



**Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway (Pueblo Room)
Las Vegas, NV 89155
November 1, 2022 (5:30 PM)
Meeting Minutes**

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

<https://clarkcountynv.webex.com/clarkcountynv/j.php?MTID=m83940936fa8bc99b3e383be3551a71eb>

Join by meeting number:

Meeting number (access code): 2485 247 3766

Meeting password: tRnsfpWJ673

Tap to join from a mobile device (attendees only)

[+1-408-418-9388](tel:+14084189388).,[24852473766](tel:+14084189388)## United States Toll

Join by phone

+1-408-418-9388 United States Toll

Global call-in numbers

Join from a video system or application: Dial [24852473766@clarkcountynv.webex.com](https://clarkcountynv.webex.com/join/24852473766)

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

Join using Microsoft Lync or Microsoft Skype for Business

Dial [24852473766.clarkcountynv@lync.webex.com](https://clarkcountynv.lync.webex.com/join/24852473766)

NOTE:

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The CCABMW members may combine two (2) or more agenda items for consideration.
- The CCABMW may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.
- No action may be taken on any matter not listed on the posted agenda.
- Please turn off or mute all cell phones and other electronic devices.
- Please take all private conversations outside the room.
- With a forty-eight (48) hour advance request, a sign language interpreter, or other reasonable efforts to assist and accommodate persons with physical disabilities, may be made available by calling (702) 455-3530, TDD at (702) 385-7486, or Relay Nevada toll-free at (800) 326-6868, TD/TDD
- Supporting material provided to CCABMW members for this meeting may be requested from Secretary Darlene Kretunski at (702) 455-1402 and is/will be available on the County's website at www.clarkcountynv.gov.
- If you do not wish to attend the meeting in person but desire to provide written general public comment or public comment on an individual agenda item, please submit your comments prior to 2:30 p.m. November 1, 2022, to Darlene.Kretunski@ClarkCountyNv.gov. Please make sure to include your name, address, the agenda item number on which you are providing comment, and your comment. All comments will be compiled into a document and shared with members of the public body, meeting attendees and on the public body's website.

BOARD MEMBERS:

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

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 for determination of quorum:

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

- Chair Paul Dixon called the meeting to order.
- Chair Paul Dixon took the roll call: (Present: Chair Paul Dixon, John Hiatt, Jacob Thompson, Brian Patterson, Therese Campbell).
- Vice Chair Dan Gilbert and board member Dave Talaga were absent from the meeting.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

- Chair Paul Dixon led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Public Comment- This is a period devoted to comments by the public about items on this agenda. No discussion, action, or vote may be taken on this agenda item. You will be afforded the opportunity to speak on individual Public Hearing Items at the time they are presented. If you wish to speak to the CCABMW about items within its jurisdiction but not appearing on this agenda, you must wait until the "Comments by the General Public" period listed at the end of this agenda. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. Please clearly state your name, address, and please spell your first and last name for the record. If any member of the CCABMW wishes to extend the length of the presentation, this will be done by the Chair or the CCABMW by majority vote.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Public Comments: (None)

- Board member John Hiatt stated there were two studies he would like to discuss: 1) Bobcats approximately 130 total and the findings were the density of bobcats is highest when it was close to a end urban area, and as they went away from the urban area there was a decrease in density and contributed this to the fact that there is a grave base in urban areas, having squirrels, rabbits possums, and some raccoons and a large amount of places for the female bobcats to hide and give birth to their young under decks and sheds therefore bobcats are getting along with people really well and their life is concentrated around people.
- Board member John Hiatt stated: 2) What coyotes eat in cities such as New York and Chicago. He stated there are thirty coyotes in New York as opposed to a couple of thousand in Chicago. He stated in regards to expectations, human food such as Big Mac's are part of their diet, but only a small portion and the diet consists of small mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians and in New York only a small portion of the diet consist of rats, even though there is a large amount of rats in New York and he stated rats are very close to human habitation with a desire to want to eat some garbage and stay with human beings as opposed to the coyotes which simply stay further away from humans. The coyotes in these urban areas are eating exactly what wild deer eat such as small game, this survey reflects these coyotes in these urban areas are eating exactly what wild deer eat such as small game, this survey reflects these coyotes are getting adapted to humans and getting along and close proximity to humans quite well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he imagined if a diet was done on coyotes here in Las Vegas with consideration of amount of feral cat colonies and him visually seeing two feral cat colonies collapse due to the family units of coyotes that take apart these colonies of feral cats, therefore he feels these coyotes are opportunist and live also around areas such as golf courses where there is quail, ducks, geese and rabbits in which they will eat a lot of these animals but again if there are resources such as colonies of feral cats then these predators are going to eat those as well.
- Board member John Hiatt advised he had a feral cat colony by his place of residence, and he stated he could not say that there was a significant dent in the species due to coyotes.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked board member John Hiatt if he could provide the links for these articles.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to board member Therese Campbell that he obtained these articles from National History Magazine, and he would have to locate the links.
- **FYI- Board member John Hiatt has provided the following links for the articles above on the discussion on bobcats and coyotes:**
- **1) Bobcat article: Natural History Magazine, Volume 130, #9, October 2022, p 12-15 by Jason Hawley.**
- **2) Coyote article: Las Vegas Sun Newspaper, October 14, 2022, p7. (He stated this was originally published by the New York Times).**
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he would like to discuss recent observations, in reference to the few hunts he has done in recent months such as elk hunt in Nevada which he seen a few elk and he has an antelope tag in the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge. He stated he took a trip to the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge eight to ten years ago and he predominantly saw a massive number of wild horses and emphasized that it was insane the number of horses there at that time, recently he went back and spent five to seven days and to his surprise he saw only two wild horses the entire time. He stated how refreshing it was to see this area come back again from what he

had seen previously. He stated he also had a deer hunt in Eastern Utah and to his amazement he seen a deer population in a small unit with hundreds of deer sighting daily with does having twins and even triplets and it was usual to see a doe with just one fawn. He stated he seen Game and Fish Wardens and spoke to them two to three times while on his trip with lengthy conversations and he also seen two black bears and two bobcats on two different occasions on this trip as well as many turkeys. He stated that this habitat is doing well and there was a large acorn crop this year therefore this is his belief of reasoning for acorn and deer on this landscape and it was really refreshing to be in a unit he stated that was over abundance of all types of animals. He reiterated this was his observation while in Nevada and our neighboring state of Utah. He advised he will be hunting next sheep starting the 20th of the month of November 2022, spending a vast amount of time chasing sheep in the hills from Fallon to Laughlin.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised this year was extremely wet in Nevada and the weather pattern starting in July 2022 there is cut off from the Arizona strip to Utah (St. George) and the west of this location to the Sierras there was a dry front but east of this location all the way to New Mexico it was massive flooding and the Rio Grande River was flowing as opposed to the last ten years as he has flown over by plane and it was simply a trickle. This year he stated the Rio Grande earned its name and literally looked like a river for certain. He stated due to the rain pattern of Nevada that Eastern border of Utah had a large amount of rain which continued throughout the summer and there was Spring for fawning and good crops for acorns coming into the fall therefore everything seen for Utah is very important for geography, especially weather patterns on the southern border.
- Board member John Hiatt stated for the last ten years in reference to the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge that within the last ten years, all horses have been removed and there has been 150 feet or barbed wire that has been removed.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised how refreshing it is to see this landscape make a comeback.
- Chair Paul Dixon he felt that the following email submitted to the CAB is based on the previous comments and discussion from (5/3/2022 CAB meeting under *Members Items/Announcements/Correspondence section*) in which board member John Hiatt discussed and submitted a graph about wild horses in the Sheldon which resulted in an email by member of the public (Ardelle Bellman, dated 10/23/2022 for tonight's meeting. She feels that the DWOL (Department of Wildlife) should be doing more in rounding up the wild horses. He stated a portion of the issue is misconception given too people is seeing visuals of this subject matter by presentation on the television and has the public thinking that the DWOL and this board has a say in the management of wild horses and burros and their management on landscape. He stated that horses are a portion of the landscape and must be managed to the landscape, he gave an example of having 700 horses versus 70 horses on a small section of land and clearly the 700 horses are not living well thus impacting the wildlife and he feels the vast majority support the management of these herds. He stated the Bureau of Land Management has difficulty receiving funding from Congress to assist with this dilemma when it comes to roundup and management. He advised from east of the border of Utah to the Atlantic Ocean, most of the wild horses do not do well in this environment. He stated there is large amount of natural vegetation but being in the driest state and adding large number of wild horses on the land, which leads to suffering to the horses.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to secretary Darlene Kretunski that he will be emailing this young lady after tonight's meeting to let her know that the CAB understands her

concerns but she needs to realize the limitations of the CAB to act on this matter and when she states that there should be no depending on the Department of Interior and BLM (Bureau of Land Management), but the CAB has zero authority to assist with the wild horses on federal land. He stated he recently seen a program pertaining to Northern Nevada in which it was difficult to maintain the darting program without getting the same horse each time.

- Board member John Hiatt advised that brown horses all look the same. He advised if there are 500 brown horses having the ability to distinguish these horses is a stretch.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that after darting the horses they use marking to try to identify each horse separately using the same method of the markings as they have done with killer whales. He stated when herd population went over 50 it became impossible to identify hence the only method of getting the population down is removal in which helps maintain the population and must be brought down to certain level to do so. He advised the process of removing horses from landscaping is not fun to see due to some animals are injured and some will die by using the equipment to collect these animals. He stated it is regrettable and gave example of the same process of removal for big horn sheep and loses one or two in the process. He advised people do not like to discuss this, but it happens.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that there is an article by the group who proposes increase of wild horses in the west to help solve fire problems with the consumption of massive amounts of foliage. He stated this article clearly was filled with misinformation and he has concerns of individuals believing in this misinformation of the wild horses being a solution for the fire problem.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that wild horses are not goats.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that horses eat and destroy everything eventually leaving nothing and there will not be a fire issue, nor will there be anything else left as well.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised that there could simply be burning instead solving the fire problem.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.**
- **FYI- (8 News Now Investigators; I-Team: Fertility program aims to control Nevada's growing wild horse population humanely) By Vanessa Murphy Posted: 11/22/2021:** The darting program is a fertility control program aimed at helping control the wild horse population. Advocates for the American Wild Horse Campaign argue that fertility control is more humane than the current method mainly used by the Bureau of Land Management which involves capturing the wild horse, oftentimes, with help from equipment like helicopters. A database is maintained to help keep track of the horses by appearance and band, or group, the horses seem to barely notice that they have been darted. Darting can be time-consuming, and it is not fool proof. According to the American Wild Horse Campaign, darting begins when a mare is as young as 10 months old, boosters continue every 8 to 12 months and then after five to seven years, the mare can no longer reproduce. During the BLM's roundups, some horses get hurt and die. Many of the captured horses are put in government holding pens. Some are adopted, in some cases, to buyers who sell them for slaughter. In 2020, Congresswomen Dina Titus led the effort to designate \$11 million for the BLMS to use for fertility control with PZP. It is not as effective as another vaccine, Bonnacon-Equine. BLM increased its use of GonaCon-Equine by 75.2%. According to BLM website, only 735 birth control treatments were done during that period compared to nearly 11,000 removals during roundups. The BLM also reports expenditures at more than \$91 million. Advocates for fertility control argue that it is

more cost-effective because volunteers do the darting, the darts are estimated at five dollars, and holding pens and other equipment like helicopters are needed. The BLM (*Bureau of Land Management*) continues to prioritize research and development into effective fertility control methods that can safely limit herd growth over the long term, where one-to-two-year vaccines like Porcine Zona Pellucida (PZP ZonaStat) fall short, in fact, in FY2020 the BLM increased its use of GonaCon-Equine by 75.2%. GonaCon-Equine is a fertility control vaccine that can last nearly five times as long as darted Porcine Zona Pellucida. Every BLM management action for wild horses and burros living on public lands must consider fertility control in the range of alternatives. Where is practical to do so, BLM is committed to implementing effective, humane fertility control measures to limit herd growth and put the Program on a fiscally and ecologically sustainable path. **(End of Article)**

