:00 pm and dinner will be served at 6:45 pm.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.**

**VII. Recap of the March 8, 2024 & March 9, 2024, Board of Wildlife Commissioners Meeting by Chair Paul Dixon (Informational)**

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the following: **Wild Horse and Burro Letter:**

Commission decided to write their own support letter and he is uncertain if the letter was finalized at this time.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the letter **Petition by Ms. Rebecca Goff:** Commission decided to take no action on this matter after the petitioner decided to withdraw the petition to resubmit it later, to avoid the waiting period of five years to resubmit another petition and because the Commission was going to deny the petition. He advised that the debate was heated, and that Petitioner Ms. Rebecca Goff brought in lobbyists that she was working with on this petition as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there will be a committee, headed by Commissioner David McNinch to discuss wildlife contests and submit their recommendations from the committee to the Commission to determine if these wildlife contests should continue certain species in areas.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that **Commission General Regulation 520- Tag Deferral Extenuating Circumstances Revision,** he stated there were revisions in the wording that NDOW decided that were needed to add to the LCB file, and the CAB will discuss those changes tonight. He stated previously the CAB saw changes to the LCB write up and there are now changes to the LCB file that need to be discussed tonight.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised **Commission General Regulation 521-Junior Tag Transfer** was passed as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that **Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review:** He stated that he let the Commission know of the CAB's recommendation from the previous meeting on 3/5/24 meeting: *CAB recommendation: (CAB does not support Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review as written, the CAB felt there are enough controls in place to protect the wildlife and it is an unnecessary regulation that NDOW does not have qualified staff to oversee or implement this currently and the Clark County Planning Commission feels it is unimplementable).*
- Vice Chair Jacob Thompson asked Chair Paul Dixon did the Commission give any indication of how they will vote on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Jacob Thompson that the Commission will support Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review, as it is back for a final reading and for acceptance from the Commission at the next Commission meeting on May 3, 2024 & May 4, 2024.
- **Chair Paul Dixon said hello to board member Jacob Thompson who joined the meeting online at this time.**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that **Commission General Regulation 511, Wildlife Management Area** that the CCABMW discussed the ADA regulation that needed to be addressed, and the changes were made. CABs recommendation from previous meeting on 3/5/2024: CAB recommendation: *(CAB advised a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 511 WMA as presented with the recommendation that NAC 504 Section 3. (b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, operating a: (1) Motor vehicle, including, without limitation, an electric or battery electric vehicle; or (2) Bicycle, including, without limitation, a bicycle that is electric or battery electric. To make sure that these two parts under Section 3 do not violate ADA regulations).*
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the young lady from NDOW who wrote up the regulation supporting material did not realize the ADA implications. He stated this

was the second time that these changes were discussed with the Commission and the Commission did make the changes to address the ADA regulations. He stated that he said at the Commission meeting that the CAB does read everything to make recommendations, and the same young lady stated yes that is true because you have a comment on everything and stated that made people at the meeting laugh.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that **Commission Regulation 24-10, Migratory Game Bird Seasons, Bag Limits and Special Regulations for Waterfowl and Webless Migratory Game Birds Public Hunting Limited on Wildlife Management Areas and Designated State Lands for the 2024-2025 Seasons** passed as presented.
- Commission Regulation 23-04, (Amendment 3) 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 was accepted as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised **Commission Regulation 23-04, Amendment 3, 2024-2025 Big Game Seasons** there was a minor change due to a mistake, but it was corrected. *(The correction was for an erroneous season date for the late antlerless elk season in Unit Group 104, 108B, 121, in which the existing season completely overlaps the late antlered elk hunt in the same area).*
- Chair Paul Dixon advised one of the big points of the meeting was the discussion on wildlife contests, he stated he felt there was a very good discussion on this subject matter.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this matter is hereby closed.**

#### VIII. General Business/Action Items:

**Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners May 3, 2024 & March 4, 2024, meeting agenda, as well as additional items brought forth to the CCABMW from the public for discussion.** CCABMW agenda & support materials are available upon request to Darlene Kretunski at (702) 455-1402 or you may email Darlene Kretunski [darlene.kretunski@clarkcountynv.gov](mailto:darlene.kretunski@clarkcountynv.gov). The final commission agenda & support at: [http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meeting/Commission/Agenda/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meeting/Commission/Agenda/)

- **FYI-** Chair Paul Dixon advised that he will not be in attendance of the next Commission meeting on May 3, 2024 & May 4, 2024, as he has acquired playoff tickets to see Golden Knights on Friday therefore the decision, he stated was not a hard discussion. He stated he will be participating in the meeting via phone. He stated he will see if one of the board members would cover for the Chair for the Commission meeting on Friday morning as he has a doctor's appointment in the morning and is then going to see the playoff game on Friday night, and he will do via phone as he indicated for the Commission meeting on Saturday May 4, 2024.

a. **Heritage Account Principal Project (*For possible action*).** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the South Schell Land Acquisition Heritage Account Principal Project Proposal. The Department is seeking Heritage Account Principal Project funding to acquire 1,720 acres of wildlife habitat in the Schell Creek Range near Ely, NV.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **(Location Narrative):** The Project is located approximately 23 miles southeast of Ely, Nevada, in the southern portion of the Schell

Creek Mountain Range. The Project Area is located on private lands surrounded by USFS and BLM lands in the Ely Ranger District. He stated the amount of acreage is 1,720 acres of land and advised that the owner is from the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

- Chair Paul Dixon read the following of the Budget Item: NDOW Heritage Trust Account 2023: \$750,000; Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation 2023: \$50,000; Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources 2024: \$250,000; Nevada Dream Tag 2024: \$100,000; NGO Donations 2024: \$75,000; US Fish and Wildlife Service 2024: 500,000; Subtotal from all is \$1,720,000 to purchase 1712.8 acres of land that is 99.2 Percent of Project and the Land Status is Private.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated as the Chair, he often wonders what benefits there are to purchasing private land parcels like this and stated one of the objectives of this purchase as like Success Loop and the wildlife management area (*Argenta*) just north of Battle Mountain. He stated both were purchased to increase measurably the wildlife populations, wildlife use, and habitat beneficial for public use and hunter success to measure across increase access for wildlife dependent recreation and to prevent conversion to agriculture or other anthropogenic development and fulfill conservation groups, therefore this is the drive of purchasing the land from NDOW intervals project objective. He stated therefore more discussion on the purchase of this land using partial heritage funds and lots of funds from other sources.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that he is curious and is under the assumption that the reasoning behind the Water Authority owning this is part of the purchase of ranches in Spring Valley.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that he is correct.
- Board member John Hiatt continued stating it was years ago and that they also received grazing laws because much of this is water at these sites thus part of the grazing operation and asked the question what it means for someone that water authority's grazing operations is giving up rights to all the springs presumably in this area.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board John Hiatt that he does not know if he has the answer to this question because he thought that they were purchased in the land not the water.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that there is some.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that he is halfway curious and when looking through the documents stated that Southern Nevada Water Authority should be a nonprofit organization. He asked the question if they are passing this land on at the same values that they themselves picked it up for or is there a premium on it.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he does not have this information.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that he assume that all of this is fair market value and stated typically for these to be transferred to the state it would have to be at fair market value.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member John Hiatt that he was under the same assumption.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that it was not bought at market value, they wrote checks for whatever.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated they wrote checks to own it.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to incentivize itself.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that he is not certain if he has an answer to his previous question nor does he know if any NDOW representative has the answer either.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that it stated in the supporting material for this that there are 14 different water rights.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He asked the question does the land acquisition include water rights, mineral rights, or just the land.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it includes 14 different water rights and his guess is that they own the water rights since they own the land. He stated because mineral would be used in future to stop anthropogenic development therefore, they would own mineral rights. He stated if the goal is to have anthropogenic development they would own water rights, own the land and therefore they would own the mineral rights.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated that the acquisition is to have it in its entirety, the land, water, and minerals.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked Chair Paul Dixon is this why is this acquisition so spread out and in certain areas.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated those parts are the land that was available for purchase with water rights most likely.
- Board member John Hiatt stated basically those areas are where there are springs and people. He advised that historically ranchers filed for these springs and got 40 acres and water and he is under the assumption that the Southern Water Authority bought up these ranges of Spring Valley, and the Southern Water Authority is willing to relinquish these, the reasonings of why is uncertain.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if this is with Pittman-Robertson matching or if it does not match, then you must go through this way. He stated he does not see this working out.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that Pittman-Robertson funding is not needed in this endeavor, instead he stated it is his understanding that it comes straight from Heritage funds and no Pittman-Robertson funding to provide land services.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett, Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that Pittman-Robertson is not eligible for predation approval, but he is not certain about land acquisition, and advised that all heritage funding is from tag revenues. He stated specialty tags are approved for Pittman-Robertson funding.
- Chair Paul Dixon gave example: if you receive 75,000 you have 4 to 1 match therefore that would be more than the purchase price. He stated he does not believe that there are any matching funds being used.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated there may not be matching funds on this specific project, but he believes that Pittman-Robertson funding is matched statewide.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated looking at this supporting material and the hydrology of this map and long-term climate projections in the West, in this we are looking at watersheds here and presumably springs which are valuable to wildlife in Nevada and with the two winters that we just went through being the exception, and getting a large amount of precipitation and a large amount of snowfall throughout the mountains and throughout Nevada and most portions of the west, he feels that these areas are extremely valuable to wildlife now just currently and not just previously but definitely in the future. He stated if this is the case from a wallet management and

population perspective this is good to think about.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member Alex Harper that he appreciates his comments and stated these are pictures of property of Southern Nevada Water Authority and he does not believe that this entity that would go turn this under simply for a subdivision and to see if they will be a pretty light user or not, they are not just going to do that.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that Southern Nevada Water Authority could lease the area for mineral exploration and being in the mountain ranges where the price of gold now and lithium mining that is being done in this state in areas, he doesn't know the mineral resources therefore he cannot answer that question. He stated if you were asking about the minerals that were in the Ruby Mountains then he could answer that because he is more familiar with the mineral resources there.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked Chair Paul Dixon why this is being sold and how difficult is it to manage this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that the reasonings is that Southern Nevada Water Authority has already purchased the ranches, these were straggling pieces that were not in the valley, and we have large acre feet of water and the amount of recharge that will come from these springs into that system, will take thousands of years, it will not current anyone's regulatory or political lifetime. He stated with that perspective nothing from the bottoms was sold, you can drill and have large acre feet of water in the valley forest. He stated that Southern Nevada Water Authority sold the Hiko Springs, which will feed those things he stated in his opinion, would feed recharge long term and this is referring to thousands of years to do that recharge.
- Board member Dan Talaga stated that we really do not know what the Southern Nevada Water Authority attentions are.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he felt that the Southern Nevada Water Authority attentions were to consolidate their holdings on to the valley, where all the water sources are located.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that this seemed reasonable.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that this would be his guesstimate, and this seemed reasonable. He advised that there were no indications in the writing to suggest this.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked the question to Chair Paul Dixon once NDOW receives this how it is going to be managed.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga how do we manage the Success Loop at this time.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that we do not have to manage it, and that it would manage itself.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked the question does the Schell Creek Range have any wilderness.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to Chair Paul Dixon, yes and that it is located right next to it.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it is right next to the wilderness.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated it sits between Taylor Peak and the wilderness area. He stated that board member John Hiatt may have been involved in this and asked if the



reasoning due to not encompassing that area to be incorporated into building this area.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that it was probably private.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated correct, and advised that it could have prevented this, and this could have been a way to save more money and encompass more bonus time and this is not going to allow that.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that it is not continuous therefore he does not see how you could.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that only congress can designate that.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked the question of why was this not incorporated, and stated if it would not have been private ground there, then would that wilderness extend the boundaries out.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he would imagine that it would have been and explained that it was private only because ranchers had purchased all the water sources.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated so are the advantages written in this brief.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that yes, the advantages are what is written in the brief.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked if these advantages are worth the cost.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that the long term when asking is it worth the cost, you see the NGO of (*RMEF*) Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation donating funding for this, you are correct about foundations not donating funding to something that will not support future hunting opportunities.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated the big threat would be mining.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he think that mining would be the big threat.
- Board member John Hiatt stated who knows.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated at the end of the day it is mainly limestone.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that these parcels were sold and there is access to the people that build houses there.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that people could and would build houses there because you have a large amount of people and money.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated that there may not be any incentive other than it is very valuable wildlife habitat and Southern Nevada Water Authority being led by people that do have a biological background, led to another agency that had biological backgrounds.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that this would not be both cost and time effective for Southern Nevada Water Authority to do so.
- Board member Brian Patterson suggested a motion to clean up some work of private property nestled in the center of the national board.
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve Heritage Account Principal Proposal for heritage funding to purchase private parcels in the Schell Creek Mountain Range.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

**b. New Commission Policy 12- Fee for Habitat, Research and Management (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a new Commission Policy 12.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: (SUMMARY): Policy 12 was last reviewed at the March Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Meeting (*TAAHC*). The policy has been developed to reflect legislative changes surrounding the three-dollar big game application fee. Chair Paul Dixon stated to those individuals who applied for a tag this year and with their \$3 fee, could advise which option you wanted it to be used for (lethal, or non-lethal) research.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that this a product of AB 70 which needs to establish mechanism to allocate the funding therefore is the individual chooses the box for lethal removal, there will be a process like with Heritage where there will be submission and vetting process and the final step is approval of a subcommittee.
- **FYI- Assembly Bill 70 was adopted which in part amended NRS 502.253 1. In addition to any fee charged and collected pursuant to NRS 502.250, a fee of \$3 must be charged for processing each application for a game tag, the revenue from which must be accounted for separately, deposited with the State Treasurer for credit to the Wildlife Account in the State General Fund and used by the Department, at the direction of the applicant, for costs related to: (a) Developing and implementing an annual program for lethal removal of predatory wildlife; or developing and implementing an annual program for the improvement of wildlife habitat and research or management activities beneficial to nonpredatory game species.**
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

