



**Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway (Pueblo Room)
Las Vegas, NV 89155
May 2, 2023 (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:

https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/ccabmw_meeting_11-11-2020.php (Scroll down to Agendas & Minutes 2023

Next in the meeting section to 05-02-2023 CCABMW Meeting and double click to Join)

Join by meeting number:

Meeting ID: 226 520 303 699

Meeting password: 2BsbUQ

Or call in (audio only)

+1 725-695-5982,,287368639#

United States, Las Vegas

Phone Conference ID: 287 368 639#

NOTE:

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The CCABMW members may combine two (2) or more agenda items for consideration.
- The CCABMW may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at anytime.
- No action will 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. May 2, 2023, 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 placed into a document and shared with members of the public body, meeting attendees and on the public body's website.

Board Members: Paul Dixon, Chair
Vice Chair Dan Gilbert
Jacob Thompson
Brian Patterson
John Hiatt
Dave Talaga
Alex Harper

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

County Liaison: **Marci Henson (702) 455-1608, Mhenson@ClarkCountyNV.gov**
Department of Environment and Sustainability, Division of Air Quality
4701 W. Russell Rd, Suite200
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.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Secretary Darlene Kretunski to perform the roll call: Present-Chair Paul Dixon, Vice Chair Dan Gilbert, Brian Patterson, Dave Talaga, Alexander Harper, Jacob Thompson, John Hiatt.
- A quorum was established with all seven board members present at tonight's meeting.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert 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.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- **Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this topic is hereby closed.**

IV. Approval of Minutes for March 7, 2023, CCABMW Meeting (*For possible action*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board Comments: (None)
- Board member Dave Talaga advised a motion to approve the minutes for March 7, 2023, as written.
- Board John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

V. Approval of the Agenda for May 2, 2023. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted. (*For possible action*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve the Agenda for May 2, 2023, meeting as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga 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).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he is happy to have both members from NDOW here tonight to have the ability to give complete backgrounds on the populations of species we will be discussing in tonight's meeting ask questions to have the board members make the best informative decisions on these quotas. He stated he has made it clear on his concerns of the mortality rates of the mule deer herds and to address if the southern herds have secondary benefits since, they were not dealing with snow and see of the betterment because of this. He stated this would obviously arise conditions and be a great thing for both the southern and the northern regions.
- Board Comments: (None)
- **Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this item is hereby closed.**

VII. Recap of the March 8, 2023 & March 9, 2023, Commission meeting by Chair Paul Dixon: (*Informational*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised of the meeting, he stated the meeting on Friday, March 8, 2023, was a short meeting. He stated on this day there was a recap of the Wildlife Damage Management Committee meeting, which was held on Friday, March 24, 2023, at Nevada Department of Wildlife, 3373 Pepper Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89120. He stated next there was a recap on items discussed from the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners Regulation Simplification, which was held on Friday, March 10, 2023, at the Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155, by Committee Chairman Shane Rogers. He advised the Fiscal Year 2024 Draft Predation Management

Plan was discussed along with the Wildlife Heritage Grant Manual and the amount of money that could be spent, and stated this will be the fourth reading of Commission Policy Number 23 Predation Management, he stated there was a discussion on Commission General Regulation 506, Possession of Golden Eagles Under Certain Circumstances. He stated next there was a field trip to the Gemini Solar Plant (*The Gemini Solar Plant Project is an innovative solar and energy storage project located just 30 minutes outside of Las Vegas developed on 7,100 acres of federally owned land administered by BLM in Clark County, Nevada*). He stated many things are being done for accommodating the wildlife without impacting the wildlife in that desert area where these solar fields are located. He stated this is done by providing a path for species such as mountain lions, turtles etc., to have ability to cross areas without these solar panels creating barriers and impeding the species movement and keeping the native vegetation that is in this area for animals that have made this area their home to continue to do so. He stated he was impressed and would be interested in seeing the in-cost benefit for all these things that were done for this project. He stated he really enjoyed the field trip on Friday, March 8, 2023, and stated the next day of the meeting on Saturday, March 9, 2023, most of the time spent was on discussion of the CR 23-13 2023-2024 Seasons, Bag Limits, and Special Regulations for the Migratory Game Birds, and advised that there were no concerns but a request on some wording changes, which were to be taken into consideration upon approval of this Commission Regulation 23-13 2023-2024 Seasons, Bag Limits, and Special Regulations for the Migratory Game Birds. He stated there was a discussion on Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Season and this was supported by the Commission, next there was a split vote on the Wildlife Heritage Grant Manual, with the ability to be able to spend more of the principal, the Commissioners voted to support spending and leaving balance of up to 5 million dollars on the principal in the account. He stated that he opposed of this but advised that the majority felt that this was great to have this amount available for special projects and for unique use and this was passed.

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

VIII. General Business/Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners May 5, 2023 & May 6, 2023, 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_Meetings/Commission/Agenda/.

- Commission Regulation 23-05, Amendment #1, 2023 Black Bear Quotas and Harvest Limits (*For possible action*).** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Regulation 23-05, Amendment #1, 2023 Black Bear Quotas and Harvest Limits.
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked the question to (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) with the different species and in area where they may have secondary ancillary effects from aspects such as winter mortality and having spent time discussing deer mortality and to see if there were any secondary benefits from the southern herd in Area 10 having high mortality and Area 7 having elevated mortality but not to the extreme of Area 10 and asked if there were any other details she would like to highlight on this topic tonight.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised that there is 22% reduction statewide in Bighorn Sheep with concerns of disease and with 40% percent overall tag reduction from last year and in Areas 6 and Area 7 between 20-25%. He stated in Area 10 winter mortality has tags going from 1,000 tags per season to 450 tags is the record. He stated for transparency he advised that the spring deer service is conducted between the months of March 2023 and April 2023. He stated in Area 10 the mortality was 30% in April and with a few more deaths, this is the reasoning of seeing conservative quota with a 60% reduction. He stated he assisted with flyovers in Area 22 and Area 23 and spoke with fourteen biologists in Areas 13 & 14 and (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) she assisted with Area 16 & Area 17. He stated there was deer collared in Area 16 in the middle of March 2023 and these deer were in great body conditions. He advised that were not burnt which allowed green flush warmer temperatures thus the deer went into the winter with good conditions. He stated the problem occurs when you have 2 to 3 feet of snow giving example of Ruby Valley having this issue and advised the deers can not stand like this for so long. He stated Areas 23, 22, 16, 14, 13 that the winter ranges were open for these areas and fawn recruitment low 30% in the surveys. He stated the conditions are not bad it is determined by how close you are too the location and the winter ranges covered with snow for long durations of time is the issue and even in portions of areas such as Area 11 on the Spring Valley side was burnt off enough to still receive recruitment of 26% as opposed to areas such as north of Ely which had large amount of snowfall. He reiterated it depends on the unit thus and stated it is showing statewide reduction of 40% and stated the valleys are harder therefore you will notice a proportional reduction, but the overall reflects an increase. He stated that Area 15 there was a large amount of harvest and stated the metrics is still great in this area. He stated it is depending on where one is looking, the elk population is doing well with quality metrics good and good calf productions hence reasoning of the slight increase.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He asked what about the central Desert sheep populations in Area 21, the Monte Cristo area.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he was a Game Biologist for five years previously working through Monte Cristo. He stated there are terrible drought conditions for two years and new novel string of mycoplasma bacteria pneumonia with adult mortality thus reflecting reduction and stated previously NDOW could classify 400 bighorn sheep in the Monte Cristo with no effort, now in the present state of this area it is a struggle just to find 100.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated really.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he never thought he would see this day but with terrible drought conditions through the years, and the string of bacterial pneumonia that came in topping the strain that was already current and doe mortality for a few years.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) how the California Bighorn Sheep did this year.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated with California Bighorn Sheep you will see a vast reduction and stated that the Silver State tag was moved to Mountain Goat, with the thought process that the California Bighorn Sheep is different goat that had below 50 tags with a threshold He stated this year there were a large amount of Bighorn sheep younger age class six and seven year olds scoring 125, 130 simply due to the drought conditions along with genetics factoring in thus explaining explanations of slight overestimates of the population. He stated the last few years have not been favorable to the Desert Bighorn sheep with bad drought conditions and terrible winter conditions.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if there

