



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway (Pueblo Room)
Las Vegas, NV 89155
August 8, 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:

To access the meeting type in the following link:

https://www.clarkcountynv.gov/government/departments/environment_and_sustainability/ccabmw_meeting_11-11-2020.php

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

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device.

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 235 824 061 644

Passcode: qVoU8S

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

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 725-696-5982](tel:+17256965982),527537213# United States, Las Vegas

Phone Conference ID: 527 537 213#

NOTE:

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The CCABMW members may combine two (2) or more agenda items for its consideration.
- The CCABMW may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at anytime.
- No action may be taken on any matter not listed on the posted agenda.
- Please turn off or mute all cell phones and other electronic devices.
- Please take all private conversations outside the room.
- With a forty-eight (48) hour advance request, a sign language interpreter, or other reasonable efforts to assist and accommodate persons with physical disabilities, may be made available by calling (702) 455-3530, TDD at (702) 385-7486, or Relay Nevada toll- free at (800) 326-6868, TD/TDD
- Supporting material provided to CCABMW members for this meeting may be requested from Secretary Darlene Kretunski at (702) 455-1402 and is/will be available on the County’s website at www.clarkcountynv.gov.
- If you do not wish to attend the meeting in person but desire to provide written general public comment or public comment on an individual agenda item, please submit your comments prior to 2:30 p.m. August 8, 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 compiled into a document and shared with members of the public body, meeting attendees and on the public body’s website.

BOARD MEMBERS:

Paul Dixon (Chair)
Dan Gilbert Vice Chair
Jacob Thompson
Brian Patterson
John Hiatt
Dave Talaga
Alex Harper

SECRETARY:

Darlene Kretunski (702) 455-1402,
EMAIL: Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNV.gov
Department of Environment and Sustainability 4701 W.
Russell Road, Suite 200 2nd floor
Las Vegas, NV 89118

COUNTY LIAISON:

Marci Henson (702) 455-1608
EMAIL: Mhenson@ClarkCountyNV.gov
Department of Environment and Sustainability 4701
W. Russell Road, Suite 200 2nd floor
Las Vegas, NV 89118

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

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

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert ask Secretary Darlene Kretunski to do a roll call of board members present,
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski roll call (Present: Chair Paul Dixon, Vice Chair Dan Gilbert, Board member Dave Talaga, Board member Jacob Thompson, Board member Brian Patterson, Board member Dave Talaga) (Absent: Board member Alexander Harper).
- Board member John Hiatt advised that board member Alexander Harper was absent and in Alaska at this time.
- **A quorum was present with 6 board members.**

II. Pledge of Allegiance

- **Vice Chair Dan Gilbert led 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 item is hereby closed.**

IV. Approval of the Revised Minutes for May 2, 2023, CCABMW Meeting (*For possible action*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board comments: (None)
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to approve the revised meeting minutes for the CCABMW May 2, 2023, meeting.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

V. Approval of Minutes for June 20, 2023, CCABMW Meeting (*For possible action*)

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board Comments: (None)
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the CCABMW June 20, 2023, meeting.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

VI. Approval of the Agenda for August 8, 2023. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted. (*For possible action*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board Comments: (None)
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he had noticed that there were some emails going back and forth on the agenda and asked had this issue been rectified. He received no response therefore he moved on to ask for a vote on this item.
- Board member John Hiatt advised a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the CCABMW Agenda for August 8, 2023.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

VII. 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 asked each board member and the Chair if they had any announcements, correspondence received or sent or any item they would like to discuss at this time.
- Board member Dave Talaga (**None**)
- Board member John Hiatt (**Yes**): He stated he came across this information and thought it was interesting to share (Millennium Biomass) on the earth, he stated presently 98% humans and domestic animals. He stated animals of the wild from whales to golfers make up 2% of the millennium biomass and 60% of all the bird biomass consist of chicken and all other birds (Pigeons, turkeys, other sea birds) make up 40% and stated that every hour there are 6 million chickens slathered 365 days for the human need for chicken nuggets and other products that consist of chicken. He stated he feels that these numbers are surprising.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that this is his reasoning for simply eating pork.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member John Hiatt that there are 8 billion people on this planet, and this reflects the reasoning of why that these numbers he stated are very high.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to Chair Paul Dixon that this maybe true statement, but if we are stating that we are taking our wildlife seriously then we will have to spend effort to continue to have wildlife.
- **FYI- Biomass burning influences the climate system through direct emissions of aerosols, greenhouse gases, and chemically reactive gases.**
- Chair Paul Dixon (**Yes**) He advised that he received correspondence from a young lady who resides in the Spring Mountain area where access roads and easements are being completed and had concerns with wild horses and burros infringed upon due to these access roads and easements. He stated she was to speak in person but due to family emergency therefore he advised for her to speak at the CCABMW (Public Comments) next meeting on September 19, 2023. He stated the CAB would listen to her and decide if they would further her concerns to be agendized for the CCABMW November meeting.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to Chair Paul Dixon that his comment was noted. He asked Chair Dixon where exactly the location for this concern Spring Mountains or Cold Creek that he is speaking about.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the young lady was not specific with the location therefore he is under the assumption that the location is up in Cold Creek somewhere.
- Board member Brian Patterson (**Yes**) He stated that everyone is aware that there is concern with the fire on our border and

recommended that everyone continue to watch for upcoming updates. He stated he feels it will be very interesting to see a comeback from this area after ruins of 90,000 plus acres.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked board member Brian Patterson if that is the count of the acreages at this time.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that as of a day ago this is the number, he heard of therefore he would think that the totals have increased again to 95,000 to 100,000 acres.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he will reiterate again on the same subject matter of the legalization of the usage of the Blood Tracking Dogs in the state of Nevada. He stated he realizes that this item he is speaking about is agenda until the CCABMW next meeting on September 19, 2023. He stated that Nevada is just one of six states nationally that do not allow this control of regulated usage of licensed blood tracking dogs to retrieve wounded game in reference to the North American Model Wildlife Conservation and ethics that underline in the six portions of this model there is the belief of not wasting game especially after this game has been wounded or killed.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Jacob Thompson that at the Commission meeting (*Friday, June 23, 2023 & Saturday, June 24, 2023*) in Ely, Nevada, he stated he did bring this topic up to the Commission under CAB comments for the DWOL (*Department of Wildlife*) to return to under informational item at a minimum to the Commission and to the CAB about blood tracking dogs and the reasoning of why Nevada does not do this method. He stated he is under the assumption of possibility of discussion on this matter in Commission September meeting on (*Friday August 11, 2023 & Saturday, August 12, 2023*) in Fallon, and urged board member Dave Talaga that he could simply ask this question again to the Commission and stated that (*Chairman, Shane Rodgers*) would be in the audience could with the Commission have explanation on what direction this will proceed too, he reiterated again that it would be nice to have information presentation on this matter to give CAB a opportunity to decide from this information presented on how they will proceed going forward with this information.
- Board member Jacob Thomposon stated to Chair Paul Dixon that he assumes that this is technically illegal with the usage of a dog to retrieve game which could be conceived as hunting usage when dogs cannot be used to hunt mule deer in this state.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*) could give an answer to this question before we proceed, and stated if an individual was out and attempted usage of dogs for this purpose what would be liability for this individual.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW,*

Southern Region): He stated that there are laws in the state of Nevada that prohibit the usage of dogs for hunting purposes, therefore if a Game Warden makes contact of a individual in the field and talk with this individual and realize that this individual is not attempting to in the middle of the night to use dogs for this and it would be evident that this individual is using the dog to find wounded wildlife for prevention of wounded loss. He stated that the Game Warden will be understanding with the situation, but the real issue will be in units with larger numbers of sportsmen this could have the potential to take away from other sportsmen with the usage of dogs in the field. He stated as of this moment law enforcement does not have the authority to force this issue if they cannot prove that the individual is using the dogs for hunting. He stated he was recently in a meeting with law enforcement from Arizona and Utah and they have no issues with the dogs if the process is done responsibly. He stated if this prevents wounded loss of so much wildlife per year, he stated he feels at this point there is not enough information provided to law enforcement to have a definite stance on this subject matter.