**c. Fiscal Year 2025 Predation Management Plan (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the Fiscal Year 2025 Predation Management Plan.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **Brief Explanation of Changes to FY 2025 Predation Management Plan Final Draft**): Language was added
  - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if this has any effects on the existing project 241.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert and Chair Paul Dixon that these are independent projects and that Project 37 or statewide protection from outlines, is simply adding additional fees from the recommendation of the NDOW Damage Management Committee and Project 38 Statewide Coyote Gotcha.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert thanked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) for his clarification on this.
- Board member John Hiatt stated his question to Chair Pau Dixon asking the annual adult survival rates is less than 90 percent would indicate reasoning for predator removal. He stated that his understanding is that most of the sheep muscle population does not live to age nine. He stated in normal situations that without predation there could be more than 90 percent support in an adult survival rate.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that for a large amount of the ungulates and the healthy populations, these groups would have annual survival over 90 percent. He advised that for deer the older populations survival rates are low. He advised that normally it is 80 to 83 percent for bucks and 83 to 86 percent for does and for sheep elk it is relatively high percentage once they get a couple of years of age.
- Board member John Hiatt asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) with the pronghorn is hunting considered one of the factors involved in mortality or is that separated out of the mortality cause.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that it would be separated out and this would be simply animal survival which is playing its course.
- Board member Alexander Harper asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): if the numbers are reflected if there was no hunting, is that what you anticipate being the annual survival rate would be.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to board member Alexander Harper that some years that may be lower depending on the conditions.
- Board member Alexander Haper asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*)

what other factors are affecting the population other than hunting.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that we lived down in the southern region and recently there has been drought conditions therefore giving good contractions of big game populations with data from Utah and this state is just across the border from collaring data where it showed annual survival rate for deer was in the 70 percent during these extreme drought conditions. He advised that the data is reflected and utilized, and it all depends on how severe weather conditions are. He stated there are other factors such as winter range and summer range habitat conditions and predation especially in smaller populations.
- Board member John Hiatt asked the question on the younger female populations how Nevada rate compares to other states like California, Arizona. He stated that his experience in California was when he moved there is that the survival rate for the young was high in the fall and many of the young were twins.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to board member John Hiatt that Nevada is a dry state therefore, the populations in this state are much lower than the other adjoining states and this has a lot to do with recruitment measures. He stated when looking at Northeastern Nevada and looking at farm ratios, in both spring and fall and compare it with Southern Nevada, there is a difference in moisture patterns and habitat conditions.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that it would be nice if the employees of NDOW who prepared this supporting material read the material to alleviate seeing the same spelling errors carrying on each time the supporting material is viewed from year to year. He stated he understands cut and paste but at some point, he advised proofreading is fundamental.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve Fiscal Year 2025 Predation Management Plan as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

d. **Commission General Regulation 500- Subdivision Map Review (For possible action)** The CCABMW will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the final revisions to Commission General Regulation 500 Subdivision Map Review.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the CAB has commented on this topic multiple times, and he stated that he has voiced the CABs concerns and recommendations to the Commission. He stated that at this time, that no changes have come from the concerns addressed by him on behalf of the CAB to the Commission. He feels that NDOW is working with the Commission to finalize LCB language therefore the CABs input on this matter will not change the direction of where this action item is headed at this time. He stated the set of process in this is different than anything that the CAB has worried about with this one.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that Chair Paul Dixon comments on this makes sense. He asked Chair Paul Dixon did he know exactly who was walking through this, and asked was it NDOW.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that it was not NDOW who lobbied for this, and he felt there were a group that felt that this is something that NDOW should be doing. He stated this is a guesstimate on his part, and stated when he went to the commercial reptile collection, there was a lot of concern about development and species impact, especially in expanding areas of the state but as you go north in places such as (Elko, Battle Mountain, the entire I-80 corridor is expanding and there are a lot of things that were not being done in these areas, and he stated that yes it was his drive as well as conservation groups support on this action item.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated to Chair Paul Dixon that his guess was excellent and stated that his statements he was about to make has nothing to do with the subject matter being discussed by Chair Dixon but on the topic of regulations existing and more coming and what is the meaning of the regulations, and if these regulations are good, reasonable, or simply jamming up the process already implemented. He stated he is not familiar with reptiles that much unless it is a desert tortoise. He stated the state of Nevada has many snakes here and these reptiles do

carry a commercial value. He stated there is a market for them that is legitimate and there is a black market for many species of snakes too. He stated the way that individuals find these reptiles is by going into these areas and turning over rock after rock after rocks at a time. He stated these reptiles are being removed and over time populations of snakes are being affected by this. He stated that does happen. He stated he is unaware if this is a huge issue here in Nevada but in Arizona where there are valuable reptiles like the kingsnake, that is a big problem, especially in social media with individuals posting these things and people finding them. He stated now people are hiding the location of these species to prevent it from becoming an issue. He reiterated that he is not certain if this is an issue here in Nevada due to the CAB having previous discussions on reptile collection and the meaning of this to habitats. He wanted to speak on this because this is something that he has been aware of for a few years now and it is legitimate issue, and he feels that our focus is on a few predators and game species. He stated there are multiple other species that the CAB does not discuss and that goes for NDOW from a management perspective. He stated there are many species in Nevada that are on the decline and the CAB is not talking about those species. He stated when these species due become listed as endangered which he feels they probably will be due to the population crashes exhibited with massive connections to the plant communities and their success, then those are going to be future things that the CAB will be talking about from the viewpoint of regulation standpoint. He felt the difficulties are coming due to more regulations and the impending regulations that will happen to intervene on the steep population declines and a couple of these species that are keystone species that we do not discuss enough about.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated that we are discussing land development and plan review therefore I would like to piggyback off your comments board member Alexander Harper just made and state my comments on reptiles and the solar industry. He advised tens of thousands of acres are being bladed completely therefore leaving these areas lost to reptiles and insects and other smaller species and nobody seems to care. He

stated that yet when we have twelve commercial reptile collectors and we had to change and put those guys out of business, the place came unglued. He stated and yet anyone from the solar farm can come out and remove the habitat and species in massive numbers as opposed to what these twelve commercial reptile collectors were doing.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Brian Patterson that we are talking about subdivision maps and if they need to bother to do a review, and this does tie back when the only solar field in the state is Genesis Solar Energy Project which is the only one where they have been building everything up and have done minimal ground disturbance of putting in the solar to see whether or not that actually can be accomplished and to see if the wildlife around could actually be maintained. He asked board member John Hiatt has he been out to this area, and if he was aware of what is happening at this location.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that he has seen what is happening there and this is a major issue and concern with (*BLM*) Bureau of Land Management with their claim of moving more natural area of friendliness regarding the solar farms, but this has yet to be seen.
- Board member Brian Patterson questioned who will staff and implement this review process and will it even be implemented.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that at the last Commission meeting (*Tommy Caviglia, Committee Chairman, NDOW Board of Wildlife Commissioners*) asked (*Alan Jenne, Director of NDOW*) on this and he stated he believes that there will be some amount of general funds that will be used to support having staff for this.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked Chair Paul Dixon if this should automatically be funded by the fees.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that it is funded by the fees, but the fees come through the general fund, and we receive so little money from the general fund, and this will be an additional amount of money that comes from the general fund, but this will be earmarked for this. He stated to board member Brian Patterson that his point is well taken.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that it goes on the books and never gets reviewed or implemented.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated his question is what the main thrust of this is, other than to just start something and it is not showing any powers and it simply puts these up for review and does not necessarily stop anything. He read the following **(Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Review Program: 4. A developer may submit a tentative map to the Department of Wildlife before submitting the tentative map to the planning commission or governing body to be pre-reviewed by the Department of Wildlife for any potential wildlife issues.** He stated any potential wildlife issues that appl, what might that word any apply to, is it regarding nesting raptors, desert tortoises with a rock or snake underneath it, I do not know exactly what it is.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert with regards to tortoises, we have already signed off.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member John Hiatt that it states “any” and the word any is such a broad term.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that it is also good at stopping development.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated the way it is written right now does not seem to be an answer.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the answer to this is no and why were we shut down if it is commercial recollection and we never discussed development, and the destruction of habitat is because of the economic development department of the County, came and talked to the Commissioners and the Commissioners basically talked to other people.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated this would be essentially the areas that are not applicable and does not have any forage cover nesting habitat or any other value necessary to wildlife. This reaches out to any piece of property which puts them in a prediction over this and going forward in the future if this got another provision added to it.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he is behind the premise, and stated if he was building a 10,000-acre subdivision in Steptoe Valley, he would think and would like NDOW to view and make certain that there is no blockage of any migration corridors or some of those types of events. He stated but when there are 10,000-acre



solar panels up and NDOW does not get a chance to review maps on this prior to it being put up and state that it is blocking a mule deer corridor or a migration corridor.

- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Brian Patterson that if you look at what is happening in Henderson, Nevada on the north face of the north compass and think about what reptiles is where they are just trashed completely, this shows no evidence that NDOW has accomplished anything. He stated and with lots of development meeting and if you are not actually at these development meetings speaking during the time that these decisions are made, then you are simply ignored, and they do not even pay any attention to it.
- Board member Brian Patterson states that the County Planning Commission goes on right now down the hall.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated that he has been here since the 70s, late 60s and the area in Henderson where they are building, when there is a good rain then that entire area on the side of the mountain will come alive with flowers and plants but unfortunately, we have been in a drought. He stated that NDOW never had an opportunity to check out that area, and state that that area is critical habitat. He stated there are plants in this area that have never been studied and if they were able to go into this area and plow that area over, then there are entire plants that were lost. He stated it was never investigated.
- Board member Alexander Harper asked (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*) if he would agree that there were no good baseline studies out there on this.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated exactly.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated therefore we do not have any idea of what we lost potentially and what we are exactly talking about when it comes to these plants.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated exactly.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to deny Commission General Regulation 500 Subdivision Map Review.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.

- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Board member John Hiatt advised that an explanation for clarification of the denial needs to be provided.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he does not think it has a well-defined goal within the legislation right now.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated it doesn't have a goal.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated the goal is to review. He stated it doesn't necessarily say that it is upon review suppose to make a recommendation about something instead it states for any potential wildlife issues.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it does not really accomplish anything.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it simply bogged down the developer.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated it gets passed on and will be another tax on stage.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked what reading of the bill is this.
- Board member Brian Patterson and Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised it is the third reading.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked if anything has changed since the first reading.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there is really no substantial changes since the first reading. He stated the CAB has submitted their concerns each time on this.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that for the sake of time that the CAB reiterate the same recommendation previously stated.
- **FYI- CAB recommendation at the 10/31/23 board members voted 3 to 1 with motion to approve Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review as presented with two questions: 1) When has NDOW's comments made for subdivision maps made a difference in the subdivision approval. 2) If NDOW is going to be in opposition of the subdivision, then they must attend the Clark County Commission Planning Meeting. The dissenting view from board member Brian Patterson objected to this and stated it is unrealistic to builder and NDOW will have to take on another new role.**
- **FYI- CAB recommendation at the 3/5/24 meeting: Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that**

**the CAB does not support Commission General Regulation 500 Subdivision Map Review as written because the CAB felt there are enough controls in place to protect the wildlife and it is an unnecessary regulation and NDOW does not have qualified staff to oversee or implement this currently and the Clark County Planning Commission feels it is unimplementable.**

- Board member Dave Talaga stated that he would like the board members to get back to the motion please.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the previous motion stated and the second to the motion as presented is still the motion.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to deny Commission General Regulation 500 Subdivision Map Review.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- Motion passes 7-0.

e. **Commission General Regulation 518- Shed Hunting (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about proposing changes to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 503.172 that better identifies unlawful activity for shed hunting and provides provisions for big game mammal skull collection.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there have been significant changes to this regulation.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that some people in White Pine and Lincoln counties basically feel if you are of this state of Nevada, then you do not have to be part of this process and others wanted to look more like Utah on this. He stated that this regulation is insignificant regulation and with the changes these are significant changes to this regulation.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked Chair Paul Dixon what exactly is driving these changes. He stated if his recollection is correct this is for shed collection with border columns not the interior columns.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that he was correct with his recollection on this.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that it has morphed into massive amount of legislation.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this did not deal with Nye, Carp, or Washoe or Pershing counties or other counties, he stated it dealt with counties where people could get access from Utah because of the large access of shed hunters coming in from Utah.