were any changes with the Rocky Desert Bighorn Sheep and stated that there was tag removal in some of the units as well.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated Unit 074 tags are very small population, and Unit 091 is shared with Utah and Unit 14 he advised the effort of the hunters on this and lack of mature rams on the surveys shows no good conscious in sending hunters there. He stated this year NDOW was able to deploy two collars on four-year-old rams recently thus giving insight on what the rams movements are. He stated in some of the areas near some of the mountain areas it is not friendly, and it is difficult to survey these areas due to the pine trees. He stated Unit 115 is doing well and Unit 102 the deferred hunters have stated they had great experiences.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked the question to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) the collared deer that he spoke about with the mortality issues, what was the determination of the cause of death, starvation, conditions, etc.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it could be seen by looking at their bone marrow. He stated pink jelly bone marrow indicates lack of nutrients and NDOW would break open the leg bone to view the bone marrow. He stated in Area 10 he advised a large amount of mortality was due to weather conditions or related to weather conditions. He advised this caused secondary effects due to the deep snow and several other things happen as well, but the key indicator is NDOW getting the bone marrow and finding the evidence that indicated that snow conditions caused the decline therefore contributing one way or the other.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised how to get no mortality regarding the Predator population which adds more pressure after the fact. He stated even when the snow is not there. He stated he appreciated the input from (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) and asked if (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) had anything additional to add to this.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) advised she felt that (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) did a great job on giving input and she had no additional input.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Sueprvisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) would be getting into the specifics next, he simply gave a overview.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked if (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) would like to speak on these specifics.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if they could simply go through the Agenda.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he was simply attempting to get some additional background from (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) to decide on Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Seasons which is the next action item.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he will go on board member John Hiatts suggestion to stick to action item order and discuss *a) Commission Regulation 23-05 Amendment #1, 2023 Black Bear Quotas and Harvest Limits*.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if he would like to read and give a brief explanation of the proposed regulation thus setting the position that NDOW is taking on this matter.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he is looking to find this information to get to this, he advised he is very organized to the point that he cannot find the material.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised it is simply one page therefore it is easy to lose.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert read the following: (**Summary**): *This regulation will set the 2023 hunting season quotas and harvest limits for Black Bears. The season dates, open management*

unit groupus, hunting hours, special regulations, animal sex, weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and dates and times for indoctrinations for black bears are included but were approved at the January 2023 Commission meeting. (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation) In 2022, a total of 16 bears (11 males, 5 females) were harvested during the hunt. Harvest limits were reached for males in Unit Group 203, 291, with 8 males harvested. Female harvest limits were reached in Unit Groups 192, 194, 195, 196, and 201, 202, 204, 206 with 3 and 2 females harvested respectively. This was the first year that the harvest limits were reached resulting in the closure of the Black Bear season after only 24 days. The Department is recommending no changes from 2022 Black Bear season. Black bear observations continue to increase in widespread areas around Nevada with one recent sighting in the Spring Mountains of Clark County.

- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that this statement was unfounded.
- Public Comments: *(Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region)*: She stated NDOW did investigate.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert continued his reading of the supporting material on this action item. He read the following: Additional recent sightings have documented bears in Humboldt, Elko, White Pine, Lincoln, and Clark counties. All indications are that the black bear population is stable to increasing with the black bear hunt causing minimal added mortality to the Nevada population. He reiterated the sentence from his current readings (Additional recent sightings have documented bears in Humboldt, Elko, White Pine, Lincoln, and Clark counties).
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that the sub population in Utah is found from time to time in Clover Mountains and Wilson Creek range, he stated only one or two transit animals, the same thing in White Pine.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked the question to *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* if the Humboldt population is coming from Idaho.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He advised he suspected that is correct. He stated the supporting material has written this information in a more exciting nature then it really is.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that bears have been seen in various areas in the state of Nevada, historically speaking once in a few years and these bears will go on their ways this is not a population established.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr. Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated this does not state that if one goes deeper into the interior of the state such as Wilson range, and Mt. Grant area that there are indeed established populations.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that these established populations are coming out of Sierra.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that statement makes sense, and listing the other areas just provides more excitement that there is possibility of seeing an established population in these listed areas.
- Public Comments: *(Jana Wright, member of the public)*: She stated her comments to both Vice Chair Dan Gilbert and Chair Paul Dixon, she advised that the supporting documents submitted for the meeting indicates that the location of the bears is known, and asked who on the NDOW staff wrote up this information.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He advised that the information on the supporting material given is indeed accurate, and stated he would not state the facts on the sheet are embellished, he would state this pertains to some of the areas in the state that are more areas that are more out of the way such as Lincoln County, more of the Eastern portion of the state. He stated it is often an infrequent occurrence to see bears, but the Western population of the state has been expanding.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated he wanted to ask a question, he stated that NDOW is

looking at the black bear population giving the appearance of hoovering slightly how much NDOW is looking at the most historic population assessments, and how far back does NDOW go back in assessing the populations. He stated if there is increase in black bears population in the state of Nevada, then historically there must be more such as the eras of 1940s, 1950, 1960s in which there were strong Predator control campaign in the West and wanted to know if NDOW is understanding that there are fewer black bears and the black bears are attempting to establish their species again in population numbers that historic populations. He stated what type of data is NDOW gathering to establish what the health and population of the black bears are now considering that there is not a large amount of good data that was collected in the 1800s.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated with collared data it uses more passive survey techniques and side techniques NDOW has a sense of areas of variance with creditable information it is with black bears their models with after data, collaring data, side data and have maintained these intervals tightly with background. He stated NDOW knows that if any population is going to be associated with variance assessment, it would be the black bears, therefore NDOW has documentation on every single animal that they touch, marking and have deployed many collars.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated looking at the mule deer population data for example, NDOW can get into historic records on the mule deer and stated NDOW takes the time to look at historic numbers and distribution and what changes have taken place since and what a habitat now could support in that context.
- Board member John Hiatt advised when having a discussion on black bears one should discuss and consider in California grizzly bears are competition for black bears. He stated the Grizzly Bears are stronger and bigger than the black bears as well therefore limiting the black bear population. He stated the last grizzly bear killed in the state of California was in the year 1924 and have been none killed since that date, he stated in the 1950s bears were uncommon even in middle section, in the Sierra area individuals at this area did not have to worry about bears getting into their food, and one would rarely seen a bear until the 1970s, this was his first bear sighting prior to this sighting he stated he had never seen a bear. He stated today in the Sierra area there are massive bear containers everywhere especially if individuals have left food out, bears will bother their food. He stated in the San Bernadino Mountains in California in 1950s bears were rare even in 1920s and 1930s, now this is a common place for bears. He advised in the summertime it is not uncommon to see dust bear tracks hence reiterating that there are many bears now and catching a bear sighting on camera is easy today. He stated the bear population is higher than it was in the 1900s and before.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked board member John Hiatt if he had answer of why the bear population has recovered.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to board member Dave Talaga that there are a few reasons of why: 1) not as many individuals killing the bears 2) Bears were confined and consisted due to trash dumps forcing the disperse more and he stated bears still receive food from humans 3) change in forest in these areas and in number of areas due to climate change, fire suppression, logging and there are more young. He stated during the year of 2002, this time was one of the driest years in California in the last hundred years therefore bears were reduced to survive on ants by tearing apart rotten logs to obtain the ants and termites inside therefore leading to death of lots of bears and malnourished bears as well. He stated the bears recovered by eating fruit off fruit trees.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised he has never heard these points that board member John Hiatt stated and his information he stated on what is occurring in California and how the bear population has had a explosion over the last 30 years.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga no it would be more like 50

years.

- Board member Dave Talaga advised if it is 50 years it is not like a recovery it is more of a decline due to those contributing factors discussed and now the population is recovering again therefore creating a disbursement of bears with healthy population.
- Board member John Hiatt agreed with board member Dave Talaga statements.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He stated that public comments should be for the public and that the board has had their time already. He stated we are seeing increase in bear population and there are board members who live in the past and if not knowledgeable of the history of what the population was with quantifiable data, then this cannot be used to make decisions therefore he feels the bear harvest should stay as intended. He stated if there is an increase in the bear population then there should also be an increase in the bear harvest quota as well. He stated this indicates that bear population is increasing and not having a detrimental effect on the bear population in the state of Nevada.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*): She read the following: Many people oppose the black bear hunt for several reasons, there is no stated wildlife management objectives, we do not hear NDOW stating the hunt is for the health of the herd instead it is always the population can sustain these losses. This does not sound like a good reason for me. Wildfires have damaged bear habitat between drought and wildfires, bears are already under pressure to just to survive and amid wildlife season is about to begin. The use of hounds is destructive and against any semblance of fair chase, even in exercising the dogs they harass wildlife. Fair chase, the hounds wear GPS collared so the hunters simply follow the collar location to the bear, now probably in a tree, yet perhaps it is a female who is hidden her cubs who then become orphans and often die. Problem bears can be dealt with separately by moving them away from civilization and educating residents that bears will follow the scent of food, trash cans that are not secure in wildlife proof garbage containers which should be mandatory in bear country. The 2018 Nevada Wildlife Values Report presents that only 13% of Nevadans support the bear hunt, what better reason to discontinue some, the public is showing in the increasing and vocal interest in wildlife and animal welfare which could make the Commission and appear archaic and unresponsive, please limit the take to one male or discontinue this hunt all together. Thank you.
- Public Comments: (*Fred Voltz, member of the public*): He stated what is missing from this is a few key elements. He stated years and years no management plan has been created by NDOW for this black bear killing practices. He asked the question of why this element is missing and that there is no one with an answer for this question from both NDOW and the Commission. He stated he found it usual and advised in this documentation (supporting material) submitted for this agenda action item there is no discussion or science logistics besides a general statement of observation from NDOW that there are more bears, this is where the discussion ends. He stated for those individuals who have followed this issue over some years they have knowledge of the guessestimated population of black bears in the state of Nevada fluctuates from 400 to 800 and everything in between these numbers. He stated that no one knows with certainty therefore where the justification is and assistance for the species and the management plan. He stated he feels this should not be given approval by either the CAB or the Commission. He stated he feels it is ludicrous and is done yearly and he stated as (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) stated in here speech, the public is very against this hunt, which is a trophy hunt and an opportunity hunt.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): She stated regarding the bear hunt, first of all female bears, if they are of age to breed, these females are probably going to be nursing their cubs or maybe pregnant with cubs or have yearling cubs who are following their mother for protection and subsistence therefore when a mature female bear is killed the cubs can be taken by predators and starvation since they cannot fend for themselves and hunt. She