- Board member Jacob Thompson reiterated again to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*) if this was “technically” still illegal.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it is illegal if law enforcement can prove that dogs are indeed being used for hunting. He stated the laws in the state of Nevada are specific pertaining to specific acts. He stated there is no law to state that an individual cannot have a dog in the field during open season, one cannot have a dog in the field with the purpose of hunting. He stated the question is if the individual is hunting the wounded loss or is he tracking wildlife.
- Board member John Hiatt asked board member Jacob Thompson if blood tracking dogs are leashed or unleashed running free.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that depends on the regulation of each state and in most states, there is requirement of the dogs being leashed.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he would concur this as well.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that if a dog is leashed then it will be very difficult to state that the dog is not “hunting”.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he agrees but advised there are no parameters giving specifics of if leash is required and if so, how long the leash needs to be and the distance of the collar before the dog is reeled back.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated the issue with this not being “technically” legal is the effect that it has on individuals who are licensed in other states who are not likely to come to the

state of Nevada due to the slim amount of a risk factors, leading to liabilities.

- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that if the unit was large or small with massive amount of traffic, he stated that law enforcement would receive numerous calls about individuals using dogs for tracking. He stated let us see what happens and deal with it as it arises but dealing clearly in the (*how, why, who, when*) aspects in the parameters of the leash.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised that this is for the highly regulated and only by licensed certified blood trackers.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he forwarded a large amount of information to the CAB pertaining (*Proposed Winecup Gamble Land Exchange*) at the Commission next meeting (Friday, August 11, 2023 & Saturday, August 12, 2023) in Fallon, NV that board member Dave Talaga will be attending and taking notes for a recap for the CAB but advised if the CAB would like to have a brief discussion on this matter they may do so, and advised that he forwarded the (*Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife*) letter and maps indicating the land transfers locations.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to Chair Paul Dixon that would be fine and stated that (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) has a massive amount of intel on this subject matter to share with us today and he hopes that he would share maybe the cliff notes on this with the CAB.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Beenett Jr, Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he would not call it a lot of information it is simply just some correspondence from the Western Land Group and NDOW regarding implications of the largest land transfer ever for Area 7 effecting the Elk Incentive Program with this property being checkerboarded with almost 1 million acres therefore with the checkerboard into one particular area effecting access, reiterating Elk incentive tags as well as effecting, if individual owns small portion of land within this area, this individual will not have to provide road access. He stated he will not infer on how NDOW or the Western Land Group will attempt to give interpretation to this informational item at the meeting this weekend, but he feels there will be proposal to calibrating aspects not a net 1 to 1 transfer but with loss. He stated he is unaware of what the exact percentage would be of the net loss. He stated there are implications and advised in some of the correspondence he has read it will be privy to the NEPA (*National Environmental Policy Act*). He stated more to come and stated the correspondence he received did not render much detail thus leading directly to a Congressional action therefore action taken will be done at Congressional level. He stated everyone should stay tuned and more information will be unveiled this weekend.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that this is knowing after the fact.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that this is simply an informational matter at this time, and it has not even made it to any form of a process to his knowledge.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that he understands that it is going through Congressional action at this time.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that this is simply being proposed a vote is still needed is his understanding of this matter. He stated there is still input being made and he feels the Commission still would like an opportunity to take their stance on this informational item in the September meeting (*September 22 & September 23, 2023*). He reiterated it is still Congressional process and will not happen overnight.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he fears that this will go through Congressional state without giving members of the public and others who live in this state, a chance to voice their opinions before going to the floor of Congress.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he does not feel this will happen quickly before members of the public and others can voice their opinion.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated from what he understands in this, is NDOW seems to want to be primary catalyst and is doing this, for ability to capture this land which has great riparian habitat.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that NDOW had a joint summer habitat meeting with powers that be and stated that NDOW is simply not going to be the catalyst of the reasoning of why this is driven. He stated the net loss and implications on NDOW's ability that this will have on NDOW to manage the lands, lots of nuance and he reiterated that NDOW is not the catalyst.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) who is the other entity that initiated this along with NDOW.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that the group is called Western Land Group.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to both Vice Chair Dan Gilbert and (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that if this is a Congressional action unless Congress specifically request NEPA (*National Environmental Policy Act*) then Congress is not subject to it.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern*

Region): He stated he will learn through this process and through reading on this matter.

- Board member John Hiatt stated to both Vice Chair and (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that Congress can require NEPA (*National Environmental Policy Act*) through Congressional action but if Congress does not require then it does not happen.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that is what NDOW was proposing through the correspondence, and stated he is no expert on this subject matter but what he has stated is his understanding on this matter at this time.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that he feels that the motivation from this matter is making this land into a reserve and asked if (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if he had any comments on this statement.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that he too had heard this and stated there is large transmission line going through this area and it can be removed to make it an industrialized renewable energy, but he stated it could be used for various amounts of things. He stated he feels the thought process on this is it is easiest to manage one land mass oppose to being checkerboarded nightmare like what is seen on Interstate 80. He stated he is unaware what the outcome will be on this, he stated he has heard many ideas on this from cow grazing to industrialized.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if what he knows is the thin end of the wedge coming to began action to take the land is that a correct perception.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated his interpretation is this is the beginning the proposal process which has been in motion for a few years and is now reaching Congressional status.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that yet, everyone is just hearing about this. He stated he recently heard about this just 4 weeks ago.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that the timing is coincile with it being an informational item at the Commission level and with this happening quickly.
- Board member John Hiatt asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) who owns the private sector of the checkerboard at this time, the Winecup or water banking which is now Nevada Natural Resources are basically the company who owns mineral and water.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern*

Region): He stated to board member John Hiatt that there is multiple landowners on this but Winecup is the largest owner in this, the remaining is end holding, surrounded by checkerboard who may own smaller portions. He stated he thinks it is roughly 928,000 acres at this moment and advised he would have to look at this map.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) if this goes through is NDOW in complete control or does this control go to the BLM.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated well if this is private ground.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that he is referring to the Winecup and after this swap is completed who will get to have this control.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated this will be federal land because federal land management agency will be swapping this land.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that most times NDOW, and other entities the management controls of that property.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that NDOW will manage the state resources, but it will still have to go through the government process.
- Board member Brian Patterson that this is still a large portion of private dirt.
- Board member John Hiatt they are proposing 3 to 1 ratio.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member John Hiatt yes, they are receiving a lot for this.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member John Hiatt that is asking then they come down.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that one never knows the friends they may need to have in members of Congress.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to board member Brian Patterson
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he would like to encourage everyone to listen to the presentation on Friday August 11, 2023, at the Commission meeting on this agendized item giving a lot more insight giving more details on the direction that they intend to proceed with.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that he feels the other he feels that it is going through NDOW and then Commission level with NDOW being privy and he feels it should be going through other committees in the state of Nevada to be able to do this.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated Elko County Commission, just recently had a

meeting on this, with this going through the process with different entities. He stated he is not privy on all the information that it is being presented on.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that he is the most knowledgeable person on these matters.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he will do his best.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that technically land exchanges between BLM and private property owners are not subject to many of the state regulations this is mostly Congressional actions.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised if one asks former Senator Harry Reid, he had stated that Las Vegas grew, with many land transfers that happen federally. He stated in previous; nobody knew much information on this but to have it finally agendized at the next Commission meeting (*Friday August 11, 2023 & Saturday August 12, 2023*) on informational discussion is a real big accomplishment. He stated in previous when this subject matter was brought up by member of another CAB Chair, he clearly felt that nobody had any knowledge on this and did not know what was happening on this. He stated it is wonderful to know that there will be information to work.
- **Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this item is hereby closed.**

