



**Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway (ODC 1 Room)
Las Vegas, NV 89155
March 05, 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

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: 218 709 088 336

Passcode: mYQaWG

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

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 725-696-5982,,459943534#](tel:+17256965982,459943534#) United States, Las Vegas

Phone Conference ID: 459 943 534#

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.
- 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. March 5, 2024, to Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov. Please make sure to include your name, address, the agenda item number on which you are providing comment, and your comment. All comments will be compiled into a document and shared with members of the public body, meeting attendees and on the public body’s website.

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
Department of Environment and Sustainability
4701 W. Russell Road, Suite 200 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89118

COUNTY LIAISON: Marci Henson (702) 455-1608
EMAIL: Mhenson@ClarkCountyNV.gov
Department of Environment and Sustainability
4701 W. Russell Road, Suite 200 2nd 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.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- All CAB members were Present: (Chair Paul Dixon, Vice Chair Dan Gilbert, Alexander Harper, Dave Talaga, Jacob Thompson, Brian Patterson, John Hiatt).
- **There was a quorum.**

II. Pledge of Allegiance

- **Chair Paul Dixon asked board member Jacob Thompson to 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.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this is a time devoted to comments by members of the public who are unable to stay through the entirety of the meeting and would like to make a comment on any action item that is on tonight's agenda. He advised if members of the public intend to stay through the entire meeting, then they may give their public comments close to the end of the meeting under (IX. Comments by the public).
- Public Comments: (None)
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this topic is hereby closed.**

IV. Approval of Minutes from January 23, 2024, CCABMW Meeting (*For possible action*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the January 23, 2024, CCABMW meeting as submitted.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

V. Approval of the Agenda for March 5, 2024. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted (*For possible action*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that we have multiple action items tonight for discussion that will bring good debate between the CAB and the public therefore he stated he is requesting that everyone be respectful of each others comments tonight.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he is going to limit two items tonight (a) Wild Horse and Burro Letter & (b) Petition- Ms. Rebecca Goff to give each item a time limit of 45 minutes. He stated he wanted everyone to be aware of this timeframe, he wanted to make sure to get through the entire agenda tonight. He stated for everyone not to repeat themselves when giving comments.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve the Agenda for March 5, 2024, CCABMW Meeting as presented.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

VI. CCABMW Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence:

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

VII. Recap of the January 26, 2024 & January 27, 2024, Board of Wildlife Commissioners Meeting by Chair Paul Dixon (*Informational*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he will ask each member if they have any correspondence sent or received.
- Board member John Hiatt: He advised that he like to give mention to the fact that BLM (*Bureau of Land Management*) has put out Draft Utility-Scale Solar Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft Solar Programmatic EIS) of 11 western states. He advised that everyone should look at this proposal which is solar leasing and he stated there are a few inconsistencies of some of what was said. He gave example: he advised at the public meeting there was a presentation shown with slides to show a proposed built out of Solar Nevada by 2035 by 48,000 acres, but there is now 4 to 5 times that amount. He stated this is a disconnect of one of the things proposed and advised comments are due April 18, 2024.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked board member John Hiatt in the expanded solar project how does the Winecup Gamble Land Exchange fall into this.
- Board member John Hiatt advised he is not sure how they fall together but advised most of the things on the western side following Greenland West and following Greenland North which is south of the 115 therefore he advised he is not certain how that falls into the Winecup Gamble Land Exchange.
- **FYI- 2023/2024 Solar Programmatic EIS**, this Programmatic EIS updates the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) 2012 Western Solar Plan to support current and future national clean energy goals, long-term energy security, climate resilience, and improved conservation outcomes. The proposal would allow the BLM to more appropriately site solar projects to meet the goal of siting 25 GW of renewable energy on public lands by 2025, as well as help lay a framework for additional future development. Large-scale planning, such as this effort, will help expedite implementation of national clean energy goals while maintaining BLM's multiple-use mission.
- **FYI- The Draft Solar Programmatic EIS** evaluates five action alternatives, each opening different amounts of public land to solar development applications under different criteria such as proximity to transmission infrastructure. These alternatives exclude certain public lands-such as protected lands, designated critical habitat

and areas where important cultural resources exist-from solar energy development and identify areas available to solar development proposals. Public input will inform a Final Solar Programmatic EIS and Record of Decision (ROD). The BLM would then conduct further project-level analyses for solar energy proposals prior to any project approval to ensure project siting its appropriate and location-specific. (Western Solar Plan <https://blmsolar.anl.gov/> <https://blmsolar.anl.gov/solar-peis-2023/>)

- Board member Brian Patterson advised that the (WHIN) Wildlife and Habitat Improvement of Nevada is having their annual fund-raising banquet on March 9, 2024, at the Orleans Hotel and Casino. He advised that doors would open at 5:30 pm.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that if anyone would like more details about the banquet, he will place it on the table in front of him and they may after the meeting view the flyer and information details and take a picture if they would like.
- Board member Jacob Thompson: **(None)**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert: **(None)**
- Board member Dave Talaga: **(None)**
- Board member Alexander Harper: **(None)**
- Chair Paul Dixon: **(Yes)**: He advised that there was a Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) Meeting on March 4, 2024 @ 4:00 PM. He stated that the Committee regarding making Nelson (Desert) bighorn sheep, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep, and mountain goat a once in a lifetime tag. He stated that the Committee will likely be discussed again at the May 3, 2024- May 4, 2024, Commission Meeting in Reno as an amendment.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if this was the only point of discussion at that meeting.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated yes. He reiterated that it was regarding the three sheep species and mountain goat being once in lifetime tag (Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep and mountain goat).
- Board member Brian Patterson asked the question that if hunters have points will not lose these points even if they had points.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patteson that there is no way to make hunters who have points lose their points, but when this is passed this will mean that new hunters who receive a tag thereafter will register their points but again those who already have points may continue to apply.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated so add a tag.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that hunters will be grandfathered in, and this stops the receiving multiple tags for those species.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that he just wanted clarification.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the NDOWs Administrative Procedures, Regulations, And Policy Committee had a meeting is having a meeting today Tuesday, March 5, 2024, and advised he was unable to get on the Zoom meeting due to having to be on another phone call. He stated that one of the items on the agenda for this meeting was a new Commission policy for predator fees for non-predatory wildlife.
- FYI- The policy that Chair Paul Dixon is speaking about is for **Commission Policy Number 12: (Purpose)**: To inform the public and guide NDOW in actions relating to the Board of Wildlife Commissioners' (Commission) review and approval of expenditures of the \$3 fee in accordance with NRS 502.253 (1) (b). Pursuant to NRS 502.253 (1) a fee of \$3 is charged for processing each application for game tag to be used by the Department, at the direction of the applicant, for costs related to developing and implementing an annual program for the: (a) Lethal removal of predatory wildlife or (b) Improvement of wildlife habitat and research or management activities beneficial to nonpredatory game species.
- **FYI- Commission Policy Number 12 (Policy)**: It is the policy of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to make awards from the \$3 fee for activities for the improvement of wildlife habitat and research or management activities beneficial to non predatory game species pursuant to NRS 502.253 (1) (b). All awards shall be made in the form of grant awards through the Wildlife Heritage Committee following the same process as prescribed by the Department's Heritage Program Grant Manual. Proposals must be submitted between January 1 and March 1 of each calendar year to receive consideration for annual allocations. Department applicants should submit projects through the Habitat Conservation Framework Project Portal (HCFPP).
- **FYI- Commission Policy Number 12 (Procedure)**: The Department shall administer the funds for projects awarded during the Wildlife Heritage Committee process and ensure its compliance with all applicable state rules and regulations. The Department will rank and score project proposals based on project viability and resource enhancement potential. Projects funded through paragraph

(b), will be ranked, and scored separately from Heritage Program Projects, but will be scored and evaluated in the same manner. As a condition for accepting any award, project proponents must agree to the terms and conditions of the Heritage Program Grant Manual. The Heritage Grant Manual is posted on the Department's website as part of the Wildlife Heritage Program. This policy shall remain in effect until amended, repealed, or superseded by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that originally this was set up to do lethal removal of predators (*ravens, coyotes, and mountain lions*) with a requirement from NDOW that at least 80 percent of the funds to be used on lethal removal of predators. He stated therefore the intent from the Commission is to deformalize the intent of the predator free money and make policy so that the department is legal for spending the money on anything and not the way the 80/20 rule has directed.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that awhile ago when the former Chair Mike McBeath, he stated he did research for Mike and got obituary testimony from Carson City to see exactly what was agreed too, and he stated he met with the primaries to discuss items that did not make it on record and to make sure there was clear clarification on what was going on
- Board member Brian Patterson asked Chair Paul Dixon that there is 80/20 with option to click where the hunters would like their funds to go toward.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson right and advised that if the hunter puts his funds into non-lethal, then they want to then state that for non-lethal, it can be used for non-predatory species preservation meaning generally habitat improvements by large areas.
- Board member Brian Patterson gave a hypothetical example that if a hunter picked out non-lethal, then their budget should be more than 20%. He stated but by statute, these hunters are only allowed to do 20%.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson, that he is uncertain of how that works. He stated he feels there is a belief that the sportsmen will not get this, but in the event, it does come true then he feels there will be something in Carson City to get things changed. He stated he wanted to discuss this to make sure to give clarification to everyone regarding what was occurring on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he wanted to remind everyone that the Wildlife Heritage Proposals were due on March 1, 2024. He stated that he hoped those who were interested put in something in for Heritage Proposals.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Jacob Thompson if there were any forward motion on the blood tracking dogs in Nevada. He stated he will keep reminding himself to check periodically on this matter with board member Jacob Thompson.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised for Chair Paul Dixon to keep continue to keep checking with him on this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon gave a reminder that the next Commission Meeting will be on Friday, March 8, 2024 & Saturday, March 9, 2024, at the Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155. He advised that you could attend in person or by phone and stated that if anyone can attend a Commission Meeting, he would highly recommend it. He stated that one could learn so many things, and stated this is his reasoning for asking the board members to take his place and attend these meetings. He stated he would like people to attend to see the difference in operational of the CAB meeting versus the Commission, at a state level which is different. He stated how his CAB gives input and how it is seen by others.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that individuals always wonder how much ability that the CAB recommendations have, and advised only if the majority of the CABs have the same point that is made at the Commission Meeting and the Commission does not want to follow that recommendations from the majority of the CABs, then the Commission must document the recommendation to show that the Commission is not going to follow the recommendation from the majority of the CABs and tell the reasoning of why they are not going to follow this recommendation. He stated that this was put in the statute a few years ago in situations of this nature.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Commission Meeting will start at 8:30 am on Friday March 8, 2024, and on Friday afternoon after Agenda item #12, there will be a tour going out to the Clark County Shooting Park on Saturday, March 9, 2024, the meeting will begin at 8:30 am.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.**

VIII. Recap of the January 26, 2024 & January 27, 2024, Board of Wildlife Commissioners Meeting by Chair Paul Dixon (*Informational*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that on **Commission Policy 24- Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapon Class and Hunter Groups**, the CAB was in favor of this unanimously and it was adopted with no change.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that the **Draft Fiscal Year 2025 Predation Management Plan**, he stated that the CAB had no comments on it, and it is now returning to the Commission for approval.
- Paul Dixon stated **Biennial Big Game Release Plan for Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025 (March 2024-June 2025)** *he stated that the CAB motion (January 23, 2024 meeting: Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to approve Biennial Big Game Release Plan for FY 2024 and FY 2025 as presented with request for different approaches to be given for sheep management with documentation of provisions to show protection of Bighorn populations from domestic sheep and the Bighorn sheep in the Montana Mountains)* but he stated at the end of the day the Commission adopted as presented. He stated that the CABs recommendations and concerns were heard at the meeting and are on record. He stated the discussion on this action item was a good decision and very lengthy in nature. He stated the Commission decided to go forward based on NDOW recommendations. He stated that the Desert Bighorn Sheep (Augmentation) in Stillwater Range, county of Churchill, Unit 182 was still a concern. He stated that the Commissioners did voice their concern as well about the Montana Mountains and Bighorn sheep populations. He stated the agreement at this time is to do the best they can to keep Bighorn sheep away from the domestic sheep as much as possible.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Chair Paul Dixon that the issue a lot of times is not the domestic sheep going into where the wild sheep are.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it's the rams coming into where the domestic sheep are.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission General Regulation 514 (LCB File No. R122-123)** he stated it was moved forward and adopted with an addition of the wording that it will be a "once in a lifetime tag". He stated he felt it will be very difficult to obtain a moose tag.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he does disagree with Chair Paul Dixon.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he is not attempting to discourage him, but he must understand that it will indeed be difficult.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission General Regulation 512, Fishing Regulations** were adopted by the Commission with no changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission General Regulation 513, Executive Order 003**, those changes were adopted with no changes by the Commission.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 23-04 Amendment #2, 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 Big Game Hunting Seasons**, he advised there were minor changes, these changes were adopted without change and he stated that on tonight's agenda there is going to be a discussion on (h) Commission Regulation 23-04, (Amendment #3), 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 Big Game Seasons because there was a mistake made and it had to be corrected therefore we are having a discussion on this portion again.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission General Regulation 23-10 Amendment #2,**

2024 Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas, he stated the Commission adopted with no changes.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that **Commission Regulation 24-06, Silver State Tags**, he advised the Commission adopted with no changes. He stated he did bring up the CABs concern on replacement of Pacific Standard Time with Pacific Time instead and advised that there is a difference between Pacific Standard Time and Pacific Standard Daylight Time, he advised that the state of Nevada has both. He stated to put it only in Pacific Standard Time solely it will cross over into daylight savings time and have hunters confused of when exactly the end of season was due to this factor. He stated there was a young lady from NDOW who stated she did not realize that there was a difference between Pacific Standard Time and Pacific Time therefore he looked up the information and sent it over to the young lady at NDOW very nicely. He stated it may seem small to administration but to law enforcement it needs to be clarified.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked Chair Paul Dixon is NDOW going to fix this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Jacob Thompson that NDOW will fix it and make the change.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that **Commission Regulation 24-07, 2024 Black Bear Season**, he stated the Commission adopted as presented with no changes. He stated the only opposing Commissioner was Commissioner David McNinch who is opposed to black bear hunting, and he has shown he opposed to this since the beginning.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-08 Mountain Lion Season and Harvest Limits**, he stated it was passed as presented but the opposing Commissioner was Commissioner David McNinch. Commissioner David McNinch brought up the fact that due to not having good population estimates on the mountain lions, he felt that the mountain lions should be handled the same deer hunting and other by regions making it restricted to certain areas hence for prevention to not overharvest the species.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-09, 2024-2025 Restricted Nonresident Guided Mule Deer Seasons and Quotas**, he stated were accepted as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-01, 2024 Big Game Application Deadlines**, he stated were accepted as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-02, 2024 Big Game Application Eligibility and Tag Limits**, he stated were accepted as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-03, 2024 Dream Tag**, he stated was accepted as presented with no changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-04, 2024 Partnership in Wildlife**, he stated was accepted as presented with no changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated **Commission Regulation 24-05, Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas**, he stated was accepted as presented with no changes.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he was on TV station in Reno (Channel 2) after a women made a public comment stating that 95 percent of the public are against bear hunts, and he stated in response to this comment in his testimony that he had done research which reflected that 5 to 10 percent of the people in the state of Nevada

that held tags and there are 5 to 10 percent of the public who attend the CAB meetings and write in, who are opposed to bear hunting, and there is the remaining people in the middle who do not give a damn. He stated he regret using the word damn and he should have chosen a better word instead. He stated at the end of the day less is brought up on this and the public does not really care and there are people on each end who are passionate on this subject matter therefore this is what is driving our wildlife regulations. He stated he does not believe in the 95 percent statement. He reiterated that most of the public do not care and are more worried about gambling or purchase of their next vehicle instead. He stated if the subject matter is regarding entertainment or sports then there is a lot more interest.

- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this matter is hereby closed.**

IX. General Business/Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners March 8, 2024 & March 9, 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. The final commission agenda & support at: http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meeting/Commission/Agenda/

- a. **Wild Horse and Burro Letter (*For possible action*).** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the Wild Horse and Burro letter addressed to (BLM) Bureau of Land Management from the Coalition for Healthy Nevada Lands, Wildlife and Free-Roaming Horses.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the CAB should have received a massive amount of input on this action item.
 - Chair Paul Dixon read off the names of some of the members of the public who submitted input through correspondence or email.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that the letter was written by Coalition for Healthy Nevada Lands, Wildlife and Free-Roaming Horses. He stated from this letter, it has sparked the additional letters and correspondence from members of the public.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised to Chair Paul Dixon that everyone in the room needs to view the letter if they have not already seen it.
 - Secretary Darlene Kretunski walked around the room and handed out a copy of the letter to members of the public who were in attendance.
 - Board member Brian Patterson asked Chair Paul Dixon exactly how much time would be allotted on this action item.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson that he would allow only 45 minutes on this action item to get through the agenda tonight and explained that if he did not stop in that timeframe then discussion on this action item could go on the entire meeting. He stated he will set the timer for exactly that amount of time only.
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon for clarification on what exactly are the expectations of the CAB on this action item. He asked if the CAB would basically be in support of this and bring before the Commission for the Commission to make a recommendation on what they would like to do and if so, is there any additional leverage that the Commission would have to have from the CAB to make this recommendation.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he felt that the Commission is waiting on the CAB to weigh in on their recommendation based on what was written in the letter from the Coalition for Healthy Nevada Lands, Wildlife and Free-Roaming Horses. He stated it is a letter that the Commission is in support of and how does this support go with the opinion of members of the public who view this letter differently from the Coalition for Healthy Nevada Lands, Wildlife and Free-Roaming Horses.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that Lincoln County CAB did their own letter to show their support and approval. He stated this is asking each CAB to do this as well.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Brian Patterson that they would like the CAB to sign up on this, that is the purpose of this letter.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that in the letter in the third paragraph, the last sentence states: **(We support a long-term step by step funding plan to achieve AML in 5 years)**. He stated he feels it is a reasonable goal with a feasible timeframe to get the funding in place. He advised he was uncertain if the attempt was to get funding and achieve the AML in a five-year timespan. He stated the goal should be to put this into effect with goals.
- Chair Paul Dixon the issue is lacking goals and in the state of Nevada, and other states have sued the federal government and the federal government have then sent most of the funding to these states and then there is the state of Nevada by not doing this has received little or no funding. He advised that Nevada is one of the driest states even though there has been a lot of perception this state will remain the driest state. He stated Nevada will remain in drought conditions regardless of having two wet years, and stated if anyone does not believe this to be true contact the Southern Nevada Water District who can verify that regardless that Lake Mead water level is up the cost of water rates is still going up as well. He stated he would like to get the wild horses into a managing level the same as the elk herd in which we have been able to manage at a certain level. He stated he is in favor of keeping the wild horses at the level of the elk herd. He stated there is a tremendous amount of work that goes into managing that level for the elk herd. He stated the wild horses are like elk and reproduce at a high rate, doubling in number up to 50 percent.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Chair Paul Dixon they do not reproduce at a high number, they reproduce at a low rate, but they do not have a large group of predators and they have a long lifespan therefore they increase in numbers even with the low reproduction levels due to these factors.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that while reading the letter he stated when looking at the horses that passed away and the conditions of the springs with the horses in the wild as the numbers increase and there is not enough range for these wild horses, these animals suffer. He stated as a wildlife person he loves to see animals on the range but would like to see that these animals are healthy animals on the range. He stated that the state has fires, and with the mule deer there is declaration in place for mule deer harvests due to hard winters that cause death of these animals. He stated this gives hunters the opportunity to remove the animals for substance for food rather than let them die due to the conditions and not having the amount of food sources.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there was a documentary that came out addressing these issues called "Horse Rich Dirt Poor". He gave example of wild horses fighting over hay with the elk that was put out and the horses ended up being gored by large adult bull elk in Cold Creek and had to be put down rather than let them suffer and they could not be saved. He stated that there must be sustainability for the animals on the landscape. He stated he is uncertain if the 5 years **AML** (*Appropriate Management Level*) is the answer and there is a large amount of effort of using birth control. He stated when he started 15 years ago on the CAB his focus was to make sure all animals in the wild are taken care of therefore if management is going to be done there has to be done to have healthy animals, if not it is simply, he feels animal cruelty. He stated when looking at the water sources available for

the animals he does not want to place blame on the animals taking up the sources, but the numbers show that there are not enough sources to support the number of animals that are out in the field.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated the inability to manage the wild horses and burros' population has to do with everything else that is managed. He stated that he heard from board member John Hiatt that the wild horses and burros' population consume more than twice the amount of all the ungulates populations.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that the wild horses and burros consume more than that amount he stated and that the biomass of wild horses and burros exceeds that of all wild ungulates combined (*elk, deer, sheep, antelope, moose*) etc., by a factor of three. He advised that this has changed dramatically since 2008 when the number was more for horses but closer between the wild horses and wildlife but now that number is three times as much biomass of horses when it comes to forage because the horses are not ruminants thus horses are less efficient at digesting plant material than ruminants (*deer, elk, antelope, sheep*). He stated this letter is the first step and that the BLM doesn't have control on the funding they have to control this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that it comes out of Congress.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that the proposed budget by Congress at this time, or the next fiscal year is going to cut BLM's budget by 4 or 5 percent as opposed of what the current budget is. He stated this will not help management of anything on BLM land and reiterated that this is the first step for BLM to take steps to view what they need to do and give clarification to Congress of this and it will be expensive but if not done it will be even more costly. He stated that BLM will have to do this and cannot continue to let the wild horses and burros' populations continue to increase. He stated that it is imperative that this be addressed to not lose wildlife and wild horses and burros and advised it would not be a good look to see wild horses dying from thirst and starvation.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised when wild horses were removed a few years back from Spring Mountain there was still 95 percent euthanized due to poor body conditions and would not have survived otherwise. He stated this proved that the wild horses were in bad shape as their numbers continued to increase across the state. He stated that blinders cannot be placed on and state the things we cannot continue to do and yet doing no management.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to not focus on the wild horses think about the habitat that is getting degraded and it's the habitat that will take a long time to regenerate even with removal of the wild horses up to the AML, it will still take the habitat years to replenish and come back from destruction and overgrazing that has taken place. He stated that the letter advising gaining 10,000 horses a year and he stated even with removal of 10,000 horses a year that is keeping status quo. He stated there is documentation showing the AML is already over the amount of 3, or 10 times over capacity. He stated his focus is saving the habitat.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that members of the public disagree that the wild horses are the main culprit of habitat.
- Board member John Hiatt states that the letter suggests strongly is that birth control is the total answer on this, he stated if it gets down to AML then yes birth control will be effective. He stated that birth control by itself will not reduce these population increasing, it will only slow the rate of increase. He stated that the success in the Virginia range is a good thing but when there is not a way to keep track of 50,000 brown horses and know which mares you have guarded is a hassle.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member if he knew the efficiency of the birth control is.
- Board member John Hiatt asked board member Dave Talaga if what he is asking per year or

year and a half after administration.

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated it is 90 percent effective and cost \$24.00 dollars a dose which will last one year, and the horses must get a booster 4 to 6 weeks later and an annual booster thereafter.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that this is done on the bulk of the horses with a roundup and the horses do not like the roundup. He stated the first time is hardest and the second time is harder as well.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated the strategic efficiency of the birth control is low and costly.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that it is not that costly. He stated it is cheaper than having more horses gather and having to find placement for them down the line.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that his point is if birth control is going to be done then you must be done across the entire population.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga that is the proposal, but to be effective the population must be reduced to what is sustainable.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that his point was if birth control was to be done, it is needed to be done across an entire population.
- Board member John Hiatt reiterated that is the proposal, but the population must be reduced to be sustainable.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member John Hiatt the question that in order for the birth control to be effective what number of wild horses would have to have roundup, what percentage 90 or 95%.
- Board member John Hiatt stated the logistics of attempting to roundup most horses that are out there is almost impossible.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that was his point therefore birth control is not the answer given the population of the wild horses.
- Board member John Hiatt gave the example: if there were 20 German shepherds in a home all which were spade and neutered, would this solve the issue of dogs in the home. He stated the answer is no because there would still be the same number of dogs in the home except there not reproducing. He stated to get to a manageable number there must be some dogs taken from the home and moved to another location.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that he felt birth control is a tool that can be used but he agrees with board member John Hiatt when he stated that the population must be brought down to a sustainable level first.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that there will still be reproductive but if you get down to AML then the number of horses to remove from the range is adoptable and sustainability is possible. He stated with the number now for the wild horses that amount cannot be sustained.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked if there any legal issues to just go and do another roundup. He stated the population should be split 50/50.
- Board member John Hiatt stated if you look at the law Free Roaming horses and burro Act of 1971, it implies horses to be managed to have reasonable natural balance of the land which means reasonable balance of mares versus stallions there with horses being part of the natural landscape, in the same way of other wildlife in terms of numbers of male and females. He stated the idea of removal of all mares would not fly due to public opinion it is what the law implies.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): she asked the process of the birth control. She asked if they shot the mares with darts.

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated yes.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): she stated so the mares must be contained in a coral.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that it must be 50 yards away.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*), that the horses do not have to be contained in a coral. He stated the person must be close enough to shoot the dart out of the gun.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated in a helicopter or whatever.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): she stated so close enough to distinguish between the sex male or female. She stated then they just do not start shooting all horses with these darts correct.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that how it has happened is to identify mares, next if the horses are different colors that is fine, need to keep track which horses are darted in an attempt not to dart the same horse again. He stated in areas such as the Virginia Range, where volunteers are doing this process, the process is done with roundups. This causes the mare to develop antibodies against her own ova (egg cells) destroying it and last between one to two years, wearing off after that timespan.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): she asked board member John Hiatt is there anyway to tag the horse to identify that the horse was tagged previously and the year it was done.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated it could be done but that would require putting hands on the wild horses to do that.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there is a small number, and this is video documented, and they name the horses and know which horses this process was done too. It becomes harder to do when the herd becomes larger.
- Brian Patterson stated that in areas such as Virginia Range or Cold Creek this is not so difficult because the wild horses are not afraid of humans, because the humans feed them and allow the humans to come close to them and make contact therefore, they are able to dart these horses easily.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised when going into other areas, one cannot get within any distance of these wild horses.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): she stated that Nevada has more feral horses than any other state.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*), that Nevada has half the total number of feral horses in the United States.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): she stated if this discussion is happening due to our worry of the wild horses and their well being, we are relying on the BLM roundups which have not produced great outcomes, there were animals injured, death. She stated there are news stories that can show proof of this, and stated her concern is the Coalition seems to be compromised of hunting organizations, but she doesn't see any organizations that deal with wild horse education located in Northern Nevada. She advised that this organization monitor and track the roundups and they provide a vast amount of information on this issue therefore she does not understand why this organization was not included and felt this organization would be valuable to this process.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*) that he does not know as well why this organization is not on this letter. He stated the CAB is not on this letter at this time but the CAB along with other organizations are being asked to have more discussion on this to see if they would like to join the Coalition on this letter. He advised this is the reason for this discussion, and he stated the Commission is being asked to do the same thing as well.
- Public Comments: (*Jana Wright, member of the public*): she stated she opposed this letter due to no address toward helicopter roundups. She stated that BLM has missed opportunities in managing the wild horses. She advised she is not certain just because there was mention about the fertility that this is accurate information. She stated that the agenda item stated that the CAB will make recommendations.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to member of the public Jana Wright, the CAB will make a recommendation for or against support of this letter.
- Public Comments: Jana Wright, member of the public: she stated it would be out of line for the CAB to support this and would advise the Commission.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Jana Wright, member of the public*), He stated that he would advise the Commission of the CAB stance on this, and he is not sure if the CAB can sign on to this letter therefore, he will ask the district attorney of this question. He advised to Jana Wright, member of the public she is correct.
- Brian Patterson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that Lincoln County along with four other counties have done so.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson that he understands this, but the Clark County District Attorney was uncertain if this should be done or not.
- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated he feels that the CAB should support this letter and stated that Clark County has way over the amount of ALMs already in place and stated that the CABs that signed on along with CCABMW should get out and view areas in Clark and Lincoln Counties of the destruction that the wild horses have done to the habitat and to other animals in wildlife. He stated the discussion of birth control for the horses, he stated is a joke in his opinion. He stated it is cost prohibited by a long shot and you cannot even get out of the starting gate and is nothing more than a dream if they have any thoughts of having birth control for these wild horses. He stated how do they think that they can go into Lincoln County to get the horses out of there when they cannot even get this same horse out of Spring Mountain. He stated Lincoln County, Nye County and go into the mountain and herd these wild horses is nothing but a dream. He stated that at this time Congress has not authorized and that would be lethal execution of these wild horses, which is possible under the 1971 Free Roaming horses and burro Act of 1971. He stated this is where the focus needs to be to lethally destroy some of the wild horses to get these horses down to AML the number that the BLM has had. He stated that he agrees with (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*) in stating the mismanagement of BLM of the wild horses.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): he stated that what did work is when states decide to sue the federal government, then action is taken, but in the state of Nevada he has noticed that we dance around writing letters to our Congressional delegates and BLM stating a side of removal or non-removal and when we do and list everyone then head nods happen and nothing changes. He