- **FYI- <https://usfwspacific.tumblr.com>** (August 27, 2014) “More than removing fences: Friends of Nevada Wilderness”
- Since 2003 The Friends of Nevada Wilderness removed nearly 200 miles of barbed wire from Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge, the fence was abandoned livestock fence that was never removed, through livestock are no longer allowed on the refuge. They’ve also removed several tons of abandoned water trough and other refuse. The Sheldon National Refuge protects more than half a million acres of high desert habitat for large wintering herds of pronghorn antelope, scattered bands of bighorn sheep and a rich assortment of other wildlife. The landscape is vast, rugged, and punctuated with waterfalls narrow gorges, and lush springs among rolling hills and expensive tablelands of sagebrush and mountain mahogany. Elevations on the refuge range from 4,100 to 7,200 feet. Annual precipitation rarely amounts to more than a dozen inches, creating a harsh environment where a wide variety of wildlife manages to thrive. The Friends are avital part of the refuge and protecting this special place. They have assisted the Service in making noticeable and important strides toward restoring, protecting, and preserving wilderness values in one of the largest intact areas of native sagebrush habitat in the Great Basin. In addition to assisting with the removal of fencing and refuges, the Friends have assisted in collecting valuable resource information for monitoring the condition and recover of springs and riparian habitats. They’ve also secured hundreds of thousands of dollars in matching contributions and grants to support projects within the Refuge. The Pacific Region’s Refuges Chief Kevin Foerster and Sheldon-Hart National Wildlife Refuge Complex Project Leader John Kasbohm recently visited the Francis to thank them for all their hard work to protect this special refuge and its wildlife and habitat. Without our Friends, the Refuge wouldn’t have been able to accomplish as much for conservation. If you want to help protect a special and a unique place, the Friends annually hosts a Refuge volunteer event for citizens from throughout the Pacific Region to accomplish a variety of projects including fence removal, habitat protection enclosures, boundary posting, and weed removal. **(End of Article)**
- **FYI-Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge (Nevada Legislative Committee on Public Lands, 4/15/2016)**
- **Sheldon-Hart Mountain National Wildlife Refuge Complex-** 851,000 acres of sagebrush-steppe, high desert habitats managed as a Complex: (Sheldon NWR- 573,000 ac; Hart Mountain NAR- 278,000 ac).
- **Complex Office located in Lakeview, OR:** 14 permanent full-time staff, 4 permanent career seasonal fire crew, 6 temp seasonal fire crew, 3 temp seasonal biological interns, 2 temp seasonal maintenance workers.
- **Conservation value of Sheldon-Hart Mountain Refuges: Important sagebrush-**

steppe habitats, rich in native species diversity: 859 species of plants, 391 species of vertebrates, 297 species of invertebrates.

- **Wildlife Species:** Pronghorn antelope,
- **Wildlife Species** Sage grouse
- **Wildlife Species:** Mule deer
- **Wildlife Species:** California bighorn sheep
- **Wildlife Species:** American pika
- **Wildlife Species:** Pygmy rabbit
- **Wildlife Species:** Migratory birds (Songbirds, Raptors)
- **Wildlife Species:** Fish (Cutthroat & red band trout, Tui chub, Pan fish).
- **US Department of Interior /US Fish & Wildlife Service/National Wildlife Refuge System:** *under 560 refuges; Sheldon Hart Mountain NWRC, 150 million acres.*
- **Refuge System Guiding Principles:** (National Wildlife Refuge System Administrative Act): *Congressionally mandated, strong and singular wildlife mission, i.e., “Wildlife First” (to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans)*
- **Refuge System Guiding Principles:** *Comprehensive Conservation Plan required to provide management direction over a 15-year horizon*
- **Refuge System Guiding Principles:** *Any use must first be found “Compatible” with the purpose of the refuge and the mission of the system*
- **Refuge System Guiding Principles:** *Managed for biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health*
- **Refuge System Guiding Principles:** *The “big Six” priority public uses are to be allowed if compatible.*
- **“Big Six” Priority Public Uses-** 1) Hunting, 2) Fishing, 3) Wildlife photography 4) Wildlife observation 5) Environmental interpretation, 6) Environmental education.
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Pre-Refuge:** (Mid-1800s-1930s)- Intensive livestock grazing-peak-1907, Cattle, sheep, and horses.
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Pre-Refuge:(1920s)** Concerns grow: American pronghorn numbers declining from less than 20 million to over 20,000. Overgrazing, and deterioration and erosion of the range
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Pre-Refuge:** NW Nevada and SE Oregon recognized as an area important for pronghorn
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Pre-Refuge:** Boone and Crockett Club and the National Audubon Society purchase private lands at Last Chance Ranch and donate them as a nucleus for an antelope refuge.
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Establishment:** (January 26, 1931)- President Hoover issues Executive Order 5540 to establish Charles Sheldon Wildlife Refuge (31,000 acres)
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Establishment:** **Purpose-** “as a refuge and breeding ground for wild animals and birds”
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Establishment:** **Administration-**USDA Bureau of Biological Survey (now FWS).
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Establishment:** (December 21, 1936)- President Roosevelt issues Executive Order 7522 to establish Charles Sheldon Antelope Range (539,000 acres)
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Establishment:** **Purpose-** “for the conservation

and development of natural wildlife resources {primarily pronghorn} and for the protection and improvement of public grazing lands and natural forage resources.”

- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Establishment: Administration:** jointly by the DOI Division of Grazing (now BLM) and the “FWS”
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Joint BLM-FWS Management:** (1936-1976): Game Range under joint jurisdiction of “BLM” and “FWS”
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Joint BLM- FWS Management:** (1936-1976) a) Game Range under joint jurisdiction of “BLM” and “FWS” b) Grazing under the exclusive jurisdiction of “BLM” c) Forage resources first to be utilized to sustain a maximum of 3,500 pronghorn and other wildlife d) 20,000 AUMs average grazing use-cattle and horses e) Focus on: Development of water sources; treatments (including sage brush removal) to increase grasses f) Predator control (ended 1968)
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Proposed Wilderness** (1974) President proposed 341,500 acres, never designated by Congress, FWS policy requires proposed areas to be managed as wilderness.
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge FWS Management-** (1976) Game Range Act- Gives sole jurisdiction of game ranges (including Sheldon) to FWS.
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge FWS Management:** (1978) Public Order 5634- Directs FWS to manage grazing in accordance with NWR System Administration Act, Combined into one-unit designated Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge.
- (1980) Renewable Natural Resources Management Plan & EIS: a) Grazing to be managed to support wildlife management objectives (compatible use standard) b) 15, 668 AUMs allocated c) 34% of refuge excluded from grazing on key wildlife winter areas d) Fencing to better manage cattle distribution e) Riparian and stream channel restoration
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge FWS Management:** (1994)- Grazing Retired: The Mellon Foundation and Conservation Fund purchase all grazing permit privileges from willing sellers; Privileges donated to the FWS and permanently retired
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge FWS Management:** (1991 & 2011): 445, 766 acres withdrawn from mining; Virgin Valley remains open to mining.
- **Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Current Management:** (2012)- Comprehensive Conservation Plan & EIS; Conservation of key wildlife species (pronghorn, sage grouse; Focus on habitat restoration, biological integrity, and contribution within the larger Great Basin landscape through natural processes; Removal of all feral horses and burros; Juniper control and removal in sagebrush-steppe; Inventory and control of invasive species; Spring and playa restoration-removal of old water developments; Management of wildland and prescribed fire
- **Pronghorn:** Refuges currently support- 3,600 summering pronghorn; 5,700 pronghorns in the greater landscape; Current average 93 fawns: 100 does; Current average 50 bucks: 100 does
- **Pronghorn & Connectivity-**Some individuals migrated over 90 miles between summer and winter ranges; Summer ranges averaged: (55 square miles); Winter ranges averaged: 98 to 178 square miles depending on winter severity; Harsher winter conditions resulted in: longer migration distances, larger winter ranges, lower elevational use, shift in location of winter ranges.
- **Greater sage-grouse-** Ongoing and long-term Greater sage-grouse monitoring and research
- **Greater sage-grouse:** Complete lek inventory and census conducted on Refuges in 2013-2014 (Over 135 known leks; Aerial infrared and ground surveys)

- **Greater sage-grouse:** Lek inventory and census of Beaty's Butte PAC currently underway.
- **Response to Livestock Removal Hart Mountain NAR (Riparian Areas):** (1989): Bank stability & riparian extent; Forb cover; Riparian & snow pocket Aspen; Riparian shrubs (willow); Bird abundance (33%); ground/understory nesters (133/67%); overstory nesters (33%)
- **Response to Livestock Removal Hart Mountain NAR (Riparian Areas):** (2013): Bare ground; non-riparian shrubs-sagebrush
- **Response to Livestock Removal Hart Mountain NAR (Uplands):** Grazed- Native bunchgrasses, Shrubs; Biological soil crust
- **Response to Livestock Removal Hart Mountain NAR (Post Grazing):** Cheatgrass under 1%; Bare ground
- **Feral Horses & Burros- (Roundup)-** The roundup started in June and ended in late October of 1948, gathering nearly 3,800 head of horses on the Sheldon Game Range and adjacent areas. Another roundup in the area was initiated a year later which netted some 1,500 head more of horses, or a total on both roundups of around 5,000 head.
- **Feral Horses & Burros:** Impacts- Displace native wildlife from water, damage habitats and wetlands, increase soil erosion; decrease water availability; reduce plant diversity; limit sagebrush recruitment.
- **Feral Horse & Burros-** (2012 CCP): Complete horse and burro removal documented as the highest priority management action needed to meet refuge purpose and goals.
- **Feral Horse & Burros-** Interim Solution-Contraception (2008-2011) Approximately 380 horses captured, permanently sterilized and returned to the Refuge. (Studs: surgical or chemical vasectomy; Mares: surgical ovariectomy. Results: Substantial reduction in the number of foals; Control of population growth.
- **Feral Horses & Burros:** 30 horses remain on Sheldon NWR today. **(End of Article)**