VIII. Recap of the June 23, 2023 & June 24, 2023, Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting by Chair Paul Dixon: (*Informational*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon to please share all the vast knowledge that he received from the meeting with us.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised (*Resident and Nonresident Landowner Wild Turkey Hunts*) He advised there was discussion from NDOW on turkey hunts in Paradise Valley and unlimited tags. He stated the Commisison decided that the current action from NDOW on this was to stay in place and will not be taking any further action. He stated the system that is working is only applied to Paradise Valley and to continue the current action until they need to make any additional changes.
- **FYI (*Resident and Nonresident Landowner Wild Turkey Hunt*) (2023)** Resident Tags Issued= (220) & Non-Resident= (27); Total Tags Issued = (49); Total Tags Returned = (24) which equals 49%; Success= (14) which equals 58%; Effort Hunter Days= (56); Toms= (12); Jakes = (2); Beard Length = (7.4)
- Chair Paul Dixon advised (**Fiscal Year 2024 County Advisory Board Budget Requests**) He stated that the budget requests for all advisory boards were approved.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised (**Heritage Project Extension Request, Funding**

Reallocation, Completion Reports) He advised that all the extension requests and funding reallocations were approved, and he stated there were not a large amount of funds to be reallocated. He stated example: that at one point there was a reallocation of \$36.00 dollars.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised (**Wildlife Heritage Proposals Submitted for FY 2024 Funding**) He advised all were approved down the line after review.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised (**Commission Regulation 23-10, Amendment #1, 2024 Heritage Tag Vendors**) He advised that all were approved based on the recommended vendors with a discussion on whether to have a tag sold at a national meeting or local meeting, this was a concern of group called Pershing County Chukars in which they always had antelope tag and now this tag is being sold elsewhere. He stated point from this is that the larger meetings received factor three more in fund for tags, more funds than Pershing County, even though Pershing County brought in substantial amount of funds as well. The determination was to stay with the larger banquets which bring larger crowds because it tends to give more money and if individuals want (*elk, antelope, deer, bighorn sheep*) tag, these individuals are not going to care whether it is larger meeting or smaller meeting, they are only concern with whichever is best availability and with the smaller meetings being cheaper. In trying to always raise as much funds as possible for Heritage Tags the bottom line was staying with the larger organizations to achieve as much money as possible.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised (**NDOW Small Game Release Plan for Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025**) He stated this was approved.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised (**Fiscal Year 2024-Duck Stamp Funding Requests**) He stated there was a question that was asked how to use the grazing fees, and if the ranchers are paying for fencing issues. He advised that he was told that the grazing fees are being used for private fencing on Carson Lake and Pasture Infrastructure Improvements and the Western Complex WMA Water Control Repair.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that (**Fiscal Year 2024 Upland Game Bird Stamp Funding Requests**) was approved.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that (**Commission Regulation 22-12 Amendment #1, Small Game Season Changes for the 2023-2024 season**) was approved with no changes. He stated there was a field trip to the new NDOW office located at Blue Diamond Ranches drove up to Success Loop and the property that was acquired with the new office, and next drove to Comins Lake and viewed all the hard work that was done to put this lake back together. He stated there were large number of individuals who were fishing, and the next stop was at Cade Lake which is almost drained and viewed the new dam being built there. He stated he was unsure how NDOW could own the dam but not the Lake after having to replace the dam. He stated it was interesting to see Cade Lake dry and he viewed 55-gallon large drums in the bottom of Cade Lake which had holes in the drums, and he stated that nobody could explain what exactly is in these drums.
- Board Comments: (None)
- Public Comments: (None)
- **Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this item is hereby closed.**

IX. General Business/Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners August 11, 2023 & August 12, 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/.

a. **Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, Third Reading (*For possible action*)**. The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Policy 23-Predation Management.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that there seems to be redactions and added language regarding the predator management fee and stated that there is also action item (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that on this action item the direction that is requested on this is not basing the discussion on Assembly Bill 70 and the language, it is discussion on how to implement Assembly Bill 70 which states when applying for tag the individual is given two options (*lethal predator management or wildlife habitat restoration, or non-lethal*) and he asked Secretary Darlene Kretunski for clarification on this as well.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski stated yes, and this is with the current vendor Gordon Darby.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if action item (a) is with action item (c) or are they separate from each other. He stated item (c) states about predators.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski stated that this is discussion about the law for Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee and the current vendor and how they are going to address the application options and not about the language for Assembly Bill 70 with NDOW as Chair Paul Dixon stated.
- Chair Paul Dixon explained that when there is an applicant the cost for developing and implementing an annual program for the lethal removal of predatory wildlife and improvement of wildlife habitats and research or management activities beneficial to non predatory game species therefore this is all there is in regard to predator management fee when applicant sends in their application. He stated he feels a plan should be for either applicant wants their predator fee of \$3.00 dollars spend on removal or improvement of the wildlife or management activities that are beneficial to non predatory game species.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that would be action item (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked if the CAB would like to combine action items (a) and (c). Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to the CAB if they do not combine both action items then action item (a) Commission Policy 23-Predation Management the old language will just be discussed and stated the reason we are having this discussion is simply for item (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee therefore he stated the CAB might as well just jump into this discussion.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated for the purpose of this discussion he feels both action items should be combined.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to have a motion to be made to do this combination.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated a motion to combine action items (a) Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, Third Reading & (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee into one item for action.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated now this motion has been capsulized as a vehicle to decide on the placement of where the desired location will be for the management fees.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked the question of the fees being there when the applicant makes purchases.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member Jacob Thompson that is is when you apply.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked the question does all of this occur online. He stated he does his application online and asked if this is the same for everyone else.
- Brian Patterson stated it is all done online now.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated he thinks it is all done online.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised that he feels there should be check the box option for the applicant to simply check lethal predator management or wildlife habitat management.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised to board member Jacob Thompson that these discussions with the same thought process have been done by NDOW recently that he stated of giving check the box option is what is being discussed at this time by NDOW or something somewhat similar in language.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he feels this is easy button, he feels.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he is all for giving choices.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he feels that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert has captured it well and stated that (a) Commission Policy 23-Predation Management states what is going to be done and (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predator Fee, both should be implemented electronically by giving two box method checking either option that the applicant would like. He stated it should be kept simple and not make this complicated by giving applicant the ability to divide where they would like their funds to go, not giving the example (30% to this option and the remaining to the other

option). He stated it should be straight forward for applicant simply checking one box only, if this is an issue later down the line then at that time additional changes can be adapted if needed then we can do that, he stated this would be my recommendation.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that there could also be a deep pulse setting going to the normal area on the applicant of where it has been going but if the applicant elects not to choose these options, then it will send them to somewhere else where the optional default is needed to get to this area.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that if most applicants are applying for multiple tags if the applicant chooses each option, then this will take care of situation that Chair Paul Dixon advised he did not want of applicants choosing proportional amounts on each application to spread around their predatory fees.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Brian Patterson that he is under the assumption that many of these applicants are technically savvy with their computer skills, but most are not. He stated he agreed with board member Brian Patterson's comment about paying multiple fees as many applicants do depending on the number of species these applicants are applying for.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he applies for about 9 tags with a fee of \$27.00 dollars with an additional \$1.00 dollar for each application labeled "convenience fee". He stated this "convenience fee should be thrown out because there is no convenience fee for being online and there is no other option.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson that he could as well go to NDOW's office with his computer and complete the application.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that this would be inconvenient. He stated he has another thought of having a third box which states no preference thus allowing either the state or the agency the opportunity to decide which option they want for the Predatory fee.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member Jacob Thompson that at this point the \$3.00 fee is a Predator Management fee and if they set the default setting it will automatically go to the Predator Management fee.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked a question to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert giving example if members of the public decide that they want \$100 dollars to go toward the Predation Management, but NDOW feels that the cost in total will be \$1,000 dollars for effective Predation Management, who exactly is making up the difference of \$990.00 dollars for this infected Predation Management for that year.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga that he did not understand the premise of his question.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that he feels what board member Dave Talaga intent to convey in his line of questioning is what happens when choosing the options, if they receive more for one option than the other, he stated that each amount given will align with the totals that the applicants wanted as their options and they will be working within the compounds of the budget for each box that is checked by the applicants. He stated he is unaware of what the outcome will be due to it being the first year, but he reiterated again that NDOW's budget will align with what the amount of funding of the options received. He stated if there is an assortment of projects there cannot be a assumption that just

one option will cover this project.

- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that he was trying to see who is covering this.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to board member Dave Talaga that he understands his question now.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that there was some language either in the bill itself (*Assembly Bill 70*) or it might have been the supporting material given that stated to improve habitat for non predatory animals. He stated this makes no sense and stated habitat is habitat and predatory animals go with prey on other animals therefore it makes no sense. He stated he is mystified of why this language would be submitted into this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that this is done by state legislature because they feel it is a difference and this is how the bill was written therefore it doesn't have to make sense. He stated that the CAB is not going to change the language of the bill but thinks that could be broaden in the language to state "for habitat improvement for all species". He stated he doesn't understand how this could only apply for non predatory animals. He feels the word non predatory made some individual in the legislator happy with the usage of this word.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): She stated she would like clarification on the \$3.00 predator fee, and there was a change made to the state statute for individuals applying for tags can make the choice of what they want the fee to be applied to, and wanted to know if this fee the same fee that was mandated by the previous law that has been in effect for she is unaware of the number of years, is this the same law stating that there must be usage of 80% lethal.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated yes.
- Public Comments: (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*): She asked is Assembly Bill 70 an attempt to bring familiarity to the effect of the 80 % lethal meaning introducing individual applying for these tags to have individuals a way so that they may can state that they do not want their \$3.00-dollar predatory fees going to mandatory lethal. She asked what the intent for this is. She stated that she realizes that she should be more informed on this matter, but she is not. She asked what the intent of Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee is about exactly.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that he is attempting to get away from this dialogue and would bring (*Therese Campbell, member of the public*) her question up for discussion momentarily.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He stated that he agrees with Vice Chair Dan Gilbert in the fee has been long standing issue for hunters who must pay this for predators and game. He stated his choice is for a box to either opt in or opt out He stated that his organization recently did public WMA (*Wildlife Management Area*) in which the focus was heavily done on predators, and he stated he feels his choice would be opt in or opt out of the conservation piece, and if not the continuation of predator management should be kept as it has previously been done, hunters have that option. He stated hunter management is a very important piece of our conservation model. He recently stated his conservation group worked with the conservation group Meadow Vally Limited to build a greenhouse. He stated since we are doing this and we are reducing the funds in the Predator Management funds, then we are taking steps backwards. He stated he would like a primary as a default then

the applicant could opt to a conservation links.

- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*): He stated he likes having a choice to opt to put toward predation fee or opt toward habitat, and stated he likes the dialogue in which it states that it will go toward non predatory per habitat, this is why we had the 80% predator rule in predator fee using this for studies on coyotes and he feels unsure of how effective this is and if we are already going to have habitat projects with these studies he would prefer that these studies focus based off big game and he is unsure how effective the study is of predators.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated he had a question and advised he does not see a definition of what exactly a predator is. He gave example on how some birds hunt different things, such as insects, mice, rabbits, and some birds prey on another bird's nest. He asked the question if these birds are indeed predators and what type of predators are being looked at exactly.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Bob Bobbett, member of the public*) that he would take his question under advisement and discuss it momentarily.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She stated she wanted more information on habitat choice and wanted input on exactly what it means, and if someone chooses death what exactly does this mean.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that her question will be answered momentarily.
- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated 86,000 applicants put in for big game tag applications, the average is three applications for one applicant which equals \$9.00 and equals almost \$750,000 dollars generated. He stated he would like a third box and advised he felt that NDOW should be responsible for the entire study on Predation study on this. He stated this third box could just have the entire amount go to habitat. He stated if he chose habitat, he would like the entire amount of whatever he checked will go to that option. He stated 100 percent going to either Predation or Habitat Management or the third box option. He stated he would like to see clarification on this so it can be clear understanding. He stated \$750,000 with just him being the many that put in, and he stated the average is 1.6 million from the application fee of \$3.00 times six if it is put toward six species. He stated that is a large amount of money that NDOW will receive, and he would like to see where the funds are allocated and have this open to the public. He reiterated his choices he feels should be the following: Predation, Habitat, or third box.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he wanted to answer the previous questions asked by members of the public. He stated the Predator Management fee, is part of a \$10.00 fee that is associated with applying for a tag of a species individually and \$3.00 dollars is spent and carved out to be specifically allotted toward the predation management fee, he stated the Pittman-Robertson funds to be able to go into this and given the option to be able to use this for something other than predator management. He stated the definition of predator to define it is protection of native ungulate species.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to (*Bob Bobbitt, member of the public*) that the definition of predator is animals that kill animals that we care about basically. He stated example: birds who kill other birds that we do not worry about that is not a listed in supporting material as predators.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked board member John Hiatt about ravens because he stated the ravens do kill other birds.

- Board member John Hiatt advised ravens are predators and they are killing birds that we care about such as sage grouse therefore they are predators.
- Board member Dave Talaga he would like to read the definition provided to the CAB, if it is so desired.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that he did not have a problem and he stated to board member Dave Talaga, please do.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised the definition of predators is located on the last page and asked to read the definition: FYI- Can be found in supporting material under Commission Policy Number 23; Definitions: (*Any wild animal species subsisting, wholly or in part, on other living animals captured through its own efforts*).
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that the definition was spot on.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that all predators are happy to eat animals that someone else captured as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that since the CAB combined both action items (a) Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, Third Reading and (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee and we are having discussion on (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee and now the CAB needs to discuss in (a) Commission Policy 23-Predation Management which will be approved by the Commission, he stated it will be adopted this time for sure.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to Chair Paul Dixon that it seems to be addition of language added on **NRS 502.253 (1): Page 1**/Amended Date: there is added language (*improvement of wildlife habitat, and research or management efforts*) combining the predator management fee. **Page 2**/ added language (a fee of \$3 is charged for processing each application for a game tag to be used by the Department, at the direction of the applicant, developing and implementing an annual program for: (a) lethal removal of predatory wildlife (b) improvement of wildlife habitat and research or management activities beneficial to nonpredatory game species. He stated the previous language (a) through (d) has been redacted. He stated to go to the point of (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region) when he stated it has yet to be decided the vehicle or implementation on which these options will be displayed on the application. He stated this language was added to give gateway to have applicant's options of their choice.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he should ask either (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region or Erin Woods, Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*) why is this statement advising management activities beneficial to non predatory game species. He stated he is not understanding the non predatory portion.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that this is the third reading of Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, and the language coincides with the language in Assembly Bill 70. He stated there will be two options for the either predatory fee or non-predatory fee.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that he will read the definition given for **Nonpredatory Game Animals**- *For the purposes of this policy includes mule deer, pronghorn antelope, bighorn sheep, Rocky Mountain elk, mountain goat, moose, upland game birds, upland game mammals, and migratory game birds.* He stated that this is umbrella for these specific species.