stated that there is lethal removal of elk and deer in certain areas, to prevent suffering and overpopulation, it is called hunting. He stated previously when lethal removal was done the animals were sent to slaughter and send the meat out of the country. He advised that horses are considered a food source in other countries, not our country. He stated helicopter roundups are effective but can lead to horses getting injured especially if they are in poor health conditions. He stated there are many places where these wild horses are in poor health conditions.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated that regardless of which side of the table you are on this matter, the problem is government, the elected officials that we the people have put in power to make these decisions on our behalf, yet it continues to be placed back down to the public. He stated that it is time to have the state of Nevada with the largest population of feral horses to sue the federal government. He stated he does not understand why the state of Nevada has not done so yet. He stated to collar mule deer but watch wild horses wither away makes no sense and is embarrassing and painful to watch these animals die. He stated he agrees with the comments, but it is not our responsibility but that of the federal governments. He stated it is time to tell these officials to do their job or we the public will find someone else who will by going after the federal government and suing the federal government. He stated for years no public official wanted to touch this topic.
- Public Comments: (*Fred Voltz, member of the public*): He stated he has been listening to both sides, he stated he is at a loss to explain beyond the public officials why there has not been widespread application of birth control process, \$24.00 dollars a year is not a huge number as opposed to price of feed, and other expenses of keeping these horses. He stated that the wild horses with the process of birth control can also be microchipped for identification to make the process easier. He stated doing a roundup in brutal conditions where a large number are killed is wrong and is not good wildlife management. He stated the BLM needs to step up and create more humane living conditions for the wild horses, if they are going to keep these horses in captured conditions. He stated there is not enough people willing to adopt these horses and the BLM had a \$1,000 program was simply a method used by individuals who planned on selling them for slaughter in countries such as (*Canada, Mexico*) and elsewhere. He stated there is a need for a new paradigm and we are not doing anything to help the sick horses by simply stating “the poor horses”. He stated where the federal government is in this process of helping these horses to survive, no vet bills to be seen. He stated to have expectations of Congress to provide more funding with all the other operational issues they have is just a dream. He stated that he is tired of the horses and burros being demonized by any number of people and stop the scapegoating and start dealing with our wildlife species all the species in a responsible manner.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that BLM can be sued for this, but it is not feasible due to not enough money available, this is a first step and urge Commission to sign off, and a great deal of lobbying.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that in one letter the young lady states that when she has guests who are visiting Nevada, she takes her guests to see the horses in their majestic state. He stated that is emotional but not realistic due to the need for effective management. He stated another letter advises the use of birth control and

he stated it is not enough. He advised it will take funding, lobbying, volunteering. He agreed this is a good start and stated that it will manifest and eventually get some effective horse management down the line.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he has requested to have a subcommittee called Public Lands, and this subcommittee would go to various meeting throughout Nevada and have lengthy discussions and have individuals to bring in statistics to show the facts. He stated that (*Chairman Tommy Caviglia*) would have to identify staff assigned by NDOW who will be working this committee and have not done so yet. He stated at the end of the day we all want the same thing, but we must get both sides to come to an agreement through many discussions and he feels that this subcommittee would be the forum. He stated the members of the public who wrote the letters for this action item could come to the subcommittee meeting and present presentations on the facts and have discussion.
- Brian Patterson stated that metrics need to be to show some sort of progress is being made or goals that are given are being met.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised a motion to accept the letter from The Coalition for Healthy Nevada Lands, Wildlife and Free-Roaming Horses Letter for Wild Horses and Burro as a start to manage the over population of wild horses and burros and the Wildlife with the support of the Wildlife Commissioners.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

b. **Petition- Ms. Rebecca Goff (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the petition to add a new section to Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code (Hunting, Fishing, and Trapping; Miscellaneous Protective Measures) regarding Wildlife Killing Contests.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he has seen a vast amount of petition submitted to the Wildlife Commission and stated that this petition was well organized, well written and laid out all the information.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he felt this individual put together the information well to have a very nice discussion tonight. He stated, this individual took time and do a diligent job researching and did not just do motions but gave us facts and reasoning behind these facts.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the term “killing contests” has come before the CAB on numerous occasions, as well as going in front of our legislatures and it was never passed and did not move forward. He stated there is more information on this subject matter ever given then previously. He stated he was not in attendance when similar information on this subject matter was presented to the legislature, but he feels that information was not close to this significant write up in discussion for the legislatures.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that he felt that this petition laid out information about the calling contests or coyote killing contests with significant history in what occurred in recent years, providing cogent and well written arguments for the reasoning that it is counter productive from the standpoint of improvement for the

number of pray animals essentially here and reasoning of why it is counterproductive. He stated it implies what other states have done on this and he advised that these types of events discourage or reduce support for hunting by the public. He stated he feels this is definitely something in need of a look and stated a very small percentage of the public in Nevada hunts and this type of coyote killing contest or calling contests generally don't incentives the public to hunt. He stated if you would like to see hunting continue as a viable recreational sporting activity then one needs to watch things such as this, he stated public relations is important. He stated he feels a very small percentage of public is involved in such activities and this does not help with wildlife management and give hunting a bad name.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated on the Nevada Wildlife Guide Report that came out a few years ago, looking at two of our largest population centers located north of Reno and surrounding area and Clark County in Clark down in this area, most of the individuals who were interviewed were called mutualist. He stated the remaining counties that were interviewed were called traditionalist and were in support of this as it is a part of their lifestyle. He stated as you go into urban areas with large populations, they do not view this as making sense since they do not withhold these traditions. He stated even though there were not many people interviewed, the result is that the population centers seem to be more mutualists not agreeing with trapping and other general things or calling contests in which prey is removed and prey animals and these animals are not protected.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the biggest concern is when a group of people are placing friendly wager on who can get the most coyotes, the question becomes is this a calling contest or not and where is the line defined. He stated he did not see that the letter defined the definition of what a calling contest or killing contest is.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the coyote along with species such as jack rabbits are unprotected animals, how does one stop these contests.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Chair Paul Dixon that this is indeed a challenge but at the same time if one is going to have an annual world championship coyote calling contest, this is not the same as the guys at the bar placing a friendly wager as you previously gave example of.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that he has never been or participated in any type of calling or killing contests and is not certain of the rules for it.
- Board member John Hiatt stated if three guys are at the bar and decide to post elk and do not reveal this to anyone, they may indeed get away with that. He stated clearly, they will not invite the public to participate in this. He advised there is no way to regulate the killing of a non protected animal but when it is organized and publicized and invites the public to participate either in viewing or as participators then it is a major issue. He stated that is what would be killed or shut down under any proposed legislation.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member John Hiatt that should be left up to law enforcement to decide whether these things can be defined as a contest by advertisement or collection of dues or fees for it, or if prizes or prize money was paid out.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he does not care if the amount is 3 or 300, this is an argument for the legislatures.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the law must be followed, and it is the legislature that would have to define this.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Nevada has big buck contests, bass contests, is this considered a killing contest because something is being killed.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated this is not a killing contest because the petition that is submitted tonight would not affect any of those things.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he thinks that Chair Paul Dixon's point to this is why is one situation alright but the next is not. He stated what is the designation to decipher what is acceptable to stay and what is not. He stated that predator control is important part of conservation. He stated that there is mule deer population in need of conservation, and we talked about the wild horses and burros and how they are putting a tremendous pressure on the habitat along with sage grouse who are listed as endangered species. He stated the coyotes are predators of these animals and have a negative effect on the growth of populations and sustainability populations.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this is a forum for the hunters where their skills are taught and passed onto other hunters to learn, and it is difficult to learn to hunt. He stated there are difficult questions such as how you make a set, what do you do when and how long, and what are the different things and stated it is propagation of these skills to be able to hunt. He stated and there is the general infringement on the freedom to make the decision that you would like to assemble and can do a pinpoint in order to have an accurate way to state the areas that have more coyote population than can be sustained on the existing prey population, and to do that it would be a great tool. He stated unfortunately due to some bad actors we cannot due to leaked video or bad optics and its not fish therefore it is a problem. He stated he will continue to be an advocate for people going out and doing these actions because he stated it is indeed helping.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that one cannot simply look for a perspective that everything revolves around mule deer only. He stated that we must take steps back to evaluate the situation and look at what is happening. He stated there are many issues such as horses and non-native species along with incoming solar and climate change, and wetlands that are being lost. He stated having discussions on these topics and focusing on them while having the realization that while these things are happening while we in a couple of years continue to regulate species that can regulate themselves. He stated there is need for management due to the introduction to many things that need removal or management. He stated that it has been proven time and time again that these methods do not work with coyotes.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked the question to board member Alex Harper, what does not work with coyotes.
- Board member Alex Harper stated to Chair Paul Dixon coyote calling contest. He advised that looking 10 to 30 years later you may kill as many coyotes as you would like but it will not make a difference in the overall population.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked the question to board member Alex Harper then why we kill coyotes as part of NDOW management.
- Board member Alex Harper stated to board member Dave Talaga that we should not do that necessarily with coyotes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that right now with NDOW management and coyotes, there is an area that is chosen selectively and harvest more than 70 percent of the animals. He stated when more than 70 percent of the animals are harvested this affects the population. He stated if less than 70 percent of the animals is harvested on a general

basis led to increase in coyote populations and takes time for the population to recover. He stated this is a proven fact and advised that NDOW has targeted in the predator fee. He stated if only 25 percent of the coyotes were removed, the issue would worsen.

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that this would cause a boomerang effect causing traditional and higher litters in all coyote areas.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated the idea of predators having the ability to increase offspring with this strategy is a new phenomenon.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it is not a new phenomenon, but the concept is.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated it is newly understood.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised when there was a usage of 1080 Predator control with killing more than 70 percent.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that he agrees with board member John Hiatt that it is a new concept which has not been proven.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga that there is a lot of evidence.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that the coyote's range radically expanded.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated what is the damages that is being done by having coyote killing contests.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised nothing.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that this is considered as being part of the predator management.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated the argument he finds the most interesting is non targeted, but clearly non targeted coyote control on a larger scale is the answer that this might increase coyote numbers.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that you might increase the numbers, "might". He stated when hard evidence or proof is presented then that will be a different story. He stated the argument at this time is the perception that people have regarding coyote calling contests. He stated these individuals have worked hard and changed the name to coyote killing contests. He stated that the CAB obliges these individuals by putting this language into the meeting minutes and agenda. He stated this has been done for thousands of years ever since there were predators and hunt them to give protection to our valued species. He stated therefore which every name you would like to label it coyote calling contest, or coyote killing contests as Rebecca Goff, who wrote this petition stated a red herring about gaming and how this reflects poorly on the state of Nevada as it is a gaming state. He stated coyote calling contests or coyote killing contests or whatever you want to call it, is simply a game. He stated that hunters have done this for many years, and it will continue. He stated what the CAB is doing is responding too an emotional swing in the public's view of animal killings and this is short sighted. He stated that if this becomes the basis in which we enact the law that removes this process which has been going on for thousands of years.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member Brian Patterson if he would be willing to sacrifice the free choice he has.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to Board member Dave Talaga that he would be willing to sacrifice my finger to save my arm.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Brian Patterson what he was