IV. Approval of Minutes September 20, 2022, CCABMW Meeting (For possible action).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion for approval of minutes for September 20, 2022, CCABMW meeting as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

V. Approval of the Agenda for November 1, 2022. Agenda items may be Held, Combined, or Deleted. (For possible action).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to approve agenda for November 1, 2022, as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

VI. CCABMW Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence: (Informational)

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

VII. Recap of the September 23, 2022 & September 24, 2022, Commission meeting in Las Vegas, NV by Chair Paul Dixon: (Informational).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he attended this meeting via phone due to having COVID. He stated that he did not think going to a in person meeting with COVID would not be a good idea and stated that he got COVID from attending a previous meeting by a gentleman from Washington attending the meeting knowing that he already had COVID and felt that if someone did get it, they could just get a shot and it was not a big deal. He stated that meeting was held in Phoenix and out of 105 individuals 72 got COVID due to this gentleman attending the meeting, and most of these individuals were not in the best of health.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the discussion was on topic discussed at 9/20/22 CAB meeting on: #9a. Commission Regulation 21-15 Amendment #1, Fishing Season and Regulations for January 1, 2022-December 31, 2023. **(The Department is proposing an amendment to modify the fishing hours for the Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge (RLNWR) in Elko County, the Department is proposing to modify the fishing hours at the Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge to be open 1 hour before sunrise to 1 hour after sunset. This change is being proposed to ensure fishing hours are consistent with Refuge hours of operation).**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the CAB voted 5-2 on this matter. The dissenting opinions were that they did not support to reduce operations at Ruby Lake, but most of the CAB felt that access should be open.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Department of Wildlife discussed with the Commission and felt that an agreement needed to be made and when *(Jack Robb Deputy Director, NDOW Southern Region)* quoted statistics via phone of the amount of people impacted by the different hours and the stats were small in comparison to other WMA around the state. He stated the Commission did not agree with the CAB's recommendation to not align the hours to match between the fishing hours and the Refuge hours of operation. He stated the CAB was overwritten on this matter.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the next item for discussion was on the topic discussed at 9/20/2022 CAB meeting #9b. Commission General Regulation 502, NAC 502 Junior Hunt, and Turkey Program, LCB File No. R051-21; **(this would amend NAC 502, limiting the number of successfully awarded tats in the junior hunt program, removed hard close dates for submitting turkey harvest return card and allow for junior turkey bonus points to roll over into the adult category once a junior is no longer able to participate in the Junior Hunt).**
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he became very passionate at meeting and addressed his concerns to the Chair/Vice Chair of the Commission and stated he is aware of the number of tags given each year and a certain amount of youths apply and there are even tags left over as well due to not wanting to drive for example from Las Vegas to the Rubies or to Jackpot, Nevada. He stated he does not feel this is a big issue that requires

change. He stated this is on the agenda tonight and we will get more into this subject matter.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised the next item for discussion was on the topic discussed at 9/20/2022 CAB meeting #9c. Commission General Regulation 508 NAC 502 Antler points and Spike Elk Defined, LCB File No. R090-22, which was accepted as presented by the Commission.
- **Chair Paul Dixon advised that this item is hereby closed.**

VIII. Discussion: NDOW's Invasive Species Program (*Informational*). We will have a 15–20-minute discussion with NDOW about their “Invasive Species Program” in southern Nevada.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he asked Mr. Horowski to give a presentation on behalf of NDOW on Invasive Species Program. Both Dane Horowski along with Matt Flores will be presenting. He stated he asks the members of NDOW to give presentations from time to time to let members of the public see the types of things that NDOW is doing outside of harvesting animals in the field and have time to speak and get to know these members of NDOW and ask questions.
- (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity Division, Southern Region, NDOW*): he advised that is non-game and non-habitat and all other species that fall under this umbrella of species is what he works with. He advised NDOW does not have an invasive species management program or staff dedicated to this like BLM (Bureau of Land Management) or Forestry Services to this, they simply provide solutions to discourage these issues and encourage wildlife instead.
- (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity Division, Southern Region, NDOW*)_ **Cheatgrass Presentation:** He advised he would like to first discuss Cheat grass known to cover two species known as (*Bromus tectorum*) which is invasive and the two species of cheat grass are: Red Brome and Bromus tectorum which is mostly located in the Great Basin.
- He advised it came from Europe or India where it was needed, he stated that cheat grass requires very low amount of nutrients, but it does require large amounts of sunlight and nitrogen.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked the question to (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity Division, Southern Region, NDOW*) if the seeds were spread by birds.
- (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*) he stated it is spread through many ways such as sticking to person's socks, on animal fur, birds, people also through large amounts of wind and water. He advised it is spread through many methods which is reflected with the vast number of ways it could be spread.
- (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*): he stated cheat grass is self polluting and it does what is called cheat which is the first rain arrives in the fall thus causing cheat grass to sprout when other native species are not sprouting and will take in all available water for nutrients taking away from the other species and native species, using up the water resource, and it is fire adaptation, in the shallow roots. Cheat grass has increased the fire and burn frequency in our Mojave system within the Great Basin which prior was non-fire adaptative. This means that there is no ability to generate from the root crown after a burn, destroying the seeds and it does not do well with the fire condition due to never having to deal with this environment until the cheat grass appeared. Cheat grass has grown and created a layer of fuels and is persist on landscape longer than the native annual species which falls apart, and the cheat grass high silk content allows them to stay in place until a fire burns them up.

- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* He stated the management used since it is difficult to eradicate the cheat grass and in past management herbicides were dumped on cheat grass as well as (BLM) Bureau of Land Management using pre-emergent herbicides and advised that NDOW does not spray like this in a large scale, instead they attempt to revegetate the dead conditions meaning the (post fire conditions) to increase competition meaning the seeds within the system. He stated it is fighting the symptom and not the plant itself.
- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* He advised this is how cheat grass comes back after burning and the cheat grass is fire adapting and when it burns afterwards it will still be the most dominant plant. He discussed in the Mormon Mountains in Lincoln County and this area also burned in 2005 and regardless 17 years later still has low species diversity, low native vegetation, and low structural components, for example, that tortoises will need from the shade of the cheat grass and stated there is very little forage for animals to have and what exist is a cheat mountain grass culture.
- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* He stated that cheat grass reduces the amount of palatable forage on the landscape, reduces cover of large perennial plant species, and can alter the amount of available nutrients in the soil as well as the time of year the nutrients are available, it can alter soil texture (the wildfire burns over and it can destroy the cryptogenic crust that forms layer) this helps slow down the spread of cheat grass and makes the ecosystem more conducive to persist and continue to thrive.
- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* He stated he is unaware of what the future invasion would look like due to the number of upcoming environmental things that are going to occur especially with more Nitrogen (N) deposition with more nitrogen deposited on the landscape and in the hills cheatgrass loves this and the increased fire attempt and fire frequency and intensity and cheatgrass loves this as well and aided by climate change and other prolific things thus it is difficult to have clear determination of future of cheatgrass and the cheatgrass invasion.
- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* He advised climate change effects precipitation which depends on factors such as frequency when the rain falls as well as the seasonality of the rain which determines on how things will play out and with restoration being difficult but plausible. He advised the restoration that NDOW is doing is out planting the native plants in certain sites to create seed islands within the bird habitat with the basis of the idea being that seeds become integrated into the landscape thus creating new vegetation.
- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* **White Nose Syndrome (WNS) Pseudogymnoascus destructans (psychrophilic (cold-loving) fungus that causes white-nose syndrome:** He advised this is a disease that affects bats, the bats have visible white fungal growth on muzzles and wings, and (WNS) was introduced from Europe. He stated (WNS) has been destroying the native bat population and the bats do not have natural resilience to the disease and distinction between the bats in Europe and the bats in the United States, the bats in the United States gather in small numbers as opposed to the bats in Europe which gather in large numbers and do not transmit the disease as readily. He stated (WNS) was first discovered in New York in 2005 and since spread to thirty-five states and several dating provinces spreading across the continental divide and is currently spread by bat to bat by bats by flying and touching one another. He stated there is evidence but not conclusive, (WNS) can be spread from humans entering caves that are (WNS) affected site and accidentally carrying chunks of the fungus or spurs on shoes, clothing, gear.
- *(Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW):* He advised that

bats could affect other bats and (WNS) is not transmissible from bats to humans. He stated that bats in the ecosystem some function as pollinators, some function to keep agriculture and pests down and with (WNS) these ecosystems could be lost. He stated regarding the insect sector, bats do not like to eat mosquitoes, these insects are not the bats preferred food source. He stated that NDOW is watching the infection occur as of now there is a test site and NDOW is working on two test sites for potential vaccine and it is air slides, and it is in the testing phase now and it is believed that Nevada does not have (WNS) yet and the two testing sites this winter. He stated they are monitoring by swabbing getting it from their wings and nose sampling and sending results out to see how the disease is moving about and also doing a spring merge in which the bats emerge and are captured after coming out of hibernation and swabbed and tested for presence of this disease.

- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): **Barred Owl Intrusion on Decking Spotted Owls (Strix varia- Barred Owl)**: He stated the discussion will be how a sample native to North America becomes an invasive species. He stated it is not an issue in southern Nevada, but NDOW still needs to address this in the future with the Spotted Owls in the Tahoe area.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): **(Distinction Between Barred Owl & Spotted Owl)**: He stated the key differences between the two species is as follows: Barred Owl have lighter facial disk and their beaks are brighter yellow with Vertical barring as opposed to Spotted Owl that has the horizontal barring, with dark grey talons and they are larger in size and are more aggressive than the Spotted Owl. He stated the Spotted Owl has darker facial disk and their beaks are greenish-gray, and they have horizontal barring, and their talons are pale gray. He stated the Spotted Owls are broken into three sub-species: Northern, Mexican, California located in the Tahoe area. He stated there is only one documented breeding pair of Spotted Owls in Nevada and the Spotted Owl is not currently listed under the Endangered Species Act but is petitioned a lot for it to be, the California species is the special concern. The Spotted Owl is the Nevada Priority Species also part of the Nevada State Wildlife Action Plan. He advised the other two sub-species of the Spotted Owl is listed correctly.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): **(Barred Owl Expansion)**: He stated the Barred Owl Expansion is something that happen due to humans without their knowledge 150 years due to European settlers moving west and building towns, planted trees, suppressed, and excluded wildfire and removed natural grazers such as bison's and beavers and all these aspects together got rid of barrier called "Great Plains" thus preventing Barred Owls from moving westward.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): **(Barred Owl Expansion)** He stated current range of the Barred Owls which origins was from eastern United States following to Missouri River and Yellowstone into Montana with Barred Owls being disbursement into multiple directions. He stated by early part of 2000 they were well located in California.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated the Barred Owl observations show in the Tahoe Area this year and are close to the Spotted Owls.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): **(Diet of California Spotted Owl)**: The diet of the California Spotted Owl consists of at higher elevation mostly flying squirrels, and at lower elevation wood rats make up most of their diet but overall, it is the small mammals make up to ninety nine percent of their diet depending on the season.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): **(Diet of**

- Barred Owl):** He stated Barred Owls diet consists of the same as the Spotted Owl and they eat just about any species that is smaller in size than they are.
- (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated that Barred Owls can occupy a smaller home range, but the pairs of Spotted Owls may be in competition with multiple pairs of larger Spotted Owls. When Barred Owls move into an area then they will stop mobilizing and become fierce with their breeding and will leave the area go to the sub optimal habitat.
 - (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): (**Question: What Can Be Done**): **Answers:** A) Responsible Forest Management- NDOW along with other partners organizations attempting of reduction too high intensity stand clearance of forest fires that are seen multiple times in Western United States. B) Protecting old growth and primary habitat from development and lobbying. C) Reduce spread of tree disease/invasive insects that can burn healthy forest into dead timber. D) Remove Barred Owls- by lethal methods and it has been done and shows great results on both the California side of the Sierra Valley as well as Pacific Northwest. He stated that Spotted Owls if they are still in the area after leaving will return within a couple of days thus this action will soon become common action taken by both land and wildlife management. He asked the question should Barred Owls be moved into a Spotted Owls habitat in the Tahoe area? He stated this is something for consideration by NDOW to keep their small but very important Spotted Owl population.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*) when he spoke on lethal removal being the best effective method and advised he cannot image this goes over well in Western California, Oregon, Washington, with the individuals who are animal activist.
 - (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He advised it is a sensitive issue when people think about removal of the Owls using lethal methods. He stated there has been lawsuits recently without success and the work in the Pacific Northwest continues under research pertinence with good work going to sciences for museum records. He stated at the end of the day the question is do you want Spotted Owls or Barred Owls.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated he is asking is because the impact of feral cat colonies in southern Nevada on wildlife regarding small birds, reptiles and mammals is huge and anything attempting to change the (TNR) Trap-Neuter-Return Program is met with resistance. FYI- (*this program is a humane and effective approach for stray and feral cats, TNR stops the breeding cycle of cats and therefore improves their lives while preventing reproduction*). He was curious to know if there is anything of that magnitude when deciding on Spotted Owls versus Barred Owls.
 - (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated he has not seen the subject matter of choosing between Spotted Owls and Barred Owls raise the same passion as the (TNR). He stated a lot of people in states like California, Oregon and Washington seem to want their threatened Northern Spotted Owls therefore they are willing to consider those other opinions to protect it and the evidence of work done is overwhelming success.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*) if there needs to be special regulation to do lethal management or how would this type of management be done if it becomes a lethal program.
 - (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated a research permit would need to be obtained (in the next few years that might change) and the individual(s) doing the removal will need training in both classroom and practical and other than a fish and wildlife permit from NDOW he is not sure what else would be

- needed.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there is a wildlife action plan as you mentioned and asked what those states about thinking about what is going to be done from the management, especially from extra congressional funds coming in and receive and it is more wildlife management outside of the key species we have right now.
 - (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated that Barred Owls are listed as red 2 spot owls under the wildlife action plan, and it does not state specifics regarding what actions may be done and he stated that this is pretty new on Barred Owls removal and there are not that many people who do this therefore we would have to look into this.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated that there is in tonight's meeting Action Item (f) Commission Regulation 23-02, Taking of Raptors for Falconry for 2023-2024: and wanted to know if there was an opportunity for falconers to raise these Spotted Owls to augment the population.
 - (*Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated unfortunately he does not have any knowledge of this, he advised he has never heard of this viewpoint and found it interesting and advised it is not under discussion at this time.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised he had never heard of anyone using an owl.
 - Board member John Hiatt agreed. He stated that some falconers do keep Great Horn Owls and it is listed in the documents that you have as a one of the legal birds and it is the Great Horn Owl.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Great Horn Owl is four times the size, it is a large bird.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated yes, it is a lot bigger and yes, but that Owl can be kept by falconers.
 - Board member Brian Patterson asked the question to (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*) in terms of cheatgrass it is his observation, and you have mentioned grazing as an opportunity to eat down the areas, but the battle has been lost its over and to his knowledge there is not that many places to graze off.
 - (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated it is only palliative over brief period when it is still young green and after it dries out the content is what makes it untalkative.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated just fuel.
 - (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated yes just fuel.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated that (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*) that he mentioned that cheatgrass responds well to nitrogen, this is true and cheatgrass also responds to increased CO2 concentration and this has been proven with experiments in Southern Nevada, these things mitigate against control interactions. He stated that several years ago while in Baja, California at San Pedro Martir National Park, and week before that in San Bernardino Mountain where there are large amounts of cheatgrass and is very interested in knowing what the situation of cheatgrass was in Baja, California and there is grazing and he found there is almost no cheatgrass there, even though there should be plenty there. He stated he talked too the botanist that he was with at the time, and he stated the only difference is when looking out into the southwest the view is the Pacific Ocean with no population of people but in Southern California there are massive amounts of cars and individuals fixing nitrogen often therefore it is the difference of nitrogen position in the movement from the metroplex Southern California going northeast across California into Nevada and Utah and nitrogen plays a key role in the proliferation of cheatgrass and the amount we have in Nevada. He stated to get rid of cheatgrass it can be done by the spread of carbohydrates

such as sugar on the ground which the bacteremia will use in the process taking soil nitrogen on the surface which will depress the cheatgrass on the ground. He stated the cheatgrass has an enormous impact on shrubs by taking all available nutrients of water limiting new shrub growth, in **bitterbrush** (*hardy plant of the wild landscape of Nevada and the intermountain west, it is a gray, small-leaved shrub that usually grows 4-5 ft. but can reach 12 ft.; it is often the source of food for small animals*) in experimental blocks using pre-emergent herbicides putting it on bitterbrush and cheatgrass had two inches and in the control area where the cheatgrass was suppressed it was six inches showing that these situations really do affect cheatgrass.

- Board member John Hiatt stated that there is also **Mycoplasma pneumoniae** (*bacteria commonly cause mild infections of the respiratory system*) which is another invasive moving from domestic sheep and goats into bighorn sheep keeping in mind that everyday there are new invasives that are appearing all the time and **Quagga Mussels** (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*) in the Colorado River system, this is new form of an invasive species. This changed the ecosystem because Quagga Mussels are filter feeders and have filter feed the entire Lake Mead in a short period of time which reduces the number of plankton that is important to the fish. He stated this is just the beginning of new invasives that are appearing all the time. He stated another invasive is **Emerald Ash Borer** (*Agilus planipennis*) (The emerald ash borer, also known by the acronym EAB, is a green buprestid or jewel beetle native to north-eastern Asia that feeds on ash species, the borer is currently found in the United States in states such as: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia).
- Board member Therese Campbell asked both (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW & Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern Region, NDOW*) both the question if we were to attempt to introduce or reintroduce more palatable desirable native species of grass, if they did seed in large amount mixed with native grass, would this attempt overtake the cheatgrass.
- (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated that it has been studied regarding the manageability plants which shows some reduction in cheatgrass when there is native species in competition with it, however after eight-year threshold the cheatgrass will begin to take over. He stated that NDOW is attempting to do this with NDOW'S restoration plan with out planting native plants in certain sites to integrate the seeds into the landscape to create new vegetation, he stated NDOW is attempting to out compete the cheatgrass. He stated that even with a seed bank native seeds are not easy to come upon. He stated NDOW is attempting to create a crew to up their native seed resources and at this time they do not have enough crew for the massive landscapes.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that it is very difficult to use seeds of native bunch grasses which have a different life cycle do to when they germinate and they do not compete very well with cheatgrass, and unfortunately cheatgrass is ideally suited for the environment in Nevada.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated Nevada has low moisture.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that cheatgrass takes advantage of any moisture received instantly and rapidly germinates any season when moisture is available while the native species is attempting to germinate.
- Chair Paul Dixon thanked both gentlemen (*Matt Flores, Supervisor, Wildlife Diversity, Southern Region, NDOW & Dane Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, Southern*

- Region, NDOW) for their presentations.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this matter is hereby closed.

IX. General Business/Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners November 4, 2022 & November 5, 2022, 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 (702) 455-1402 or darlene.kretunski@clarkcountynv.gov. The final Commission agenda & support at http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Agenda/.

- Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review (*For possible action*).**

The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 to provide for the Department review of tentative subdivision map(s) and inclusion of recommendations for methods to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife, mitigation measures, best management practices or required design features, and provide for collection of associated fees to the Department for carrying out such reviews.

 - Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chair Paul Dixon read the following: He stated this is the first reading of new proposed draft language to NAC 278: (**Summary:** *New draft language includes definitions for “Infill development”, “Substantially vacant.” And “Vacant” relative to subdivision development. Draft language also includes direction for the collection of fees for conducting review of tentative subdivision maps relative to wildlife and /or habitat resources with potential to be impacted, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.337. (Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation): Existing law sets forth an approval process for a subdivision of land, requiring the sub divider of the land to submit a tentative map to the planning commission or governing body of a county or city, as applicable, and requires the tentative map to be forwarded to certain state agencies and local governments for review, including the NDOW (“Department”). Existing law also authorizes the NDOW Commissioners to establish reasonable fees and procedures for the review of a tentative map (NRS 278.335, 278.337). This regulation sets forth procedures and requirements for the review of a tentative map by the Department.*
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that this is a new CGR (*Commission General Regulation 500*), and NDOW is going to evaluate land subdivision for impact to the wildlife and stated he asked awhile ago about when commercial collection of reptiles ended several years ago. He stated he ask the question with all the development in place who from NDOW is going out to make sure that the animals are being removed to other areas or if animals are doing well. He stated it has taken multiple years and he is uncertain if this is the right regulation or set up to address this. He gave example: when the Clark County Rifle-Pistol Center & RV Park was built and he was at this location and noticed where the cuts at the shooting range on the walls before they carve them with sand, there is a series of holes 18-24 inches below the surface with each one being a tortoise burrow which had been cut through, and a large portion of landscape has been removed. He asked the question of where are all the tortoises that lived in these burrows, and he found out that most of the tortoises had not been relocated along with lizards and other species living in that environment below the mountain landscape. He stated he felt uneasy about how if it was commercial landscaping that made them exempt from having to deal with these

issues of the species living in these environments and feels that this is an issue that himself as well as others have complaints and concerns about.