- Public Comments: (*Lt. Christopher Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated when this regulation first came out it was written like some of our laws which do not provide clear direction how to enforce it necessarily. He stated that (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) is aware of why this regulation was instilled. This law was for prevention of harassment of wildlife in critical ranges and when this came in it was given grace period by issuing some warnings and try to use some control and educate people and it spiraled out of control because there were no teeth in the game for enforcement. He stated it is a very difficult area to control due to controlling a vast area. He stated there was nothing in the language of stockpiling or GPS translocating and then coming back. He stated regardless of if they were taking or not, they were still in that area and manipulating the night. He stated that Lincoln and White Pine County, there is a large amount of influx of individuals from Utah. He stated he is not familiar with Utah's shed antler regulation, but the failure to regulate has obviously driven Utah residents to the state of Nevada. He stated he feels from reading that this regulation and the changes to it goes a lot further in giving teeth in the game now. He stated now law enforcement does not have to catch an individual red handed with an antler in their hands in the field or in their vehicle or with it in their hand, law enforcement can make a case that there is probable cause that they of GPS or stockpiling and utilize that and make a case.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*) that he agrees that from a standpoint of law enforcement and management side regulating shed hunting and having more teeth in the game now is a good thing.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated it is a biproduct that will give us a moment of teeth in the game to help law enforcement out there to educate and do good enforcement and help the range and the habitat.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated it is looking at a necessary evolution of the concept.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this started very simple with an honor system in which individuals would take the class and doing the honor system correctly, but instead 95 percent of the people do the honor system correctly and there are 5 percent who do not. He stated this is still creating a major problem and we cannot basically under the current regulations do anything to those who are not doing the honor system correctly.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that he thinks there should still be a lot more teeth in this, but this is still a step in the right direction. He stated again nobody wants regulations, but from a law enforcement standpoint, with the issues that we have and the cases presently this regulation has helped.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated if you read through the changes on this regulation now, it is really involving around stockpiles and caching where the individual person that goes out and grabs shed antler and walks out with it, it is not the person that is going to be the target of this increased regulation. He stated it is immersion that is abusing it.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern*

*Region*): He stated that law enforcement does not physically see in these individuals' possession so they just cache fifty antlers underneath a juniper tree or something and walk away 10 feet and law enforcement has nothing. He reiterated that this gives law enforcement a little bit more teeth in the game to do their job enforcing it and they maybe should educate out of state shed antler collectors that maybe we do not want to learn about.

- Board member Alexander Harper asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) if he felt that this regulation falls short in any manner. He stated that it sounds to him that (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) that he feels there could be some improvements but is there anything that you think that the regulation should have that you wish it did.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he does not and feels this is a very good start with the regulation. He stated that he would like to discuss a correction: on Commission General Regulation 518 (NAC 503.172) #8 A sealed big game mammal skull and legally collected shed antlers may be sold, auctioned, or traded by a nonprofit organization after receiving it as a donation. He stated that the wording and **legally collected** in that sentence, he stated those two words should be removed. He stated under #3 (f) use of dogs for collection of shed antlers; law enforcement has not had one report through Lincoln or Clark county. He stated he cannot answer why that was there and maybe in Elko or another county up north they utilize this regulation. He stated to comment on the drones that is an entire issue in and on itself dealing with unbanned.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated with programs that are out for object identification you can have drones fly on the grids and GPS mark and you go, and hunt and the issue is we have laws against using drones for hunting and other things and there is none stating that you may use the drone for collecting shed antlers.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated again this helps law enforcement.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that this will come back next year for amendment due to you coming back and stating that this is where law enforcement is falling short. He stated we are slowly adding to this regulation as we did with another regulation called the First Come First Serve process starting with the honor system and four years ago, he warned what would happen with these issues and now the regulation has been tightened up due to the things that were happening based on the honor system and they happened.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that if law enforcement meets an individual that is hiking and has a GPS, law enforcement has no reasonable suspicion of this individual marking shed location, they could be. He stated absolutely and this gives that opportunity to think whereas previously law enforcement came across the hiker with GPS and had the thought process of this individual is simply hiking, so it is evolving.
- Public Comments: (*Jerlindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He asked the question to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*) if there have been any tickets issued in the last 30 years and if so the convictions on those tickets in the areas of Clark, Lincoln, Nye counties.

- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDO, Southern Region*): He stated to (*Jerlindo Tiberti, member of the public*) that in Clark County we do not have regulation, in Lincoln County there is a regulation, and we have some adjustments.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*) asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*) to clarify if he was talking two tickets or thousands of tickets.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he is talking about thousands of tickets. He stated we are talking about probably into several dozens over the course of Lincoln, White Pines, Elko, these are the counties that he is familiar with and work closely with.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that we do not have thousand of violations in other areas.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he realizes this but gave an example of the percentage if law enforcement wrote ten tickets, this would probably be five percent of the people who are out there possibly.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated or less, he stated it is just like speeders who run the red light.
- Board member John Hiatt read the following: Commission General Regulation 518 (NAC 503.172) #5. A person shall not take or gather skulls of big game mammals without obtaining a big game mammal skill tag or permit from the Department. He stated that his guesstimate is that there are ten of thousands of animal skulls out there which include deer skulls with antlers on them that are located on farms, in houses and everywhere in rural Nevada. He stated there are plenty of Bighorn sheep skulls that have been collected and for the presumption here is that any individual who picks up a skull is a criminal. He stated and it is clear stating you must have a GPS location data of where the skull was found as well as taking a photograph of it. He stated that most of the skulls that he knows about have been picked up by individuals who were walking, hiking and just out and about and what this does basically is unless the individual has GPS and camera and all the other things listed on regulation and complete all of the steps and within 5 days go to the office and get it sealed or you are essentially a criminal. He stated he feels that this is a problem.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to board member John Hiatt that he appreciates his comments and advised that in the Muddies in November while on patrol he receives two calls a day regarding Bighorn sheep that is for veterans skulls and the individual who are calling us and who are finding these skulls are completely aware of the regulations of picking up the salvage head and they know they have to take a photo of it and get a hold of one of the game wardens communicating with these individuals through text or via email and these individuals send us all their information with 99 percent of these skulls with undetermined cause of death. He stated most are years old and even if theoretically poached law enforcement would not be able to most likely tell because it usually has been scattered across the landscape. He stated and there are people who find the skulls and have no idea and will not call. He stated

most people are aware of the salvage heads certificate system and know they cannot possess a Bighorn sheep skull theoretically without either being sealed. He stated our game division have a self check certificate for the residences and it is legal to possess. He gave an example: There was a certain incident where the hunter had a failure to pursue an animal and the hunter could not find this animal. There was another party who came across this animal a few days later and the animal was a trophy animal and a very good one too, there were some issues due to the awareness and determination of it being human cost fatality based on what law enforcement saw. He stated there were discussing about what is the legal right these individuals have to this animal versus the legal right that law enforcement has as the agency and it is clear due to the NRS on this that if it is human caused then they cannot possess it. He stated that this is why he is asking to clean it up a little bit for clarification and educate these individuals who are out there finding these things and know we are not trying to criminalize it. He stated there have been many issues where they tell the individuals to leave the animals and skulls in the field so that law enforcement can theoretically expect it. He will get some calls where the individual is telling law enforcement that they just brought species and skull to their garage and advised that he does not initially run over to the individuals house and write this individual a citation for possession. He reiterated that we must have a discussion with them and educate them and advised that most of these situations are rare. He stated he feels the value of the education to these individuals goes further than payment of a citation.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated that when you take the shed antler course yearly because it is not one of those courses that are good for a say ten years it is yearly. He stated all the new regulations will be in the training for this year and you should take this course to cover yourself and if you do not take this course, then you are simply setting yourself up for disaster because you will be out in the field doing things and if you took the course, you would cover yourself.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He reiterated that the salvage skull that has been out there for three years, and law enforcement is concerned with potentially that the individual's pursuit or failure to find something and prevention of the skull getting into the wrong hands or preventing the trophy buck from getting harvested illegally and posted on social media.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that he wants to make sure that we are not in the same situation for allowing people to overstress animals and do damage to the habitat. He stated to not pursue something due to have double opportunities and he advised that he wants the book to be thrown at these offenders. He stated he does not want this regulation to criminalize his child for simply picking up fork and horn antler that they found on their hike. He stated that he has a big problem with this not putting the information in a clear direction.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he would never second guess the discretion of one of his officers in the field that have encountered you and your son and your son is holding a fork horn and the officer decides to write a junior citation especially if the parent is being a jerk to the officer.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW,*

*Southern Region*) that this goes into the spectrum of a person deciding based upon their rationale at that moment based on the circumstances, rather than having defined clearly what is going to be.

- Board member Dave Talaga advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he agrees with his statement of tracking down the shed and throwing the book at offenders' 100 percent. He stated that his concern is individuals that go out and casually come across something and pick it up and are stopped by law enforcement therefore he feels that this is putting all the power in law enforcements hands.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that this is the same as going to Yellowstone National Park and a kid found this huge skull and threw it in the back of his truck and they got stopped by the National Park Game Warden who took the skull away and explained the rules to both and did not write a citation. He stated he realizes that was a long time ago but his point he is making that one cannot write a regulation that gets so structured to law enforcement thus having their hands tied when it comes time for enforcement. He stated there must be officer discretion, and in everything he has heard of with talking to residents of Lincoln County and their relationships that these locals have with law enforcement in Lincoln County and NDOW therefore the residents have knowledge of their game wardens and the likelihood of the scenario previously stated would not happen unless as previously stated the parent is being difficult.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked for clarification of what is considered being difficult.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that he feels that the officers have a good grasp on discretion and communities that live in a good realistic view of the works of situations. He stated that law enforcement is given a lot of power to enforce every statue in the state for criminal and non-criminal and speeding as well. He stated a traffic stop could be made every 100 yards in this town therefore it is not the goal of law enforcement, but it can be done. He advised that law enforcement is not utilized for the family that is going on a hike for the weekend and find something.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he can respect that but advised that it does not state this in the regulations and gives full discretion to the officer in the field. He stated he rarely goes around looking for sheds and if he found some is he worthy of receiving a citation. He advised at this point the discretion becomes the officers.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that if he is doing it out of season then yes this would happen.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated in reading the regulations, he stated if I contact you in the field and you have your phone and you have a lot of Onyx pinpoints therefore there is reasonable suspicion that you are marking sheds. He stated this would give law enforcement probable cause to cease your phone.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) that the point he is attempting to make is that he is not doing damage to the habitat and not stressing animals, he advised not doing anything



expect going into the new guidelines on season that has been established because of not his doing but that of the abusers who have done things in order for containment.

- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): as previously asked by (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*) how many cases a year are we having these issues with. He stated that the issue is when you are adding more teeth to the game to the regulation to help deal with the problem with a dozen and convict those dozens because they are the bad actors in the group. He stated law enforcement tend to catch people to get grievance. He stated what I am trying to state to Vice Chair and other board members is the likelihood we are going to have this scenario is if we had one case in a year with this, are we going to change the regulation for that or possibly have officer training to deal with this scenario a little differently. He stated you cannot put everything in regulation.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He reiterated that there is a large amount of influx of out of state residents that have come into Nevada and disregard our state and do what they think.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that if someone breaks the big laws there is no anarchy, instead you get a bunch of little laws. He stated and then how many little laws should be written that there are so many that it leaves no room to do anything.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked the question if the CAB feels a petition should be put in to change the policy.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that shed hunting laws are common across America and he stated he does not feel that people see an issue with over enforcement and agreed with Chair Dixon. He stated if there is in an unlikely event over enforcement and it happens to one of the CAB members kids or a CAB member, then yes officer training is the answer. He stated this regulation helps prevent people who are the equivalent of modern-day market hunters for profit solely and are extracting resources from the land unsustainably therefore disturbing wildlife habitat, migration and animals that are already stressed. He stated this regulation seems to have common sense and he advised he could get behind this regulation. He asked what the penalty is associated with this rule and wanted to know if it was a fine structure.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the penalty is a misdemeanor violation in the state of Nevada and is an arrestable offense with up to one year in city or county jail. He advised that law enforcement has leeway to write a misdemeanor violation from \$1.00 to \$999.00 dollars. He stated none of the misdemeanor other than operating investment to the influence are arrestable offenses per the statute and the OUI statute states that shall arrest as opposed to may arrest. He stated that this is the only misdemeanor that he is aware of that law enforcement is directed to arrest the subject. He stated he would have to look up the fine and he thinks it is \$200 dollars for having possession of shed antlers. He reiterated that officers have the discretion.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked the question that it is not based on the amount of pounds and its worth a certain amount per pound.

- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He reiterated again that it is officer discretion on an individual that has a large number of shed antlers in their vehicle. He stated the officer will address this situation accordingly. He advised that law enforcement can read individuals well and can see and know who is out there and what they are doing.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): if there were any demerits assigned to this.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he is unaware of any demerits on this and does not believe so.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there are no demerits on shed.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He advised that law enforcement is doing continuous training and the training. He stated he believes that this regulation will give law enforcement a firm footing in helping maintain the habitat.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked why Lander County and Eureka County on this since they are in the middle of the state.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He advised that there is obviously enough gain in these counties where this could potentially become an issue.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that he believed in the Open Meeting Law that there should not be this back and forth but advised the answer of why is due to the elk and deer population associated with these two counties.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) that you can do this under the Open Meeting Law and stated he does the same format at each CAB meeting.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he was uncertain due to his remembrance of being yelled at for doing the same and going back and forth with dialogue.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that he too gets yelled at when individuals want him to follow strict rules and take input without discussion. He stated if we are going to have public meetings here and ask questions and get answers and have discussion as well and the discussion may take additional time, then he stated he felt that this would be better for all involved in the meeting and he will take full responsibility of it. He stated he rather have dialogue with the public to avoid people walking away feeling that they got nothing from the meeting and stated this is not what he wants to happen.
- Board member John Hiatt advised the purpose of the Open Meeting Law is to facilitate the openness to the public to be aware of what is going on and the public can comment on these issues. He stated this is what we are doing here in our meetings.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he was sorry and not trying to disrupt the meeting, this is not what his intentions were when he was attempting to make his comments.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked why it

against the law is if you pick up a deadhead in the middle of the forest and it has been there for a couple of years.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He advised if the animal in question was poached then by law you cannot have this animal in your possession because it was poached. He stated this applies to animal that was collected due to not following Fair Chase after wounding an animal that would die.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated this applies to roadkill where it is not allowed for an individual to possess any parts thereof animals' death was caused by a vehicle hitting this animal. 1) He stated condone harvesting, depending on what happened to that vehicle as far as the trauma is concerned. 2) He stated why would we allow a citizen to potentially harvest the antlers of the animal, that was killed by human cause and is the property of the state of Nevada. He stated theoretically this individual has no legal right to the antlers or the animal, it is contraband at this point. He stated that law enforcement does respond to a large amount of roadkill in different parts and will go and physically remove the animal from the roadside and remove the antlers. He stated he is unaware of how salvage head law came to be meaning that what was written in.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He stated he has seen deadhead and the bones and stated if an individual picks up these things they will be ticketed or go to jail.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that it would be nice in this regulation if the purpose would be stated.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that he would have to review the NACs on this regulation and is certain that it does not explain clarification on the reasoning behind the salvage head law.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that it is certainly not explained in the regulation presented here.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She stated that it is very interesting and she was unaware of this law and for the sake of public education on this, for those large amount of citizens who are tourists and non-hunters, that do not know this and also for her friends who have come back from hiking and found antlers and advised that they will make great decorations on their wall therefore a way that the public could get notification.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*) that this is a season in which you cannot do this from the months of January 1<sup>st</sup> to April 30<sup>th</sup>. He stated individuals are hiking in the mountains especially this year and if you were to go to Mt. Charleston now, there is only one trail due to the amount of snow up in that area.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that there is many individuals hiking in places like the Muddy Mountains and it is a great time of year to go there.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He reiterated that it is about public education and outreach. He stated whether it be in the format of social media, or on the NDOW website. He advised he is uncertain of the amount of traction that the website receives and stated it has a vast amount of information on it, physical gaming regulations

and things. He stated only a certain number of individuals can be reached with this format and he feels that soon with NDOW and the Nevada Department of Outdoor Recreation will get everyone on board and keep individuals informed of changes that come. He stated that is important.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated that the focus of this is not pertaining to the one or two individuals that find one or two items (*antlers, skulls*), it has a focus mainly on the commercial guys that are making a deep impact. He stated educating everyone is important but not the focus. He stated this is not the focus of NDOW to chase down individuals who found one item.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that it is those individuals who are ignorant of the law and have no ill intent and feel that they made a mistake and have done this and are now a criminal, versus the guys that are out collecting these items illegally and could care less.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He read from the supporting material the following: (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation) what is required to collect during May 1- June 20 open season. He stated that is on page 1 but when you go to page 2 under NAC 503.172 is hereby amended to read as follows: under (b) it states May 1 to June 30, and he wanted to know if this was a mistake and if not why is it different and stated if this was correct or a is typo.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it was just that a typo and should reflect June 30 on both areas.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that section (b) which states May 1 to June 30 is for residents. He stated the shed collecting season is from May 1-June 20 and from May 1 to June 30 you may not collect, and this is the timeframe in which the shed rules are in effect.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that is correct and explained that it opens on May 1<sup>st</sup> to residents with a certificate that is the idea, and nonresidents has the section 3
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*) that the department can track the number of individuals who have taken the education classes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated correct.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he spoke to Lt. in Elko, there were discussions on possible requirement of having a license which is a lot stricter in this area regarding the regulations. He stated the irony of the shed collection certificates is that law enforcement in his division were the last divisions to know about it. He stated whether the individuals have the copy of this with technology on their phones and can retrieve it with the cell service, or they carry a hard copy, these items are things needed to deal with as law enforcement with discretion. He stated if we educate and get the information out there hopefully in a couple of years, we will not even be going to have this discussion.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He asked the question is it alright for collection of sheds from the months of July 1 through 31<sup>st</sup> of December and no need for certificate during this time.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated correct.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to go back to Vice Chair Dan Gilberts comments regarding Annex marking a spot and sitting on the road. He stated if an individual is glassing for animals while seeing sheds at the same marking, law enforcement has no rights to view your phone, but it would be hard to prove that the individual was not GPS marking locations of animals where they would be hunting or where the animals would be sitting. He stated this would almost be an impossible case for law enforcement to win.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated it is difficult to get a right of search warrant on a phone for a Goggle Fence Maps, and it is becoming much more difficult to obtain this information and the officer may get a search warrant for this and receive pages and pages of metadata that takes time. He stated he has never done a search warrant for Annex Maps and advised he would love to do one to see how it works.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert reiterated that it puts the discretion into an individual person discretion.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated it would be an individual who has a license on their phone and their phone is dead due to hunting for a few days, he stated this would be officer discretion.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated shed antlers locking out began in the state of Utah a few years ago, and due to ice snow and in the northern portion of Utah the residents wanted to shut out restrictions to not disturb wildlife during deep snow. He stated the following year Nevada decided to follow along with the methods of Utah. He stated people were jealous of the residents of Utah coming over and count to Lincoln County, the next year following, the Utah residents stop the law. He stated there is no deep snow in Lincoln County or Nye County and yet we are still having restrictions on shed antlers for the Nevada residents, and he advised this law should be thrown out. He stated it is ridiculous to continue it and Nevada should have no parts of this law. He advised that if people want to get shed antlers let them do so, this is what nature intended. He advised there are miles and miles of road work and other things in this state and yet we are restricting individuals from picking up a shed antler. He reiterated that the law needs to be thrown out and is ridiculous and that by doing so, it would relieve the strain on the officers of NDOW. He advised he does not understand the reasoning of continuing this law and that there is no deep snow and there is no harassment of wildlife by simply picking up an antler.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*) that there is harassment to the wildlife in the manner of the way that individuals do this and with the commercial companies that come over here as well.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated there is no distraction to the animals to Chair Paul Dixon and stated if there is animal harassment then there are already entire laws in place for this. He stated if he is walking in the desert and there is no deer in sight and he sees the deer anthers instead, then he did not disturb anything. He stated on the other hand if individuals are chasing deer into wire fences or wire netting then there are already laws in place for this as well and they need to be used if that is the case.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*) that it took the state of Nevada a little over five years to address shed antlers and to do anything. He advised it went before the legislature a few times, and when the law was done around three years ago, it was due to abuse of the system and the environment.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked Chair Paul Dixon by whom.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated not by native Nevadans.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*) that most people who were doing this were out of state people, and there are people who want to make Nevadans exempt from this and from what he got from the individuals in Lincoln and White Pines counties is that Nevada residents should be exempt. He stated if it later becomes a problem due to an overzealous law enforcement officer then the law might change.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated that this law should be eliminated and take out shed antlers.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated that there needs to be more teeth in the game, but he is against this regulation, and wanted to know what impact does shed hunting have on the biology of the environment, and stated this is for the biologist at NDOW to find out and answer. He stated if an individual picks up or puts horns on their shed, in the state of Nevada one year and one day is a misdemeanor, and after than the statute of limitations expires which means that law enforcement cannot come to your residence and take the shed nor can they do an investigation unless there is additional probable cause found for law enforcement to take it from you. He stated with ecology of shed hunting why is Nevadans being limited when the uniform crime report by NDOW would clearly show that the offenders are from out of state and NDOW knows this therefore, they can do an investigation into these matters. He stated law enforcement is not looking for juveniles who picked up sheds to write citations, and regarding investigating cell phones the owner of the phone falls under The Federal Act of Right to Privacy but if you gave them verbal permission to go through your phone, then unfortunately that is on you as the owner of the phone. He stated if the officer has probable cause, then a search warrant must be obtained, and this takes a district court judge to approve the search warrant for Goggle Maps and Annex which takes up to two days. He stated to use common sense on this and asked the question what will happen to the animals on the state of Nevada side and how exactly is shed hunting affecting these animals, he stated this is the important question.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to the CAB if they would like to make a motion for said law, that was solely for non-residents for the shed law, then he stated that he would have no problem with that motion. He stated individuals are suggesting this, therefore at this time, until we know that there is a resident issue, educating individuals in shed hunting on how to respect the shed hunting and if an individual has taken the shed hunting course, it is not simply about picking up the sheds. He stated it is about respect for the animals and the environment. He stated if an individual is a resident or non-resident, this is a healthy thing to do regardless. He stated if individual is walking around in the field, then the course should be taken thus giving a greater degree of

understanding of why we do what we do in nature.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to say not to change this and simply get rid of residents, he stated he does not know that this has been problematic for residents simply picking up sheds and getting in trouble for this. He advised instead it is the individual who is commercially collecting in this state sheds and he knows that his way he is collecting is not doing it in an unlawful manner but in a way that is conservatory of the land and the environment, then these individuals should be fined. He stated if they are doing it correctly, and this individual gets arrested and this individual feel that they were doing this ethically, then possibly this should be changed from residents to non-residents. He stated he felt that individuals did not have the facts to change it from resident to nonresident.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised this was put in place to target non-residents coming over to Nevada and taking sheds.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated absolutely to board member Dave Talaga.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that this law is a bit much and he felt it is not taking the teeth out of law enforcement, by stating if Nevada residents come across a shed and pick it up or take it, and he feels this has not been thought through and to make a motion that either accepts it as is or breaks it up and states that it should not be included in this is short sided on both sides of the spectrum on this. He stated it needs more work and individuals need to sit down and think through the various implications of what has happened. He stated he firmly disagrees with the thought process that since there is not many tickets being written on this, then go ahead and go with this. He stated that this is not a good law and even if one ticket is written out of many there is potential for abuse and that is concerning. He stated instead come up with recommendation for policy or law that shows that there was thought that was given regarding the implications and the CAB will have something to work with.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that he feels this is overreaching and the government doing things that have not been seen in this state before.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that overreaching is a facet of bigger things and has not been thought through and what was supposed to limit out of state individuals from coming here and being problematic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to educate people on how to ethically clean.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated he feels that the entire education thing was a way of a progression of stopping out of state people from coming. He stated if this was just for stopping the out of state people from coming into Nevada, he would be fine with this, but it is not and its creepy. He stated the scope of creep is significant and advised it might be justified, he stated he is uncertain, and he felt he did not hear this in the points in the discussion therefore he is unable to decide on this.
- Board member John Hiatt stated this begin because of commercial shed and because Nevada did not have any elk population until after 80s, consequently shed hunting was done in other states having significant elk population going on for some time. He stated the commercial value of antlers has increased in recent years therefore the damage to habitat and the animals is irrelevant to in

state resident or out of state residents. He stated it was that most of the population of people who were commercial shed hunting were residents who lived out of state. He stated this is due to having more resources in other states when certain conditions occurred and when these individuals were presented with this opportunity to come to Nevada they did so. He stated it is really regarding commercial shed hunting and not about in state residents versus out of state residents.

- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that if this was simply about commercial shed hunting then he stated he would be for this.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga that one of the issue is individuals stating they are not doing commercial shed hunting at all and advising that collecting shed antlers is simply a hobby therefore to place burden on law enforcement to distinguish if it is commercial or not is problematic and abuse of law if everyone is concerned about this, then we should get rid of all criminal laws because they have the potential to be subject to abuse. He stated we must have faith in law enforcement to do the correct thing and not be abusive because we cannot write perfect laws and it is not physically possible to do so.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that this should be sent back and asked to target commercial shed hunting and use the language needed to make this a work around stating the obvious instead of using the citizens.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga to tell the CAB what language the CAB is going to use.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised to board member John Hiatt as a board member that if he had individuals around him discussing this, he advised he would be disgusted.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated we went around for five years and could not come up with words at the Commission meeting and this is the reasoning they did not pass a law, and it was stated that during the time when it was environmentally and air logically critical, they did not want individuals collecting.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated in this supporting material for this there is a large amount detailing caching and collecting.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that individuals do it by caching and GPS, this is the way they do it. He stated ask law enforcement and stated an example in which a man put 40 elk sheds under a Pinion tree and walked 5 feet away and stated it was not his and he has no sheds on his person.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to Chair Paul Dixon that (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*) that if this has teeth in the game and an individual gets 40 to 50 sheds sitting there and this individual has a dumb grin on his face 20 feet away, then that is probable cause because there are teeth in the game. He stated this is not what people who take a hike do.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that an individual hiking is not going to pick up an elk shed meaning ½ of elk shed or a full shed and they are not going to be giving a ticket. He stated it will not happen and it has not happened period.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised to Chair Paul Dixon that there is a distinction being made here between an individual who is collecting sheds



- commercially as opposed to individual who simply stumbles across the sheds. He stated therefore he is requesting for the language on this to be made better.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that he has stated that the language is fine but needs to be made better and he asked the question to board member Dave Talaga if the language is fine why it needs to be refined. Chair Paul Dixon gave the example that this is like polishing feces and stating it will not be brown and smell.
  - Board member Dave Talaga stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he has received tonight input from three members of the public that all stated they are not for this, with one stating to take this law off the books. He stated he will not argue with these individuals and agrees with them and still feels that this needs to be refined.
  - Board member Dave Talaga advised that he give a solid recommendation, he advised convene a committee next get public input and find out where the talking points are that need discussion. He stated after you have done this next do a write up of this input and finally make your laws based on this write up. He stated to Chair Paul Dixon there is your recommendation. He stated this occurs all the time and this is the job of these committees.
  - Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga that he cannot ask for this to be refined without a solid recommendation.
  - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to take Commission General Regulation 518, Shed Antler and Skull pick up back to the Commission to find ways to have teeth in the game to take care of the offenders and not the arm the innocence who come across a shed.
  - Board member Jacob Thompson stated for the sake of expediency he stated he wanted to make a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 518, Shed antler and skull pick up as presented.
  - Board member Alexander Harper second the motion.
  - and next the board members who do not agree can state why
  - **Motion passes 5-2. (The two dissenting opinions are for the following reasons):** *Recommendation of a rewrite for the to deal with the offenders and not innocent and focus on the real issue at hand of the commercial shed hunting draw line between the commercial shed collectors versus the average person with non-commercial shed encounter with shed antlers and skulls, and consider residents being exempt.*