- saving by not allowing coyote killing contests.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that you are not impacting the population and not impacting the population of sage grouse either or anything else, whether they are hunted or not. He stated the argument has been on it not having any impact up or down on the population of either predator that you are taking out or the rare species that you are trying to save. He stated it is simply a perception on the hunting community as being a group of blood thirsty goons who are barbaric.
 - Board member Dave Talaga asked board member Brian Patterson to state what his trade off would be.
 - Board member Brian Patterson advised that using the previous scenario of the group of friends at the bar talking about killing coyotes, he suggested that these group of friends should go and kill as many coyotes as they can and stated it is allowed.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Brian Patterson if he wanted to have a coyote killing contests then it should be advertised nationally.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that he is on the fence because he agrees with both sides.
 - Board member Dave Talaga asked board member Brian Patterson what he is trading off by not allowing coyote killing contests. He stated what is being done is giving up coyote killing contests for the optics of the public to appease the public so the CAB can move on from this action item and do something else. He stated by taking this away from people of the coyote killing contests is taking away a group of people's rights. He stated this is not fair trade at all.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated he cannot answer that question if it is indeed a fair trade but stated this is something that he is not willing to die for.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that he hears what he is stating and agrees in everything stated but advised it is also short sighted to not consider the views of the public on this activity when it really doesn't impact a large amount of the hunting community and only a small percentage of the hunting community.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated that there are not any traditional bear baiting contests and advised that if they ask the public would it be alright to go around and shoot as many animals as they possibly could, the public will decline and state that it is important issue. He stated that this would not be beneficial to other hunters who are ethical hunters.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that we appease a particular portion of the population.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga that it is not about ethics.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that there is not anything ethically wrong.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated to board member Dave Talaga that is debatable. He advised that laws are different than ethics.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated that one will not go to the proverbial if you have a coyote calling contest any more than if you have a big buck contest or if you catch the most fish contest. He stated it is the same and advised that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert pointed this out earlier and stated that we are arguing semantics and why does

semantics apply here but not there.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised that one of his concerns is that a snowball effect and stated one of the reasonable arguments that is given is, if one creates the ability for one hunting right to be taken away this then creates an open door to remove other rights as well. He stated that previously there were restrictions on hunting and trapping which were the first steps in taking away other traditional rights therefore this is his concern regarding this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he would like to give an example: he stated that we took away rights of a few individuals to commercially collect reptiles due to it being in the public interest of the economic development of Clark County to not have the optics and someone doing it commercially even though there was land development here they kill indiscriminately.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to look at the solar.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that he totally agrees.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that we brought up how many millions of acres of solar going in and discuss the destruction of habitat for lizards and every other species.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that one side is concerned with protecting and guarding the gate against any future incursions and restrictions of rights to hunt but the other side is optics can give negative affect the ability to participate in hunting soon. He stated that he disagrees with the statement earlier in which it was said that it is not possible for hunting rights to be taken away. He stated not all hunting rights at once.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that he had a misrepresentation of that statement.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he felt that the hunting rights would be taken away based on characterization of hunters as bloodthirsty terrible individuals who make bad choices, or the public generally finds disfavor with hunting.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that he could state the same thing regarding black bear. He stated there are the public on the phone who are against it, but the CAB has drawn the line and stated no, and he asked why that is that the line was drawn there but not with other things, maybe he stated it is due to really not caring about the coyote calling contests. He stated he does not care and never has been one to care about this and never will.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to board member Dave Talaga that he does not either personally but stated the reasoning is that he might consider going bear hunting but not coyote calling contest due to not matching with his personal ethics. He stated he does not feel as a hunter that his ethics are radically out of place with other hunters.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member Jacob Thompson if he would deny Vice Chair Dan Gilbert or others up in northern outreaches if they would like to do a coyote calling contest because it does not affect these individuals' ethics because they are perfectly fine with this.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that by doing so, this may protect their hunting rights in general ad nauseam.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that now they are getting to the crux of the matter. He stated that the fight is against the perception

of a group of individuals that we would like to manage to our benefits.

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to board member Dave Talaga that his statement is only half of the issue and the other half that he conveniently left out is that is unsure that it is 100 percent ethical.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he is not discussing about a necessity of having to go on the outlaw but stated he felt that hunters in general should find methods to educate themselves how to perceive today of posting due to one bad image going viral worldwide. He stated that there is a responsibility to educate oneself to be able to behave properly.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there are urban and rural counties in which nine rural counties have commissioners who have signed in unity petitions in support of coyote calling contests. He stated the two urban counties signed in opposition of coyote calling contests. He stated that 96 percent of the population of the state of Nevada lives in these urban populations. He advised whether all people in these counties agrees with this, it only takes one newscaster showing hunters with four bloody coyotes on their truck advising these are how many they killed today, and the public goes nuts.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to Chair Paul Dixon that is not the reason of eliminating a coyote calling contest.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it is not a reason, he gave an example and stated when we got into trapping boundary setting, standoffs, and what areas we were going to close, ultimately there was a compromise due to not being to trap everywhere when we want and where we wanted because it would not hold. He stated what was held was drawing a line that stated there were not going to be 24-hour trap checks, but it was impossible because you cannot trap a 24-hour trap check. He advised that it states 75 hours for a reason because this allows an individual time to trap.
- Public Comments: Members of the public corrected Chair Dixon to advise that the correct number is 96 hours not 72.
- Chair Paul Dixon apologized and continued his statement, that it was left at the higher number because if not it would be considered that you were banning trapping, but by going to a lower number you basically are going to minimize to eliminate, and there had to be a compromise and I need to know where the compromise in this is. He advised that one board member is stating there is no compromise, while the other two are stating that there needs to be a line drawn. He advised that he is not certain what the compromise is and would like to discuss it.
- Public Comments: (*Jana Wright, member of the public*): She advised for the CAB to support this and stated that the CAB spent all last year discussing this action item on multiple occasions. She stated it is a walking waste of wildlife, and whether you are calling this animal the result is this animal will be killed. She stated when she thinks about hunters gathering to kill animals, post images of dead coyotes, and she felt it just does not set well with her. She reiterated for the CAB to support this petition.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She stated there are many reasons why these wildlife killing contests, but you can refer to them as calling instead but you are not pulling the wool over anyone eyes, you call the animals to kill them therefore it is simply wildlife killing contests. She stated these contests are so bad for the state of Nevada and these reasons are listed in this petition. She stated she urges the CAB and public to read the petition, and stated one reason is that there is no management of wildlife objective for these contests, simply prizes. She stated it is

ineffective and the CAB has pointed out there is science, hard science that if you decimate the coyotes they only repopulate quickly ending up with the same amount or more with an objective to kill more. She stated simply look online to see dead coyotes and the images are ugly, with dead coyotes spilling over huge dumpsters. She stated this gives ethical hunters a black eye and she would assume that the entire CAB sitting today are ethical hunters and if so then you should disapprove of these horrible things.

- Public Comments: (*Jelindo Tiberti, member of the public*): He stated next, we will have a discussion on the feral hogs in which we are shooting feral hogs out of helicopters and poisoning them in any we can to reduce their population, and secondly one does not have to have license to kill a coyote. He stated therefore to correlate hunters and hunting coyotes is not fair to hunters. Thirdly he stated he feels there are many reasons for the state of Nevada to have these hunting calling contests. He stated it is good for the gas stations, and a lot of different monetary reasons. Lastly, everyone who is anti hunter or everyone who kills coyotes, this process has not hurt the population and has not hurt the population before, it is all perception. He stated that someone over here wants to take away the rights of another person who has a fair right to kill something. He stated it is just like trying to take away rights like trapping in Nevada, lizard collecting, which shows the rights are shrinking away, and it is being left up to the government to kill our animals. He stated this is the same with mountain lions, and when California banned the killing of mountain lions, there was still a killing of mountain lions of 300 a year. He advised that the government now kills 300 mountain lions a year and the switch went from the public to the government and the word perception is incorrect and most people complaining have never seen a coyote in their lives and only have seen these species in pictures.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked Secretary Darlene Kretunski what the name of the magazine that comes out from wildlife services. He stated they are paid a large amount of money to do so. He stated that nobody seems to care about this, and stated it is done by helicopters, or in snow, and when they kill, they leave the coyotes at that location. He stated they do not collect, remove, they simply shoot and leave them where they are located, that is there job. He stated some of the killings are done around farming areas and cabins.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it is called Trap line.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that this magazine kills 50 to 100 times more coyotes than any killing contests each year.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylereich, member of the public*): She stated that most sportsmen support ethical fair chase practices. She stated they simply want to put food on the table for their families which is respected even by non hunters. She stated she would rather see this than a package that came from the grocery store and pick up a package that came from factory farms and slaughterhouses. She stated that she felt board member Brian Patterson gets it and head the nail on the head when he stated that these contests do not represent many of the sportsmen and hurt the culture and image. She advised that she conducts a vast amount of her work from social media and comes across these images of wildlife killing contests and she advises she can tell us, as well as the individuals in this room that they see, that this imparts images of bloodthirsty psychopaths. She stated that she does not see anyone in the room in this manner but advised that the public views hunters in this way when viewing these postings and this does nothing for the culture. She stated it does not

help perpetuate hunting for the next generations due to them looking at these images with distaste and a turnoff, therefore if you want to continue this culture this is not helping. She stated that pet dogs at some of the coyote killing contests have been mistaken for coyotes and killed at some of these events hence this does not sit well with the public. She stated that she thinks that the hunters that are coming into our state for these contests have a ban probably in the state in which they live, and they are not spending all of their winning in the state during their time here therefore it really does not help the state with a lot of our residents or jurisdictions. She stated that she feels that there is a fear amongst those individuals that do not hunt that if these contests are banned, then the hunters feel that the public is now out to ban all contests next, which she advised is simply incorrect and untrue. She stated that she supports humane ethical respectable hunting practices, and she is certain that the rest of the public does as well. She stated that these contests are simply not that, they are not respectable and create a blemish on the culture.

- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He stated if you are going to let the hunters hunt, then there are two ways: let them hunt, and control the contests. He stated the people need to be educated and ask that the hunters behave accordingly and not throw the dead coyotes on the hood of their vehicle and parade through town. He stated that he does not do this. He advised that he walks along a park located at Durango and Lone Mountain and in that walk in the morning he sees one or more coyotes along with a vast amount of people walking their dogs on a leash. He stated one morning he saw a coyote grab a women's pet dog and run away with it; she could not chase the coyote because she was about 70-75 lbs. He stated there have been reports from his neighbor about another neighbor who let their dog go out through the doggy door and heard the dog screaming and when she looked out the coyote was taking the dog away, therefore he stated that we need to have management control, but he is uncertain of the number of coyotes for that. He stated not to advertise this, simply do it.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Mark Transue, member of the public*) that the Wildlife Services does indeed provide this service and they do not advertise, and they do a lot.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): She stated she will make this brief because she felt the previous comments stated is what she feels as well, therefore she advised she read the letter and felt that the facts indicated were put down in a reasonable and passionate manner. She stated the different arguments of banning these killing contests were already stated and she will not rehash the same again but reiterated that these contests that are advertised and agreed with board member John Hiatt that a vast number of traditions of years or centuries past are no longer done due to having a civilized society. She stated such things as bear baiting, dog fighting, but people still dog fight and this is not good visuals. She stated that the contests do not fit into the any kind of specific scientific wildlife management plan and does not feel the people who are participating are not in belief that they have a grim duty or by doing so it controls the coyote population. She stated there are several states that have banned killing contests which include Arizona who banned these contests on public land. She stated no we are not coming for the hunter's guns and the public are not anti-hunting, and she felt that the hunters in the room tonight would partake on any of these contests. She stated that two of the board members made a point that if you want to continue hunting as your way of life then you will need to police the ranks and get rid of these contests might be the way you do that,

due to the perception rightly or wrongly due to being splashed over public social media and this is what people will remember.

- Public Comments: (*Rachel Glaze, member of the public*): She stated she had a clarifying question for board member Dave Talaga regarding his comment stating that he would not approve this petition, it would appease a small group of individuals who lack and have an emotional swing. She stated she would like to know the difference between appeasing that small group you discussed and the small group of people who enjoy their killing contests.
- Board member Dave Talaga, stated to (*Rachel Glaze, member of the public*) it is a matter of freedom.
- Public Comments: (*Rachel Glaze, member of the public*): She asked board member Dave Talaga did he say sweetheart.
- Board member Dave Talaga repeated his statement again to (*Rachel Glaze, member of the public*), it is a matter of our freedom, so we have rights and a constitution, which part of that is usage of public lands, hunting and fishing and things of that nature. He stated when looking at the population of individuals who oppose this sort of thing, this is fine but as Chair Paul Dixon pointed out the urbanites versus the rural people. He stated the urban people have a different view on how life works therefore he will not take away their rights by putting into place a law which some find wrong due to people in the other group feeling that the other group is wrong. He advised that this is just the way the Republic works. He stated unfortunately this can be seen reoccurring repeatedly. He stated that this culture is about cancelling and advised that to cancel is very easy. He stated it is easy to put a log into for restriction and much difficult to put a log in that opens possibilities. He advised this is a law that restricts and stated we already have plenty of restrictions therefore this is the reasoning for his statements. He stated this is why I said what I said and there is more too this issue than this group versus this group.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbitt, member of the public*): He stated there are 35 contests listed on the petition and only three are like the contests in Clark County, with a large group of people and the remaining contests are in rural areas. He stated it looks that the individuals who are in coyote killing contests want to tell individuals living in the rural areas how to live their lives. He gave an example and stated that the community where he resides, there was an individual who wanted to have a gated community and HOA and the other residents in his community voted no to either. He stated the individuals who wanted the HOA and gated community moved out because he felt they could not control the rest of the residents on this matter with their votes. He stated that he does not feel Clark County or cities large metropolitan areas should tell people who live in the rural areas how to run their lives. He stated if you would like to do so then that would make the individual who desires to become a King or Queen, or super Duchess or dictator. He stated he does not feel that this is right and advised that this is the reason the country was established, to get away from that type of government. He stated the officials are elected by the people and for the people. He stated this is not for the people.
- Public Comments: (*Fred Volts, member of the public*): He stated he would first like to correct the accounting statistics that were cited previously about this discussion, 83 percent of the state through their elected officials in the Clark County Commission with the city of Reno voted 7-0 and 6-1 to pass a resolution to outlaw these contests. He stated rural counties including Elko that decided to do these contests would be

lucky to get 100,000 people. He stated he found the statistics statement to be overwhelming regarding how things should be done. He advised that rules and laws are put in place due to people not doing what they stated is the correct thing to do. He stated it is about one living in a respective manner to other individuals and the wildlife. He stated if anyone in this room is confused, please go to the petition (*Petition of Ms. Rebecca Goff*) and look at Page 11, on the last paragraph in which it described the contests and what is excluded and by this description, it should address individual's concerns. He stated and regarding the unprotected animals, both the Wildlife Commission and NDOW (*Nevada Department of Wildlife*) are obligated by their responsibilities to protect all wildlife. He stated it does not matter what category these species fall into whether it is unprotected or not. He advised for everyone to view NRS 501.100 Paragraph 2. He advised that the hunters who are involved in these contests have no idea of the number of animals that are considered inappropriate in each area therefore to suggest that these individuals are some sort of biologist makes a poor argument. He stated there has been no discussion of the disruption of the wildlife families of species that are affected by the mass killings that occurs at these contests. He advised that the juveniles of these species that attempt to rebound are unsocialized and get into trouble. He stated another problem that everyone should be concern about regardless of their position for or against these contests. He stated that it seems that the lethal open is the option that we seem to go to in a knee jerk reaction. He advised it does not matter whether the Fish and Wildlife Services is doing this or a group of people who organized one of these contests and sent out the word on it domestic or further. He stated the ability to hunt in the state of Nevada is not a right, it is a privilege and can be regulated or taken away. He stated that there is no need for these contests and that the petition (*Petition of Ms. Rebecca Goff*) should pass. He advised that this petition has been before the Commission on three different occasions and should have past previously. He stated he hopes that the petition does pass and that there is no slippery slope here, simply respect of wildlife and not doing any mass killing of animals.

- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*): He stated he would like to speak on the coyote contests in which he feels this subject matter has been debated to exhaustion. He advised he has debated in both the legislature as well as in the Commission and will continue to debate it, he stated this is going back and forth with who is right and who is wrong with science and then find the opposite of that science previously given. He stated regarding individuals' rights, there are many he is not in agreeance with or will not watch but he simply does not deal with these individuals, nor do I watch. He advised that we live in America and individuals have the right to do what they want within the boundaries of the law and not affecting other individuals. He stated that when it comes to these contests and stating advising individuals that they may not harvest, he stated the definition of a contest is to face an opposition. He stated that NDOW (*Nevada Department of Wildlife*) had a coyote killing contests a few months ago when they were killing coyotes in and around Lake Las Vegas due to a biting incident in which the coyote bit a lady. He advised that NDOW went against the opposition and harvested ten coyotes and did not put these dead coyotes on their truck. He stated shame on the hunters who do this, they should send out these images in private messages to not offend people but at the same time individuals should not go and seek out this if it does offend them. He stated when it comes to coyote killing contests it is a right of freedom therefore people deserve to

have freedom to live their lives in the manner of which makes them happy. He stated the comment that a normal city person does not like to hunt, he advised that WHIN (*Wildlife Habitat Improvement of Nevada*) has raised 750,000 dollars and felt that his time could be spent doing other conservation matters but he must come to CCABMW Meetings in order to protect his rights. He understands that there are non-hunters who have never participated in the outdoors and stated it is infectious. He stated it will exist in America and will continue to exist and every single instance when he feels his rights are being affected, he advised he will continue to attend these CCABMW meeting each time there is a bill that comes up that affects his rights, and he will bring others as well as bringing others who enjoy the rights of the outdoors as well.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated his question is for the public, that maybe the word from coyote contests, would it be better if we eliminated the word contests make it more applicable for everyone maybe more appetizing. He stated he sees some shaking off individuals' heads on that. He advised he would like to now discuss the financial portion of this and the state of Nevada benefits of it, there are a large amount of people living in Mt. Charleston, and the question is the police and fire come from for the people that live in that area, where does the money come from to pay for those services. He stated that the taxes that are paid to the state of Nevada are coming from the convention, and the rural portion of Nevada is in mining and the cattle industry. He advised that the cattle industry brings in a large amount of money to this state. He referenced a study taken in 2020 during COVID that stated that there was \$30 million dollars from just small game hunting to this state, not by trappers and not by fisherman or big game hunters. He asked the question when one lives in Reno, and Nevada or Vegas deny small rural communities that \$30 million dollars when they need fire, and police and Mt. Charleston is falling apart when it comes to the rain. He stated that there are only two places, and it is 96 hours for checking trap is for the rest of Nevada and 48 hours if it is within Clark County around (*Mt. Charleston, Laughlin, Vegas*) and he checks the traps every two days if he had too, but I do not trap. He stated the tax dollars are being removed that would help places such as Mt. Charleston by not allowing the individuals their rights to kill a coyote. He stated he has visually seen hunters pile dead coyotes on top of their truck. He stated the Fish and Wildlife Services in Reno when they have problem geese, they simply catch them, kill them, and dump them. He stated he that he runs a small management area in Key Pittman, and he witnessed 2 coyotes killing 2 geese and he could have posted these images by video for everyone to view but stated it would make some people very upset therefore he did not, instead he grabbed his rifle and killed the coyotes. He advised he could find these images all day long and be mortified but when it comes to the bottom dollar, coyote contests bring in a large amount of money in. He advised he does not kill coyotes for that purpose only if he must keep them off the ducks and away from the duck nests. He stated the coyotes are decimated by coyotes, they either kill the mother geese or eat the eggs, therefore where do we go to appease the public, either change definition of a coyote or move this species into the big game category instead of being known as a varmint, or to change the term from contest, let us come to common ground. He stated that the coyotes are an issue, and we cannot seem to come up with either the coyotes or the contests. He stated either step up to the plate and handle this issue or walk away from it in its entirety.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*) mentioned trapping, and two of the 17 counties have different rules on trapping and 15 counties do not therefore if there is going to be a compromise then it is built twice in the legislature and failed three different times with the Commission due to the split of opinion between the rural and the urban. He stated to compromise it could be stated that in the urban county's restrictions can be placed on the contests, but it will not be placed in the rural counties, and he feels from his viewpoint this will be considered a compromise.
- **FYI- NRS 501.100-Legislative declaration regarding wildlife** 2. *The preservation, protection, management, and restoration of wildlife within the State contribute immeasurably to the aesthetic, recreational and economic aspects of these natural resources.*
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that he heard a lot about science-based potential of essentially instigating reproduction based upon a harvest of coyotes. He stated that Utah is amazing for a case study, it has had a bounty in the last few years, and it is seen that there is a substantial number of coyotes harvested on an annual basis and he believed the number is upward to 14,000 or 14,000 animals a year which is propagated. He stated the mule deer herd showed increases in population when other states are having decreases in their population of mule deer and reflected a diminish decrease in the years of 2021 & 2022 when Nevada got hammered by the severity of the drought. He stated he feels the science supports the predator management of the coyote populations with people asking the question that this is a small population therefore why we are focused on this small population of people, and we will not infringe upon everyone's rights solely take the rights of this small group of people. He stated using the example of the feral horses and burros and that they are affecting a small population in the northern portion of the state of Nevada with very few people seeing these species or interacting with them and the population is in Washtoe County and Clark County and not to worry about them because they can deal with the horses, and they are not in the forefront of anybody's concern. He stated at the end of the day it has a large effect on what these people must live with daily, and he feels it goes across strains of good conservation minded plans and science. He stated he is 100 percent on reduction and to give more predator control especially with diaster of the mule deer population in the state of Nevada with a compound of the horses and burros.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated that trends do matter and stating when looking at Utah where there is reduction in coyote calling contests this can be traced to see that the mule deer population did indeed bounce back for a small amount of time. He stated what is the trend and advised, this has been the most unsuccessful campaign to kill any predator of all time, the coyotes have expanded their range and moved into cities and the coyotes cannot be killed by the nature of their biology therefore they cannot be managed in the same manner that other predators could be. He stated it use to be seen as a coyote now it is seen as just another predator.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that he not take exception to what board member Alexander Harper stated about coyotes coming into urban areas, and advised the coyotes are coming into urban areas because there is food and opportunity and if these coyotes do thrive in these areas, it is due to no predator management. He stated he received from his HOA a letter advising that there has been coyote sighting in his area and to get use to it because in past, this was the coyote's land and development

took this land away from the coyotes. He advised this is not predator or wildlife management, therefore when discussing that the coyotes are coming into the urban areas, they can be killed. He stated he has no issue with stating coyote contest or coyote calling contests are fine, it means they kill animals. He stated that words such as harvesting and coyote calling these words can enter the Lexicon because hunters must pacify the people that don't like idea of killing so we use the word harvest or coyote calling contests instead. He reiterated he does not care the coyotes will be killed. He stated there is an overabundance of predators in the urban area therefore they must kill them to get rid of these species.

- Board member Alexander Harper advised to board member Dave Talaga that it is not working, the coyotes move into the cities anyway.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Alexander Harper did he know why there are 60,000 feral horses in Nevada and stated the reason is we do not kill them. He stated instead of killing the horses we spend millions of dollars with placement.
- Board member Alexander Harper advised that he understand that we have over the number of feral horses. He stated regarding the coyotes he felt that the contests were not a sustainable plan and asked the questions of how long these contests will take place and if this was going for 10 to 30 years or would it simply be yearly.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member Alexander Harper what he was referring too.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated with the coyote killing contests and predator control management strategies. He advised that the coyotes have a trend of cycling and cannot be eliminated and stated he does not want the coyotes to be eliminated and they cannot be eliminating any coyotes.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Alexander Harper who said anything about eliminating any coyotes.
- Board member Alexander Harper advised that people have attempted to eliminate the coyotes and it did not work and the coyotes are everywhere. He stated some coyotes have recently just come into Miami and he stated he understands that the coyotes can be killed in places like that, but the fact of the matter is coyotes are spreading due to the biology of the coyotes. He stated the question is how long this is going to last.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised to board member Alexander Harper that one does not eliminate one controls the coyotes instead.
- Board member Alexander Harper advised he understands what board member Dave Talaga is stating but he is showing the analogy that even if one would like, they cannot, and this is the only species that this cannot be done too, that is that size, therefore eliminate them. He stated that people have tried to kill these predators and it did not work therefore this is what he is representing.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member Alexander Harper to explain his statement, you cannot do what exactly.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated to board member Dave Talaga he was stating eliminate the coyotes and it did not work.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Alexander Harper that nobody is discussing the elimination of the coyotes, instead the discussion is about controlling the coyotes.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated to board member Dave Talaga that he

understands.

- Board member Dave Talaga stated that is controlling.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated he was simply using an example.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Alexander Harper that he took exception to the idea of the word eliminate that board member Alexander Harper used as well as the statement that was that board member Dave Talaga was afraid to say the word killing. He stated he felt by doing so it was insinuating that he was attempting with his words to mislead people.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that in the 1800s there was an effort to eliminate the coyotes from the American landscape. He stated he felt at this time, we are simply unsuccessful, and our attempts are backfiring. He stated there are more coyotes presently, then in past Pre-European content.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that he sees no relevance in his statement made.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to board member Dave Talaga ok.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that his statement pertaining to the 1800s and we are 100 years later, or 50 years later.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to board member Dave Talaga that efforts to radically attempt to try to reduce the coyote populations often backfire.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson nobody is in discussion about radically controlling instead we are talking about coyote killing contests.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that people kill as many coyotes as they possible can.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised the content is different and advised in a coyote killing contests, the winner kills as many coyotes as possible and what percentage are killed in these contests of the population of coyotes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga versus Wildlife Services.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated it is a little hard to have it both ways and still make a argument of the importance of protection of native wildlife.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised to board member Jacob Thompson that he was not speaking on quote protecting coyotes.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that this was brought up initially by Vice Chair Dan Gilbert about protecting coyotes. He stated that board member Jacob Thompson stated in his point that if the number is so small how are we protecting the wildlife.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated he is talking about protecting the rights of individuals to do a certain thing, and stated this is his point.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he understands.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated when getting to predator management this is a small portion of it and not a particularly effective portion of predator management, is a right. He stated it is a freedom and a choice.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he is torn on this matter, and he can see both sides. He stated predator management should only be done if it makes logical sense.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that the coyote killing contest or coyote contest whichever you want to call it but know this is not predator management. He stated it is contest for individuals in rural areas that have a set of skills for doing lifestyle that these individuals have. He stated this lifestyle is not urban since most urban individuals

cannot relate while some hunters in the urban areas can. He stated that the bottom line is that these contests have zero impact on the coyote population. He stated the optics of this was brought forth earlier and a hunter ethics issue of how some people who harvest them present this action on social media, causing a backlash. He stated why has this never passed the legislature twice or why it has never passed the commission, it is due to this item being more complexed than other items under CAB's discussion tonight. He stated it may be a possible compromise like what was done with trapping and other matters in which the rural counties management would be different than that of urban counties.

- Board member Dave Talaga advised to Chair Paul Dixon that would be an effective compromise.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that on (Page 5) he referenced the large quotation listed by Tony Wasley in the section puts everything into perspective.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that he agrees with board member John Hiatt.
- **FYI- Page 5-** *(Tony Wasley, hunter, and then-director of the Nevada Department of Wildlife, summed up how killing contests defy the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. He said, "I just want to clarify that contests are not threatening coyote populations, nor are they in and of themselves saving mule deer or other game populations... nor do they save the agency any appreciable amount of money." Discussing NDOW's proposed regulation to ban contests, Wasley explained, "It proposes no change on an individual's right or ability to gather, call or kill coyotes." He went on to say, "Killing contests are ethically upsetting by virtue for most members of society. Hunting should not be a competition as such behavior ultimately degrades the value of life and undermines respect for the animals being hunted... The North American Model that we often prop up as the anchor of modern wildlife management disapproves of, I quote, "Frivolous killing" ... In my ethics as a hunter, I hope to defend a deeper and more profound sense of hunting than what I fear coyote contests say to the general public about hunters and our ethics. Hunters need to be conscious of the public image we project and the way in which the public perceives us." Pointing out that "hunters are in the extreme minority of citizens," Wasley stated, "our actions must be with the awareness of our broader societal irrelevance." He concluded, "Really what my biggest fear around this issue is for the future, for the future of conservation, for the way that we as ethical sportsmen and women are viewed by a changing society and the consequences on a whole host of other activities... My fear as a sportsman and my fear as the director of the Department of Wildlife is an unwillingness to consider what society at large feels about a certain activity will hasten the erosion of privileges that I hold near and dear."*
- Board member John Hiatt advised that Tony Wasley put everything into perspective in this large quotation above and stated that he felt anybody would consider Tony Wasley anti-hunting and, in this quote, he lays out case for ethics. He stated that most of society finds frivolous killing of wildlife to be unacceptable. He stated the coyote killing contests are frivolous killing and it is not a hard argument of real purpose therefore the idea that by doing this it will help with the mule deer population is simply misplaced. He states when viewing other parts of the country such as Maryland there are plenty of coyotes there and the population of mule deer in Maryland exceeds 250 deer per square mile. He stated there are many deer and the season runs from September to April and the hunters still receive predation permits