stated the question if there are more bears in Nevada or are humans encroaching on the bears habitat therefore if this is so, there will be more bear sightings due to the decrease of liveable habitats for the bears due to human habitation taking over these areas. She stated maybe this is why there are more bears coming over from California to Nevada due to same issue human encroachment on these bears habitat. She stated the bear hunt is a trophy hunt and NDOW does not include the bears in their predation management plan. She stated this plan seems to indicate that bears are not a significant predator to other game species. She stated this leaves the thought that bears are present therefore it becomes a trophy hunt, and she feels this is not helping with the image of Nevada. She stated this is somewhat archaic to have this hunt still in place and a lot of other states have outlawed their bear hunt because they could not get past that it is simply a trophy hunt.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated the question to NDOW if they take any property damage reports from insurance companies on vehicles that have hit bears and is this considered when NDOW is completing their metrics.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he did not want to speak out of turn and stated my apologies, but he does not want to speak too much out of turn.
- Public Comments: (*Nicki Gulli, member of the public*): He asked the Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if he was out of order and apologized.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised yes, this time is for public comment not a question and answer.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to (*Nicki Gulli, member of the public*) that if he has a question, he can ask this question to the Chair of the meeting tonight which would be Vice Chair Dan Gilbert, who will then ask this question on his behalf to NDOW staff if he deems it to be a relevant question.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated he will withdraw the question. He stated his comment is to the CAB that maybe NDOW should investigate property damage such as loss of animals, bears are getting into yards and killing cats and dogs, as well as the amount of vehicle accidents that are occurring involving bears. He stated as (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*) stated previously there is loss to mother bear on the road leaving orphans not due to hunter's actions but from a vehicle traveling down a road thus leading to (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*) previous statement of citizens encroachment. He reiterated that NDOW should possible view what the property damages are and put this information into their metrics next time for the near future.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he has been on the board for years and remembers when the bear hunt was first started. He stated the amount of study and effort learning about the black bear as opposed to other species of animals in the state of Nevada has an increased factor of five or more black bears, since the hunt begin. He stated when asked by the public the value of the black bear hunt, by doing so it gives the ability to have funding within the department thus giving staff the ability in their studies to dedicate vast amounts of time to have knowledge of bear movement, habitat, impact, and education for towns where these bears live. He stated in past with the bear committee which at the time was led by Commissioner David McNich, he worked diligently with the local community to receive trash pickup and obtain bear proof containers. He unfortunately stated some communities along with Waste Management refused to assist with this request due to cost and time. He stated there have been many things that have been tried on this subject matter and advised the bear hunt harvest numbers are such a small number harvesting less than 2% of the population therefore he stated you can believe or not believe the reports from NDOW. He stated last year the limit for both male and female was reached, and the hunt ended. He stated this was the first year the quota was reached for both male and female. He stated he feels that the black bear receives more attention from NDOW then before the hunt begin. This will give healthier and more sustainable population

- of black bears with the hunt taking place.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that there is data that gives the amount of black bear that are killed by vehicles and advised that there are more bears killed by cars than in the bear hunt.
 - Board member Dave Talaga asked if NDOW uses this information.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised that NDOW does indeed have this information on the number of bears killed by vehicles, and he is not aware on if they use it or not.
 - Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated this is documented by NDOW.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) it is.
 - Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated yes, it is well documented by NDOW.
 - Board member Dave Talaga asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if NDOW also counts black bears in the urbanized areas as well.
 - Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised that NDOW documents any black bears that they “get their hands on” are marked and processed therefore he reiterated yes, it is processed and documented well.
 - Board member Dave Talaga advised to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that documentation is one thing but if NDOW estimates for example 800 bears but out of the 800, but 200 were counted in urban areas, is the count of the 800 include the 200 or not.
 - Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised yes, the count is statewide.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated okay.
 - Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it is statewide or units.
 - Board member Dave Talaga stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) okay per unit.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated he realized that the topic is a hot topic, he just wanted to state he appreciated the discussion and input but the issue but it is for harvest quota, and we are discussing if there should or should not be a bear hunt, we are getting off task, He appreciates that the conversations have some impacts on the quotas but the main focus tonight is to set the quotas and request to continue moving with the topic due to the volume of the action items on the agenda.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated the normal procedure is when the action item is presented there is a motion made to the committee, next a motion and a second then committee comment, then there is public comment, lastly returning to the committee again. He stated he is unsure if the motion on this action item was made yet.
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he believes the motion was made previously when the agenda was accepted as presented if he was not mistaken.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised that if these are action items then each action item must be moved separately, reiterating that each action item must be moved.
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked if board member Jacob Thompson would like to make a motion on this action item. He advised unless this is out of line, and stated he is asking board member Jacob Thompson due to his vast experience and time on the board.
 - Board member Dave Talaga advised a motion to approve Commission Regulation 23-05, Black Bear Quotas and Harvest Limits as presented.
 - Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated that he would like to again go out to board comments unless the board members have nothing further on this action item.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if there were any board members who are in

opposition.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised none.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

b. Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Seasons (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Seasons.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic: **Antelope.**
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert read the following: (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation): In general, the Department is recommending quota reductions in many areas for mule deer and bighorn sheep. Big game populations continued to face depleted range conditions due to severe drought conditions going into the summer months. However, fall precipitation across much of the state improved range conditions for many herds. The winter of 2022-2023 has seen near record snowfall and prolonged cold temperatures for many areas of the state, particularly in the Western and Eastern regions. According to the most recent NRCS snotel data, many water basins are experiencing well above median levels, ranging from 194% in the Snake River basin to over 320% in the Carson River basin as of April 15, 2023. Most mule deer captured in December, February, and March had very low body fat reserves, which indicates that animals are not receiving adequate nutrition to survive the winter or produce viable offspring. Poor body condition can have an impact on many factors including lower survival rates, reduced fawn production, poor fawn health, and reduced antler/horn growth. In addition, big game animals seeking to find areas of better forage may expose themselves to increased predation. Department biologists make recommendations based on data collected through aerial, ground surveys, and reported harvest results. Population models are utilized to provide population estimates for each big game population with densities large enough to require survey efforts. Smaller populations simply use the demand-success formula to determine recommended quotas. The Department quota recommendations represent the best available science using multiple techniques to provide the CAB's, Commission, and interested publics with the best information possible to make decisions for the following proposed quota recommendations for the 2023-2024 hunting seasons. FYI- (*Antelope, Desert Bighorn Sheep, California Bighorn Sheep, Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep, Mountain Goat, Elk, Mule Deer*).
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised this would impact in Hunt 1181 (Resident Mule Deer-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon) with 2023 Quota Recommendations of 205, in some of the most impacted last winter in Areas 6, 7, 10. He stated he would like this recommendation to be removed, and stated there is new healthy data he would like to discuss.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated he would like to do each category of species one at a time as previously done in past meetings regardless of the order.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised to have a motion per species and have board comments then public comments in that order.
 - Board member Brian Patterson agreed.
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert agreed, he stated Antelope has changed quotas from last year, with two new hunts. FYI- New Hunts Under Resident Antelope-Horns shorter than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2181 (New Hunt 078, 105, 107, 121 with 2023 Season September 8-September 24, with 2023 Quota Recommended 1) & (New Hunt 115c with 2023 Season September 8 – September 24, with 2023 Quota Recommended 20).
 - Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked board member Brian Patterson would he like to vote on Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2151).
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated that in past the board would discuss the antelope then vote on each classification of antelope thereafter.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised by species is good and that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert could decide to make a motion to accept all the classification of species at one time.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert agreed with both board members Brian Patterson and Jacob Thompson.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that there is a request to lower recommendation quotas as there is to make some recommendation quotas higher. He stated the 2022 Quota Approved was 973 as opposed to 2023 Quota Recommended of 1,068. He stated he felt it was consistent and advised he wasn't alarmed by these totals.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that board members to notice that in Resident Antelope- Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2151/Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2251 & Resident Antelope-Horns shorter than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2181 which is generally rifles the quota numbers have been down due to hunters success is up and if you notice in Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Muzzleloaders Hunt 2171 & Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Muzzleloader Hunt 2271, there is a increase due too two factors: lower hunter success and population stability. He stated there is also as Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised earlier two New Hunts: under Resident Antelope-Horns shorter than ears Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2181: 078, 105, 107, 121 & 115c thus establishment for future hunts. He stated comparing to years past the quotas seem to be consistent with stable population and hunter success also including Resident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Archery Hunt 2161 & Nonresident Antelope-Horns longer than ears Archery Hunt 226.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he would be making a broad guesstimate in the that harvest objectives are around 10% of the overall herd population, asking NDOW employees if they felt that this was correct.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated management is done by NDOW of 20 to 30 bucks per 100 does of the age of 2 years old bucks in which is driving quality quotas and decrease in Areas 15 and in Area 115 and 231. He stated the pronghorn they reach their maximum potential between 3 to 6 years of age and this is creating a trend in previous years in which we had great harvest more than drought creating increase harvest and poor fawn recruitment with no replacements creating 100% success in these same units with poor quality metrics for 15 inch or better thus creating fluctuations through these units shifting demographic changes with buck ratios is driving factors including the amount of available bucks on the landscape.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated if the quota is 1,000 would the objective be to harvest 300.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson that pronghorn success rates stay wide into the 70s as other groups are in the 80s or 90s and this is indeed factored in by NDOW.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that if Bighorn sheep is in the 90s and Elkhorn is in the 40s and he realizes that each species is different, and he is attempting to get a clear understanding that if a quota amount of 1,000 is given does not necessarily mean that the harvested amount of this species will indeed be a 1,000. He stated this depends on the classification of the species that will make that determination of the quota.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the success rate has factored in.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) he advised that this is the first-year quota recommendations sent out by NDOW discussing detail of what is occurring in each hunt unit with populations in that unit and gave description that the material was useful and helpful indeed. He stated for those individuals who did read this material reviewing the compensation tag and success rates it clearly shows the amount being higher than what (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern*

Region) advised. He stated there are a large amount of 80% to 100% range for success, with the Any Legal Weapon Hunts individuals were successful in their hunts.

- Board member Brian Patterson thanked Chair Dixon and stated he and stated this is the first year to receive backup information of this nature giving the rationale from biologists for areas for the classification of species in that area. He stated this was a large amount of information and unfortunately, he did not have enough time to view all the information with feeling of not being completely prepared but stated he is more prepared than in previous years on the quota information. He stated he felt the information presented by NDOW was great and appreciated the preparation of putting these packets together and stated he used the information heavily in the past few weeks while viewing his tag applications.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert as stated previously by board member Jacob Thompson, that he in past meetings would run the meetings by having board decisions with the members of NDOW who are in the meeting (*Joe Bennett Jr., Erin Woods*) next move to Public Comment then afterwards coming back for additional board motion or for the board to make a motion. He stated when there is Public Comments occurring at this time, he did not want the board to respond or speak directly to any member of the public at this time. He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that as Vice Chair he could take the lead and ask for clarification on these Public Comments if needed from NDOW or any member of the board if he deems it necessary.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert agreed and thanked Chair Paul Dixon.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He stated he has no issue with the quotas that are written in the material but instead has issue with quotas based on harvest rates especially in today's environment. He stated that meaning excess of new hunters who arrived during COVID pandemic meaning for duck harvesting quotas being low thus not meaning that the duck species have small numbers. He stated this is due to new hunters who do not have knowledge to hunt correctly and are hunting inappropriately and these new hunters will not harvest. He gave examples stating if there is 80% harvest rate dropping down to 70% harvest rate there is no method to reflect if the determination of results is due to the reduction in the species or due to reduction in the quality of hunters that are hunting in the field. He stated this must be done by science which is primary means to set these quotas. He stated he feels including other hunters who are not in attendance of tonight's meeting that the quotas should be reduced in many areas but not solely using harvest data but instead using as many methods available (physical counts, scat studies he stated these are not very reliable unfortunately, or using alternative technologies such as drones which are indeed effective in all states besides Nevada. He reiterated that all tools available needs utilization and stated he feels that instead the least reliable tools are utilized hence he encourages for future endeavors the usage of alternative technologies to receive better quotas.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to (*Brian Burris, member of the public*) in defending NDOW he stated the biologists are looking at habitat conditions and fawn rates, he stated NDOW has just did a flyover and advised rationale of waiting till May is due to this to create these quotas from the flyovers and doing counts for the species and not solely basing the information from the harvest from the previous year success or lack of success. He stated all these factors are under consideration when creating quotas and recommendations and creating backup information.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he agreed with board member Brian Patterson. He asked the question for NDOW members (*Joe Bennett Jr., & Erin Woods*) the doe harvest is listed and in some which have been lightly hit such as Area 10 and Area 7, Area 6, which are staying at the same level as previous year. He stated in some areas there is increase and, in some decrease, leading him to ask if NDOW Have thought of elimination of the hunts or further reduction of tags.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he is cautious of comparison of effects of deer populations versus where pronghorn go to for winter. He stated with open areas NDOW does not have the collaring data going through spring with not the same effect on pronghorn as with deer. He stated that others with updates on winter harvests but be cautious to make these similarities.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised a motion for approval of Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Season for Hunt Units: 2151, 2251, 2171, 2271, 2161, 2261, 2181 as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic Resident Elk
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member Dave Talaga advised a motion for approval of Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Season Hunt Units: 4102, 4151, 4251, 4156, 4256, 4161, 4261, 4651, 4181, 4281, 4176, 4276, 4111, 4211, 4107 as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic: Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that there is reduction from 2022 Quota was 244 and in 2023 it is 190. He stated this is cause for concern to everyone for the health of the herd as opposed to the opportunity to hunt and receive a once in lifetime tag. He stated when populations are down tag numbers are down. He stated regardless of if as a hunter he would love to obtain a tag he would like this to make sense.
- Public Comments: (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*): He stated his comment is regarding Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep Any Ewe-Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3181) in Hunt Unit 268 he advised of giving sheep to Utah and wanted to know if this is still occurring.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*) exactly what is his question.
- Public Comments: (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*): He stated his wanted to ask for the quota which has remained the same in 2022 and in 2023 at 36 for a reduction down to 20. He stated he does not want to give away too many sheep since the state of Nevada already gives a large amount away to Utah.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked the question to NDOW (*Joe Bennett Jr., and Erin Woods*) that he had read an article that stated that 30 to 50 sheep again to the state of Utah this year. He stated is this a correct statement or incorrect.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated did not want to respond out of protocol by speaking to a board member during public comments.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that he would like to continue with public comments.
- Public Comments: (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*): He stated it was a good idea to give some sheep away helping other states and stated that he feels there is no need to harvest as many ewes as has been in past and advised that he applied for this tag and has not opposing this and is just requesting to be more conservative with harvest on this species.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burriss, member of the public*): He stated he is in agrees with (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*) if the state of Nevada is cutting back on tags the priority is to the species of animals in the state of Nevada as well as the citizens in the state of Nevada. He stated therefore is there is reduction in the number of tags given then there should not be doing a surplus and giving animals to other states. He stated if