**f. Commission General Regulation 519- Waiting Periods for Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat (For possible action)** The CCABMW

Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners, about amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502.345 and 502.364 that would adjust the waiting periods for Nelson (Desert) bighorn sheep, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep, moose and mountain goat to once in a customer's lifetime.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that both (*Tommy Caviglia, Chair Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee and Shane Rodgers, Nevada Board of Wildlife*)

*Commissioners, member of Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn*) both have supported making Bighorn sheep tags less than a lifetime. He stated that he could count possibly 50 individuals or less who have received more than one tag in lifetime. He advised that everyone already has received in their lifetime one tag and the number of individuals this pertains too is small amount. He stated this came out of the TAC committee's recommendation and the likelihood of extension on this recommendation is not going to be extended by the Commission is very small and he feels that this is a reasonable thing. He stated he knows of two people who received more than one tag. He stated it is a small percentage indeed. He stated that this regulation came from TAC Committee therefore the likelihood that this recommendation from the TAC Committee not being extended by the Commission is very small and this is a reasonable thing because it impacts very few people. He stated he knows only one person who received two tags (*Michael McBeath, Wildlife Commissioner*) and another or it was three in their lifetime.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that it is being stated that hunters being conservationists and the dollars that we throw into being an important factor. He stated we are going to eliminate this by stating truth to individual by advising that their chances are almost none, but we will still take payment on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Patrick Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn, President*) to give stats on how many people have lost after they only harvested and go back to receive another tag thereafter and how much revenue is lost in this.
- Public Comments: (*Patrick Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn, President*): He stated to Chair Paul Dixon that his question was a great one and the analysis is what is strikingly absent on this Commission regulation. He advised this will be part of what his statement reveals, and he will leave this comment here for right now.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that he add moose to this list as well.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to board member Brian Patterson, that moose is already in the regulation.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated it is. He stated he finds the potential loss of revenue compelling and advised he would like to see data on this.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that his understanding is the largest revenue source in the entire application is coming from revenue of non-resident tag application for Bighorn sheep. He stated that is taking a large portion out of the biggest revenue crop generator.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he doesn't mind indicating in the recommendation an explanation would be needed for what would be loss of revenue by making this tag once a lifetime. He advised he is trying to see the total number of individuals who received a tag over the years that reapplied thereafter. He advised that most individuals who are in the age group of 60s and 70s and have received a tag, did not

- reapply.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that 50 California tags were given out, 1,214 mountain goat tags were given out, 150 to 250 desert horn sheep tags therefore the pool of applicants are insane.
  - Chair Paul Dixon stated the pool of applicants is 10,000.
  - Board member Brian Patterson stated that a large amount of money is not going to be lost one way or the other. He stated it takes 300 applicants out of the pool each year.
  - Board member John Hiatt advised the pool of applicants must be smaller than that because last fall it was successful.
  - Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member John Hiatt that the wait time is 10 years currently.
  - Chair Paul Dixon advised if you started at the age of 18 add 35 years to age 18, and the individual started to apply for another 25 years, you will be in your 80s.
  - Board member Brian Patterson stated he drew 17 years ago and sat out for 10 years and now he is back to draw again this year therefore in 27 years, he will have an opportunity to draw again this year. He stated if you view the data provided there is no individual in the last three years with less than 3 points is ever drawn three tags.
  - Chair Paul Dixon advised that is because there are so many individuals applying.
  - Board member Jacob Thompson stated that this is a solution in place of a problem, and he thinks that the number of people getting repeat tags appears to be low and he feels that statistics seems to take care of this issue all by itself. He stated that he opposes this regulation.
  - Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated he wants to leave the regulation the same with the 10-year waiting period and advised as you age and get older the hunter will probably not want to hunt solo and will want to hire a person therefore putting more money into the community.
  - Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated he is opposed to this, he stated the regulations worked out well over the last 15 years and he stated each time NDOW starts messing with the system this creates another issue. He stated this affects very minimal amount of people less than 1 percent therefore why would we going to start the process, he advised to deny this.
  - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*): He stated he is also opposed to this.
  - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee, member of the public*): He stated he is in favor of this for the Rocky Mountain and California Bighorn Sheep since we do not have that many of these animals, but advised he is not in favor for the Desert Bighorn Sheep and if changes are to be made to leave the Desert Bighorn Sheep alone. He reiterated that once in a lifetime for California Bighorn Sheep and the Rocky Mountain, especially the Rocky Mountain because he stated it used to be a once in a lifetime.
  - Board member Alexander Harper asked the question of the rationale behind this and advised he does not know enough about this population.
  - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee, member of the public*): He stated that it is two

tags and stated it is completely wrong.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated it is like the moose tag. He reiterated that the Rocky Mountain is like the moose tag.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee, member of the public*): He stated the reasoning behind the change with the Rocky is due to a minor age 12 drew a tag and the father stated to the Commission that his son would never again in the state of Nevada for Rocky Mountain. He stated but at the same time this same kid can go to other states like Wyoming, Idaho, Montana and apply. He stated but when the state of Nevada only has two mountain tags to give out therefore it should be a once in a lifetime tag.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked (*Kensen Lee, member of the public*), if he would include Mountain goat with this.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee, member of the public*): He stated he would include the Rocky Mountain goat and the California Bighorn Sheep and advised that the California Bighorn Sheep have a pretested draw. He stated it took him 39 years to draw, and advised he started putting in for a tag and finally drew it when he was 60 and he stated he feels the system made an error because it gave him a California Bighorn Sheep as well the same year. He stated it takes 39 years. He stated it doesn't matter to him but stated with the few Rocky Mountains that we have and the California Bighorn Sheep in such demand, and the factor that the California Bighorn Sheep are not doing well at this time therefore he feels these two species should be a once in a lifetime and if things change for these species, then we should change it back. He stated he does not want the Desert Bighorn Sheep for a once in a lifetime tag.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn, President*): He stated his organization provides the following statement relative to Commission General Regulation 519 Waiting Periods for Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat, to start he would like to inform the CAB that the Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep incorporation with Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU), Reno Chapter not the Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, Fallon Chapter, Nevada Bighorn Unlimited Nye Chapter, Elko Bighorns Unlimited and The Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife produced a letter and sent it to the Commission expressing clear opposition, both regulations that will amend language to NAC 502.345 specific to the Bighorn sheep tags, then similarly NAC 502.364 which applies to Mountain Goat tags. It is understood that the regulation change will provide the lifetime limitation of eligibility respectively to apply for Nelson Bighorn Sheep, California Bighorn Sheep, Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep for management of Bighorn Sheep, if he or she received a tag since the date of regulation passage, now the tenants of our position as expressed within the letter focus on what we recognize amongst hunters that previously drew a tag and that many were actively engaged in Bighorn Sheep and wildlife conservation. You will get broad palpable sense of disenfranchisement stemming from knowing that they will never hunt sheep again. This dreadful sense we think will manifest; it will degrade the motivation among hunters to continue volunteer efforts. Moreover, when you consider children and young hunters in general that draw sheep tags early in life, many of these people may never develop and send it to engage in conservation activities, for they may never hunt that sheep again. The heightened concern is magnified and is inextricably linked to otherwise near

limitless opportunities realized through volunteer efforts that translate to upfront in-kind match dollars that are matched at a ratio of three to one under the federal Pittman Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act. Very importantly, the reduction in volunteer efforts will result in reduced annual federal funding to support Nevada's wildlife restoration and conservation programs. Now, beyond the scope of the letter the Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn states that there is no statement for the problem. We have proposed regulations to make profound changes in eligibility to apply for tags without defined problems. We truly have a solution looking for a problem. He advised that is what is stated in general. Without a statement of the problem, we are left to presume that the proposed regulation is intended to enhance fairness in the application process. I get to see that the deep dive that was taken to analyze just how the proposed regulations would materially benefit high bonus point holders. The limited general figures that we made available as support material suggest that not only is there no problem to address but there is no benefit to the proposed regulations, and I think we can see what is going on here, the regulations changes have the appearance of fairness but I serve that the proposed regulations are not about fairness or the appearance of fairness, it is about the appearance more than anything else. Frankly it may be rhetorical but how did this Commission General Regulation ever move out of the tag allocation application hunting. I should say, as a retired NDOW Game Biologist, and from listening to hunters for many years, the last big game application and draw process is the envy of some other states and many out-of-state hunters.

- Chair Paul Dixon thank (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of Desert Bighorn, President*).
- Public Comments: (*Matthew Blackburn, member of the public*): He read the following: In researching the proposed change to once in a lifetime for all sheep species and goats, he advised that he has concluded that this has come out of attack prematurely and more discussion is needed to determine if the problem even exist regarding application process for individual sheep hunts and goat hunts. In the current system, it is unclear what the intended purpose of the change is. It needs to be sent back and have further discussion by the committee. More discussion is needed to uncover viable alternative solutions if a problem exists. From what I have gathered and about the proposed change in the attack only one option is ever referred too, that is the once in a lifetime option. It is my belief and feeling that the current system is in no need of change of life with anything. It can be debated and discussed, I strongly encourage the CAB to encourage the Commission to send it back to (TAAAH) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee for a real debate and further discussion using science and data.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated he would like the board to think twice about the ecology or the volunteers that we get to go out there and save the animals. He advised we are the ones who haul water when NDOW cannot because of their time constraints and stated we are the ones who will lose if you change this. He advised he is opposed to this change.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that a lot of points were spot on, and he advised that it has changed his focus.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated absolutely.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated with the volunteers and time and money that is matched is a big hook not to mention the youths that are discouraged from helping and applying in the future, giving example if they applied at age 15, then they are done. He stated the percentage of individuals that draw multiple tags is minimal. He stated after listening to (*Kensen Lee, member of the public*) and his comments in which he advised that certain species only have a few tags available and, in his view, warranted a minimal lifetime ban of hunting those species. He stated in taking that same discussion a step further then he advised he feels any set of tags that have less species than pick a number, if its 25 tags annually or 50 tags, then we would give less than that number of tags and maybe make that species a once in a lifetime.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised for board member Brian Patterson to be careful with his comments because Black bear hunters are coming.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that we will loose more in the future by accepting this and in the long run than gaining with a level playing field of taking a certain number of individuals out of the game for the lifetime after these individuals have already drawn. He advised he feels we are losing more than gaining by supporting this.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated there is nothing on here to be in support of, and this is minimizing hunter involvement, and it is the largest conservation group when it comes to habitat and wildlife and funding plays a large part in that.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated he appreciates the comments stated and advised a lot of this is not in his wheelhouse, it is more other's ecology therefore to have insight into the complexities into this is very helpful. He thanked everyone for delivering their comments.
- Board member John Hiatt gave an example that this is like having people who won the Powerball that they cannot play anymore and advised that he does not see the point.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that the CAB is in opposition to Commission General Regulation 519-Waiting Periods for Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat as presented for the following reasons: 1) Loss of revenue, making it once in a lifetime appears to be a solution in place of a problem 2) This should go back to the (*TAACH*) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee for further discussion of what are we attempting to solve. 3) There is impact to volunteerism and future participation by individuals once we take away their opportunity to hunt in this area.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated this should not go back to (*TAACH*) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated why take this back to (*TAACH*) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that a friendly amendment to this motion is why take this back to (*TAACH*) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated this will diminish hunter participation and hunter conservation participation and the revenue associated.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to refer to (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of Bighorn Sheep, President*) letter. He stated he has already sent the letter in.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of Bighorn Sheep, President*): He

stated to board member Brian Patterson that he had not turned in the letter he read in tonight's meeting and that it is free if they would like to use it.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that basically adding that the CAB does support the Fraternity of Bighorn Sheep letter.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked if everyone understood the new motion with the friendly amendments added.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that the CAB is in opposition to Commission General Regulation 519- Waiting Periods for Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat as presented for the following reasons: 1) Loss of revenue, making it once in a lifetime appears to be a solution in place of a problem 2) There is impact to volunteerism and future participation by individuals once we take away their opportunity to hunt in this area, and the CAB is in complete support of the Fraternity of Bighorn Sheep letter.
- **Motion passes 7-0**

g. **Commission General Regulation 520- Tag Deferral Extenuating Circumstances Revision (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to amend Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code that would update the rules related to the timeframe and circumstances surrounding tag deferrals. If approved by the Commission, the Chairman will sign on behalf of the Commission approval of the Department's standard operating procedure.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon how many times we have seen this action item.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dan Gilbert numerous amounts of time but there are some changes. The added language is due to the department thought that they had some language in this regulation and amendments were withdrawn and it was not there.
- **FYI- (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation):** This regulation change amends section 1 of LCB File No. R022-19 which established a program to allow the customer the option to defer or transfer their big game tag if an extenuating circumstance happened to the customer before the hunting season of the tag opened that prevented the tag holder from hunting on the tag.
- **FYI- (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation):** The regulation change adjusts the timeframe of which an extenuating circumstance could happen to the customer for deferral qualification. It also excludes the deferral option if a tag is awarded through certain programs. The regulation change removes the deferral option. If there is no identically matching hunt season available, the following hunt year. The regulation change includes an amendment that better defines the rules related to the tag transfer to an organizational program.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised on Page 2 in green are the changes: added language is bolded: (h) Through the Silver State Tag Drawing, **auctions or other sealed bids** conducted pursuant to NRS 501.3575 and 502.250 NAC 502.4291 TO 502.4298, inclusive. (i) **If there is no identically matching open season the following year, in this circumstance, the tag will be returned, and bonus points restored.**