- Board member John Hiatt stated that he is embarrassed about this regulation and stated that there are a dozen tentative maps in Clark County weekly due to individuals subdividing small amounts of land such as 5 or 10 acres and with this regulation these small amounts of land will have to go through review and the developers will be charged for these small acres, \$250.00 plus \$5.00 each acre. He feels that people do not pay attention to these acres, and stated he held the position of Town Board Chairman and he never seen a time where NDOW showed up to any meetings on behalf of any matters or gave any input whatsoever. He stated he feels that in rural Nevada people are going to want to subdivide land in places where new cities are being built such as Coyote Springs in valleys in this area having great tortoises or if they still have some then this regulation would make logical sense but anything in the Las Vegas Valley should be exempt from this.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated subdivision map review is exempt for infill situations such as area like Decatur & Jones with a vacant lot surrounded by new development, this should be exempt and stated he feels it would target for large ranch parcel broken up into 40 ranchettes. He stated he feels this regulation is coming from a good place in terms of protection for the wildlife but with no mention of massive solar fields that are being put up and the destruction of every living species and killing lizards, plants, and animals underneath many acres of solar fields and complete this with no issues but 5 to 6 years ago with the band the commercial reptile collection with individuals making their living by doing this and collected a few thousand reptiles yearly but one of the solar panel complexes is destroying hundreds of thousands of reptiles and reptile habitats and has doubts that NDOW would take the opportunity to look at this and he feels it is giving only focus on breaking up ranches and ranchettes and its potential impact on mule deer and migratory corridor and feels there is a seed of something that is either needed or wanted potentially helping wildlife but the vast majority is detriment to the development and the development community. He stated the planning commission is having a meeting tonight down the hall from CAB meeting and he knows that Chairman, Commissioner Nelson Stone would not like this at all and advised that he has an appointment with Chairman, Commissioner Nelson Stone tomorrow and he definitely would be addressing this issue to him to see what his thoughts would be on this matter and stated he has a clean copy for Mr. Stone to review. He stated that this is insane and thought process here is acceptable but showing a map is already a condition of approval and when a tentative map is submitted to the County Commissioners for approval then this is before it is seen by the County Commissioners and the City Council with NDOW wanting to view map(s) before anyone can do so and make their comments. He stated it is putting undo burden on the developer and is asking for address and contact name of the developer for the subdivision, which he feels is insane things that is already a burden to the developer already. He feels there is other methods this could be done without adding another task for NDOW to review, maybe contact the planning commission could alter NDOW after the fact stating these are developments that may have impact on wildlife for your review. He stated to do it any other way or by bringing in NDOW to review the development first seems erroneous to him.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked the question what the difference between this regulation is and an environmental impact statement. She stated maybe she was incorrect in her thinking, but she was under the impression that any individual who is developing any land had to submit a request and wildlife management or whatever agency is the correct one would investigate this request as part of the environmental impact.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated that when heritage projects are done an EIS (*Environmental Impact Statement*) must be approved and goes to public comment and the NDOW also comments on the EIS, he stated he agrees on what board member Therese Campbell was stating.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated she thought it was a law and they had to have this.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that Environmental Impact Statement is only referred to federal land unless there is a state thing; he gave example of California where he stated in California they have equivalent called (EIR) Environmental Impact Report, an EIR contains information on potential effects, measures to mitigate those effects, and an analysis of alternatives to the project and key feature of the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) is it gives the opportunity for the public to provide input on Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations and EIRS. He stated Nevada does not have EIR so that does not apply only under a federal nexus. (*Federal nexus- a project has a federal nexus when a federal agency must take an action on a project. Before the federal agency takes an action, environmental impacts must be evaluated under NEPA (National Environmental Protection Agency. Common actions that create a federal nexus include federal and decision required within the projected area).*)
- Board member Therese Campbell stated only under these small tracks of land if considered to be “infill” or five acres and it is not required to have the subdivision map submitted and asked if what she stated is correct and now, they want this for smaller tracks, and wanted to know if these statements were correct?
- Board member John Hiatt stated there is no clear clarification on who is exempt as far as he could see and stated there is some exemptions, but it is just not clear who is exempt. He stated for individuals in the Las Vegas Valley in which maps are submitted daily and weekly having to pay \$250 dollars and submission of all the paperwork for the state going through the motions, therefore it seems like undo burden on these developers hence accomplishing nothing for the wildlife.
- Board member Therese Campbell wanted to hear from any NDOW staff in ways that these required regulations could be made more effective for the goal of the protection of our wildlife and their habitat.
- (*Lt. Chris Walther's, Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that these questions should be directed to (*Brad Harbenbrook, Supervisor Habitat Division, Southern Region, NDOW*) he reviews all the maps that are submitted to NDOW, and he would be the individual contact for that.
- Board member Brian Patterson reiterated that he felt that NDOW's heart was in the correct area on wanting review capability over certain developments, but the regulation is too broad because it must look at every development. He stated and the cost of \$250.00 associated with this and not to mention the time factor thus causing a slow down for the developer up to 2 month or 2 years or 2 weeks, it is unknown. He stated the process of review, making comments, additional comments, revisions, resubmission back to NDOW and additional costs of \$5.00 acre with second review, all these factors are cumbersome. He asked (*Jasmine Kleiber, Wildlife Staff Specialist, Habitat Division*) who prepared this and need to know where this originated from, and he doesn't see mention of 40-acre parcel (ranchettes), and it is unknown if this is the minimum size or what is the minimum size.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that was one of his questions and he felt the intention for this draft is good but unsure of the execution due to not having a clear statement of limits, size, parcel and requirements, example: if he had a one acre parcel and wanted to divide it into two half acre parcels he knows that would not make a

- significant impact on the wildlife in Nevada but if he had a larger parcel such as 500 acre parcel thus dividing into several five acre parcels that is different, he stated he too saw the 40 acre section and it is not clear that amount is the limitation, no clarity on this.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised from his perspective there has been unlimited development in Reno region and the Las Vegas Valley happening for years and he came to Nevada in 1982 he would camp in Desert Shores and the road 95 north of Jones was only two lanes, paved off of 95 and Jones east only but going west toward the mountains it was a dirt road and he had to drive on dirt road to camp in that direction and now 40 years later with 2 ½ million more people now the population is spread everywhere and he is not sure that if developer was going to develop north upwards toward the Paiute Reservation off toward Lee Canyon, how much of that land has not already been sub parceled and developed and has not already impacted the wildlife.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated when looking into exemptions that certain pieces of land in Nevada have been developed already and when doing over 200 acre parcel in the Valley, it has changed the wildlife environment today with all the development to date that he is uncertain what NDOW would be looking for in these areas now, but in Cave Valley if developers in this area would like to break up his massive acres into subdivisions of parcels then that is different environment because of the area this would certainly have a different impact on the wildlife habitat in that area. If it were a ranch with lots of acres broken into subdivisions that would only impact large portions of the land that have nothing to do with anything other than the ranch. He stated that he feels the application is for rural nature of things but in reference too urbanized areas he feels it would be for financial purposes only to make income having little or no benefit to wildlife. He stated this is his opinion.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson asked if urban development not be considered” infill development”.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated yes.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated it would be excluded.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated it would be exempt, and an individual unfortunately would still have to submit their \$250.00 application only to be advised that it is exempt. He stated he is not sure, maybe not.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised it is not clear. He stated they define “infill development” but do not clarify where you are exempt.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked if it is “infill development” when there is expansion from Ann Road to Lee Canyon or is it “infill” when the expansion is in the open areas around Ann Road South to Durango where they are filling “infill”, he stated that would be “infill development”.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated clearly this was intended for large projects and asked for everyone to view Pg 3 (h) *A master plan showing the location of future development and the intended use of all the land under the ownership or control of the developers in the vicinity of the subdivision.* He stated that this shows this applies to large projects.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated Green Valley, Henderson, Anthem.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated this does not state clarification of what they are looking for or limitations that they have at their disposal or in their power to put on developers. He stated example: if a developer would be advised that they need to set aside out of your 100 acres 75 acres for this corridor and by doing so now the developer has made his property worthless.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised that the corrective actions are listed on **Pg 4 Sec. 7: *The Department of Wildlife will provide written comments on a tentative map and review from submitted pursuant to section 6 of this regulation by the deadline set forth in***

subsection 5 of NRS 278.335. The comments provided by the Department of Wildlife may include, without limitations: 1) Methods to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife 2) Recommendations on mitigation measures; or 3) Best management practices or required design features. He stated this sounds to him as them advising to developers here would be a good idea and the mandate would be the required design features and he feels if they had regulation with clear intention to assist with wildlife there should be more than just a recommendation comment and the ability to issue more than just a recommendation or comment on the map that is not serious enough.

- Board member Brian Patterson advised to board member Jacob Thompson if it has no teeth, and they would not just give recommendations of what actions they would like the developer to do, and these recommendations are just recommendations with no consequences.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised this is under Sec. 7 #3 Best management practices.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that he has been to hundreds of meetings and there have been dozens maybe hundreds of Planning Commission meetings and County Commission meetings, if you do not go in person, you will not be heard, and submission of letters is just them addressing they have received three letters from protestors and they simply move forward and do not address the letters. He reiterated if one is not there in person to protest then the matter will not be addressed properly. He stated an individual must be present in front of the County Commissioners to get approval of their matters.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated even if the individual does protest and is standing at the meeting in person then they will still say no.
- Board member John Hiatt stated if one submits letter than you are wasting your time. He stated he does not understand why every individual must submit \$250 dollars and their \$5.00 fee per acre just be told no.
- Board member Therese Campbell asked the question of where the funds go to after payment does it go to the County of the development.
- Board member John Hiatt stated the funds go to the general fund for NDOW.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated NDOW has certain amount of man hours for review of these tentative maps and the exercise of doing so is redundant because the planning commission is already doing.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to the CAB to think about the recommendations on this action item and remember that this is simply a first reading, and this action item will probably return before the CAB two or three more times. He asked the CAB what the key items are they would want in this recommendation to help with clarification going forward and all the CAB's concerns.
- Public Comments: (*Fred Volz*): He stated that the CAB does not need to overthink this action item and stated it is clear on what the target is, which is large portion of land in which there are a large amount of on the Peripheral of the Las Vegas Valley in different directions and if impact then the Planning Commission has no expertise to figure this out hence reasoning of why NDOW should be the reviewer of these maps. On the other hand, if the parcel is only one acre located in central Las Vegas and it is vacant land and has not been developed for reasons unknown and a developer is seeking this vacant land the likelihood of this acre impacting the wildlife there is extremely minimal and he stated these acres should have exclusion. He stated on areas such as Rhodes Ranch, Gypsum Mine located next to Red Rock that Mr. Rhodes wants to develop now, these are significant parcels of land in which a assessment is needed and the funds received from this is actually very minimal in the scheme developing property and putting in infrastructure and the pieces that make up this equation therefore if you are asking for