management, completed scientifically then this does not make any sense and if relocation is needed then it should be done in areas of Nevada where the sheep population is struggling not to other states. He stated this would be his choice.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that due to disease in the sheep population there has not been a great deal of movement around in the state of Nevada in various parts. He stated that in Unit 268, the sheep that were to be given to the state of Utah. He reiterated that again there was not a safe place to place the herd of sheep in different areas in Nevada and asked for clarification from NDOW as well.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he will let (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) to answer this question.
 - Public Comments: (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated Chair Paul Dixon comments were 100% correct in stating that Unit 268 Ewes NDOW indeed uses this area to relocate the sheep within the state of Nevada as well as other states to achieve clean source population of the herd. She stated she would like to give clarification on this matter: 32 sheep were given to Utah last year (2022), but this will not occur again this year (2023). She stated the reasoning behind this is to make sure that the facilities that the sheep were located too are working well and if so, they will be translocated, and the relocation concept will be visited again next year if all is well in this process. She advised that the sheep in Unit 268 will not part of the relocation in 2023. She stated there was a good survey for Units 267, 268 for this year and due to the excellent winter and perception, cool temperatures there is prediction of good pregnancy rates and survival and the depending on the summer months this may help higher survival rates due to non struggle with the effects of pneumonia and no sheep removal from this population for translocation there was the ability to catch the harvest as previous. She advised that there is no need to put on this population that is experiencing temporary habitat fragility and NDOW is watching this year and upon notable increase of the population, if that the habitat may not be sustainable, NDOW will revisit the quota numbers and possibility of translocation for future endeavors.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*), he reiterated about 32 sheep given to the state of Utah prior, and with mortality of sheep ranging in numbers from 28 to 42 due to drought, he stated with a large amount of matrix and with quota of tags, is it keeping population at a sustainable harvest it seems to be high numbers.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated the harvest last year was double the number than the previous two years ago and what we had this year as well and NDOW wants to keep the balance good. She stated that Unit 268 is more resilient and there is more room to experiment with the numbers and the water hauls and guzzler machines that NDOW had during the summer last year and NDOW will hopefully be more initiative-taking in keeping a lookout on this in case the summer with be a dry summer.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that the mortality of the sheep was isolated to the area of the Muddies Peak and Muddy Wilderness Area which have two dilapidated older water developments and advised that there was a classification and this is result of population increase through the blacks and Muddies with the uncertainty due to drought conditions last year and populations back is why we have certain data and classified 300 sheep in the Blacks and 500 sheep in the Muddies which is surprise due to the mortality that the sheep have including any kind type of reasonable survey in the Muddies area. He stated the success rate was 52% therefore predictions of only twenty-five ewes harvested with the resident and nonresident quota.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated he appreciated that the hunters are taking a step back until they receive more significant data, which shows a care for conservation.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated he realizes that the sheep population go back and forth between Units 65 & Units 67 and stated he had a tough time in locating a mature ram. He stated there have been discussions in past about taking tags and distribution of tags to the wilderness area to spread out hunting and give opportunity to hunters to have mountain hunt. He stated to revisit this next year if the CAB would like to take the opportunity to do this.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked NDOW (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region, Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) if he knew what the total was for intake last year.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated 52%.
- Chair Paul Dixon thanked NDOW staff.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated regarding members of the public comments about the sheep given away to Utah and harvesting ewes, he feels that NDOW has answered the question and he would be in agreeance on the harvest quota.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked if the five hundred sheep that were classified in the Muddies, where these sheep are, the target population or what exactly is the targeted population.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated NDOW more distribution in areas where this was not on the surveys and the population objective changes as the landscape changes as well.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that there is also a new permanent water source which is in the park will help disburse animals to the area and stated that all of this is a positive.
- Advised motion for approval of Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Season Hunt Units: 3151, 3251, 3161, 3261, 3172, 3181, 3281, as presented.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic: **California Bighorn Sheep**
- Board member Brian Patterson asked to have these species voted on at the same time with this discussion: (*California Bighorn Sheep, Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep, Mountain Goat*).
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert agreed. He stated the flight survey showed that there was reduction in animals especially California Bighorn Sheep.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that that the support materials are due to drought conditions and that their Bighorn Management Plan reflects management of 8% of the total rams at 50% for mature rams and this is the best estimates in which quotas, derived from.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that it was a responsible reduction.
- Public Comments: (*John Mitteness, member of the public*): He stated that since these species are in tough shape and advised that he has been in and around mountains in the state of Nevada and indicated that he did not understand why ewes are still shot.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated this year there is Nonresident Mountain Goat and wanted to know if the Mountain Goat had been in Heritage and was it taken away from Heritage.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the due to the drop for California Bighorn Sheep dropping below 50% which is the Dream Tag requirement, there was a need not to be any additional pressure on the California Bighorn Sheep therefore he stated, he believed it was the Silver State that was moved to Mountain Goat. He stated this includes the supporting material.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated there were 12 Mountain Goats for years now but have not had Nonresident.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it was an issue a couple of years ago coming, and all NDOWs are 10% Nonresident allocations, and it is to stay with consistency with NDOWs policies. He stated that it was a surprise to people when NDOW had Nonresident Mountain Goat.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated there was a time in past when there were 28 to 30 mountain goat tags a year, it makes sense that a lot of hunters accrued points while sitting out for a numerous number of years.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he noticed that Unit 121, removed out and asked the question what this due to hardly any harvest.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that he is under the understanding that 121, he is going to be captured again but NDOW has run out of authority for spending for the capture contract and advised that there is a family that is keeping their eyes on this Mountain Goat. He stated NDOW does not want to send hunters to simply hunt one mountain goat when they should focus on hunting in a viable population.
- Board member John Hiatt advised motion for approval of Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for the 2023-2024 Season Hunt Units: 8151, 8251, 9151, 7151, 7251, as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic: **Resident Junior Mule Deer**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he does not like the existence with any quota at all in the doe harvest and would like for complete elimination of this.
- Board member John Hiatt asked which Hunt he was referring too.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he was referring to Hunt 1181 (*Resident Mule Deer-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Hunt*). He stated all the units have received a significant hit, and feels it is a path for reduction but without the knowledge of knowing what the number of applications that will be turned in there should not be any reasoning behind having this doe harvest. He stated there is no merit to put quotas on does.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated even though the population is up at least 50% to 75%, you would like it to be at 100%.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he is speaking on the population that could loss 40% when these populations are already on the downside with the quota numbers, if one would look at Area 10 the success rate was average and down to something about 22%.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that these population between the range of 6,000 to 10,000 mule deer with low success rates and poor winter conditions and body conditions and be responsible with animal removal from landscape. He stated for reasonings of having the correct amount for carrying capacity. He stated if there are 70, 50, 15, tags and there may be twenty harvested yes, this is reduction.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that in the 1950s-1960s, the mule deer population was over 100,000 and stated he does not believe it is the carrying capacity that is an issue it is habitat. He stated he hopes due to the amount of moisture received this year that the habitat will do well. He stated he does not see that carrying capacity and habitat conditions are moving factor and advised that the mule deer population, must built back again, and stated the entire state is centering around the nucleus of the deer population herd, getting it right back to previous years. He stated responsible conservation tags, needed to employ this.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if there was removal of all the tags where there is no hunt and considering the carrying capacity would NDOW expect the herd of mule deer to grow or downsize.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated with the amount of removal of this population with the basis of this quota it will have a big effect especially of that size. He stated what will be seen in Area 10 is poor fawn winter conditions and stated going into better conditions with all the moisture, there is expectation of this change in the coming year, He stated with a population size of 10,000 animals there was an attempt by NDOW to put this quota into relevant perspective quota, and stated there is a great demand for these hunts. He stated if the mule deer herd could not be sustainable then NDOW would not have given recommendations of this level of harvest.
- Board member Brian Patterson reiterated that there is 50% in one unit and 75% reduction in the other three is the reasoning of why he asked Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if the population would have to be at 100% and he understands this.
- Board member Dave Talaga the success rate is low.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated if there is quota of fifteen with a success rate of 25% then you will have a harvest of three, and if it is a birth of twins that would be 8 a year.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that this year there was a process in which they abort the fetus based on body condition and it is unknown what the effects would be from this. He stated this should be known in another month or so and this would not be something that the effects would show in a day.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it should be longer than needed than that.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that it is unknown the number that will survive to birth as well as afterwards, he stated he understands there is a demand but would prefer to have ten tags ten years from now than later today. He stated looking into the future he is hopeful that we will get past the drought and receive better habitat conditions to get the mule deer population back successful. He asked the question of what the total population is now.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated at this time the population total is mid seventies.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert reiterated that the population needs help in building back up again.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated if there were catastrophic loss this would be reflect in the next year. He stated with the assumption that there is catastrophic loss, he stated that (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) stated previously that the success rate of 30% for Area 10 would have next able impact on that catastrophic loss therefore you could not state that one factor would create an impact for the others from view of a standpoint of major depopulation factor of the hunt, then this current year would make a significant difference hence next year if there were dramatic reduction then there should be a cut in tags for that area. Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he completely understands board member Dave Talaga viewpoint but would rather be cautious and feels that the mule deer are dealing with drought conditions, winter, predation population and with doe harvest turned back he feels it would be the reasonable and responsible action.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated from a financial viewpoint 205 tags would equal the amount of \$20,000.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated except that should never be the reasoning.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated this is not a reason.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that it is not \$100 per tag but instead it cost \$40 for a mule deer tag.
- Board member John Hiatt asked NDOW (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region and Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW Southern Region*) the question of which portion of the population would be taken by hunters (young animals, or animals in poor conditions, or animals in prior conditions). He gave example: X amount of does, killed the best or ones with medical).