- Board member John Hiatt stated the definition makes no sense and stated if there is a water development being placed somewhere and the predators drink out of this water development. He stated in no shape or form do we have a specific water development that is solely for predatory animals to drink out of.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised he would like to go back to the comment made by *(Ron Stoker, member of the public)* that if you are doing elk habitat then this is targeted for elks, but obviously other animals will also enjoy things that are benefit and targeted for the elk. He stated from this study of the elk habitat one should be able to see the influx of predatory animals as well that are needed to be managed therefore, he stated this will become the secondary management plan for the elk habitat restoration. He asked *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* if this is how NDOW will be approaching this matter.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that each situation is unique therefore as the realization becomes inevitable that they need to be managed and when there is excessive predation then you will manage the situation appropriately.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* that for the purpose of clarity, this will have soft boundaries in the beginning, and he reiterated that if you are having wildlife management for certain species, other species including predatory species will benefit from this wildlife management set for a particular species. He stated it is up to NDOW at that point to enhance their plan to give coverage for the predators that would thrive as a result from their habitat plan in place. He stated that this could not work any other way.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that this is interesting that you stated plans because NDOW manages holistically at the influx of being affected and stated that at any given area NDOW would have a prescription for that area.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* that the issue with Assembly Bill 70 is, he gave example: (if NDOW receives \$80,000 dollars and all the money will be going to habitat restoration or improvement, then NDOW will have to come up with a plan for this amount of money.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated he understands now what board member Dave Talaga is asking now, he stated it is his interpretation that this will work in a similar fashion which might be NDOW's Wildlife Heritage Trust Account or Habitat Conservation where there is a pot of money and has sideboards with proposed projects that fit the statewide criteria and that are under the umbrella and then match the funds to allocate for those projects. He stated this was done for Upland Game Bird and Waterfowl.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: to correct him if he is incorrect but in years past, that the funds were not all exhausted.
- Public Comments: *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)*: He stated that a balance rolls over yearly.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* that he understands that is correct but asked if it had not been exceeded or exhausted it, correct.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated it is not like the Heritage fund, there are certain allocations. He stated for the Predation Management Plan a certain amount is given for staff time, and allocation individuals are 80% mandate for lethal removal, and then you have the other funds. He stated he would like to make correction and advise that lethal removal is not available for Pittman-Robertson match therefore convoluting things. He stated one would have the other percentage for study or different project which might be eligible for Pittman-Robertson match which would expand available funding. He stated he will need to go back and review the plan due to it specifically giving mention to funding sources for each project and what is Pittman -Robertson eligible versus what is not eligible.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) the question about his statement that Pittman -Robertson funds cannot be used but he understands things differently and give the example that if a individual wrote a study plan and this plan had a baseline set, and went in with the study plan and this plan is carried out with the lethal removal and do follow up of this study plan with results on impact against the baseline then this is eligible. He stated this would require a significant number of staff, effort, time to put together this multiple year plan. He reiterated baseline, removal, follow up on impact therefore this would be a 5-to-7-year study.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that portions of what Chair Paul Dixon stated would be eligible but not for lethal removal.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated the biggest question that he has is without NDOW having knowledge of which way this will go, does NDOW have a plan in place in case there is a substantial reduction in potential funding or budget management.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised that he is aware of the vast amount of discussion and obviously NDOW will simply have to adopt. He gave examples of percentage wise 60/40 70/30, he stated he is throwing random numbers out there for this example.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) what if there is 100/ 0 and in favor of prediction.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member John Hiatt well it is not.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) what if there is a a major shortage how does NDOW make this up.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated or there is a big surplus with not enough project to use all the money.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that NDOW can only use the money they have, and this money is not projected forward therefore each year on the Predation Management Plan that is the money that they already have is being spent. He stated to board member Dave Talaga that there is no way that there would be a situation in which NDOW planned to do a project and now there are not enough funds because everything is all planned out with the Predation Management Plan with the funds.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that he thought that there were funds and when there is a needed project then they get the funds from the money but if the need is not sufficient.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated if this is the case then it could use the example of your own household and keeping food on the table it is the same thing.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that he is concerned with predator management and it is mandated at 80% and gave the example: if there is 1 million dollars yearly and have 800,000 dollars for Predator Management and stating to give the public a choice and the public states that they want the million to go to not the predator management, but there is a predator problem therefore where does the money come from.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it doesn't happen.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that is a problem, and stated this is the achilles heel of this potential legislation, is that it has not been thought through. He stated therefore handcuffing NDOW to do their job, is his concern.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that the public will speak on this and the majority of the public who are spending the money will see what their desires are and these desires are two options: habitat or predators.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Brian Patterson that wildlife management cannot be based on whimsical.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that it is already done like this now.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Brian Patterson that he doesn't think you should, perhaps you could try.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga it is already done like this, supply, and demand, based on how many animals are available and how many tags can we add on.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member Brian Patterson that that is different issue all together.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Dave Talaga he stated that he is questioning what if 100 percent goes to habitat, he advised that he understands that awhile ago the rules were changed in the handling of the Heritage funds. He stated that Heritage funds can be used for lethal removal and stated he remembered when the funds had been used for payment of the killing of mountain lions. He stated he remembers the payment amount of being \$2,500 per lion by putting in language which allowed the ability to use Heritage funds for lethal animal removal. He gave example: if everyone sitting to the left in tonight's meeting made a decision to place all the funds into habitat, and stated he found this example highly unlikely but if so there is an option that if there is desire to do lethal predator removal they could with the Heritage funds in which they could always use.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to Chair Paul Dixon that is alright because atleast there is a balance in what he refers to as a shortfall.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated there are different types of funding available, but he suspects it would not be the percentage ratio that board member Dave Talaga has given. He stated that the language did change if everyone read the Assmebly Bill 70 in which this bill has everything to do with social process, specifically stating lethal removal versus habitat management and this language change was advocated for.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*)

that at this time there is \$3.00 fee going directly to Predator Management, 80 percent going to lethal removal and the remaining 20 percent going to other non-lethal and at this point a drop is inevitable, therefore removing the funding from the bucket therefore he wants to know from this it is statistically assured to be reduction in funding therefore at this time, NDOW has no means to be able to adjust fire to control predators. He stated if there is a picking and choosing segment with the numbers in which they must decide between different species, would like to know what is NDOW's Plan B.

- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated until the numbers come out this is speculative.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he feels this is purely speculative and the numbers can have example: (100 percent going to lethal as well as 80 percent). He feels it is premature to get excited and worked up about this.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member John Hiatt that he feels that this is not being premature about this issue because he reiterated that it is inevitable that a drop is going to happen.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that this is not a random set population who are buying hunting tags.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert to just let the public speak.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that the original reasoning for setting the 80 percent, was the argument that the hunters wanted most of their application fees to be used toward lethal predator management which seemed to be popular.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he would not be surprised if the ratio was 80/20.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that is fine but that is not how you plan.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the planning happens after the money is in place.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he would like to explain it differently, he gave the example: (X is in place to do Predator Management and M is now in place as well but unfortunately M is less than X therefore how do we deal with the difference.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated this is called risk management. He stated a definitive risk that there could be a significant drop in predator management, therefore where is the difference coming from.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member Dave Talaga this is what he was attempting to say.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that bigger the risk if we are calling it that is there is not as many tags available for purchase therefore causing the funding to go down. He stated this has been happening for years.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised to board member John Hiatt that this is a different issue.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member John Hiatt that there has been increase in applications, purely driven by applications and nothing to do with tag allotments. He stated it is increasing the funding, but he fears how does it get adjusted if needed. He stated we have a predator management in place now which is

allowing the decline of the mule deer population and we are doing less to provide the ability to keep the mule deer on the landscape, therefore what is the Plan B. He stated as far as allowing the public to have more freedoms in choosing he has no problem with that. He stated he wants to do everything to make sure that the species that are part of the wildlife can prosper as much as they can.

- Board member John Hiatt spoke on this prior to making a motion, that under Commission Policy 23: Definitions Page 4 (Resident NRS 502.015, a person is a resident of the State of Nevada if they are a United States citizen who has maintained his or her principal and permanent residence in Nevada for six months **next** preceding the application and has not purchased or applied for any resident hunting, fishing, or trapping privileges in another state, country, or province). He stated he feels the word next should be removed, he felt it was simply confusing the sentence meaning.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to recommend adoption of Commission Policy 23- Predation Management and recommend that NBWC utilize a two-box option and the application fee requiring the applicants to allocate their fees to either lethal predator management, or wildlife habitat and research or management efforts.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert would like to add friendly amendment that anything that is adopted on this is coupled with a secondary plan by NDOW to ensure continuation of proper management for predators, secondly there should be defaulted to give applicants the option the one box option instead of having to check the box options.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that the amendment he just referred to as friendly amendment was not with respect to him due to it being a different recommendation and proposal altogether. He stated that his motion he proposed is on the table and he can second it or not and it can be voted for or against. If his motion is defeated, then they can come up with another motion in its place.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to both board member Jacob Thompson and Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that they could choose as well to simply continue to have a discussion on this matter instead.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he would like to bring up his recommendation and asked board member Brian Patterson if he had any additional comments.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he felt that the two boxes in his view are plenty. He stated either lethal control or habitat improvement and he stated as he said earlier let the public decide. He stated the public will see with their checkbook and advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if he is worried about tipping the balance to prevent NDOW from having the ability to manage the predator, he feels this is unfounded. He stated unless the non-consumptive users come to the table and reach into their pocketbooks as well, which these individuals have never done before and begin to apply for tags, and if they do not then these individuals will not receive a tag and this is the only way it will tip the balance, ensuring more funds coming into play for habitat restoration versus predator removal, then it will not happen.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that everything is in great shape.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated exactly, he stated it is win-win in getting the even balance on both sides, and reiterated that the non-consumptive user will not be coming to the table on this therefore this argument can be forgotten and advised to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that everything is as it always is and conservationist meaning

the hunters who come to the table with their pocketbook and this will pay for everything. He reiterated that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert does not have to worry about the scale being tipped in one direction and NDOW will continue to have their funding to complete predator management. He stated that most of the applicants will pick predator management and he felt that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert should just let it play out for one year and he will see this.