- response time to be limited than that is fine but NDOW should be overseeing and reviewing these large developments. There are many in areas such as Reno and in Las Vegas that need assessments done and not just rubber stamped and approval and next.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris*): He stated he is opposed to any of this, and it is ridiculous, and he always hears from NDOW of the shortage of staff for this or that or to properly manage wildlife and now we want to bring NDOW a massive project that would require tons of staff. He stated that NDOW needs to stay in their lane, and he is elected to town board official, and his duty is to decide what is best for these areas of lands. He stated my committee elected him to have the best interest of these areas of land and he hates to advise Mr. Volz, but he knows very well the needs and requirements in these areas of land. He stated this will affect rural communities where there are already major impacts trying to manage getting developers into these lands. This is now limiting these lands and the federal government already has massive land grabs and the EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) only affects the government and even with the EIS he cannot do anything, therefore he suggests if NDOW is concerned about this then they need to get together with the federal government when they start disposal of federal land and give other land to other people and NDOW needs to review those lands first. He feels it makes no sense that there is going to be the public dealing with this and NDOW complaining of not having the staff to perform these duties and request more money to get more staff that they don't already have, and this makes no sense to him. He stated in the rural area where these huge projects arise then everyone knows about these projects and if NDOW cannot figure this out like everyone else then they have their heads in the sand therefore if NDOW wants to make a impact then they need to work for County Commissioners or state officials that are over these districts where these lands are located in order to make this work not adding additional fees to the public. He stated NDOW has received enough of his money yearly and does not manage these lands properly therefore no additional monies should come from the public for NDOW.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated he is in agreeance with a member of the public (*Brian Burris*) and what he stated as well as Chair Paul Dixon when he stated why put in the hands of policies and the middle class and not in the hands of little guy who is just trying to develop lands and build houses for families and it should be placed into the correct policies and not in the hands of anyone else.
 - Chair Paul Dixon asked board member Jacob Thompson since he will be taking his place at the Commission meeting to advise a motion on this action item.
 - Board member Brian Patterson advised that it should state about 40 acres and the ranchettes.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised he felt the motion should be a clear size limitation based on expert opinions.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated it would be helpful if it is recognized of who does this does not affect, who is exempt from this.
 - Board member Brian Patterson advised this is not just a subdivision map but a tentative map for a solar field.
 - Board member John Hiatt stated for solar fields for disposal of federal land normally NDOW should be cooperating agency on the EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) therefore this should not affect them, NDOW should already be corpora ting agency on the EIS.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated that tribal lands are not in this because they are exempt as well. He stated all these large parcels of land such as land Tesla battery plant is on outside of Reno could be taken up.
 - Board John Hiatt stated ten of thousands of acres for industrial parks.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated he feels it is solely focused on 10,000 acres carved into smaller ranchettes and the impact on the effects of wildlife due to this and he understands this is done for the caring of the wildlife but unsure if the method is the right method to achieve this goal.
- Board member Therese Campbell asking the question if there should be more stipulations or more specifics for the minimal size of the land parcel required to have this kind of (interrupted).
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Therese Campbell that when she makes these kinds of statements that he agrees and stated 40 acres next to Patterson Pass in the wilderness is different than 40 acres in North Las Vegas or Aliante.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it is not necessarily in reference to size.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated not size but ecologically environment.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated without the process there is no one looking to determine the criticality of habitat and (interrupted).
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this was his concern when there was a question about reptiles regarding stopping an individual from collection of hundreds of reptiles or thousands as opposed to individuals who decimating hundreds of thousands without any consequences.
- Board member John Hiatt stated to do this correctly CAB needs to talk to the right contact person at NDOW (*Brad Harbenbrook, Supervisor Habitat Division, Southern Region, NDOW*) asking him questions such as how he deals with various projects and land easement application that you see and even those that he does not see, and this would be very helpful in determining how this affects (interrupted)
- Board member Brian Patterson stated its mapped already hence might be grandfathered in but development like this has impact on big horn sheep, rabbits, quail, reptiles.
- Board member John Hiatt reiterated that (*Brad Harbenbrook, Supervisor Habitat Division, Southern Region, NDOW*) is the person who the CAB really needs to speak with.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the next time this action item is on the CAB's agenda he will reach out to (*Brad Harbenbrook, Supervisor Habitat Division, Southern Region, NDOW*) to have him be present at the meeting by phone, to have him available on that date.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he agrees that there is a need to do this because we have not been doing this to determine how and where it is implemented, these are great questions and are at this time unclear on what we have right now.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that there is a developer who wants to develop Ruby Mountains.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that there is an investor at Harrison Pass, half a mile strips up and down the pass.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated there could be Circle K there.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that could be and maybe put 7-Eleven on the top of the pass so that campers would not have to drive into Elko to get their food.
- Board member John Hiatt asked if the CAB going to return to this action item.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to talk to (*Brad Harbenbrook, Supervisor Habitat Division, Southern Region, NDOW*) and gave six ways that could give clarification and improvement based on the CAB's discussion: 1) Clear size limitation on parcels that are included in the process.
- Board member John Hiatt stated basically what is exempt.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated 2) update statement of what is excluded as well

- and stated these two items 1 & 2 are not mutually exclusive therefore we need both. 3) Why does NDOW receive the first opportunity to review this before the Commissions.
- Board member John Hiatt stated the reasoning for #3 is the Commission will make the final determination therefore if it is not received before the final decision is made then this is a waste of time. He stated one must be early in the process to affect the final decision.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated he had stated #3 because he was under the impression that this was early in the development process before the Commission bangs their gavel.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated the map is sent to the Planning Commission or governing body at this time NDOW is asking to be incorporated into this.
 - Board member Brian Patterson disagreed with Chair Paul Dixon and read the following from Pg 4 (4): *A developer may submit a tentative map to the Department of Wildlife before submitting the tentative map to the planning commission or governing body to be previewed by the Department of Wildlife for any potential wildlife issues.*
 - Board member John Hiatt stated that if there was an issue, he would like to have knowledge of it.
 - Board member Therese Campbell stated to board member Brian Patterson that Pg 4 (4) the sentence said may and that is not the same as stating that they have too.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised that he thinks this allows them to do it perhaps.
 - Board member John Hiatt again reiterated that he would like a heads up if there is going to be a problem in the future with that word.
 - Board member Therese Campbell indicated the developers do not have to submit the map with that wording of may meaning they do not have to do it.
 - Board member John Hiatt advised that the developers are smart with the knowledge if they would like to do this or not.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated if there is spotted owl couples posted up in trees one on each side then NDOW needs to know.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson returned to his motion: on #3 (*Asking where does NDOW fall in the process precisely 4) Purpose and Rationale (asking NDOW to give rationale of why they need to do the process, need to know because of the breakup of large parcels and the effect on the wildlife migration) 5) Corrective powers/Actions that can be taken by NDOW and is it cleared meaning is there really any teeth to this. 6) Are there any relationship between this process and existing environmental assessments or status quo or environmental assessments that are already doing or being done, is this part of the normal process or demand for collaboration of NDOW with the Nevada Department of Environment or other state agencies.*
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion for Commission General Regulation 500, Subdivision Map Review the CAB indicate a desire for clarification on six separate items: 1) Size limitation 2) Exclusion from the process 3) Placement of NDOW in this process or timing 4) Their statement of purpose 5) Explanation of corrective actions 6) Exploration of opportunities for collaboration of other state agencies.
 - Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion
 - **Motion passes 5-0**

b. **Commission General Regulation 502, NAC 502 Junior Hunt and Turkey Program, LCB File No. R051-21 (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending to consider amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 to limit the number of successfully awarded tags in the junior hunt program. The regulation also removes hard close dates for submitting a turkey harvest return card and allows for junior turkey bonus points to convert to the adult point category once a junior is ineligible to participate in the junior hunt turkey program.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **(Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation):** *To keep consistency, the Department is proposing changes to the business rules regarding the turkey harvest return card and bonus point programs. The proposed changes would align with the business rules established for the big game species by allowing an applicant who failed to submit their turkey harvest return card by the established deadline to pay the \$50 associated fee and complete the survey during the following year's turkey application period to lift the applied suspension and successfully apply. The changes would also allow for juniors participating in the junior turkey hunt program to roll their accumulated bonus points into the adult category once they are no longer eligible for participation as a junior turkey hunter. Additionally, the Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee has proposed a limitation to participation in the junior hunt programs that would make an applicant ineligible for future participation in the junior hunt programs after three (3) successfully awarded junior tags. This limitation is specific to the species being applied for.*
- Chair Paul Dixon advised stated that due to the limitation to participate in the junior hunt program after three (3) successfully awarded junior tags this would make an applicant ineligible for future participation.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the proposed changes would allow the applicant who failed to submit their turkey harvest return card timely to pay \$50 dollars and complete the survey to lift the applied suspension and submit their application.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised it would allow for junior turkey bonus point holders to roll over their accumulated points into the adult category once they are no longer eligible to participate in the junior turkey hunt program.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he felt all listed above was good and he only had a problem with limiting the amount of successfully awarded tags through the junior hunt programs to three (3).
- Chair Paul Dixon had a presentation in tonight's meeting has been updated and stated that this same presentation will be presented at the Tag Committee meeting and will be presented to the Commission as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that it takes tags away from juniors but places more juniors into the field. He stated the following facts from his presentation:
- Juniors who bought combination hunts 9, 785 (hunt/fish combination license).
- Out of that total from the 9,785 only 240 were not eligible for the junior mule deer programs.
- 6,821 applied for the big game across the board for all species tags.
- 3, 612 were not awarded any tags= 52%.
- 3,209 were rewarded one or more two tags= 47%