- Chair Paul Dixon gave explanation regarding Page 2 (h) and stated if an individual defers from medical issues and the following year that unit is not open for any reason or if a unit is divided from one unit to two units, then that tag is no longer relevant. The individual would simply just receive their bonus points back. This was added due to concerns from several wildlife guides on how this was handled previously therefore leading to this specific language being added in. People assumed that this language was part of the regulation in the past, but it was not.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised on Page 3 in green are the changes: added language is bolded: 4. If the holder of a tag is diagnosed as terminally ill **after the tag has been awarded** the holder of the tag may claim an extenuating circumstance and request to transfer the tag to another person who is otherwise eligible to hunt a big game mammal in this State. **A tag holder may claim an extenuating circumstance any time after the tag has been awarded and choose to transfer their tag to a qualifying organization. All transfer requests must be received by the Department no later than 5 business days prior the hunt season.**
- Chair Paul Dixon gave explanation regarding Page 3 #4 and stated that if an individual knows that a hunt unit may be closed the next year, and they may change the dimensions of that unit (example: making the unit A or B, or East and a West), this allows the tagholder who is claiming this to donate their tag to an organization via the process. He stated this offers the tagholder the benefit to give away their tag rather than lose it.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): he stated a lot of language is because of last year with NDOW having exponentially higher number of deferred tags as opposed to previous years and it is to straighten up to the language to become similar in what was heard in the (TAACH) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee and to have as we had previously a handful of deferrals as opposed to now we have over 100 that NDOW is dealing with and this language will help clarify.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that we left the door open on this leaving thing to the (TAAC) Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee thinking it was the right thing to do and it was like opening a fire door and letting all the animals out. He stated we are going back to the language we had three years ago. The green on the supporting material was the final edition to this.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he is never going to use the word “abuse” but advised that there was some language used that placed the Department giving them discretion to determine medical thus placing the Department in a difficult situation and that is the way I would phrase it.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) if he felt there was some abuse in the system on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon reiterated we had the Department issuing decisions on medical things with no medical qualifications.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) there are 100 tags and all those last year were sent to an alternate for first come first serve right.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*):



He stated to board member Brian Patterson that the majority were and there were a couple that were held back due to being too close to the season.

- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) if all those tags were deferred.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to Chair Paul Dixon yes.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated these tags may have been deferred because there were no animals, or the weather was not good.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the reason of the individual having IBS.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated there is a medical reason associated with all of these and those tags are going to be reissued to those hunters this year that is an applicable season, if there is one and that is in the regulation.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to have a spike like what you stated it is people taking advantage of the system.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it went from five to over a hundred.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised on Page 3 in green are the changes: added language is bolded: 5. Except as otherwise provided in subsections 2 and 9, the Department shall allow the holder of a tag to return the tag to the Department pursuant to NAC 502.422, for the restoration of any bonus points that he or she used to obtain the tag or defer the use of the tag to the next year's applicable hunting season, **if any exist**, and if any of the following extenuating circumstance occur after the last day that the holder is entitled to return the tag pursuant to NAC 502.422 but before the hunting hours begin on the opening day of the season for which the tag was issued: (a) The death of a family member of the holder of the tag, as verified by a certificate of death. (b) The holder of the tag or a family member of the holder incurs a severe and unanticipated injury or illness which prevents the holder from hunting during the season for which the tag was issued, as verified in writing by a physician; or (c) The holder of the tag is serving in the Armed Forces of the United States and is transferred to a location which makes it impracticable for the holder to hunt in the area for which the tag was issued, as verified by a copy of his or her orders or other proof satisfactory to the Department.
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 520-Tag Deferral Extenuating Circumstances Revision as presented.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds this motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

**h. Commission General Regulation 522-E-Tag Regulation (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 that would update the process related to use of game tags in the field and allow the department to offer game tags in an electronic format.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- **FYI- (SUMMARY)-** The Department of Wildlife

strives to offer the most convenience to its customers, this proposed regulation change is an effort to continue that convenience and keep up with the advancing use of technology in our society. The change amends regulations that would allow the Department to offer a game tag in an electronic format while updating existing regulations related to use of a paper tag.

- **FYI- (SUMMARY):** The proposed regulation would update the requirements around game tag transporation permits.
- **FYI- (SUMMARY):** The Department plans to continue to offer game tags in paper format for any customer who wishes to continue to receive game tags in such way.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there has always been a paper tag in the state that is required people to sign it and we are looking at people having a E-Tag, he stated he has a question for law enforcement is that we have always required to sign our hard tag therefore if we have the E-Tag on our phone is this considered by default that the individual has signed the E-Tag.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to Chair Paul Dixon that back in the day the hard tag that had a signature line and with the new E-Tag there is no signature line on it.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*) that you still are required to sign it according to the law.
- Public Comments: (*Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated but without giving an individual a certain area where there is supposed to be a signature line and they didn't do that, then that comes down to the fact that these individuals are out hunting was their admonishment of a signature. He stated loosely phrased. He stated that law enforcement did not really enforce it to the extent that was previously done with the older tags on the nice paper that you could be punched in.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that he still has a paper tag, and he has it in his wallet and it is signed. He stated he feels these are a great idea. He stated we had a four-year time, where we found that when we first started there were about 500 people that wanted to do hard copy tag submissions and every year that number decreased until it was done to just 20 individuals. He stated today everything is required to be electronic and he feels the same is going to happen to the hard copy

tags to E-Tags instead because today every person has an electronic device therefore eventually, they will simply say no more hard copies period. He stated there will be a phasing out in the next couple of years. He stated in the same manner as we did with tag applications.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated that the state of Utah offers both hard copies and E-Tags and he still prints out and carry's a hard copy with him as well as having it on E-Tag on his cell phone device in case he leaves his hard copy. He stated and he always has his cell phone on him, he explained that he got stopped last year fishing in Utah and did not have his paper tags and law enforcement was able to look up his E-Tag and it had expired two days prior. He stated law enforcement allowed him to go online and get a E-Tag and used his discretion and he did not receive a ticket.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion to approve Commission General Regulation 522 E-tag Regulation as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

**i. Commission Regulation 24-11, Black Bear Quotas and Harvest Limits (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Regulation 24-11, 2024 Black Bear Quotas and Harvest Limits.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: (**Brief Explanation of Proposed Black Bear 2024 Harvest Limits and Quotas**): The Department recommends a few small changes to the 2024 Harvest Limits and Quotas: Increase unit group harvest limit for Hunt Unit group 192, 194, 195, and 196 numbers from 10 to 15. Increase 2024 Resident Quota from 30 to 38. Decrease 2024 Nonresident Quota from 7 to 4.
- FYI- The recommendation for these slight increases is due to increasing populations of black bear in Nevada and increases in the metapopulation that is connected to the California black bear population.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She stated quotas were increased because it was stated that here was an increased number of bears and bear populations. She stated she would like to know how this determination was made and ask also was there any kind of documentation to support this.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated between the Nevada estimates and recent California estimates which have shown increases for both.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there is population increases on both sides and as part of Heritage there was a DNA hair-snare project and the number of animals that are being seen on roads and the number of roadkill instance are up and have been in previous years as well as several sightings of bears in places where they were tagged and moved around. He stated all these factors show increase in the bear population in areas where hunting is done right now. There is more of an increase happening now.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She asked the question to Chair Paul Dixon is this information he just gave available anywhere.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*) yes, it is and asked (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*) who is the biologist for NDOW for the bears.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated Carl Lackey
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he did not feel it was Carl Lackey any longer.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett, Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated it is still Carl Lackey for NDOW. He stated that Lackey had worked with two other biologists and gotten previous estimates that moved more to passive and recent work is with UNR professor who gave some recent estimates with a little variable because there is confidence in the intervals associated with these. He stated things are reflecting an increase through time.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there has been two wet winters and forage for the bears that everything suggests that the bear population is on the rise. He stated California is showing a dramatic increase on their side therefore if there is an increase on their side then our increase is higher because we have a large population due to the flow over to the state of Nevada. He stated the bears do not care where the state line is.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*): He asked Chair Paul Dixon if the bears are showing up in different areas of the state.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to *(Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President)* that yes, the bears are showing up in different locations of Nevada. He stated there are bears spotted in places that they have never seen bears before. He stated in some of the eastern counties.
- Board member John Hiatt asked Chair Paul Dixon, what is the bear situation in California.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member John Hiatt that they have a harvest limit of 10,000 or something like that is statewide, he stated it is huge.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated that is high number.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Alexander Harper that it is an enormous number. He stated there are many bears in California.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he was just wondering and stated that due to the drought in Nevada prior to 2023, there have been more bear sightings in urban areas where they are counted and in California, they have expanded the range and moved it in search of bear habitat due to the number of bears and people and their interactions. He stated that the only real data that means anything is doing the DNA analysis of hair samples thus finding more individual unique bears.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that he understood that by doing these things with heritage, they are seeing more unique things that have ever been seen and putting this into population statistics.
- Board member John Hiatt asked Chair Paul Dixon how many years previous, does this data go.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt three years.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated when it comes to predators and stated you have a baseline based on facts acquired from persecution of these predators. He stated they recover coming back to populations that were probably more historic and by looking at this, we assume that there is an increase in the population but increases relative to what exactly. He stated his question is this something we are doing based upon short term data that we have on the bear population going back a few decades or what was the bear population like a long time prior to losing friends (wolves, grizzly bear extinct).
- Chair Paul Dixon stated previously there were many

bears but after ten years of mining there was a decrease I almost all large predators and ungulate populations to almost nothing in the northern portion of the state just to feed the individuals who were mining. He stated these individuals hunted and killed 365 days a year, they did not kill every season.

- Board member Alexander Harper stated that there were grizzly bears in California, which is represented on the California state flag still and one might say that there are zero grizzly bears now, but some might argue that there is a recovery but relative to what.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that due to the bear population in California being so large, especially on the west section of the Tahoe basin in Lake Tahoe, there has been large population with an outflow due to the drought over the past 10 to 15 years. He stated the bears have headed to Nevada and established themselves in areas where the bear population is historically low but now with wet winters and good forage we have seen east and west of Lake Tahoe the population increases and this is due to the population doing well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated not certain how this relates to historical data and is uncertain if there is any historical data on the numbers of pairs. He stated in past there was not good data in Nevada.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Chair Paul Dixon that there is data on bears in the Sierras and fifty years ago there were very few bears there and if individual was backpacking in the Sierras, there was no worry about bears eating your food. He stated everyone should be required to carry bear food canisters because there are now many bears and there has been massive increase in bears in California in the last fifty years.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that some of the data models since 1997 through the end of 2022, there was 2,094 different capture events for bears, and some were recaptured therefore this data helped inform the analysis and estimates range.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he is in favor of small increases regarding the harvest population for bears, in places NDOW states is advisable. He advised the question is not where the bear population is at regarding historic high or what benchmark is being used. He stated the correct question is what percentage of the bear population we can responsibly

extract for hunters without having population impact and still lets the bear population grow and feels that playing with the margins with a handful more bears will be a way to give additional opportunities to hunters therefore using this resource without harm to the bear populations. He stated when going back to previous years numbers if we see problems or a lower bear population.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated that the simple fact that (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) that NDOW can handle over 1,000 bears speaks volumes due to not having to handle every single bear on the landscape. He stated if NDOW is stating that they have touched over 1,000 bears.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett, Jr. Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated the 1,000 bears that NDOW was able to touch was over a 20-year timespan.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he looked up California and it states that once the state of California harvests 1,700 bears, the hunting season is simply shut down and thereafter are open in seven different small units in the northern part of the state. He stated that California has the harvest quota at 1,700 and Nevada has 54 or something as a harvest quota.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked what data is being used.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that is based on 100 percent of their success. He asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) what range would you give the bear population.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he wish he had the recent data from the bear fair and stated that he believes that the higher data estimate was the marketing side initially which was at 700 hundred.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that is 70 percent of the population which the harvest objective is always less than 10 percent.
- Board member Alexander Harper asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that due to how long it takes for the female bear to become sexually viable, since we are having a small issue with a couple of years when storing the system that carrying capacity is brief and can accommodate these animals and asked the question if allowance of

more time for recovery should be allowed due to trend of climate is going, with two years being the exception. He stated adjusting the quota for the year but what about long term based off the time it for the sexual maturity of the bears. He stated if removal of a few bears during a good year but then you have a few bad years you will have to back those modulations but down the line there definitely have and is this considered.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that as soon as female harvest limits are reached, then the unit is shutdown therefore you may have up to five females that are harvested. He stated with that being a small portion of the female section of the population even when additional factors and mortality are thrown in, he advised this is negligible from the overall size of the population.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated that he agrees especially with males because they will mate with several female bears.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that the female harvest all together is a total of 14 cubs.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to board member John Hiatt, that his statement was correct and that it helped a lot, and the general success is low from year to year. He stated when female harvest limits are factored into this and having other hunters who are unsuccessful.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She read the following: She stated for the record, when sending these seasons and quotas there is no concern for the wildlife. The bear hunt has so many unresolved issues such as no management objective. Mama bears who hide their cubs, hounding where GPS collared dogs chase these bears to exhaustion, and then they tree the bears and then a hunter comes along in ATV, I do not see these issues being addressed. Besides hunting bears are killed on the roadways while they look for food and the Tahoe areas has still not mandated a bear proof trash container. She advised that bears are also killed sometimes by NDOW itself with problem bears and some bears die naturally. She stated when you add all these things together, this trophy its too much. The bear hunt is deeply unpopular with many Nevadans. She stated please limit the quotas rather than raises them.



- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated the concept of source and sink, California Sierra is the power source, and Nevada with suboptimal habitats are out of sync. He stated that in the discussion it was indicated that the data demonstrates population increase in Nevada. He asked the question of what portion of that increase is due to dispersing bears from the California Sierra from the source.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*) that his understanding is that a large percentage is dispersed a lot of California spending increase. He stated he is uncertain of the percentage, but it is a high amount.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated this is more reason to have sound harvest management programs.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that when the bear hunt was started that one of the Commissioners was asked by the public the reasoning of why we are having the bear hunt and the Commissioner stated to the public because we can. He stated we have been trying through bear biologists Carl Lackey and others with studies to show that we have a sustainable resource that we can harvest from along with hunter opportunities. He stated he is not certain how we are managing this source, other than our usage of sustainable harvest from that resource along with education from areas that are impacted by having increased bear populations. He stated with bear containers, bear awareness and that we have established a population of bears that we can hunt, and we have been hunting and this has not impacted some of the numbers. He stated the numbers have not gone down since the start of the bear hunting. He stated we have had increased roadkill, increased sightings, but no population decrease since we begin tracking and becoming more sophisticated in the way we are tracking. He stated that most individuals think in management spaces or anything that we are doing outside of managing a harvest and monitoring the animals and trying to understand their populations that we are doing in management space that we are not doing or should be doing.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated from a management level or from a level of putting our hands on the bears, there is no other species in the state of Nevada in which NDOW does to this level, but the

different types of models, data points being collected are the best models that NDOW has available. He stated he viewed the long-term harvest, and it ranges about 35 percent success therefore of these totals of 40 to 50 tags issued then the math is very low, being 2 percent of the overall estimated population. He stated he believes that it is a sustainable level from this regard.

- Board member Dave Talaga asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He asked if the bears in the overall population are counted in this.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated it is all the bears that NDOW is involved with, the data points for the model.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She stated that since the issue about no responsible management she stated that several years ago (*Dr. Rae Wynn-Grant, Wildlife Ecologist, Author, TV Presenter, Speaker*) and she worked with NDOW in Northern Nevada, and she stated the following statement from Dr. Rae Wynn Grant: **Viewing bears of the wild as one of our continents most popular forms of ecotourism tourism, and an important revenue source.** She advised if we are just hunting bears because we can hunt bears, then it seems like kind of fortuitous hunt.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*) that this is how it started and that individual cannot ever walk away from what they have done and if a statement is made by this individual, then it is for eternity making reference to the statement by the Commissioner who said when asked why are we having bear hunts and he said because we can.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*): He stated the reason there are bears in Nevada is because California is mismanaging them, and they come to Nevada and reiterated that (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*) stated it is because they have no other place to go. He stated he thinks that any person who has had their trash container taken or have had a car accident with a bear or must fight a bear for their child would agree that bear hunting is effective and necessary in the state of Nevada. He stated this is due because we can bear hunt and it is managing a resource and there are less bears killed by hunters then by cars has a statement that the bears are not

properly managed at this point.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there are 600 and some different species of animals in the state of Nevada and other than the species that are endangered, the only other species that are managed are the species that the hunters buy tax for, and asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) if that was correct.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that the number is pushing 900 statewide.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated 900 and advised to simply state 50 species or less that we monitor or do something with because there is money to do it with and this would be without the wildlife resources grant therefore, we do not monitor or do anything with any of the other species. He stated we only deal with the species that we have a worry of endangerment or listed of the species and the impact on the species. He stated we monitor and try to manage species that hunters pay for hunting and harvesting but 80-85 percent of the other species are not dealt with due to no money available for them and not due to anything with monitoring. Therefore, if there was no black bear hunt then there would be no studies of black bears and there would be a nuisance bear issue that we are dealing with but no studies. He advised that there is a NDOW biologist that is dedicated to this. He stated we would not be doing studies and putting Heritage money toward the studies and due to the black bear being a huntable species that we know more about black bears in the state then we would if we did not have a large population.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): #1) He stated that he has heard this comment for over three years that the majority of Northern Nevadans are against bear hunting, and he would like to know what that number is #2) He stated he would like to know the number of homes and vehicles that are being damaged by black bears. He stated if we are going to sit here and continue talking points of believing in the science and the professionals are advising that more bears are needed to be killed, he is not for trophy hunting and will never be, but the science is advising that the bears must be taken off the landscape then he wants to listen to this to that.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised motion to approve Commission Regulation 24-11, Black Bear Quotas and Harvest as presented.

- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0**

j. **Commission Regulation 24-12- Big Game Quotas for the 2024-2025 Season (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about regulations for the numbers of tags to be issued for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, moose, bighorn sheep, and mountain goats for the 2024-2025 season.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this will be done by each individual species and the hunts under that species and the CAB agreed.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated Antelope, there are increases in both Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon, and Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon, and Resident/Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Muzzleloader. He stated there is also increases in Resident/Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that our animal populations are doing well, and there are increases across the board.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if he was in agreeance.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that will antelope pronghorn it is realized the maximum potential of age and the deer is about five years of age therefore we did have some drought conditions three to four years ago and now we realize the effects of that recruitment from the last couple of years in which yearling bucks were excluded eligible and in areas where there was no drought conditions, Areas 14, 15 in the eastern portion with reasonable recruitment.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised he wanted to advise that he appreciates the report from the biologist's rationale in the report as he reads through these reports heavily and this was helpful.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson that he feels viewing the quarterly recommendation form and survey data, he stated he was asked by the public and others where this information is located, and he advised that it is in the backup information, and it is all there.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that he would like to mention something that applies to all species is the (TAACH) Tag Allocation & Application Hunt Committee went through Commission Policy 24 and

adjusted a fixed allocation for all the primitive weapons classes and this is why you can see a increase because it is pushing more demand for you to have a lower success. He stated it is demand success, he gave the example of deer tags and seeing recommendation of 35 percent increase statewide but in juniors it is only 13 this is because their demand state 25 percent, but their success is much higher than a lot of primitive weapons, even including platform. It is due to the fixed allocation.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic (**Antelope**)
- Public Comments: (**Antelope**) None
- This includes the following: Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2151; Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 225; Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Muzzleloader Hunt 2171; Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Muzzleloader Hunt 2271; Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Archery Hunt 2161; Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Archery Hunt 2261; Resident Antelope-Horns shorter than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2161.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve (**Antelope**) Hunts 2151, 2251, 2171, 2271, 2161,2261, 2181 as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic (**Resident Elk**)
- Public Comments: (**Resident Elk**) None
- This includes the following: Resident Elk-Antlered Any Legal Weapon Depredation Hunt 4102; Resident Elk-Antlered Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4151; Nonresident Elk-Antlered Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4251; Resident Elk-Antlered Muzzleloader Hunt 4156; Nonresident Elk-Antlered Muzzleloader Hunt 4256; Resident Elk-Antlered Archery Hunt 4161; Nonresident Elk-Antlered Archery Hunt 4261; Resident Elk-Spike Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4651; Resident Elk-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4181; Nonresident Elk-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4281; Resident Elk- Antlerless Muzzleloader Hunt 4176; Nonresident Elk-Antlerless Muzzleloader Hunt 4276; Resident Elk-Antlerless Archery Hunt 4111; Nonresident Elk-Antlerless Archery Hunt 4211; Resident Elk-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Depredation Hunt 4107;
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve

(Elk) Hunts: 4102, 4151, 4251, 4156, 4256, 4161, 4261, 4651, 4181, 4281, 4176, 4276, 4111, 4211, 4107 as submitted.

- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic. (**Desert Bighorn Sheep**).
- Chair Paul Dixon stated with elk and the fixed harvest there is a decrease in Any Weapon class and was added to archery and muzzleloader instead.
- This includes the following: Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Any Ram-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3151; Nonresident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Any Ram-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3251; Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Any Ram-Archery Hunt 3161; Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Management Ram-One Horn-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3171; Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep -Any Ram Management Ram-Access Limited-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3172; Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Any Ewe-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3181; Nonresident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Any Ewe-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3281; Resident California Bighorn Sheep Any Ram-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 8151; Nonresident California Bighorn Sheep Any Ram-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 8251; Resident Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep Any Ram-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 9151; Resident Mountain Goat Any Goat-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 7151; Nonresident Mountain Goat-Any Goat Any Legal Weapon Hunt 7251;
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve (**Desert Bighorn Sheep**) Hunts:3151, 3251, 3161, 3171, 3172, 3181, 3281, 8151, 8251, 9151, 7151, 7251 as submitted.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic: (**Resident Junior Mule Deer**)
- Public Comments: (**Resident Junior Mule Deer**) None
- This includes the following: Resident Junior Mule Deer-Primitive Antlered Only Archery or Muzzleloader 1105; Resident Junior Mule Deer-Antlered ONLY Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1106; Resident Junior Mule Deer-Antlered ONLY Archery, Muzzleloader, or Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1107
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve (**Resident Junior Mule Deer**) Hunts: 1105, 1106, 1107 as submitted.

- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic (**Resident Mule Deer**)
- Public Comments: (**Resident Mule Deer**) None
- This includes the following: Resident Mule Deer-Antlered Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1331; Resident Mule Deer-Antlered Muzzleloader Hunt Resident 1371; Resident Mule Deer-Antlered Archery Hunt 1341; Nonresident Mule Deer-Antlered Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1332; Nonresident Mule Deer-Antlered Muzzleloader Hunt 1372; Nonresident Mule Deer-Antlered Archery Hunt 1342.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve (**Resident Mule Deer**) Hunts: 1331, 1371, 1341, 1332, 1372, 1342 as submitted.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic (**Resident Moose**)
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She asked Chair Paul Dixon why we have a moose hunt at all, where is the management objective and we talk about the science is this and she gave example that if there are 100 moose then the desire is to kill all of them. She advised that is the sense she gets from all of this.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) if she attended the Congressional virtual meeting where there was a discussion on moose. He stated there was a presentation on the last ten years of studying moose in the state and what the population has done and compared the moose population here in Nevada to Oregon, Washington and Idaho with similar environments with these types of moose. He stated that the population were small then increased and continues until it hits a plateau and based upon the other states, it has been determined that the population will be flat right now but will continue to increase. He advised due to this factor we now have a biologist that is full time to study our moose population and doing it with management skills and tracking it thus giving it the same attention as we do with viewing our bear population. The reason for the moose hunt is to fund that biologist position by the number of individuals that apply for a moose tag. He advised a once in a lifetime tag in which there are two that are given out, with a moose population of 150 moose right now.

- Public Comments: (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region): He stated the supporting information states the moose number at 105 but based upon the collaring efforts it is about 12 to 15 unique views over three to four years which show higher but obviously there are intervals associated with this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (Stephanie Myers, member of the public) back to your original question of the science behind this, what is it, and we are basically setting up and tracking this moose population closely with a harvest of one to two now giving the only method of death other than youth dying due to them living long and older moose other than wolves which go after deer or other animals before they go after moose and we do not have large populations of wolves in this state but we have large coyote population. He stated he feels that to fund the continuation understanding management and making certain we are doing the right things for our moose population in this state and getting this biologist full time and funding that he advised that the number of individuals who apply for the moose tags will fund two biologist positions.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he thinks the last number for moose population was at 5,000.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that it was significantly higher.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (Stephanie Myers, member of the public) that we are having moose hunt to obtain better understanding and we are not taking other animals off the landscape in this process and the only other way is youth dying due to predation when they are young or human consumption therefore the population will continue to grow overtime. He stated making this a once in a lifetime month means that there is over two more weeks for individuals to apply for this tag and normally 50 percent of the people apply in the last week and a lot of other people wanted to apply for this tag after tonight's meeting because they wanted to see the quotas that were in place. He stated he is excited to know that we are doing this for the state of Nevada and not just observing the moose. He stated when he states managing and having the study on the moose and meaning making sure that everything done in the process maintains a healthy growing viable population therefore there will be more studies and more projects coming from Heritage funds and now we



have a season that would have never been if we didn't have a season. He stated this is the only reason for him stating we have a season and that isn't because we can't have a season, it is because we can manage better those animals by assigning biologist to study and protect the state.

- Board member John Hiatt asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) what success rate does he expect. He stated with only two tags do you expect 50 percent or 1 percent or zero, these are the three possibilities.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated it to be 100 percent because there will be a lot of people helping people on this novel.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She stated to Chair Paul Dixon if she could continue.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) that he apologizes.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She stated thank you to Chair Paul Dixon and advised that this sounds like it is a fundraiser basically fundraising in order to have biologist to study the moose and that is it, and stated only 11 other states authorize moose hunts with over 60,000 and Montana, with Utah as low as 2,500 each and North Dakota bottoms out at only 5 now. She stated now Nevada joins this list with only 100 moose and it sounds like a new shameful low for Nevada.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) it's a high.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*, stated to board member John Hiatt that she was not quite done, and advised that there is no good reason for this, and the public would like to view moose in their natural habitat and not kill moose. She stated the regulation benefits only hunters and not the species that you hunt or trap. She stated thank you for letting me finish.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) he apologizes for not letting her finish and that he did not realize that she was not done and that is his fault, and he will take responsibility for that.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*): He stated he agrees with NDOW for the management of wildlife and accommodate other species, and to fund another biologist to further wildlife.