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that the predator application numbers will most likely increase.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised when Predator Management fees are done the only thing the applicants are paying predator management fees other than ungulates are turkeys. He stated to board member Brian Patterson's statement that there may be individuals that blame the habitat improvements on turkeys rather than the predators therefore he gave the example: if the applicant is doing (elk, antelope, deer, bighorn sheep, rocky mountain bighorn, california bighorn sheep, turkey) if the applicant states they want to do predator removal for six and habitat for the last one then there is no need for extra boxes. He stated the individuals who are applying for he feels will see greater than 80 percent for lethal, most people are upset that there is still 20 percent remaining. He stated the public wants will be discovered after this, he feels that the majority want lethal removal and only small amount for nonlethal. He stated the law will be revisited in three or more years. He stated NDOW in past use to decide all this then next it was decided it was a need to mandate this. He stated if it comes out more than 80 percent for lethal then NDOW will have a heavy lift for themselves.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked a few individuals who were in the meeting who apply for tags what their decision would be if they are comfortable in speaking about it. Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised he would do 100 percent lethal, board member Brian Patterson stated he would mix it up, board member John Hiatt no response, board member Dave Talaga stated he would like to pick the third option and advised his reasoning. He stated he felt board member Jacob Thompson sampling was off.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that he said beforehand that it was not scientific.
- Board member Dave Talaga continued with his reasoning he stated the group here are indeed highly educated and well-informed conservationist and stated most everyone wanted the two boxes, but Vice Chair Dan Gilbert wanted the third box, and the third box was based on speculation with no proof and ability to show proof basing it on experiment of what will happen when this is up to the public choosing. He stated the public is being forced with the two boxes he advised to give a third choice: 1) Predator 2) Habitat Restoration 3) I do not care, by doing so this represents a much vaster statistical representation.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked the question where the third box of (I do not care) go.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised where NDOW would like it to go. He stated that he felt that two boxes covered this perfectly well.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated that he did not feel so confident with two boxes only.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that there have been numerous people who previously applied for tags and there is data that can be used to determine the amount

that went toward both options.

- Board member Dave Talaga advised that this is really coming down to being just an experiment.
- Chair Paul Dixon advise to board member Dave Talaga that it is an experiment but would like board member Talaga to remember if it turns out to be wildly miscalcuation there will be a course correction in 2024. He stated that NDOW will come back with a new recommendation implementation, and either it will work or not work. He stated that he feels if NDOW sees 100 percent to lethal or whether it be 100 percent for management, NDOW will simply state that “no that is not going to work”, NDOW would be happier with 60 to 70 percent for lethal range, and somewhere between 30 to 40 percent non-lethal making it easier and wiser way to spend the money for NDOW. He stated at this moment hard work is put into finding 80 percent lethal expenditures for the funding available. He stated that he agrees with board member Dave Talaga with the third box of I do not care, but going back to board member Brian Patterson who stated that he would do a mixture, if the applicant applies for multiple tags, this is the ability to have the same method of stating the third box of I do not care due to the applicant having multiple box options to choose where they would like their fees to go toward.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to Chair Paul Dixon that the applicant is giving the opportunity to select a third box.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he does not feel that selecting the third box option helps anyone exactly. He stated you want the applicant to state if they feel predators are the issue or habitat or other conditions are the issue and where should these funds be spent, regards of what tag they are applying for and regardless of species.
- gives applicant a choice or is helpful by them checking the two-box option it gives reasoning of what the public feels of either they agree that it is predator or habitat that is the issue and letting us know where the applicant feels the money should be spent. He stated there is not much discussion on predation on antelope but there is lots of discussion on species such as deer and elk and other species. He stated maybe we should do more for the antelope to where there are bird areas and do things to repair areas to help bring back the antelopes in these areas.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that this comes down to being a two-question poll for the hunters.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that they find out if this two-question poll works.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Dave Talaga that if the poll came back 51 to 49 ratio, staing 51 percent predator management, then he stated to board member Dave Talaga you will be upset, because it is not a 100 percent.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised that he is making this into a poll and not a good tool for NDOW that would be good tool and there is risk associated with this as well.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised to board member Dave Talaga that he hears his point but does not feel it is valid.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that he feels that the public is being underestimated the interest and sophistication of these applicants who are purchasing these tags and feels with the third box very few people would consider checking a box stating (I do not care).
- Board member Dave Talaga stated to board member John Hiatt that he doesn’t know that for certain.

- Board member John Hiatt advised that does not know that the sun will come out tomorrow, but he is pretty sure it will.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised that he does not feel the third box option (I do not care) is good option.
- Board member Dave Talaga advised if the CAB wants to call it a two-question poll, then he is fine with that, he stated he thinks by doing so it is not giving the issue at hand the proper potential needed.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this is system in place that will significantly change 33 percent of its funding levels which is designed to control the predators and is one of the greatest impacts to the population of ungulates in this state. He stated the predator take is substantial each year therefore to have ability to shift away from that in very significant way meaning the 33 percent (funding levels) without having the exact amount, since that is not possible until it happens. He stated using board member Brian Patterson as example, he is well educated, and he is moving in the direction of choosing multiple options for all his applications, therefore showing that there will be indeed a difference based upon this as example in funding levels if they want to control the predators as they have been going. He stated he does not care whether it is one or two boxes still would like to have the default setting to go to where it is currently, and if the applicant would like to check box to go toward habitat situation its alright, and stated that he really needs to have NDOW prepare today for a Plan B. He stated then as Chair Paul Dixon stated there can be course correction in 2024 if needed, NDOW will have a Plan B already implemented to show in 2023 so that NDOW has anticipated this and has a Plan B to show this is what will happen moving forward. He stated we need to be the best stewards of the native ungulates' species in the state.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that a third box could be used, to choose the fees to go toward BLM wild horses and burros therefore really doing something for habitat and ungulates especially in the state.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to board member Jacob Thompson that he is willing to remove the number of boxes down to two options as previously stated and ask simply for NDOW to prepare a Plan B to administer in case of reduction in funding and asked would this now be considered a friendly amendment.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he does not know how Vice Chair Dan Gilbert's request for a Plan B could be done.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that NDOW could start in 2023 with model showing the Plan B if they received 33 percent less in fundings, or even the 50 percent less funding.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he heard from Chair Paul Dixon in previous statements that NDOW already has difficulty in spending the 80 percent received from lethal removal.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to board member Jacob Thompson that is correct as far as the lethal aspect of this is concerned.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that is exactly what we are discussing.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated as far as the 20 percent and 100 percent that NDOW would have to present.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated the process for Predation Management is in steps going to go before the Commission