- The number of applicants who received one tag for the junior hunt is 2,982 = just under 50%.
- The number of juniors who received two tags for the junior hunt is 209.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked Chair Paul Dixon if the stats showing only 209 have only received more than one junior tag.
- The number of juniors who received three tags for the junior hunt is 16.
- The number of juniors who received four tags for the junior hunt is 4.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated a child from the age of 12 to 17 has only drawn two times out of six years.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he feels as if he knows these two kids.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that is terrible (in reference to a child only drawn two times out of six years).
- Chair Paul Dixon stated my apologies of the 3,209 only two have drawn a total of four tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated out of the 3,209 only 209 have received tags this year have drawn two tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon reiterated again that only 16 have drawn three tags
- Chair Paul Dixon stated and 2 have received four tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated and none of the junior hunt have received five tags.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that of all the juniors who have received tags this year a small percentage, less than 1% and less than 001% have received multiple tags in their entire lifetime of receiving tags, that received a tag this year.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that this reflects just for the year of 2022.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the information shown is simply for the year of 2022 only.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised for the juniors who applied in 2022 he asked the question of how many have received tags in previous years and the answer is 209.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that 6, 821 applied and out of that total and half did not receive a tag. He stated this should be the focus and these stats reflect that only 50% of the people possibly drawing a tag in any given year.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated in any given year yes and what this reflects to him that this year 2022 this perception that juniors are receiving multiple tags is taking away opportunity for others is faulted by the stats that he has counted is that 227 juniors received multiple tags in 2022 during their career.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised out of 3,200 that were awarded tags.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that was out of 6,000 applicants.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that would be 3,000 submissions this year and all of them will draw making them not eligible to draw next year and the next 3,000 applicants draw in the next year thereafter on the odd number year therefore every other year they would be almost 95% draw.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he wanted to make a point that he did not believe that the number of juniors receiving multiple tags was enough during their junior hunt career would make any difference and this is reflected in the 2022 data.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked Chair Paul Dixon the question of the

- age range on those participating.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member Jacob Thompson 14 years of age to 18 years of age.
 - (*Lt. Chris Walthers Game Warden, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that the individual cannot be 18 in the summer prior to the hunt starting.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated that ruffly six years when the data started, we will assume that the information is correct; he gave example: if 200 kids are receiving multiple tags in any given year that would be looking at total of 1,200 over a six-year period in which a single youth would attempt to apply.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated that is 1,200 out of 40,000 kids that would apply in a six-year period making it 6,000 applying each year.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated that is 40,000 applications but not 40,000 applicants, it is likely a pool of kids.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that these stats are all for junior mule deer only.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated we are not talking about junior mule deer we are discussing turkeys. He stated the stats for turkey hunt would be much higher.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated this strikes him as a solution in search of a problem.
 - (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden, Southern Region, NDOW*): He stated he reads in the junior hunt program additionally turkeys. He stated it is not clear if this is referencing only turkeys because of the number of turkey tags.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that there are not that many kids that are applying for turkey.
 - Chair Paul Dixon he stated those who are applying for big game draw across all species and tags is 6,000. He stated only 3,200 were rewarded one tag or more. He stated 3,000 were awarded one tag.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated asked Chair Paul Dixon what types of tags, would it be deer tag and antelope tag and that is the two tags.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated the tags he is speaking about were for deer, antelope, and elk.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He asked Chair Paul Dixon if this was indicating that one could receive four tags this year.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated this is saying that of the kids who apply this year there will be two kids that will receive 4 tags.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated to Chair Paul Dixon that the only focused should be on the deer only. He stated what we are saying with these numbers is that half the kids apply and only half receive a tag.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that 4,324 applied for junior mule deer and 2,677 were awarded the junior mule = 62%.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated that he is under the assumption that they are using the information from the junior mule as reference point since the mule deer is the highest category of junior application. He stated therefore it would not be informative to advise us of the amount of youth applying for a turkey tag received multiple tags.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated that the fact a kid received a mule deer tag received an adult turkey tag or elk tag or antelope tag.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated it would be as if the kids would receive the same percentage of tags as the adults who draw four tags in a single year

is less than 100. He stated the focus should be on the amount of youths receiving tags giving more opportunities for more youths to be in the field, therefore 62% are happy minus the 38% which would be 4 out of 10 each year will not get any opportunity. He stated in theory it seems one kid could receive a deer tag yearly and would be in the 62% yearly for six years. He stated he would prefer to say a guarantee if the kid is in the field and every other year, they will receive a tag.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated the maximum tag given is three which is what is stated and asked the question what the difference stating every other year you can apply only apply or be awarded three times.
- Board member Brian Patterson gave example: he stated the youth are aware in that year they can only give away 3,000 tags and the youth know they are going to be one of the receivers of the 3,000 receive those tags because the number of applicants who applied for the tags this year was around 3,500. He stated he will have odd number based on the year he was born was a odd number and there you have it, I would be applying on a odd number of years and vice versa if my birthdate is on even number then as a applicant I have to apply on even number of years both of these scenarios have a 50/50 chance and will receive three tags every other year to hunt with family.
- Board member John Hiatt stated when he reads this, the only focus before the CAB is the addition of turkeys.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated yes, it is about turkeys.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it is indeed addition of turkeys and the condition to limit number of tags for juniors, and it allows an applicant who failed to submit their turkey harvest return card by the deadline date the option to make a payment of \$50.00 associated fee and complete the survey during the following year's turkey application period to lift the applied suspension and successfully apply.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that if he were on the panel then he would automatically assume that with 3,500 deer tags given out that every youth will receive one and unfortunately, they do not.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated there was a time around 15 years ago when he first started that there were more tags because there were more deer than there were youth that applied. He stated now it has reversed with less tags and more youth applying.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he feels this should be revisited the junior system in place to guarantee that the youth will draw on their even or odd years.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that even with that system that Brian Patterson talked about in place there is a total number of kids that have apply in the system was 4,324.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated a larger number of the youths aged out each year with the new youths that come in balancing out the process and guarantee each kid receives a tag every year.
- Brian Patterson stated youth's numbers are larger when they are younger, as they get older the youths focus is on other things such as sports, family, friends.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the number of juniors who have drawn multiple tags during their six-year career are as follows: 1 tag = (5,534) 35%, 2 tags (3,858) = 25%, 3 tags (2,791) = 18%, 4 tags (2,046) = 13%, 5 tags (1,480) =

9%.

- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He asked the question were the stats giving pertaining to solely deer or both turkey and deer.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated multiple junior tags.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated it is not defined.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated it is junior tags which is defined as junior deer and junior turkey.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated does this mean different species.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he was sure it was combined species.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated that if you combine species and a kid was lucky and got both junior deer tag and a junior turkey in the same year, that kid has already used up a total of 2 and if the commission wants to use up a maximum of 3 junior tags therefore with this scenario the kid, he/she is only eligible for one more hunt.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he is under the impression that this is mainly dealing with mule deer due to all comp results up to this point was pertaining to deer and the units for deer.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated that he felt that this should have been broken into separate items one for junior mule deer and one for junior turkey instead of combining this information.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated only one-third received one tag in five years. He stated the patience of the kids drop once they get older as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he agreed the participation dropped once almost 50% once going from one-to-one year again then to three years.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated if a youth has gone three years in a row and never drawn then the youth get into sports like basketball.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated the numbers in the chart shows that if this passes then 3,500 additional tags would be available to the youth who received less than three.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked board member Jacob Thompson if he was taking the four and the five and adding them together.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stating yes taking the four and five and adding them together to be redistributed to any youth that does not have three already.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that is true.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated of the changes indicated that was the only thing he wanted the CAB to have a discussion on including the presentation information.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He asked the question of the total number of how many had been harvested. He asked the question differently, out of the tags issued; how many were harvested.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that the graph shown earlier on harvest success looked to show in his guess mate is 40-60.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to Jacob Thompson, it states that in 2022 tags successful were 9,000.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked the question to Chair Paul Dixon that each one is successful. He asked Secretary Darlene Kretunski to read off the correct percentages on the chart for both successful and no successful.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski read 38% unsuccessful and 62% successful.

- Chair Paul Dixon located the information and stated that 62% were harvest success.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He asked the Chair how much the percentage was for successful.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised it was 62%.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He stated so that would be 62% of the 9,000.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised to member of the public (*Robert Gaudet*) that no 62% but there were only 3,600 tags awarded.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson 3,600 tags I thought you said there were 9,000 tags.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated no 9,000 applicants.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He stated oh 9,000 applicants.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He asked the question of the number for does and the number for bucks is that total known, of the 62%.
- Secretary Darlene Kretunski read the following the amount for bucks is 80%.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated 80% of the 62% success rate of the 3,600 tags awarded were bucks.
- Public Comments: (*Robert Gaudet*): He asked board member Brian Patterson that 3,600 were bucks.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated no 80% of the 62% success rate of the 3,600 tags awarded were bucks.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that means 2,000.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated 2,000 were successful and 80% of the 2,000.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated 1,600 were bucks and 400 does.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that was reasonable.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to the CAB that they need to understand that this action item is first reading and will be presented at the Commission meeting and the CAB may not have seen it yet therefore this is his reasoning of presenting it at tonight's meeting for discussion. He advised he will submit this to the secretary for posting as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that his point in doing so is when looking at what board member Jacob Thompson stated 3,600 tags added back into the available draw with a thousand more tags over a lifetime of the juniors these additional tags are available if they are limited to three.
- Board member John Hiatt advised if the Chair Paul Dixon would not have asked for the additional information the graphs and charts, he presented, then the CAB would not have the ability to make an informative decision with just the packet that was presented by NDOW. He stated if the CAB is going to be effective in providing useful advice, then the additional backup information needs to be presented as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he was told if he were present at the committee meetings then he would have this information. He stated the committee meetings are usually the week of the commission meeting which means it is after he has had his public meeting therefore it is not effective for him to afterwards go to the committee meetings.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the Commission did not have this information as well and were upset about this. He stated as an Advisory Board we need to at

least have the basic information to advise, or they cannot do so.

- Board member Jacob Thompson stated based on the last slide in which it references the total number over the lifetime he stated he is moderately tied to the conviction that limiting the tags to 3 tags for the juniors would provide more opportunities if youth had this over a lifetime cycle.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that if you viewed the units that most people would like to apply for and take their kids hunting, there seems to be each year many used tags. He stated if there is a tag that was not awarded in the additional draw does taking this tag in the second chance draw count as the three if picking in an area that nobody really wants to hunt. He stated he feels if in the main draw it is limited to three as limit for the junior, but they would like to go to an area that nobody really picks, and you have done three tags why can't this junior still apply for another tag in these types of areas rather than for the tag to go unused. This should be considered because the youth were choosing areas like this with their parents to have opportunities to hunt after the limitation of three tags.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he feels the second draw would not count against the youth but advised it is still a tag.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the way he read it; it would count as another tag.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he would be reluctant to endorse the caveat to state that second chance tags do not count the three successful applications if it is unused.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it is called a turnback for example.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated or over the counter tag. Chair Paul Dixon stated there are second chance tags and occasionally there are tags that are returned from over the counter that are issued, therefore if these do not count against the youth then they could receive more.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he is under the understanding that the Commission is leaning toward a vote of approval on this.
- Board Brian Patterson advised the member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) made a great point in stating there are only two good hunts: the turkey and deer, he feels they should be classified separately not combined. He stated that youth that want to do turkey hunting may not feel the need to hunt for deer.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated that his daughter did not apply until she was 16 and did not draw last year but did this year, he had her put into Unit 10 as a last choice for her to at least receive a deer tag due to this being her last year of eligibility. He stated she did get Unit 10 and drew a youth turkey tag in Lincoln County. He stated so in actuality she drew two youth tags this year and this is the reason he would like the separation of the two tags. He stated there cannot be a combination of junior hunt turkey and junior hunt deer.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated agreed.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked the question to give a guesstimate on the number of junior turkey tags if they had to guess, just within a year.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he has no idea.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated maybe 20 and stated he feels that is very small.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it counts against 20 kids yearly, if lumped into all the junior tags and this could equal out to 100 kids.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated these 20 kids would be the luckiest

kids in Nevada.