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he feels from his experience in being in the field and having discussions with individuals who also have experience, it is opportunistic with the does in the family group, they are simply harvesting a doe.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he was not buying that there is a selection, he changed the question to simplify instead of having the broad aspect on this question, he stated which of these groups are likely to be taken which is the easiest due to them waiting and not hiding or being invading whether this means actively until there are more persons.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated this could be a reason.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that Area 15 comes out to him, and other areas are doom and gloom but not this area, there is increase of tags by roughly one hundred.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that in Area 15 due to weather conditions as opposed to Area 10 conditions, he stated this was seen also in Area 14 as well and it can be seen with pronghorn deer and stated that Area 15 is the best area at this moment with viewing the buck ratios, surveying data, and fawn recruitment, and in a great place with the population in this area.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burriss, member of the public*): He stated he agrees with Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if there is a concern for fawn recruitment due to poor range conditions then by taking any doe off this range would be insanity therefore stating we have concerns about recruitment but will remove the species of animals who are responsible for this recruitment, makes no sense. He stated earlier one of the Biologists from NDOW gave him concerns stating wildlife, managed by science therefore demand should not be in this content at any point. He stated as a hunter's demand does not come into play with development in this hunting community. He stated taxes, paid to bring animals back into their environment to thrive. He stated he does not care about hunter demand or what this equals, if this is not for population increase and sustain population. He stated demand is going from 100,000 animals down to 30,000. He stated if we continue to follow demand versus science then there will be no progress made to get beyond a curb therefore serious view needs to be done to cut tags where it is needed by doing this will set goals to have a better recruitment next year therefore having ability to increase tag harvest for the following year. He stated management needs completion by science and not budget reviews of NDOW.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He stated he agrees with Vice Chair Dan Gilbert and is against the doe hunt and stated earlier board member John Hiatt asked regarding which groups would likely be shot, and he feels that it will be whichever one the hunters will shoot and the answer to me will be the first one they view doe or buck.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): She stated that she agrees with members of the public and the Vice Chair and stated to get the mule deer populations to increase due to pressures they received from drought and disease, they need to have more females to have fawns and not issue more mule deer tags this year.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated that if there is going to be elimination of tags is this also for Junior Mule Deer Tags. He stated the hunter will shoot the first thing they see which will be a doe, therefore he would like to know the stats on Junior Mule Deer Tags versus bucks and it has not been mentioned in tonight's meeting.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated this changed as of late last year therefore Juniors not allowed to hunt twice for buck or doe and must decide which one, they would like to hunt while purchasing the mule deer tag.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*) that this did not pass.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that the Tag Allocation Committee did approve as far as antlerless is for approved accompanied antlerless hunt the only Units for Junior to Hunt are in Units 6, 7, 10 for this.
- Board Brian Patterson advised that he like to make a motion but leave out Unit 1181 (*Resident Mule Deer-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1181*) to have a separate discussion.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert agreed with board member Brian Patterson on his suggestion.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the reasoning to have a doe hunt is if there are poor range conditions and not able to maintain the herd size reduction is better with removal of does giving survival for the remaining animals then to keep large herd and have larger amount die. He stated NDOW has agreed with this science in Area 10 for ten years. He stated he would like NDOW (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region, Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) to discuss about carrying capacity and range conditions and the rationale and necessity of doe hunts.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated that it is to try to reduce the overall burden of a limited forage landscape and increase the health of the herd and with the no doe hunt means having body conditions that are low level across the entire herd.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked if there are factors when these quotas are set in these areas.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the quotas are conservative based off data points and in support materials it reflects where body condition is poor which deals with Units 6, 7, 10 which is expected based from snow from the valley and winter ranges, and this is coupled with collar data and survey data.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): how much of this information is based on those factors' percentage wise.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the body condition, this is difficult when attempting to scale from this condition thus making a scale more conservatively without having knowledge of the level of mortality. He advised that NDOW this is the rationale of why these quotas vary.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated if no hunt completed, does NDOW have expectations of seeing does expired due to carrying capacity as opposed to completing the hunt and having a healthier herd if there is a reduction of the herd of 15% to 20%.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated his opinion is at the level of harvest he does not feel that at this level there is no quantification.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated at this level he feels that it sounds as if there is hope of deer rebounds to historic level and regulate their population but previous carrying capacity is not the same today. He stated if the limit to rebound is based upon current environmental changes. He stated examples of (*Houdan wolves and Delhi sheep*) in which case the hunters would kill the Houdan wolves to help the Delhi sheep population rebound but later found that even though the Delhi sheep, not being hunted and predated off by the Houdan wolves and these sheep were still dying and the carrying capacity had shifted. He stated all these animals were competing over limited resources therefore average Delhi sheep of the herd become lower even though the health of each individual animals become lower due to no regulation.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated he felt that (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) was saying it would seem if they simply left it alone that everything would rebound and go back to previous therefore the animals have limitations by the environment due to change in the environment and realistically have expectations of the animals going back to previous in the next few years only if there is a restored

environment is not realistic.

- Public Comments: (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region, Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): Both agreed that board member Alexander Harper words did indeed capture what they were stating. (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that the effect, seen during the weather conditions is when the effect seen during population mode.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that the weather with the amount of snow and depth of precipitation and the prolong cold made it difficult for the animals to be able to reach forage covered by snow. He stated he understands making sure a matrix of making sure the population aligns with the habitat and carrying capacity. He stated he does not feel it mitigates any risks with 40% in an undetermined level of recruitment that may not occur this year. He stated he feels that the conservative tag allocated and recommendations from NDOW is good, but we need to make sure that the does are maintained.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised motion for approval Commission Regulation 23-14, Big Game Quotas for 2023-2024 Season Hunt Units: 1107, 1331, 1332, leaving out Hunt Unit 1181 (*Resident Mule Deer-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Hunt*) from this motion as previous motion by board member Brian Patterson was advised asking for this Unit not to be included in this motion to have further discussion on it.
- Board Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic: **Hunt 1181 (Resident Mule Deer-Antlerless Any Legal Weapon Hunt).**
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he supports this after hearing from Vice Chair Dan Gilbert as well as members of the public. He stated that the demand is not what drives this therefore maybe it needs to be off the table for a year or so and see what happens thereafter.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that if it were based on public perception and not science then pulled off the table, but he will personally base it on science, and we should stay with the recommendation.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that he agrees with Chair Paul Dixon and agrees with staying with NDOWs recommendation after hearing from the Biologist tonight and room for discussion but in the end, this is good for sensible wildlife management.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he feels that the historical numbers, carrying capacity and habitat could carry the population if it tripled in bold form but feels that the historical numbers along with everything else is gone, therefore using all ability to move this population back to its original self.
- Public Comments: (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*): He stated this cannot be pulled due to it being established and individuals have already applied for the tags, therefore an alternative would be to reduction of one tag per Unit.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion that the CAB approve the amendment for Unit 1181 to allow each single tag for each one of the units listed in Unit 1181.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that he agreed until he realized that the hunters had already applied for tags in this area meaning that these hunters have already viewed this area and applied for a tag. He asked Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if NDOW published the number of tags.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised they published the last year in which they indicated a total and it indicates that they believe that the tag total is 270 tags, and we are reducing it down to one per unit.
- **Motion 4-3 (opposed by Chair Paul Dixon, board members Jacob Thompson and Alexander Harper)**

c. **Fiscal Year 2024 Predation Management Plan (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about approving the final draft of the Fiscal Year 2024 Predation Management Plan.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the CAB has read and given comments on this action item accepting the action item as written, he stated he feels it should be more time given to public comment. He reiterated that the CAB has given comments on this and feels Vice Chair should move forward to public comment.
- Board member John Hiatt asked NDOW (*Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region, Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that he heard that there is new legislation currently before the legislator, that will remove the 80% lethal mandate, what will happen if this legislation passes how will that effect this management plan, will they stick to this plan or will they have to scrap said plan and start over to input in the new legislation if it is passed. He stated 80% of lethal mandate is no longer a part of the law.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated his understanding of this is it will remove the 80% mandate and give hunters the option of selecting Predation Management or have a Plan B, He stated that is not a option for folks that have already applied for their tags currently and stated the funding is in place for this year but if that passes then the entire process would have to be reevaluated. He stated at this time this is with the House of Representatives for initial discussion only.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He stated that he also has concerns about this just as board member John Hiatt spoke about, he stated it has not passed yet and is heading through the House of Representatives to the Senate and he feels it will pass through the House since majority has the vote at this time and Senate therefore the CAB next to think about options to put in place, he stated yes option was given but there is no clarification on whether that 80% stayed through or whether the lethal portion became 100% and wanted CAB to ask the Board of Commissioners along with the DA when this is passed to decide the best course of action on this.
- Public Comments: (*Kensee Lee, member of the public*): He stated he was viewing the 2023 deferred tag list and noticed that one of the individuals listed was deceased, and asked the question how one defers a tag when this individual is deceased.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that the individual is not deceased it was a death in the individuals family.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve the Presentation of Fiscal Year 2024 Predation Management Plan as presented.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