from 4 to 5 different times, next to the Park Committee, next to the Subcommittee, and to the Commission. He stated there are limitations giving example of federal which allows only 2,500 therefore you can only implement that amount of work which is contracted through Wildlife Services, next you have the statewide coyote removal, Project 37/38, which is part of the mule deer enhancement which is Project 47, next there might be low population California Bighorn sheep with a project for \$100,000 therefore once NDOW knows the funding model, the adjustments are approved through the social process. He stated by knowledge of the funding model and after adjustments, therefore the process gives the remedy. He stated with the language from the new Assmebly Bill will be the confines of with language specifically for lethal removal. He stated there will be two boxes, there is limitations from the Assembly Bill taking out certain language and Vice Chair Dan Gilbert is looking at this solely with the 33 percent less in fundings but if you look at it after taking out staff time, and the projects being matched for fundings, it is not a large amount of money left. He stated that NDOW will continue to adjust in this method, and it will be very difficult to project what the funding will look like with the different language as well. He stated there are already a vast number of lines being blurred on this matter presently. He asked Vice Chair Dan Gilbert if this information helped at all.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* that he appreciated his comments.
- Board member Dave Talaga asked *(Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region)* that he feels confident that NDOW can manage whatever funding will come for the Predation and Wildlife Restoration.
- *Public Comments: (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region):* He stated that he will not speak on behalf of the staff specialist on this level but stated it will be whatever fundings is available and NDOW will adjust accordingly. He stated he did not want to speculate too much but he feels it will be between 60 to 80 percent in the lethal removal area and will have to adjust within those confines. He reiterates that again this is completely speculation.
- Board member Brian Patterson, he stated by just removal of certain predators does not guarantee help to the herds such as the deer, elk, they must have food as well therefore the balance must be happy balance as well. He stated one only helps one component therefore by spreading the wealth around with the fundings to both the lethal and habitat thus giving the best opportunity to the ungulates for survival. He stated it is not good to wipe out predators if there is nothing to eat.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he agrees and advised to board member John Hiatt's remarks about the feral horses and burros, the improvements to habitat are going to be capitalized by them and the only thing within our management privy is to be able to control predators which have a large take on one of the largest species in the state.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked board member Jacob Thompsen if he should go to public comments at this time.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated yes.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he will go to public comments next but clarification on the motion is that the motion will be adopted as presented with the option of two boxes only.
- *Public Comments: (Brian Burris, member of the public):* He stated he feels it is

continuous discussion about the the single box and predator management fees, stated he feels that the thing that nonprofits don't do is predator management. He stated he doesn't see many nonprofits doing predator management but stated he can confirm that every single wildlife nonprofit has done habitat improvement and advised that his organization and Meadow Valley Sports Unlimited together have built a greenhouse recently, spending two weekends doing two separate projects totaling 100,000 dollars into the wildlife in the state of Nevada with (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) and (*Tommy Caviglia, Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners*) other members of the NDOW staff. He stated that habitat improvement is not the issue at hand and there are many people doing habitat improvement. He advised that the issue is that this is about a single Assemblyman who wanted to make a name for themselves, therefore placing rules in place without realization of the consequences. He stated now due to this we are going to eliminate our predator management funds and do habitat improvements which is not the issue. He stated there are individuals putting money into habitat daily, and stated he is not able to do predator management, nor can he take a helicopter and do predator management taking out species such as coyotes, mountain lions but the state of Nevada can do this. He stated now you are taking the ability for the state of Nevada to properly manage the predators hence he feels whatever can be done to manage these predators please know that the nonprofits and the NGOs will pick up the pieces on their side and stated the banquets that his organization does doubles in size each year. He stated his organization is at the point where there will be more funds than the organization can spend on habitat improvement. He feels to push in this direction to him makes no logical sense at all. He understands that predator management is important part but understand that his organizations and nonprofits are also putting in important part as well. He stated he feels this is left entirely out of the equation here and needs to be part of the discussion.

- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*): She stated that hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on habitat management yearly but with predator management it is advised that this fund cannot be completely used to its entirety every year and joked that he would spend this if NDOW would want him too instead. He stated with the bounty on coyotes and with habitat especially with what is being done around the state this will not solve a feral horse or burros' issue and stated any stress that can be taken off the ungulates makes logical sense. He stated if these species do not have food, then make it where the species does not have to go so far to obtain food. He stated this is already passed NRS and he is not sure what else can be done on his end at this point.
- Public Comments: (*Annoula Wylderich, member of the public*): She stated she thinks that whomever perspective is viewed, everyone in the room can agree that more habitat is being lost due to ongoing development which will only increase in the state due to wildfires and climate in the state of Nevada. She stated that less habitat means less animals, regardless of if individuals want to observe the species or hunt them down. She stated she feels that it does not hurt to have this box because ultimately it is up to the individual to choose the box, they would like to have their funds go. She stated it is good to have that choice regardless and agrees about the comments of the ungulates. She stated this is her two cents.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Bobbett, member of the public*): He stated that he has a

preference of four boxes, (box (a) *predator control*, box (b) *habitat improvement*, next box (a & b) *would be both options of predator control and habitat improvement together*, and the last box (d) *feral horse removal*).

- *Public Comments: (Stephanie Myers, member of the public):* She stated up until this last Assembly Bill 70, for previous years there was a \$3.00 predator fee in which 80% must be used for lethal removal and year after year when there was this Predation Management Plan and gave examples: (*there was less than 85,000 dollars used for coyote removal and less than 100,000 dollars removal of mountain lions*) all for the purpose of saving the mule deer population and using mule deer for all the game animals. She stated we see all these projects every year adding up to almost 1 million dollars being spent in this manner, she asked the question of what the results are, are there more mule deer now then before the lethal predation plans. She stated she does not feel that is the case, she feels that the mule deer are going away and feels it is a habitat situation. She advised that she sees nothing in the reading to advise that NDOW cannot use these funds for lethal predator management even if the non-removal box is checked. She stated she feels there are enough checks and balances here and that this is new thing and applicants receive a choice and she does not because she will never get a tag, but applicants get to choose lethal or non-lethal.
- *Public Comments: (Nicki Gulli, member of the public):* He stated he believes NRS is already stating that there are two choices, and it is already written out. He stated that Chair Paul Dixon had pointed out that all the money received in funding and NDOW still cannot spend it all on lethal for predation. He stated from working as a NDOW volunteer there is not enough funds for habitat control. He stated he agrees with board member Brian Patterson in deciding to split his eight tags evenly between habitat and some for predation as his options. He stated the issue is there is individual who is involved in the 80/70 is also the same writer of the coyote contests being banned. He stated this gentleman meet with him and they were able to meet in the middle on this matter, but regardless NDOW is responsible with how the funds are spent and feels we should let them do their job. He stated no results will be seen until after 2023, possibly in 2024 or 2025, by the time the applicants can apply again until April of 2024, correct.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated yes that is correct.
- *Public Comments: (Nicki Gulli, member of the public):* He stated we are not even seeing results regardless of whatever management plan that NDOW comes up with until 2025.
- *Public Comments: (Mark Transue, member of the public):* He stated to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he asked individuals in the room to be honest about what option would they choose, and he stated that he would split his tags in half and do both options. He stated he felt the third option is not needed, he stated we simply need box for habitat improvement or another box for management of predation. He stated that Vice Chair Dan Gilbert simply asked the board members what their choices would be and did not ask the members of the public and he should do so.
- *Public Comments: (Robert Bobbett, member of the public):* He stated he would for bear and mountain lion tag he would choose option of habitat and for mule deer and other species he would choose predator control and habitat improvement.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that he felt everyone in the room has commented on this except for ...