- Public Comments: (*Fred Voltz, member of the public*): He stated that some of the comments made by Chair Paul Dixon don't make much sense, so we are going to hire another government employee and look what that has done for the bear hunt. He stated we now have it going on 13 years that there is no question that the Commission will go ahead although it makes no sense with no management plan for the bear hunt, nor do we have a management plan for the moose either and we are just starting another hunting cycle for hunter convenience, opportunity and success. He stated it has nothing to do with what is best for the species and need to give hunters the chance to go out and kill something else, not harvest it, kill it.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He stated the moose taste good.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he would like to make the same comment he has been making for the last 12 years that he has been a board member: he did his application with a cost of \$269 dollars this year, to put in for all the hunts and every year he is agitated about the \$1.00 fee, this convenience fee for every application I make. He stated this year is the only year he did not do the math on whether it was \$17, \$13 dollars or whatever extra he is paid for the convenience of this \$1.00 and he either just rolls it into the cost of the application or do not insult him for giving him this one-dollar fee for convenience because I am doing this online now. He advised that this is annoying, and he is already paying \$269 dollars for all of his applications.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Brian Patterson that he believes under statute we have what we can charge for a tag.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he knows.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked board member Brian Patterson that a convenience fee is because NDOW cannot get what they are charging you if you carry out your tag.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he is on his soapbox to complain about this. He stated it is a slap in the face after every \$10 dollars and to have to do this every single year when it is mandated that he cant mail it on a paper when it takes the Department more man hours to process his application when the Department had to come and take his piece of paper and input the information into the computer and now it is him inputting the information into the computer and there is nothing for the

Department to do therefore do not insult him the customer with this \$1 dollar service fee on top of the \$3 dollar predator fee times the 14 or 15 tags he has applied for. He stated he is just a common man and if a man like (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*) who has 15 kids, you cannot afford this there is no way you can. He stated or a family man who has five or six people in the household cannot afford it, it is simply economically not possible. He stated he is sorry, but he had to vent.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson that he is glad he was able to vent about this matter.
- This includes the following: (Resident Moose-Antlered Any Legal Weapon Hunt 10151)
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve (**Resident Moose**) Hunt 10151 as submitted.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic (*Landowner Resident/Nonresident Mule Deer Compensation Tag*).
- This includes the following: Landowner Resident/Nonresident Mule Deer Compensation Tag and the percentage of the 2023 Deer Tag and Antelope Quotas.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Deer Compensation Tag percentage was 2 ½ percent, with the total number of Landowner Compensation Tags are 421, and the total number of mule deer and pronghorn tags this year is 1,681. He stated it is 2 ½ percent of the total.
- Public Comments: (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region): He stated to Chair Paul Dixon that is the maximum of it, so if it does not exceed the accident logs, it goes of each individual account. He reiterated if you are not exceeding the percentage, and this does not mean you have to have that percentage.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that we need to understand that there will be probably 50 percent more.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Resident/Nonresident Mule Deer Landowner Compensation Tag as presented.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

k. **Request from the State of Utah for the Desert Bighorn Sheep** (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources request for desert bighorn sheep for translocation into the State of Utah.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there is a request from the state of Utah for Bighorn Sheep.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon how many are being requested.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he would recommend saying that they are not asking for the numbers of sheep and where the exact location is.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he would love to see what happens to the shipments.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He would strive for brevity on a quick synopsis. He stated internal discussion is NDOW is thinking approximately 20 of their original site locations, Sky rider Wilderness Ranch in Tabiona, Utah. He stated NDOW translocated 32 sheep a few years ago and that process did not fair well. He advised out of that group there are 12 remaining due to it being the harshest winter on record therefore those 12 sheep a few months ago were moved to another location called Promontory Point in Utah. He stated that the game plan is to translate goats into tumbles from Utah this upcoming year so that it will not always be Nevada giving to Utah. He stated this location seems to be more conducive to these sheep. He stated besides the initial predation event, NDOW was able to alleviate that concern.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) where does NDOW want the 20 other sheep to go, Promontory Point, Utah.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that the sheep will indeed be going to Promontory Point, Utah, and that would be the new location.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) Promontory Point in Salt Lake Utah.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) to board member that the location is north of Antelope Island.
- Board member John Hiatt asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) if the sheep are checked to make certain that they do not have pneumonia.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) He stated to board member John Hiatt that all the sheep are not released to be taken until they have negative results back.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked multiple questions to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) #1) how long it takes to catch the sheep#2) how quickly NDOW turns the blood test around.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson that there are still going to be details that need to be worked out and it will be approved by the Commission. He stated the last time one of the NGOs (Non-governmental organizations) flew the samples to model. He stated we had it within about a day and half, he recalls.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) if they simply just held the sheep until they received the results.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated the sheep were held a little further away from the other sheep until NDOW was ready to translocate them.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated one of the tools in the toolbox is harvesting ewes, and advised that he has always been in favor of translocation of sheep and has seen our biologists in our state of Nevada when we collect them and even with other states the biologists helping and normally capture 100 sheep and you do lose one or two and even with the capture program, he has seen the biologists get so upset over one loss that he is certain that the state of Utah was upset over this loss therefore this is not taken lightly by Utah and he would recommend as a native Nevada whose been trying to take care of sheep for forty years would recommend translocation of sheep to Utah. He stated especially if there are only 20 sheep and stated that Muddy Mountains could get rid of that many sheep easily and we are harvesting the sheep.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that they are going to increase the money you harvest to 60 ewes this year as opposed to 35 or 40 that were done last year.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated the Muddy Mountain Bighorn Sheep resource, the Muddy Mountain and Black Mountain carries the largest bighorn sheep herd in the state. He stated with 100 to 1,000 adults roughly and oscillates around this level. He stated notwithstanding disease you will not impact that herd being so large it can withstand that level of removal. He stated one can ask the question of where we with the sheep are as far as potentially having a serious gender balance in 100 populations of Desert Bighorn, there is usually a ram to ewe ratio 68 rams to 100 ewes. He stated when targeting source population for removals for transportation and continue, in the case of the Muddy Mountains, some would consider it aggressive ewe harvest and the RAM population could be seen in the components and ratchet up thus undesirable when starting to get one to one ration or even exceed the ewe proportion. He stated that NDOW worried that this provided incentives for additional numbers of RAMs to go on Tarrant movements therefore NDOW does not want to see RAM or ordinate number of RAMs, a few proportional RAMs that would be going on these forays. He stated the RAM ration was not excessively high going into crossing the confluence of the Muddy River, Virgin River, into the Black Ridge and Virgin South Ridge Peak River then encountering an only positive sheep, then going back and introducing with the great Muddy Mountain and Black Mountain population. He stated this is something to be aware of, and if the herd is not impacted with pneumonia, then NDOW can lay the hammer down regarding ewe removals due to the populations being large. He advised that the nursery concept is a failed one and even though people view it favorably and if the population is right then we can take the little

population within the confinements start to become bigger we can translocate them elsewhere. He stated we tried this before in 1968 through most of the 70s at the Duck Creek enclosure on Mount Grant Preserve, outside of Hawthorne and it failed. He stated the mountain lions got in there and just pounded the Desert Bighorn sheep and he advised that when this first occurred, he told NDOW what was happening. He asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) if he remembered that he told NDOW of this.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*) if he is looking for an outlet here, then it will not here.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated no it sure enough did happen and stated the one thing that we did correctly and it is important is the capture was done early in the year in late June and when doing captures in late June translocated the sheep to more latitudes thus giving the animals sufficient timeframe to acclimate. He stated traditionally when doing aerial captures this was done either in the last week of October or the beginning of November to track the sheep therefore this timeframe is when sheep are in the worst state mentally of the year. The best condition of the Desert Bighorn this far south and the distribution of Desert Bighorn Sheep is in May and June, this is the timeframe you would want to translocate them, giving you the best chance. He stated Promontory Point asking the question does everyone realize how far north that is. He stated Promontory Point is far north in terms of latitude and is further north than Wells, and is not seeing latitude essentially as Montello, Nevada which pushes swirling within 50 miles of the Idaho board. He stated if we are going to furnish sheep you got Division of Wildlife Resources with Nevada sheep and Southern Nevada herd and Lower Colorado River drainage herds. He stated we must give the herd a chance to survive therefore we must do the translocation when the sheep are in the best shape of the year.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that is the plan to (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*).
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): No, it must be then because otherwise it is a death sentence.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*) that NDOW is planning on a June capture, thanks a lot.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*) asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*) whether the capture would be aerial or dropping.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor NDOW Southern Region*): He stated to (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*) that due to the timing of the request... (interruption)
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated that it is his assertion that whichever the way the chips fall for reasoning that because of wildlife capture management is critical and they are not available, and another capable company is unable to do it, do not advocate to

do this in the fall and stated they had to comment in order to do the right thing. He stated it is remarkable the efforts that went forth for this, the time and effort and planning to get correct people together with the right skill set along with the correct equipment and planning and all logistics and figure this out per animal the cost. He stated the per unit cost cannot be solely looked upon and what the company charges.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that due to time constraints he is going to have to move along at this time.
- Public Comments: (*Pat Cummings, Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep, President*): He stated that it comes down to time and advised it must be done early.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked Chair Paul Dixon if the state receiving any type of compensation on this.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She asked the question if this discussion was talking about all the big game species.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) that this was only about translocation of the Bighorn sheep.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Mark Transue, member of the public*) that we are receiving a handshake and a smile.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he believes that there are two dozen turkeys down in Key Pittman.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He stated oh really.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated there is not enough time on decision on this.
- Board member Brian Paterson stated there was a request from Utah for Bighorn Sheep, he stated he would recommend if Bighorn Sheep were given to Utah, that the Bighorn sheep will be translocated in the time of year to give the Bighorn Sheep the best chance of survival since they are being sent far north to the query point of Antelope Island, based upon a May to June timeframe.
- Board member Alexander Harper asked Chair can we say only during that time frame like this. based upon a May to June timeframe.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

**IX. Comments by the general public- A period devoted to comments by the members of the public about matter relevant to the CCABMW's jurisdiction will be held. No vote may be taken on this 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 the presentation, this will be done by the Chair or the CCABMW by majority vote.**

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She asked if there were any anglers at tonight's meeting and there were none, she advised that the article was regarding anglers. (Article: Las Vegas Review-Journal By Alan Halaly 3/28/24 "MDMA in the Las Vegas Wash? Drugs are in the water, study finds: Link to read below:  
<https://www.reviewjournal.com/local/local-las-vegas/mdma->

[in-the-las-vegas-wash-drugs-are-in-the-water-study-finds-3024919/](#) ). She stated this article advises that there has been discovery of higher concentration of party drugs and prescription medication into wastewater after major events such as (EDC) Electric Daisy Carnival and the NFL Draft and other major events. She stated and yet there is insurance that the drinking water is safe but worries about the build up of these containments unmagnified over the course of time for our marine life because it is difficult to track these drugs.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*) that her comments are very good and advised that PBS had a special on the build up of chemicals that are not destroyed in our wastewater because he stated most of our wastewater treatment plants deal with certain things and the only way to get rid of these chemicals is by oxidation or UV light treatment therefore very few of the wastewater treatment plants have this in it. He stated this is how COVID and the drugs that individuals were taking for COVID, they were testing water at the wastewater treatment plant. He stated and it could be seen the rise of COVID across the states as well as the rise in the drugs given to these individuals to take for COVID. He stated Estrogen into the environment for birth control pills and other sources in certain areas have led to the emasculation of fish and other amphibians.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that is what we have in our park.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He stated to board member Dave Talaga that the water is in the park.
- Public Comments: (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated in the discussion on Commission General Regulation 522, Electronic Tags (E-Tags) and he advised Vice Chair Dan Gilbert and his mentioning of his 14 year old son and his electronic device, his phone and he asked the question if he had his son's tags on his electronic device, his phone or can anyone have another person in their hunting party tags on their phone.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*) that he assumes yes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (**Bob Bobbett, member of the public**) that you just need to have electronic evidence that you do have a E-Tag on your phone already in your party.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that he thinks he read earlier today that for a Junior hunter that the parents can be in possession of the tag from the hunter and the junior doesn't necessarily have to have it on their own device. He advised that does not apply if the person reaches the age of 18.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this action is hereby closed.**



- X. Authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its May 3, 2024 & May 4, 2024, meeting in Reno, Nevada (*For possible action*).**
- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
  - Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to prepare and submit recommendations from tonight's meeting to the Commission for its consideration at its May 3, 2024 & May 4, 2024, meeting in Reno, Nevada.
  - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
  - **Motion passes 7-0.**

- XI. The next CCABMW board meeting will be scheduled for June 25, 2024, at Clark County Government Center (*Pueblo Room*) Address: 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155. This meeting will be in support of the June 28, 2024 & June 29, 2024 Commission meeting in Lovelock, Nevada.**

**XII. 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, NV89108
- City of Henderson: Henderson City Clerk: 240 S. Water Street, Henderson, NV89015
- Laughlin Regional Government Center: 101 Civic Way, Laughlin, NV89028
- Moapa Valley Community Center: 320 North Moapa Valley Road, Overton, NV89040
- Mesquite City Hall: 10 East Mesquite Boulevard, Mesquite, NV 89027
- Boulder City: Boulder City Hall, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, NV89005

**ONLINE:**

**[https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment\\_and\\_sustainability/advisory\\_board\\_to\\_manage\\_wildlife.php](https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/advisory_board_to_manage_wildlife.php)**