d. **Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, Fourth Reading (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about adopting changes to Commission Policy 23-Predation Management recommended by the Regulation Simplification Committee.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this is simply the Commission Policy 23 of Predator Management simply revising on when the reading will be completed and how many reading will occur and this is the fourth and final time on this and advised that the CAB had no comments previously on this action item when it was brought before the CAB

therefore he advised Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if there is no additional comments from the CAB his suggestion is to move forward with public comments.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised motion to approve Commission Policy 23-Predation Management Plan as approved.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

e. **Commission General Regulation 506, Possession of Golden Eagles under Certain Circumstances (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission General Regulation 506.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that the CAB has reviewed this action item on occasions and advised that our newest board member Alexander Harper is an expert on the Golden Eagle and had input on this matter in the last CAB meeting on March 7, 2023.
- Board member Alexander Harper advised that his comments in the last meeting on this action item on March 7, 2023, where the Golden Eagle population in Nevada are stable and they have been nesting in the last few years. He stated that their 75 % of their diet consists of jack rabbits and cotton tails and lost a large amount of prey items due to drought and the illness (*Tularemia aka rabbit fever*) in the rabbits in the west, therefore losing these types of prey. He stated they breed at youthful age and hang out with other birds, and even though the population is stable there are indications that this population is slowly decreasing. He stated with the threat of solar projects that could endanger them according to Joe Barnes. He advised that Joe Barnes is “the guy” when it comes to the state of Nevada Golden Eagle populations. He stated that he did not know if Joe Barnes is still with NDOW, he was at one time.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that Joe Barnes is not still with NDOW, he is with the state.
- Board member Alexander Harper stated this to him does not seem to be taking too many Golden Eageles from the wild, it is mostly Master Falconers bringing in Golden Eagles from other states and rehabilitating other Golden Eagles in the state of Nevada. He stated that many younger Golden Eagles that are being hit by cars and survive, he stated that since the Golden Eagles are scavengers and in the process of retrieving the roadkill on the Highway in areas such as (*Mohave, Great Basin*), they are hit by vehicles and survive, and these Golden Eagles are eating a large amount of roadkill. He stated he is in agreeance of rehabilitation and feels that this has no impacts on the Golden Eagles therefore his recommendation is without the ability to have the knowledge to adequately know where the individuals are obtaining the Golden Eagles from that are in need of rehabilitation, he advised his recommendation is if there is a possibility to rehabilitate the Golden Eagles then he stated it should be done.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the number of Master Falconers interested in rehabilitating Golden Eagles is small.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised he remembers from the Commission Meeting of the discussion about this action item, stating that at that meeting, there is exactly 43 Master Falconers in the state of Nevada who are rehabilitating these Golden Eagles.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 506, Possession of Golden Eagle under Certain Circumstances as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

f. **Legislative Committee Report (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about bills of interest and any associated amendments, consider Legislative Committee recommendations and may take official positions on those bills.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if he had any supporting material on this action item for tonight's meeting.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this information was in the supporting material submitted by Secretary Darlene Kretunski (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*), this spreadsheet gave extensive detail to advise which bills the Commission is tracking, what the status of these bills are and whether NDOW is in support or is simply taking no position on the matter. He stated that he had received a call from Commissioner Mike Reese, he is putting together the CAB was asked to view at this time are Senate Bill SB 90 BDR(Bill Draft Request) 19-560 NRS 235 which designates the wild mustang as the official state horse, with sponsors of this bill being Senate Committee on Natural Resources, the notes for this bill states: Designates the wild mustang as the official state horse of the State of Nevada. Amendment provides that the designation complies with the Wild and Free Roaming Horses and Burro's Act. The Commission opposed on 3/11/2023 and on 4/4/2023 Amendment. He stated the concern is having an animal to represent as state horse who does not have the best representation in this state and has caused major damage to the other wildlife species as well as to the landscape. He stated that individuals believe by naming the wild mustang the state horse it will receive protection status and the round ups for the horses will cease. He stated he feels that until there is management for this species to give this title seems quite irresponsible at this time.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he is in agreement with Chair Paul Dixon comments, and stated he is not in favor of this bad idea.
- Board member John Hiatt stated (SB 90 BDR (Bill Draft Request) 19-560 NRS 235 the bill designates the wild horse mustang as official state horse of the state, he advised this bill was introduced by Legislative in Southern Nevada as a project to demonstrate to fourth graders to teach them with how to deal with government, and how to exercise their rights with government and stated this could have serious implications if passed. He stated there was no research done prior to this about implications that could come from this passing. He stated there is difference to designate state which has no actions and simply gives students project to do, but this action could have consequences for the state of Nevada in management of the wild horses and urges the public and everyone down to the Commission to not support this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert should ask the public to view the supporting material and advise which bills they would require a discussion on from the (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*).
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he would ask public if they would like to discuss any of the bills on the (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*).
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he would like to discuss one more bill prior to going out into public comment. He stated that would be AB 355 BDR (*Bill Draft Request*) 937 NRS 202 Revises provisions relating to firearms, Assemblywoman Jauregui sponsor it, and passed on 4/12/2023 and it prohibits a person under twenty-one from using a semiautomatic shotgun or rifle. He stated this bill will make its way to the Governor's office. He stated he feels the intent solely is prevention from under the age of twenty-one kids, obtaining rifle and with the simply adding semiautomatic

shotgun, this will affect duck hunters, chucker hunting, Upland Games and he advised by adding semiautomatic shotgun into this bill it has lost his support. He stated if this bill was for the purpose of stopping an individual under the age of twenty-one from purchasing semi automatic weapon.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised that he without doubt feels the Governor will veto this. He advised as soon as we open this type of weapon it is not good and talked about the number of mass shooting in the United States and all of them used semiautomatic rifle none used and advised none of which was a shotgun that was used in any of the scenarios therefore, he feels it is overreach and it will create more buzz with news outlets.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): She asked the question if there would be a discussion on all the items on the (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*) or is it simply discussion on the two bills only, she stated if they are going to talk about other bills, she will wait to give her comments, if not then she will give her comments right now.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that was the intent to give the public an opportunity to speak out on the bills they would like to discuss and thereafter giving public comments next give the board comments next then a vote.
- Board John Hiatt advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he needs to bring it up for public comments on the bills that they would like to discuss then return for board comments thereafter.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked the question of why there is even a discussion on the bills on the supporting material tonight (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*) when these bills have no relevance to the wildlife, he did not understand. He stated it is simply informative and does not understand why it is on tonight's docket.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated the agenda for tonight's meeting, approved prior by the Commission for the CAB to discuss and was unanimously voted prior for the CABs recommendations and discussions.
 - Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He stated he is in agreeance with Chair Paul Dixon and feels that Assembly Bill 355 BDR (*Bill Draft Request*) 937 NRS 202 will put burden on the parents, guardians, or any individual who is taking the youth out for a hunt and providing the youth with a semiautomatic shotgun, the bill states the first offense is a misdemeanor and the second offense would be a felony. If these individuals do not know the law and the offenses and charges, they are at risk therefore turning hunters who are allowed to hunt with this type of weapon into felons. He then stated that Nevada Assembly Bill AB 70 BDR (*Bill Draft Request*) 502.25, he stated this bill is not good and stated there is 80% lethal management for a reason and he stated there were individuals not performing their job duties and stated there was studies being done on scat (*animal droppings, waste*) which had nothing to do with the subject of lethal management. He stated another bill is SB 269 BDR (*Bill Draft Request*) 246 NRS 574 this bill states revises provisions related to wildlife and the sponsor of this bill is Senator Ohrenschall and this bill prohibiting a person from restraining a dog during any time in which a heat advisory has been issued for the area. He stated that dogs used in hunting and by stating that heat advisory, this could potential send out during time limit in which the weather is not that hot, and the dogs can run in these conditions thus elimination of dogs in the early part of the seasons. He stated there is another assembly bill he is not sure of the name of the bill; this bill is requesting to add additional members to the Wildlife Commission. He stated he is opposing this and feels this is by individuals who are not hunters to have control of the Commission. He requested that the CAB oppose on the expansion of the Wildlife Commission. He stated the number of