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated Secretary Darlene.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated and there is a motion and a second on the floor and it is time to either accept or make another and he stated he appreciated the discussion on this matter from both the board and the public and advised it will be very interesting to see how this does going forward.
- Board member Dave Talaga stated this comes down to a poll with two options and it will be revealed what the hunters and have to say and the non hunters will obviously not have a voice in this, and it needs to be a course correction next year if this falls apart. He stated perhaps asking for the course correction could be added to the previous motion.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member Dae Talaga that he will leave this as a thought, that he feels the general public sitting in tonight's meeting who do not apply for hunting license, they will be surprised and stated that he agrees with (Nick Gulli, member of the public) as well others, and stated there will be enough individuals who will understand that predators are a issue for certain species, habitat is a issue for other species therefore you will see split on the options on this. He stated he feels that there are people out here who feel that the hunters want to kill every predator out here at all costs and forget about the habitat thus the implementation of this will show that the hunters are truly conservationist. He stated it will show that lethal and habitat improvement are both done for conservation. He stated he does not see 100 percent vote on one option and feels it will be a vote down the line. He stated he appreciated the discussion and thought it was excellent decision. He stated to board member Dave Talaga that he will have a lot of interesting thoughts from our discussion tonight to take the next Commission meeting in Fallon, Nevada (Friday, August 11th, 2023 & Saturday, August 12th, 2023).
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to adopt Commission Policy 23- Predation Management, Third Reading as approved along with Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee with the amendment to have two boxes in the application screen to make a choice of where the funds will go to.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

b. Commission Policy 24-Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Group-First Reading (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Policy 24.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert asked Chair Paul Dixon if he had a better understanding of this topic than he does.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there are some changes to the demand success formula and reflect these changes in the formula for Commission Policy 24- Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Group-First Reading. He stated if you go Under Terms and Definitions Page 3- Demand- *Demand is defined as the measure of interest that a particular hunter group has in attaining a big game tag based on applications from previous years for a given species*

and weaspon class. Demand will be based on a 3-year moving average of all 5 hunt choices, allocated separately by each game species. Chair Paul Dixon asked for assistance from (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region) for his explanation on the changes in the formula for clarification. He stated that there is change in defining demand success by making it a three-year average across all five hunt choices made in that weapon class, rather than one hunt choice by one year, he believes and asked for (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region) to correct him if needed.

- Public Comments: (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region): He stated that demand previously was defined and only based off of first choice, and stated if anyone in this room who applies, most likely puts a harder to draw any legal weapon as their first choice, and in many instances therefore there was a desparity even based on a three year average that was with large fluctuations on permitted weapons in which not all were success driven, and stated in some instances it was such as muzzleloader was not as high as any legal weapons and any more then it would lead to desparity with 5 to 1 or 10 to 2. He stated this would be corrected by taking that average because he stated there is someone who would consider as a third, fourth or even fifth choice of placing the muzzleloader or archery hunts down and previously NDOW did not capture it, but he stated this language will. He stated and it changed he would have to look from the last Commission meeting in which that would simply be a projection, he thinks it was 80 to 11 at 8 percent. He stated he would have to look back at previous information to confirm, but by doing this it stabilizes the percentages making it more equitable among the classes.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated he read under the defintion: Hunter Success- This definition is provided merely for clarification purposes as this metric is not used in the Tag-Demand Success formula for developing a quota for any species. He stated to (Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region) that that is like what he just stated previously.
- Board member John Hiatt stated under defintion- Resident: In accordance with NRS 502.015, where it states: permanent residence in Nevada for six months **next** preceding the application, he stated the word next should be deleted or replaced by the word *immediately* or use the words *preceding and succeding* the application instead, he stated if someone would like to do that.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked board member John Hiatt that he would like the recommendation of under definition of resident to remove the word next with the replacement word of

immediately or just delete it altogether.

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that the statement should simply state: *six months preceding the application* (delete out the word next from the sentence).
- Chair Paul Dixon agreed that the sentence is incorrect grammar.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that there is no disagreement there.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*) that this average, not everyone is awarded there first choice therefore they might drop to the third choice, even if it was Any Legal Weapon. He stated this will help balance it out even if this means taking your first choice whether it is success or unsuccess, these will be put together giving you the correct picture.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated do not even think about success, just your first choice application, and advised that one is much more likely to put the late rifle hunt as the first choice then as the fifth choice and advised the system goes one through five therefore factoring of each choice throughout the calculation of that percentage of how likely you want to hunt.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): that it is where the person applied and not actually where they drew the tag.
- Public Comments: (*Joe Bennett Jr., Supervisor, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson that where they drew is irrelevant because the individual can draw between one through five. He stated it is mainly where the individual would like to hunt and through which weapon class.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked the question to Vice Chair Dan Gilbert for explanation of why this is going to be since individuals put in rifle, archery, and asked if he was stating that individual can put their first choice as rifle, choice two no archery.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised to (*Mark Transue, member of the public*) that he did not want to engage in too much dialogue and stated this is simply your time for public comment period not dialogue, and advised he can have the opportunity to bring this question back around.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He advised that he does not understand this at all.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Mark Transue, member of the public*) that he would do his best to address your comment momentarily.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris, member of the public*): He

stated that he feels it is good usage of lethal, and stated individuals like (*Ron Stoker, member of the public*) will put in his first four choices which are legitimate choices of his desired hunt area which is most likely Area 10 therefore the success rate in Area 10 is going to be a lot less and its is further down the list and stated his first choice wold not be muzzleloaders and advised the first choice should be familiar and should always have a higher success rate. He stated if it is stated fifth choice then the metrics will not be the same.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to accept Commission Policy 24-Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groiup-First Reading as presented.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to board member Jacob Thompson with striking the word next.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised to include with the language change of striking the word next from the definition of Resident.
- Board member Dave Talaga seconds the motion.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated that this is essentially changing the matrixs of how the Department of Wildlife is tracking choices made in getting a better representative sample for their model for future tag opportunities.
- Public Comments: (*Mark Transue, member of the public*): He asked Vice Chair Dan Gilbert can't they read, if you write down your choices do you have to explain why.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert stated to (*Mark Transue, member of the public*) he stated no it is simply how they are acquiring their sample data for the modeling.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that the motion is accepted as presented with the recommendation to include with lanaguage change of striking the word next from the definition of Resident.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

c. **Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory Fee (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the strategy for implementing the change in the Agency Management System (AMS) to allow tag applicants to choose where they want the \$3.00 fee applied: wildlife management or lethal removal of predators.

- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to combine both action items (a) Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, Third Reading & (c) Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predatory fee into one action item.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**
- **After the discussion the next motion was as follows: Vice Chair Dan Gilbert**

advised a motion to adopt Commission Policy 23-Predation Management, Third Reading as approved along with Assembly Bill 70 \$3.00 Predation fee with the recommendations to have two boxes in the application screen to make a choice of where the funds will go too.

- **Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.**
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

X. Authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at the August 11, 2023 & August 12, 2023, meeting in Fallon, Nevada (*For possible action*).

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised a motion to authorize Chair Paul Dixon to speak at the Wildlife Commission meeting on 8/11/2023 & 8/12/2023 in Fallon and prepare and submit any recommendations that were advised by both the CAB and members of the public.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 6-0.**

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

- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there are two sections for Public Comments, one is for items on the agenda and the public would like to speak on, and the other is the closing public comments in which the public can bring discuss things that were not on the agenda, that could be new.
- Public Comments: (*Stephanie Myers, member of the public*) She stated she would like it to be on the agenda.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski gave an apology and stated it was on the last agenda, no problem it will not be missed on the next agenda.
- Board member John Hiatt asked if the public would like to discuss any items that are not on tonight's agenda.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated any discussion, or thoughts that the public would like for the future items.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): he stated he would like to go back to previous discussions had on blood tracking dogs and stated in the NRS pertaining to hunting there is no mention of tracking of any sort, and it can be construed to capturing with possibility of killing therefore he stated there is room for interpretation. He stated this section needs cleaning up this and adding a section for tracking into the component within the NAC to help with the clarification.

- Public Comments: (*Nick Gulli, member of the public*): He stated NRS 503.050 Wasted Game as hunters doing what they are supposed to and the Game Warden and will be up to the Game Warden to show intent through investigative techniques to utilize the dogs. He stated as hunters there is an obligation to not waste game species. He stated he agrees with board member Jacob Thompson to investigate more into the usage of blood tracking dogs.
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert advised that this item is hereby closed.

XII. The next CCABMW board meeting will be scheduled for **September 19, 2023, in the Clark County Government Center (*Pueblo Room*) Address: 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155. This meeting will be in support of the September 22, 2023 & September 23, 2023, Commission meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada.**

XIII. Adjournment.

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

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

ONLINE:

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