for the remainder of the year, therefore if hunters would like to hunt deer, they could do it essentially 365 days a year. He stated this is due to having such many deer and even with coyotes there is no dent in the deer population. He stated he feels it really is regarding ethics and what everyone is willing to accept as reasonable today. He stated there is no old age contest or anything of that nature that was acceptable in past, therefore there needs to be recongination of this and if we would like hunting to continue as a sport, then it is up to the hunters to pay attention to their image that they portray thus being portrayed in the minds of the public as just one killer does not make any sense. He stated this is simply not productive for both hunters and for anyone else. He reiterated that Tony Wasley on Page 5 of this letter makes a valid point on the need to do away with coyote killing contests in general.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he has been reading some articles that are like the topic and with the term poacher, these types of cases, the media blows them up by television and writing articles on this topic and instead of using the word “poaching” they instead use the word “this hunter” and state that the hunter shot 15 deer for example and has a hefty fine. He stated the media assoicate with these words to make a hunter like a poacher and a poacher is not a hunter. He stated that on Page 5 by Tony Wasley the points that he brings up is that a conservationist and a hunter you are not in favor of the destruction of coyotes. He stated that he is on the fence on this topic and advised he has heard everything that the other board members have stated. He stated that this entire microscope of this topic has been placed on hunters as a group due to bad judgment of hunters who post all the graphic images on the internet of the harvest. He stated this too shall past just like dog fighting issues and everything else that happens in the underground world that continues but it will not be publicized any longer by the public. He stated this is a good thing maybe it will stop the hunters from posting offense things on the internet from the public perspection. He stated but regardless of it will still happen and that is the reality. He stated this will continue in rural communties.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that there are certain things that if you see it on the internet and you do not like or agree with, simply do not view it or any pages of that nature, move past it.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised to the board if the CAB supports this, then they are telling the Commission, is there should be law to not hunt coyotes, killing coyotes, calling coyotes under this format. He asked the question to board member Brian Patterson if he would be willing to take the freedom away from those other people due to you being as you stated, “on the fence”.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that when he stated the term “on the fence” is when hunters are lumped into the same category as all hunters are posting these graphic images on the internet and advised he does not like to take away the rights or opportunities from anyone but at the same time if someone does this too themselves by posting these images.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to the CAB that they may do a motion stating that in the urban counties that the CAB supports having no contests but in the rural counties the CAB supports their ability to live their lifestyle period.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he did like his advised motion but would like to add onto that advised motion. He stated the motion should state that the CAB believes that there should be regulation on the coyote calling contest should be dealt with on a county-to-county basis in the state of

Nevada.

- Board member Dave Talaga advised that is a good compromise.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that all wildlife is regulated at a state level therefore the wildlife here in the state of Nevada is the property of the state. He advised therefore we do not let counties decide on tag allocation for species, this is done at a statewide basis. He stated yes this is regional per hunting unit, but counties do not have authority to do what you are asking. He stated therefore it is not legal for allowance of counties to set their own regulations.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to board member John Hiatt that he feels that he is correct in his statements, but he advised that Chair Paul Dixon has given example in past where policies where indeed decided by a county-to-county basis.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he was speaking on the Commission having that ability not the counties. He stated to board member John Hiatt that this gets around his concerns and read the following: regulations of a County Commission on a county-to-county basis by the Wildlife Commission. He stated this was done with trapping amongst other things.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated if these are non-gaming animals.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated this is also his reasoning behind his concerns as well.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to both board members Jacob Thompson and Brian Patterson that it is a non-gaming animal because the state declared the coyote as one. He stated it is essential to our ecosystem. He stated predators taking out other predators is a great idea but in the early part of the 20th century is when we found out that this does not work. He stated this idea was a mistake that if we get rid of all predators, we could have large population of deer and elk and other species. He stated there needs to be recognition of the legal aspects and the biological role that coyotes and other predators play in our ecosystem, therefore frivolous killing of any species is indeed mostly individuals important. He stated this needs to be kept in mind when making regulations.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that if you ask someone in Lincoln County and Nye County and White Pines County where coyote killing contests are frivolous killing, these individuals in these counties would say no, but if you ask that same question to an individual in Clark County and the individuals in this room tonight, they will say yes. He stated that is the point of asking to have the Wildlife Commission side on a county-to-county basis, based on the county's public input on the issue is how the county should vote. He stated this was done with trapping which was a compromising traction.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he would advise a motion for the regulation specifically for coyote killing/calling contests as described in the proposed NAC Page 14, describing what exactly it is the petition will attempt to control. He stated this is proposed language for NAC 503.196 in this petition. He stated he is saying the things that are suggested to be outlawed in this petition he feels should be regulated by a county-to-county basis, whether choosing to make it legal or illegal or regulated.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this would create more of a workload on the Commission but essentially giving the urban and rural counties a voice therefore if the urban county decide to take away this right due to the large number of mutualists who think differently than their counterparts the traditionalists.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to advise that the CCABMW supports a regulation on killing calling contests on a county-by-county basis as administered by the Wildlife Commission.
- Jacob Thompson asked Chair Paul Dixon did his advised motion mention coyotes in this motion.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated no we do not want to mention the word coyotes in this motion.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked the board what exactly then this is about. He stated this is about unprotected mammals or furbearing animals, not fish or any protected mammals, or regarding a buck contest. This is about wildlife killing contests.
- Board member Alexander Harper advised that he feels as a CAB we have many agenda items due to unintelligent intrusion of individuals that oversee the ecosystem for a long time now, and we need to have a conversation to view the ecosystem health and what is the counties' role in this and what is being done with this. He stated that he feels that with NDOW managing all the wildlife and the state should have some continuity in that and manage all animals with sort of the same approach.
- Board member John Hiatt advised this is about predator killing contests,
- Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-2 (Dissenting opinion is this should be a statewide regulation and not by county by county).**

c. **Mule Deer Tag Quota Development, Harvest Estimation and Effects of Harvest (*Informational with Public Comment*)** The CCABMW

Board and Public will see a presentation on Mule Deer Tag Quota Development, Harvest Estimation and Effects of Harvest.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- (*Presentation done by NDOW Biologist Erin Wood*)
- (Erin Woods) introduced herself (*Biologists for NDOW, Southern Region (Las Vegas)*). She stated that she will be going over the process to establish quotas by NDOW for species and estimating the populations.
- (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated for most of the species' population in the state of Nevada NDOW follows the process to pick activation data from aerial and ground surveys. She stated that this information is plugged into a population model and incorporating a portion of hunter harvests data into this replot thus putting all these data into your model to receive a recommendation quota. (Survey Data & Harvest Data makes Population Models + Harvest Objectives + Quota Array which turns into the Final Quota Recommendation).
- (*Erin Woods, Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated Harvest Data includes Hunter success, Buck quality, Hunter effort and Hunter satisfaction, which are

indicators of availability of gear for each unit or unit group. She stated that Hunter effort is measured in the number of She stated with Buck quality NDOW uses the number of points and overall amperage.

- *(Erin Woods, Biologist NDOW Southern Region)*: She stated the NDOW population models account for expected changes in populations overtime for steps and immigration. She advised that the biologists could change the vital rates based on literature factors (*disease and prevalence, drought*) as well as having the ability to add harvest numbers. She stated that NDOW asks for population increase on their server ratios and expected vital rates on two most important methods used for quota recommendations (*fonted over ratio, this indicates herd growth and the buck to doe ratio, this relates to research which uses herd growth and harvest quality*).
- **FYI- Harvest Data (NDOW Website)**: *Manadatory harvest reporting for all big game species, asking the question did you Hunt Yes or No, Successful or Unsuccessful, Hunt Unit of Harvest is asking questions: Number of antler points, Number of animals wounded or tracked, Number of days hunted, or days scouted, Hunter satisfaction level from (1-5).*
- **FYI- Population Models: Why do we estimate numbers? (NDOW Website)** 1) No survey method has perfect detection, may not have survey data. 2) Populations constantly change because of mortality, births, immigration, emigration. 3) To provide an estimate of abundance for tag allocation. 4) Limiting factors.
- **FYI- Population Models: How do we estimate populations? (NDOW Website)** 1) NDOW uses a deterministic spreadsheet model. 2) Deterministic= no stochasticity (random variation). 3) Basic input parameters. 4) Initial population size. 5) Survey data (#bucks, does, fawns). 6) Recruitment data (fawn: adult ratio). 7) Harvest data (we account for animals removed from population). 8) Survival rates. 9) Buck: doe ratio is one of the primary outputs we use for quotas.
- **FYI- Population Models: Integrated Population Models: (NDOW Website)** Count Data, Telemetry Data (for Adult Survival, Juvenile Survival), Harvest Data, Environmental Covariates.
- **FYI- Bucks Don't Have Babies- (NDOW Website)** a) Harvest of bucks has very little to do with population size or population dynamics (rate of change) in mule deer. B) Females are the reproducing segment of the population and their body condition, and the size and weight of fawns

are what drive population dynamics. C) That's why recruitment of young, and our Spring surveys and fawn: doe ratios are so important to track. D) Other means to track fawn recruitment include camera studies, radio-collaring and telemetry studies, mark-recapture methods. E) Mule Deer Working Group is working on a new Fact Sheet!

- **FYI- Management Objectives: Mule Deer (NDOW Website)** (*Erin Woods, Biologists NDOW Southern Region*) presented these facts: a) Standard Hunts: 25-35 per 100 bucks to doe ratio. She stated this is well established web management or ungulate management which is around \$3 dollars per day or per 100 does. b) Alternative Hunts: 30-40 per 100 bucks to do ratio. She stated these are slightly higher buck to doe ratio. She advised that NDOW likes to incorporate the success at 40%.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Erin Woods, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) why does she adjust that number.
- (*Erin Woods, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*): She stated it is more difficult to manage on a lower buck ratio in a more distributed population. She stated this is her understanding of this.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*) so you mean when there is less dense in the population.
- (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*): She stated if you assume that every doe contributes to the reproduction but not every single buck contributes to the reproduction yearly therefore if you have a resource limited population from the bottom up. She stated some factors such as not a large amount of forage quality or availability, or from the top down there might be too many deers on that landscape. She advised in the state of Nevada with our mule deer this is not usually the case. She advised in a limited population every non-breeding buck is consuming resources and not contributing to our growth. She advised with increase competition amongst the bucks during the rut, leading to higher mortality due to going to winter conditions with poor body conditions therefore fewer bucks on the landscape means managing for a lower ratio should be competing less for those resources and have better access to nutrition for survival and growth. She reiterated higher doe to buck ratios can insulate population from stochastic events by putting more resources into does leading to more funds and a recovery of the population faster.

- Board member Brian Patterson asked what the difference is between the Hunts listed (Standard, Alternative, Non-Standard) to (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*).
- (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*): She stated to board member Brian Patterson that this is the method of which it is broken down in regulations.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett, Game Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that he will explain the differences, he stated there are units that have better deer densities which conducting aerial surveys for fall and spring to evaluate winter mortality and true recruitment. He stated Standard Unit- 30 bucks per 100 does which is a postseason buck ratio which means the hunts have taken place already. He stated there is very good data from this, flying deer in the rut and flying to receive your adult to fawn ratio in the spring and the bucks are shedding. He reiterated that the adult ratio must be done. He stated the Alternative Hunt: he advised NDOW is managing for better trophy quality which include 35 bucks to 100 does ratio. He stated with this individual who are hunting want better experience and a higher age class buck therefore this is the reasoning behind having the buck ratio higher. He stated you will see more older age class deers. He stated in the other Alternative Units which have usually lower density populations posing more difficulties to get aerial sample size therefore these populations are managed based off success rates. He stated he thinks it is 35% to 45% for some of NDOWs nonstandard units and the other units are 45% to 55%. He stated there is a 4-point component. He stated this is the basis of how NDOW is managing for quality experience. He stated that what matters is that there is usage of harvest data, metrics to advise a population model and factoring in population model with a fixed allocation from Policy 24 which is no longer about managing success any longer.
- (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*) continues Mangement Objectives: Mule Deer She advised: c) Hunt Success 40-55%, % 4 point or greater 50-75%. d) 8 Unit Groups throughout the state: Western Region: Unit 014, Unit 194-196. Eastern Region: Unit 065, Unit 081, Unit 114-115, Unit 131-134. Southern Region: Unit 221-223, Unit 241-245. Non-Standard Hunts: Hunt Success Objectives greater than 45% for 8 hunt units, Hunt Success Objective 35% to 45% for 6 hunt units.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilert asked (*Erin Woods, Biologist NDOW Southern Region*) Regarding the Hunter Success

percentage of 40-55 percent, why does NDOW adjust this number. She stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that it is more difficulty to manage a lower buck ration with a more distributed population. She advised this is her understanding.

- *(Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region)*: She stated that all quality metrics go into our code development process and once NDOW has the population estimates and our ratios, then the management objectives are understood, and NDOW will derive on the quotas. She stated that the number of animals that are available for harvest or desired harvest, this number is divided into the weapon classes that were previously based on demand and is fixed allocation.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the fixed allocation has changed, and it is no longer arranging numbers that are picked up.
- *(Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region)*: She agreed with Chair Paul Dixon. She stated what used to be broken down into weapon classes would be some of the first-choice applications from the previous year and any legal weapon with
- **FYI- Quota Development Process: (NDOW Website)**
1) Determine number of animals available for harvest: Population estimate, Buck to Doe Ratio. 2) Distribute harvest into weapon classes: Based on Fixed Allocation %. 3) Expand harvest to quotas: Divide harvest by Tag Success (3-year average).
- **FYI- (NDOW Website) DEMAND Definition from Policy 24 Fixed Allocation: A fixed percentage of desired harvest allocated to any big game species and weapon group:** A) Juniors 25%, Any Legal Weapon 57 %, Archery 10%, Muzzleloader 8%.
- **FYI- Public Review and Wildlife Commission Process:** 1) NDOW posts official quota recommendations in late April. 2) County Advisory Board (CABs) receive NDOW quota recommendations. 3) CABs hold public meetings to discuss quota recommendations. 4) Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission meeting in May to approve NDOW's quota recommendations. 5) NDOW, General public, and CAB's provide input. 6) Commission makes final decision on tag quotas.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that in our urban counties we support having no contests but in rural counties we support their right to continue to live their lifestyle period and we believe as a CAB the regulation of Coyote calling contests and should be dealt with on a county-to-county basis.

- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

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

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised in CAB meeting previously (10-31-23) board members voted 3 to 1 with motion to approve Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Review Program as presented with two questions: 1) When has NDOWs 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 stated that it is unrealistic to builder and the think that NDOW to take on this new role).**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to the CAB that since the meeting in 10-31-23 when the CAB had discussion and gave their recommendation on it, he stated there are no new real changes, and advised it will just go through for approval at this point.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that if you are not seen or heard at the Commission Planning Meeting, then there be no attention paid to your recommendations or oppositions, instead they want to know if these individuals are present at the meeting and will listen to these individuals' recommendations and oppositions at that time. He stated he felt that in terms of what NDOW is doing looking at Subdivision Maps, it is simply a waste of time. He stated if a letter is sent to the Commission Planning that too is a waste of time, nothing happens, and no attention is paid to you. He stated that the CAB would be simply spinning their wheels on this action item.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that he is concerned that NDOW does not have the manpower to look at the plot plans given.
- Board member John Hiatt stated many of these Subdivision maps have absolutely no impact on the wildlife.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt unless you are a reptile.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that the construction industry already has many checks and balances on it regarding wildlife. He stated there are tortoise fees that are applied to all aspects of everything.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that you have many federal regulations, and you are not wanting to have state oversight of this as well. He stated that he feels where the drive is coming on this is The American Values Project that is coming from Congress that they would receive and use those funds to support this.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he would have difficulty getting behind this.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to deny Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review.

- Board member Dave Talaga asked Vice Chair Dan Gilbert what his reasoning behind the denial is.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that his rationale behind it is he felt that there are enough control measures in place to be able to support any concerns of the wildlife.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that this action item basically provides for NDOW to have the ability to review this, but it does not require NDOW to receive every subdivision map.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert disagreed with board member John Hiatt and stated it says that they require you to submit your subdivision map.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that it does require for submission of map, but it does not mean that NDOW will do anything with it. He stated it is burdensome on the guy who wants to have a subdivision but there is no actual guarantee that NDOW will look at these subdivision maps.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that NDOW does have to check a box to approve or disapprove. He stated this is his understanding of it and advised that NDOW does not have the staff to review or have the expertise to review. He stated they might be able to do this on a mule deer corridor, migration corridor but most of the review will be on some little subdivision that will not mean anything.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that there could be subdivisions in places in Northern Nevada.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Jacob Thompson that he agrees in rural in some of these in places outside of Ely, Nevada and advised he could pick a spot.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that could affect mule deer migration.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated correct to board member Jacob Thompson.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated in the Rubys.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it is insane to think that NDOW will review every single subdivision map. He stated it is hard enough to get maps through the agencies that are trained to review the maps, it takes months on a subdivision that is approved.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to simply increase the cost and pass it on globally.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski stated to Chair Dixon that the last time the CAB gave recommendations on this action item, you stated about NDOW and having to hire staff for this and how NDOW would pay the staff who would be reviewing this, and the time it would take to do this. She stated that board member John Hiatt stated that they will not view the subdivision maps unless you go to a meeting. She stated either meeting.
- Board member John Hiatt advised it is either Commission Planning Meeting, or a Commission meeting.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised he could take this to Nelson Stone, the Commissioner of the Planning Commission to review and see exactly what his thoughts on this is. He gave an example that if it takes the Department \$100 dollars of mantime to review it, therefore the applicant will have to pay for this process of review and he stated he guarantees that the cost would be more than \$100.
- Board member Jacob Thompson read the following to board member Brian

Patterson to advise the cost, it is 200 dollars for additional review and \$5.00 dollars for the initial review per acre.

- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that the 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 NDOW does not have qualified staff to oversee or implement this currently and the Clark County Planning Commission feels it is unimplementable.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

e. **Commission General Regulation 511, Wildlife Management Area Designations** (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Commission General Regulation 511, Wildlife Management Area Designations.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- **FYI- Summary:** The Commission recently designated the Argenta Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and Pole Canyon Cooperative WMA. Additionally, the Department will be incorporating the Blue Diamond properties into the Steptoe WMA. Restrictions on the use of firearms and ammunition, campfires, camping, blinds, trapping, access, guiding, and predator hunting are recommended by the Department with some items stipulated as part of the Pole Canyon access easement. To regulate and enforce access easement stipulations and Department recommendations, the Commission must modify and update WMA NAC 504.
- **FYI- (Brief Explanation of Proposed Guidance)** Restrictions on the use of firearms and ammunition, campfires, camping, blinds, trapping, access, guiding, and predator hunting are proposed to protect wildlife resources, ensure WMAs are safe for the public to recreate, and comply with stipulations as part of the Pole Canyon access easement.
- *Added Language in bold: Sec. 1. Chapter 504 of NAC is hereby amended by adding thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2 and 3 of this regulation. Sec. 2. (Added language) "The Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Area is compromised of the Meadow Unit and the Mountain Unit. The: 1. Meadow Unit is compromised of that portion of the Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Area that is located within Unit 111 or Unit 222, as designated in NAC 504.210, and is west of the boundary line of Cave Lake State Park; and 2. Mountain Unit is compromised of the remaining portion of the Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Area that is not within the Meadow Unit. Sec. 3. 1. Pole Canyon is a wildlife management area established in cooperation with landowners in Pole Canyon. The following activities are prohibited on the Pole Canyon Cooperative Wildlife Management Area: (a) Overnight camping, including; without limitation, overnight camping in areas designated for parking; (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; (c) Riding an animal other than a horse or mule; (d) Providing a guide service pursuant to NRS 504.390; (e) Hunting any predator (f) trapping; and (g) Building or having a campfire. 2. A person may use a motor vehicle or bicycle, including, without limitation, an electric or battery electric motor vehicle or bicycle, in the parking area of the access point at the Franklin River or the 1,340 feet of dirt road comprising the access point in the Horse Canyon public right-of-way on Horse Creek Road to access the Pole Canyon Cooperative Wildlife Management Area. 3. As used in this section, "predator" means any fur-bearing mammal, mountain lion or coyote.

- *Sec. 4. NAC 504.135 is hereby amended to read as follows: 504.135 1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 5, the discharging of a rifle or pistol is prohibited on the following wildlife management areas: **(Added language in bold): (f) Argenta in Lander County.** Added language: 2. A person may hunt big game mammals on the Mason Valley, Wayne E. Kirch and Argenta Wildlife Management Areas using: (b) **Shotguns containing shot that is toxic or larger than standard-size T; or (c) Bows and arrows.** A shotgun that is used to hunt big game mammals pursuant to this subsection may be quipped with a smoothbore barrel or a barrel that is partially or fully rifled. 3. Added language: **Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, the use or possession of shells for a shotgun containing shot that is toxic or larger than standard-size T is prohibited on the following wildlife management areas: (i) Steptoe Valley within the Meadow Unit in White Pine County. (k) Carson Lake in Churchill County. (l) Argenta in Lander County.** 4. The use or possession of shotgun rounds with sabots that contain other than rifled slugs or a single expanding projectile is prohibited on all wildlife management areas owned or managed by this State. 5. The provisions of subsection 1 do not apply to persons authorized by the Department to use rifles and pistols for the control of predatory animals and rodents. 6. For the purpose of this section, all shot shall be deemed toxic unless it has been approved as nontoxic by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to 50 C.F.R. 20.134.*
- *Sec. 5. NAC 504.140 is hereby amended to read as follows: 504.140 1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, campfires and bonfires are prohibited in wildlife management areas. **(Added language in bold) 2. Subject to any fire restriction order issued by this State or any federal agency, campfires are permitted in the: (g) Mountain Unit within the Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Area.***
- *Sec. 6. NAC 504.145 is hereby amended to read as follows: 504.145 1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, camping is prohibited in wildlife management areas. 2. Camping is permitted in the: **(Added language in bold) (g) Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Area in: (1) Any area within the Mountain Unit that is more than 0.5 mile from Success Summit Road; and (2) Any site designated for camping that is 0.5 mile or less from Success Summit Road.***
- ***(Added language in bold) Sec. 7. NAC 504.160 is hereby amended to read as follows: 504.160 1. Except otherwise provided in subsection 4, a person may construct a single blind on any wildlife management area if the Department has***

*no obligations to protect a privately constructed blind or to arbitrate the use or priority of use of such a blind. A blind must be: (a) **Temporary and constructed of material found on the wildlife management area**; or (b) **Portable**. 2. A blind may not be locked or reserved for the use of a particular person or group of persons. 3. **A portable blind that is not used to hunt big game mammals must be removed daily from the wildlife management area.** 4. The Department may: 5. A person may use decoys on a wildlife management area so long as the decoys are not left set up in the field between the hours of 9 p.m. and 3 a.m.*

- *Sec. 8. NAC 504.170 is hereby amended to read as follows: 504.170 1. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, a person shall not trap on a wildlife management area. (Added language in bold)2. **Except as otherwise provided in subsection 4, persons having permits to do so may trap on the Overton Key Pittman, Wayne E. Kirch, Humboldt, Fernley, Scripps, Mason Valley, Steptoe Valley, Franklin Lake, Bruneau River, Carson Lake and Alkali Lake Wildlife Management Areas.** 4. **A person shall not trap in any area that is 0.5 mile or less from any site designated for camping within the Mountain Unit of the Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Areas.***
- **FYI- Previously in October 2023 meeting the CAB advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 511 Wildlife Management Area Regulation NAC 504 as presented to include the following: NAC 504.320 Pole Canyon Cooperative Wildlife Management, 1) board member John Hiatt asked the question if the term WMA an agreement in perpetuity or is it limited time agreement or expire with the sale of the land. 2) NAC 504.320 #3: Board member Brian Patterson asking for more clarification on what animals are not restricted needs list and is the restriction simply for horses and mules only. 3) NAC 504.320 #2, board member John Hiatt stated that in place of simply stating motorized vehicles it should state mechanized instead to cover all items listed and any other items that will be brought up in the future that fall into this category for clarification and asked for addition of ADA rules to be listed as well. 4) NAC 504.145 #4, board member John Hiatt asked to replace to state “permanent non- NDOW erected dwelling or permanent dwelling therefore giving clarification.**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 511 WMA (Wildlife Management Area) 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.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

f. **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 about Commission General Regulation 520-Tag Deferral Extenuating Circumstances Revision.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there is a (SOP) Standard Operating Procedure regarding Determining Extenuating Circumstance Qualifications for Tag Deferral Requests that was approved by (Alan Jenne, Director, NDOW) and (Tommy Caviglia, Chair NDOW).
- **FYI- (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation):** *This regulation amends section 1 of LCB File No. R022-19 which established a program to allow a customer the option to defer or transfer their big game tag if an extenuating circumstance happened the customer before the hunting season of the tag opened that prevented the tag holder from hunting on the tag. This regulation adjusts the timeframe of which an extenuating circumstance could happen to the customer for deferral qualification. It also restricts the excludes the deferral option if a tag awarded through certain programs.*
- **FYI- Sec. 2. Section 1 of LCB File No. R022-19 (uncodified regulation) is hereby amended to read as follows: 1. A holder of a tag may claim an extenuating circumstance and request to transfer the tag, return the tag for the restoration of bonus points or defer the use of the tag pursuant to NRS 502.103, as amended by section 4.5 of Assembly Bill No. 89, chapter 109, Statutes of Nevada 2021, at page 473, only in accordance with the requirements of this section. (Added language in bold): (a) Tags excluded for deferral approval include: (1) Tags awarded pursuant to NAC 502.421: alternate list. (2) Tags awarded pursuant to NAC 502.4215: First Come First Served program. (2) Tags awarded pursuant to NAC 502.4237: drawing of tags for the restricted nonresident guided mule deer hunt. (3) Tags awarded pursuant to NAC 502.424 through NAC 502.4268, NAC 502.42253 through NAC 502.42283: for any management, depredation, landowner damage compensation antelope or mule deer, elk incentive or emergency hunt programs. (4) Tags awarded pursuant to NAC 502.4269 through NAC 502.42696, NAC 502.4273 through NAC 502.42905, NAC 502.4291 through NAC 502.4298, NAC 502.250 for Dream, Partnership in Wildlife, Heritage, or Silver State specialty programs.**
- **FYI- Sec. 2. Section 1 of LCB File No. R022-19 (uncodified regulation) is hereby amended to read as follows: 2. A person who applies for a bi game tag may designate a beneficiary of**

the tag. Upon the death of the holder of the tag, if the designated beneficiary provides a death certificate to the Department, the designated beneficiary will be treated as if he or she were awarded the tag pursuant to subsection 6. The designated beneficiary may: (a) Use the tag if he or she is otherwise eligible to hunt a big game mammal in this State, subject to any applicable waiting period, as long, as the person has not been suspended by the Department from using a tag; (b) Transfer the tag to a qualified organization approved by the Department pursuant to subsection 10; or (c) Return to the department.