individuals serving on the Commission was set into law for a reason.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised that would be SB 224 BDR (Bill Draft Request) 1013 NRS 501. This bill revises the membership of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners, the sponsor of this bill is Senator Goicoechea, and it is asking to revise the membership of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners. He stated this bill failed to meet the deadline therefore at this time no action taken on this bill.
- **FYI-** AB 70 (*Existing law provides that in addition to any fee charged and collected for a game tag, a fee of \$3 must be charged for processing each application for a game tag, the revenue from which must be deposited with the State Treasurer for credit to the Wildlife Account in the State General Fund and used by the Department of Wildlife for costs related to certain programs and activities, including, without limitation, wildlife management activities relating to the protection of nonpredatory game animals and sensitive wildlife species and conducting research relating to managing and controlling predatory wildlife. (NRS 502.253) this bill revises the wildlife management activities for which the Department may use the proceeds of such fees to provide that the Department, at the direction of the applicant, may instead use the proceeds of such fees only for: (1) developing and implementing an annual program for the lethal removal of predatory wildlife; or (2) wildlife management activities relating to the protection of nonpredatory games species and the habitat of such non predatory game species. The existing law also requires that the Department expend on any program developed for the management and control of predatory wildlife not less than 80 percent of the total money collected from the \$3 application processing fee in the most recent fiscal year for which the Department has information. (NRS 502.253). This bill removes the minimum 80 percent expenditure requirement for programs developed for the management and control of predatory wildlife.*)
- Board member Dave Talega stated regarding public comments by (*Mark Transue, member of the public*) asking why the CAB is having discussion on the (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*), he stated the reason is *as previously discussed AB 355 BDR 937 NRS 202 & SB 90 BDR 19-560 NRS 235 & SB 269 BDR 246 NRS 574* all, of which will have a direct impact on hunters and the wildlife. He stated if the mustang did indeed become the state horse would this give the mustang protections that the state of Nevada already can not afford.
- Board member John Hiatt advised this would simply make it more difficult to address the issue of the overpopulation of the wild horses that the state is already dealing with the management issue. Every time there is an issue it would be brought to attention if the mustang became the state animal, therefore nothing can be done to this animal due to the protections it would receive.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated yes it would be extra layer even though it is federal.
- Board John Hiatt advised that the individuals who decided on this did not have enough knowledge on the federal component on this and gave an example of horses in the Virginia range these horses are not under protection by federal aspect. He stated the Department of Agriculture has not done all the requirements that are needed to be done, with the stray animals meaning the horses in the Virginia Range, therefore this bill will not help and there is suggestion of adding amendments into this to give instruction to the Department of Agriculture in how to proceed in taking care of these horses, and reiterated that this bill will not in any way assist with the management of the wild horses in the state of Nevada. He reiterated that the purpose of this exercise which led to this bill was to teach the youth a lesson on civics, he feels this is not a good bill.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated in AB 70 for NDOW collection of \$3.00 fees for

wildlife management and removal of the 80% lethal predator requirement, if this passes how would everyone expect NDOW to make the judgement on the usage for predatory management and would this be a good thing.

- Board member Brian Patterson showed board member Dave Talaga were on the (*Legislative Committee Tracking Report*) opposed by the Commission on 3/11/2023.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that it was only on a Commission level.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to board member Dave Talaga that his line of questioning was a bit unfair to ask NDOW staff who are present tonight to answer this question.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that he would like to hear from NDOW staff that his question was indeed unfair.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Dave Talaga that he will answer his question so that the staff for NDOW in tonight's meeting do not have too, he stated that this would go to the Predator Management Committee and this committee would give their recommendations to the Wildlife Commission. He stated just because you are not mandated for spending 80% does not mean you cannot spend 100%. He stated the verbiage states that 80% must be done out of the 100% for lethal but in the future even if verbiage states there is no amount for lethal this does not change the amount that the Predator Committee could decide, and you will see improvement projects for other things.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised he understands this to Chair Paul Dixon, but he stated in future he does not think it is a great idea to give that option of trust to NDOW Committee to make that decision and he feels if there were trust in NDOWs decision then there would not be a law for this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Dave Talaga that this became law due to certain Senator who wanted 100% lethal predator management but the comprise was 80% instead. He stated that the desire at that time was for all to go toward predator removal and none for any other projects or studies. He stated the compromise between House and Senate was 80%. He stated it might have been 8 to 10 years ago. He stated this bill was led by Nevada State Senator Ira Hansen and prior to this bill put in place the amount spent was between 60% and 70% on lethal yearly and with studies and habitat work with Wildlife Commissioner Mike McBeath heading this committee. He reiterated even if the verbiage to remove the 80% lethal this still does not give guarantee that there will not be more than 80% lethal done. He stated the Commission and NDOW can put together appropriate programs that needs to do, and these programs were in place prior, and this upset a lot of people who wanted 100% and gave in to compromise at 80% instead.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he feels that this change would lead to NDOW having additional flexibility for NDOW to manage predators in non-lethal ways but still feels that there would be a large amount of management at 60% or even 70% but not at 80% if the bill passed. He feels that NDOW would like the additional flexibility, and this is his guess.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Jacob Thompson that he too feels that NDOW would not use the monies received properly and with removal of the law there would be even poorer predator management than what is in place currently. He stated he feels it should leave at its current state rather than take the risk of NDOW "managing it properly." He stated what is the reasoning for wanting to change it, is it expectation to see more improvement of predator management coming from it, why was this put in place to begin with, and do we have expectations of the Commission opposing it. He stated it would be great to trust NDOW with this decision, but he wants to trust and verify instead.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the Commission is opposing this already with additional

language to eliminate the amount of lethal and this is what he feels the reason the Commission is opposing it. He stated that has since amended and that language the Commission opposed was removed and he is uncertain at this time where this bill stands, he asked (*Brian Burris, member of the public*) if he knew.

- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He stated this bill had an amendment which was a draft amendment presented to the Assembly and passed but this draft bill created two sources of funding now becoming predator management or lethal predator management (lethal or non-lethal) whichever the management would be with option to split the funds between predator management or habitat improvement. He stated this concerns him due to his group having over half million impacts on habitat management this year. He wants clear understanding if he opts for predator management portion does this mean 80% lethal predator management fees or 100% lethal predator management fees or zero lethal and predator management fees. He stated he is unsure if it has reached the Senate floor at this time or not.is sitting at the Senate and he is unsure at what phase it is in.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion to oppose Senate Bill 90, Assembly Bill 355, Assembly Bill 70, Senate Bill 269 as currently written with recommendation to the Governor, that the following bills listed, if he will veto these bills.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised he will accept the motion but would like to have a separate vote on the predator management question.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he will accept board member Jacob Thompson friendly amendment regarding voting on the predator management which is Assembly Bill 70 apart from the other bills.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to accept Senate Bill 90, Assembly Bill 355, Senate Bill 269 as currently written with the recommendation to the Governor that the following bills listed, if he would veto these bills.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that he agree with the motion regarding Assembly Bill 355, to include removal of the primarily the shotgun.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he will include in the motion the CAB opposing of the shotgun portion of the semi-automatic weapon in Assembly Bill 355.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion to oppose Senate Bill 90, Assembly Bill 355 with the CAB opposing the portion of the semi automatic weapon and Senate Bill 269 as currently written with the recommendations to the Governor that the following bills listed, he would veto these bills.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds this motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced the vote for Assembly Bill 70 and asked board member Jacob Thompson since he wanted to vote on this separate from the previous bills if he had any additional comments on this.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised he did not he did not feel he was in opposition of this he simply needed more information on it and potential for flexibility for predator control.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion to accept Assembly Bill 70 as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-2**

- g. Wildlife Heritage Grants Manual (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about capping principal balance withdrawal for Heritage projects at 50% of the available balance per year.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon read the following: SUMMARY: the committee recommended “to cap principal projects at 50% of the amount of available funds per year”. He stated anything above five million dollars you can take 50% of it, this is the change. He stated that board member Jacob Thompson attended the Commission meeting and he stated he knows that the Commission supports this.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised that board member John Hiatt had in previous meeting on March 7, 2023, advised a motion to accept the Wildlife Heritage Grants Manual with the recommendation of not spending any of the principal.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Jacob Thompson that he did.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve the Wildlife Heritage Grants Manual as presented, with the recommendation that the Commission always be more conservative to strive to spend zero percentage of the principle.
 - **Motion passes 6-1.**

- h. Elk Damage Payment Exceeding \$10,000 (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve an Elk Damage Payment above \$10,000. An

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to accept Elk Damage Payment Exceeding \$10,000 for Granite Peak Ranch in White Pines County, totaling \$28,346 as presented.
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

- IX. Authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today’s meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at the May 5, 2023 & May 6, 2023, meeting (*For possible action*).**

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that he prepare and submit any recommendations from tonight’s meeting to the Wildlife Commission meeting on May 5, 2023 & May 6, 2023.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 7-0.**

X. The next CCABMW board meeting will be scheduled for June 20, 2023, in the Clark County Government Center (*Pueblo Room*) Address: 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155.

XI. 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