- *(Added Language in bold) Sec. 2. Section 1 of LCB File No. R022-19 (uncodified regulation) is hereby amended to read as follows: 4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 8, 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 applicable hunting season if any of the following extenuating circumstances 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 is issued.***
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that it is listed in what would be the extenuating circumstances.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he stated that if a person defers for a year and come back and the unit, they defer from is closed then this person will get their bonus points back.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked Chair Paul Dixon was this the CABs first time seeing this action item.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Jacob Thompson that this is the second time the CAB will be having a discussion on this action item.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that he had concerns for beneficiary having to obtain a death certificate to provide to NDOW to be awarded the tag. He stated that in at times it takes awhile to receive a death certificate.
- Public Comment: (None)
- 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 the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

g. **Commission General Regulation 521-Junior Tag Transfer (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission General Regulation 521-Junior Tag Transfer.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this is the second time that the CAB has received this action item for discussion.
- **FYI (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation):** This regulation was drafted in coordination with the Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee after the passage of Senate Bill 311 of the 82nd Legislative Session. The regulation outlines a program that would allow a mule deer tag holder to transfer their mule deer tag to a minor between the age of 12 and 17 who is otherwise eligible to be awarded and hunt the mule deer tag.
- (Added language in bold): New Tag Transfer NAC 502 1. ***A tag holder may transfer their main draw awarded mule deer tag for the current corresponding hunt year to a minor between the ages of 12 to 17 who is otherwise eligible to hunt on the mule deer tag. a. A minor must have reached their 12th birthday before the opening day of the tag's season and must not reach their 18th birthday before the close of the tag's season to be eligible to receive a transfer. b. Junior mule deer tags are excluded for transfer within this program. 2. The minor receiving the transfer may only receive one mule deer tag annually and must have been unsuccessful in receiving any big game tag through the main draw for the corresponding hunt year. 3. The tag holder must designate the name(s) and client ID(s) of the minor(s) they intend to transfer their tag at the time their main draw application is submitted. 4. The original tag holder shall surrender the mule deer tag to the Department and correctly enter the required information on the Department issued mule deer tag transfer affidavit. The information may include a. The original tag holder's legal name. b. The legal name of the minor the big game tag will be transferred to; c. The relationship between the tag holder and the minor receiving the tag transfer; d. The Nevada client ID of both the original tag holder and the minor; e. The type of hunt as defined in NAC 502.165; i. Species; ii. Species Category; iii. Weapon; iv. Residency; v. Season; vi. Hunt Unit; 5. Transfer requests must be received by the Department no later than July 1 of the corresponding hunt year. 6. The original tag holder is responsible for the payment of the tag fee pursuant to NRS 502.250. 7. Both the original tag holder and the minor receiving the mule deer tag will be treated as if they were awarded the mule deer tag with respect to bonus point cost. 8. The Department will return a copy of the Department signed and dated affidavit to the original tag holder-at the time the transfer has been completed. The tag holder transferring the big game tag must accompany the minor receiving the mule deer tag into the field, regardless of the age of the minor, and have on their person a copy of the Department signed tag transfer affidavit. 9. A tag holder may only transfer a tag through this program once in their lifetime. 10. Transferred tags may not be returned to the Department for the restoration of bonus points. 11. The exchange of anything of value including, without limitation to, money, goods, and/or services is strictly prohibited from participation in the program. 12. Transferred tags may not be deferred or transferred a second time to another person. 13. As used in this section: a. "Accompany into the field" means the youth and adult must remain close enough for the adult to see and provide verbal assistance to the youth hunter, no***

more than 10 yards. Using electronic devices, such as walkie-talkies or cell phones, does not meet this requirement.

- *(Added language in bold)- NAC 502.385- Use of tag or permit 1. The tag or permit must be carried by the holder while the holder is hunting or trapping or while he or she is fishing for wildlife for which a tag or permit is required. 2. Except as otherwise provided in NAC 502.42905, **name of new junior tag transfer regulation LCB File No. RXXX-XX**, and section 1 of LCB File No. R022-19, it is unlawful for any person to: (a) Use or possess a tag or permit issued to any other person. (b) Transfer or give a tag or permit issued to him or her to any other person; (c) Use any tag or permit in a management area or unit for which it is not intended; or (d) Use a tag or permit at any time other than at the time intended. 3. After it has been issued, a tag or permit may not be exchanged, or a refund made except in accordance with the policies and regulations of the Commission.*
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that there is risk of this being gamed.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that like the first come first serve, this action item will be amended next year, considering of how individuals are gaming the system. He stated if you attempt to account of the different ways that individuals are gaming the system and keep making changes to this it will become unreadable. He stated you continue to fix it until it is so restricted that only a few individuals who are smarter than the rest will still game it and then you can never stop fixing it.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he was thinking about a mother for example who accrued bonuses points and receives a tag and gives it to each of her children as come up as their present. He stated this is not an individual who drew the tag.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a mother cannot defer to her children.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert read the following to Chair Paul Dixon to show that a mother can defer this to her minor children: (New Tag Transfer NAC 502) 1. A tag holder may transfer their main draw awarded mule deer tag for the current corresponding hunt year to a minor between the ages of 12 to 17 who is otherwise eligible to hunt on the mule deer tag. He stated to Chair Paul Dixon that this is stating as long as the minor is eligible between the age of 12 to 17.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert between the ages of 12 to 17.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to Chair Paul Dixon that the minor must be between the age of 12 before the start of the opening day at tag season and must not reach their 18th birthday before the close of the tag's season to be eligible to receive a transfer.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that this is a lot of work for one to be able to get hunting license and apply for tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member John Hiatt that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert's comment is valid because there was a change for the adult transfer, and we had individuals doing this thing we are discussing therefore we changed it to adult transfer. He stated right now we are making assumptions that transfer would be within families. He stated if we are being honest and there is hunting between family, mom may hold the tag and the family goes out (*mom, dad, son*) and the son gets the honor of shooting the deer but for the sake of the rules of the tag mom will say if the game warden comes up that she shot the deer because there is nobody there to see what really happened. He stated right now there are no issues but if there become issues then this will have the same type of restrictions as the adult one for transfer and will be very restrictive. He reiterated that they are leaving this open under the assumption that families will behave accordingly. He stated the Game Wardens can do what they

like but unless they are involved in this it will be very difficult to manage.

- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW Southern Region*): He asked Chair Paul Dixon if he was able to elaborate on his comment.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 521-Junior Tag Transfer as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

h. Commission Regulation 23-04, (Amendment 3), 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 Big Game Seasons (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Regulation 23-04, (Amendment 3)-2023-2024 and 2024-2025 big game seasons and dates for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goat and moose, including limits, hunting hours, special hunt eligibility, animal sex, physically characteristics and hunt boundary restrictions.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- **FYI-** (*Summary- The Department's proposed Amendment #3 to CR 23-04 is intended to correct an erroneous season date for the late antlerless elk season in Unit Group 104, 108B, 121. The existing season completely overlaps the late antlered elk hunt in the same area.*)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to accept Commission Regulation 23-04, (Amendment 3), 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 Big Game Seasons as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

i. 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 (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about 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.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this is the same regulation as last year with no changes.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*) advised that there is a change under SWAN: with the Permit Quota changing from 650 to 750 in total permits.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that WMA (Wildlife Management Areas) rules are still the same as the previous year.
- Board member John Hiatt asked Chair Paul Dixon for clarification on Moapa Valley listed:
- (Ducks and Mergansers (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers)
- Scaup (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers)
- Special Youth Waterfowl Hunt (SOUTH ZONE: INCLUDING THE Moapa Valley portion of the Overton Wildlife Management Area, OPEN AREAS: Moapa Valley portion of the Overton Wildlife Management Area)
- Coots and Gallinules (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers)
- Snipe (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the muddy and Virginia Rivers)
- Canada and Cackling Geese and Brant (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers)
- White-Fronted Geese (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers)
- Snow and Ross 'Geese (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers)
- Falconry Seasons for Migratory Game Birds (SOUTH ZONE: Moapa Valley to the confluence of the Muddy and Virgin Rivers).
- Chair Paul Dixon explained that there is the Overton portion and then there is Moapa Valley.
- Board member John Hiatt asked Chair Paul Dixon that Overton is in the Moapa Valley.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*) to give a brief synopsis of this.
- Board member John Hiatt advised he realizes where Moapa Valley is located and wanted to know what the portion that is stated (EXCEPT MOAPA VALLEY)
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated he is confused by this question and stated that Moapa is located is the entirety of the valley even extending north of the highway for the interstate. He stated the Overton Wildlife Management Area is encompassed into that area.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the Moapa Valley portion of the WMA is what the question is about.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to forget the Moapa

Valley it is stating Overton Wildlife Management Area.

- Chair Paul Dixon reiterated it is stating Moapa Valley but is just a portion of Moapa Valley the portion of the WMA.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that this makes no sense.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that if a hunter wants to hunt on the WMA there is different set of hunting rules.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it says the entire portion of the Moapa Valley area.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member John Hiatt that the entire Overton is in Moapa Valley. He stated outside of the WMA a hunter could shoot anything
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW Southern Region*): He stated that it is simply giving clarification with the rules
- FYI- Page 9 (OVERTON WMA):
- 1) Before or after any waterfowl season, hunting is allowed every day for wildlife species upon which there is an established season.
- 2) Waterfowl hunting is permitted on the Moapa Valley portion of the area on: (a) the opening day of the earliest opening waterfowl season (b) even days thereafter through the end of regular duck and goose seasons (c) the final two days of the second duck and goose season (d) during any youth waterfowl hunt.
- 3) Upland game bird and rabbit hunting is prohibited during the regular duck and goose seasons, except for persons possessing a valid turkey tag to hunt turkey in the Moapa Valley of Clark County. These persons may hunt turkeys every day for which the tag is valid. These persons are prohibited from pursuing any other upland games birds or rabbits during such time that the fall turkey season is concurrent with the waterfowl season.
- 4) During the waterfowl season on the Moapa Valley portion of the area, hunters must hunt from assigned hunt locations (blinds) constructed by the Department of Wildlife. A maximum of up to four hunters are permitted at each hunt location. Assigned hunt locations are marked by numbered stakes. Hunters shall hunt only within their assigned hunt location and moving to vacant locations is prohibited. The only exception involves reasonable accommodation of the disabled.
- 5) During the opening day and the first weekend of the dove season, the maximum capacity for the Moapa Valley portion of the area is 60 hunters by reservation. Vacancies will be filled by stand-by hunters on a first-come, first-served basis.
- 6) An Overton Hunt day, only persons authorized to hunt waterfowl may use vessels on the portion of the area inundated by Lake Mead.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to approve 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 as presented.
- Board member Alexander Harper seconds the motion.
- **Motion passe 7-0.**

X. 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: (*Jana Wright, member of the public*): She stated that Chair Paul Dixon referred to the 80/20 mandate and it no longer exists regarding lethal. She advised now when the applicant applies for the tag and pays the \$3.00 fee, they choose either predator control or habitat. She stated it could be 100 percent one way or the hunter can divide it 50/50. She stated it is up to the hunter when applying for the tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the new policy and procedure is helping to expand the greater ability on what the money for spent on predator fees at this time. He stated at this time the money is spent on is for protection of predatory animals now and the only non-predatory animals that the \$3.00 fee protected was turkey.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She stated to Chair Paul Dixon that at the beginning of the meeting he made a comment that majority of the residents of Nevada don't know anything or care about black bear hunt. She stated that he presented this, and she wanted to know if there was research or study that he could site.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he will site that since the Black Bear hunt has started, nine years ago.
- Public Comments: (*Jana Wright, member of the public*): She stated the first Black Bear hunt was in 2011.
- Chair Paul Dixon continued; he stated in 2011 he received approximately 4,000 emails that he categorized as (*Nevada residents, Western United States residents, United States residents, Foreign residents*), when doing this way, it came out that Nevada residents who opposed the black bear hunt out of 4,000 emails turned out to be 125 and the majority of the letters came from outside the United States 2,500 and he presented this data and since then went to meetings and received input and talked with individuals who do a presentation every year on black bears with the black bear coalition and all other areas looking at the amount of people and the number of hunters in this as well. Based upon this data and history he obtained he stated 10-15 percent of the people in the state may

oppose black bear hunt based on his history. He stated that 10-15 of the people are people who buy licenses but are with individuals who do not buy license and support the fact that they do not buy licenses. He stated 70 percent of the individuals who are in the middle have no opinion on bear hunting nor would they ever give their opinion. He stated based upon all of this when the statement presents itself stating 95 percent of the people are against bear hunting, he stated he disagreed with this statement and believes it is false. He stated his statements are based upon personal information that he has collected since the start of the black bear hunt and not based upon any other statistical facts and no surveys done regarding this either. He stated when he looks at the American Value Report, with hunting and various things, the 1100 people who they have interviewing in the state suggest based on mutualists versus traditionalists, this split is urban and rural. He stated if you go to any of the 15 rural counties you would find a different opinion then that of the urban counties. He stated that it is not 95 percent of the people who are opposed to black bear hunting and there is group of people who articulate their disagreement with bear hunting, trapping, killing contests, etc. and then there are the individuals who buy hunting licenses or are married to individuals who buy license or are with someone who is in support of this. He advised he calls the two groups equal size and the remaining people just do not care.

- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She stated that it is not true Chair Paul Dixon's statement that majority of people just don't care about the bear hunt. She advised that she is not interested in opinion just facts.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) that everything stated in tonight's meeting was opinion and comments and not factual and asked her to show him anything otherwise. He stated each one of the CAB members does give their opinion as well and he did his in a public meeting and he presented his findings, and it was on the news to his surprise. He stated if anyone can show him 95 percent of the people are against hunting and fishing, he would pay \$1,000 dollars for that study. He stated he does not feel that study would ever happen to reflect such findings.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She stated that Chair Dixon made it seem like he had heard this from higher power or something.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) that no he did not and stated that he received those 4,000 emails in past and had to go through with details these received emails and no other CAB did this.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that the Chair Paul Dixon sorted through these emails in his official capacity as CAB Chairman.
- Public Comments: (*Fred Voltz, member of the public*): He stated he would like to comment on two things at this time, first the comment made is not correct, the correction is over 95 percent of the people in the state of Nevada do not buy hunting and trapping tags. He stated in the

discussion tonight here at the CAB level and the Commission they are never considered in any of the policy therefore showing how lopsided the opinion is. He stated going back to the Nevada Wildlife Value study which was done by NDOW with researchers and was done in scientific manner and when residents of Nevada are asked pertaining to specific wildlife issues including the bear hunt, these individuals are opposed, and this is factual. He advised he would encourage anyone to view this study, which is available for public view in order to get an understanding of where residents of Nevada are on things such as bear hunt, trapping and other controversial and poor decisions that have been compromised and made over the years with bear hunting included.

- **Chair Paul Dixon advised this matter is hereby closed.**

XI. Authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its March 8, 2024 & March 9, 2024, meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada (*For possible action*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit recommendations from tonight's meeting for consideration at the Commission meeting on March 8, 2024 & March 9, 2024.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

XII. The next CCABMW board meeting will be scheduled for April 30, 2024, in the Clark County Government Center (*Pueblo Room*) Address: 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155. This meeting will be in support of the May 3, 2024 & May 4, 2024, Commission meeting in Reno, Nevada.

XIII. Adjournment.

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

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

ONLINE:

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