- Board Brian Patterson stated yes but these kids do not get opportunity for turkey or deer within the next three years. He stated he understands that there is only 20 and it is not indeed a big population.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he is in favor of the idea of redistribution after three tags.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated of deer only to board member Jacob Thompson's statement of redistribution after three tags.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked the question if the example that member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) gave would that be two tags with four years left to keep those tags even although the applicant is applying for deer and turkey.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that to draw a turkey tag is harder and if there is 1 draw in their youth of a turkey tag he would be surprised. He stated he has applied in the areas of Lincoln and Clark County for the last five years and is unsuccessful each year, but he continues to try. He stated next year he will be hunting in Michigan.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated he has been in turkey tags since 1995 and only has received three tags since that date.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that he gotten five tags in the ten years and recently he has not received any in the last eight years but has drawn every other year.
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris*): He stated that he disagrees with this action item and feels that the 1) Chair Paul Dixon charts he presented is misleading and that 35% have only one tag and if adding the 1-5 tags that this number adds up to 100 and this is the number of hunters that put in a tag and advised that he only harvested once in his youth career versus four times in his youth career. 2) He stated looking at Area 10 there is always 100 tags leftover therefore if one is smart then Area 10 would be these individuals very last choice. By applying this method, he stated his children get to hunt in Area 10 yearly. Prior to this location he has three to four prime choices and Area 10 is his subprime choice in which he will automatically receive a tag. He stated he should be able to do this all five years without having to go to second draw for it not to count and makes no sense. He stated we are not going to greatly prevent these youth from receiving tags he feels we are just not. He stated when discussing adding bonus points to the youth hunt to an adult hunt therefore individuals such as himself who have been putting in got every tag for the amount of areas allowed to put in for over six years and then having not drawn a tag, now there will be other individuals who will equal him on bonus points which is not fair and not mentioning application fees and other fees with this. He stated he feels if the youth and their families are willing in the beginning to take a sub primary area using one of their choices on that area knowing that there will be leftover tags, then these youth should be able to hunt that area regardless of it being on a second draw or not. He stated it is not making sense to tell everyone to put in on five prime areas but on the sixth they will go to the second draw. He stated he knows that member of the public (*Ron Stoker*) applies this method to his children by making Area 10 their last choice and they draw Area 10 yearly and his children harvest in Area 10 because it is tough unit to hunt. He stated if we have a youth who has three years and does not have any success due to not having any skills developed and when becoming 17 and having more skills developed now this

individual can no longer hunt. He stated opportunity is being taken away when there is no need to do so and there is no need for any additional regulations. He stated he is opposed to this still.

- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated this is his kids last year of hunting therefore he is adamant regarding this and if he knew this law was going to be put into effect, he would have made different choices including for the primaries and wishes they would show the stats where the youth applied. He stated for some kids their parents might feel it is too far for these subprime areas and for him it is not because his kids do not play sports but instead hunt that is his time spent with his kids. He stated he will spend his money in Utah or Arizona if this law passes and he agrees with member of the public (*Brian Burriss*) when he stated the stats are all over the place. He stated stats are given clearly to advise where people are applying but the data collection there is no good from these data agencies. He asked the question of how many individuals are applying to Mt. Charleston and stated that is the only one he did not apply for and then you have individuals upset for not receiving a tag in this area and advised well the public will not get a tag from these areas. He stated that NDOW does a great job of showing the applicants the stats about the specifics in areas, and their ability in percentage of drawing a tag therefore helping parents see what areas which are not always prime that they need to place their kids in to get a tag. He is upset that due to his choice of having his kids travel to these subprime areas in order to get a tag he stated he is upset because his kid is really becoming a great hunter and this may be a deterrent because under this action item it would take him out of youth and place him in with the adults therefore he will start having interest elsewhere and will probably not come back until he is 25. He stated losing the best time at that age to bond and hunt with your kid. He stated he hunted with his friend member of the public (*Brian Burriss*) kid and at age 15-16 killed his first deer and the experience was great. He stated that the youth will receive these tags and limit out and lose their interest and he advised that board member Jacob Thompson stated it best when saying “it is finding a solution to a problem that does not exist”. He stated the law is a bad imitation of a law and rule. He stated maybe have kids that have drawn many tags have to apply for areas that are not prime or have year waiting limit if the youth have drawn two tags a row. He stated there are more ways to implement this action without having three tags your out, no turkey and no deer.
- Public Comments: (*Nicki Gulli*): 1) He stated once we take away from the youth you will never get it back and once it is voted on and accepted never going to see it back and this is the reality. 2) He stated previously the CAB voted that when it comes to youths that does can no longer be killed only bucks therefore kids cannot choose between a buck or doe, only one sex of deer. He stated using the matrix of NDOW, which is incorrect, and we are now asking the question will this lead kids to lose interest due to parents only putting in for tags in areas such as Mt. Charleston, Lincoln because of lack of desire to travel up north. He stated these decisions are up to the parents of the youth to make not NDOW and stated he felt the numbers show in tonight’s meeting were incorrect. He reiterated that if we take it away from the youth, we will not get it back.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated that member of the public (*Ron Stoker*) his comment made him think that if this is approved, he would be in favor of having it grandfathering us starting with new youth hunting for the

first time and agree in his point that parents and youth hunters made strategic choices about applications and took chances on low odd units before this law was written therefore, he advised he would not want to unduly disadvantage or harm them. He stated that he felt if this is passed there is zero change in the opportunity it is only redistributed in potentially equitable manner and there are not fewer tags offered in this proposal only that tags are just redistributed in a different manner with some limitations on the number that one is able to draw. He stated to also to make caveat inclusion or caveat for leftover tags in units not being drawn and not penalized if the youth decide to go into these areas like Area 10.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated he does not feel that Area 10 is a lesser desirable unit. He stated that certain families do not have the ability to travel to these areas due to the amount of travel time, therefore they are delegated to choose closer areas in travel to their home. He stated that each family make their own decisions on the area to hunt and what is right for their families and advised to state there are leftover tags in Area 10 is not due to it being not prime unit it is because more opportunity exist and there is simply less desire for families to travel the distance to this unit in a non-populated area such as Reno and Las Vegas. He stated just because there are some families who have the means and ability to drive to this non-prime area should not guarantee them the ability to have a tag each year. He stated these individuals have played the game correctly and found a loophole in the system, but this should not be a guarantee. He stated as board member Jacob Thompson had stated that this is increased opportunity without touching the number of tags issued. He feels this has gone elsewhere regarding the quota setting time based on population of the herd. He stated he simply is attempting to get as many kids as possible to hunt and to go five to six years without ever having a draw.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that when realizing success rates of youths having more than one drawing not more than one tag back in their youth, the number is very small and stated board member Brian Patterson reasonings stated of why are correct. He stated as opposed to members of the public who spoke who have the means and desire to go beyond the rules of the envelope. He stated the two largest youth hunting population is from Reno and Las Vegas and mainly Las Vegas. He stated he feels more than 50% of the youth that hunt in Las Vegas do not hunt over 3 hours past Las Vegas, the youths' families work or just do not want to travel any further. He stated due to the demographics there are not a large amount of mule deer here in Southern Nevada as it is in Northern Nevada so youths will have to go out further to hunt. He stated this is the reasoning of why the mule deer committee took so long to become established due to the fact as stated there are not a large amount of mule deer in Nevada.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he feels that the Commission is 99% in favor of this and getting to the number of 3 tags. He stated if a caveat could be placed onto this to make this acceptable and he stated he felt that the CAB should give the Commission some caveat that would make this action item acceptable. He stated the following: 1) Turkey tags and Mule Deer tags are not considered the same tag 2) If the rules are changed then these rules that are in place should be grandfathered in until these rules age out. 3) Over the counter second chance tags should not be counted whatsoever. He stated by doing so, this is going above and beyond the original draw and if the youth is

in the system and going for this then this should not be counted against the youth.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated he had a thought to add to Chair Paul Dixon's list, he stated the turkey tag should only be worth a half of a point because reaching the three thresholds would not happen. He stated then keeping in place the opportunity if they had to get 4th or 5th tag making it still under and free.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised the number amount is so small therefore would exclude from consideration or not address at all in Chair Paul Dixon's statements to the Commission. He stated that he agrees in separating the two (mule deer tag and turkey tag).
- Chair Paul Dixon advises motion to accept Commission General Regulation 502, NAC 502 Junior Hunt, and Turkey Program, LCB File No. R051-21 CAB supports as presented with the following recommendations for youth tags: *1) Second chance and over the counter tags do not count for the three awarded tags per youth. 2) Turkey tags do not count as part of the awarded tags in the junior hunt, only mule deer. 3) If regulation is adopted that it is for all youth hunters starting in the year 2023 going forward and all current youth hunters as well are grandfathered in until they are aged out.*
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

c. **Commission General Regulation 510, First Come First Served (FCFS) Exchange to Obtain a Tag (*For possible action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider a temporary regulation amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 that would include any money, goods, or services exchanged for procurement of a tag through the First Come First Served program as grounds for suspension from the program.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **Purpose:** The Commission will hold a workshop to consider a temporary regulation amending the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 502 that would include the trade of money, goods, or services in exchange for a tag procurement through the First Come First Served (FCFS) program as grounds for suspension.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation:** The proposed regulation change would include the trade of money, goods, or services in exchange for a tag procurement through the First Come First Served Program (FCFS) as grounds for suspension. The proposed change is intended to keep a fair and equitable system for all participating parties.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the following example: A individual cannot offer a new car for exchange of a tag just as a person cannot state to give someone a new car to obtain the tag. He stated this is to control and tighten up on situations such as individuals who are going to obtain second chance tags and over the counter tags to state they cannot hire someone or offer them goods and services to get a tag awarded. He stated he agrees with the wording, it is to the point and stated this is the only changes on the existing Commission General Regulation.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated it is to tighten up so that you cannot pay someone to chase down a tag for you.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated yes.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated or to have someone apply for a tag and pay

this individual to get this person in first.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised the purpose is to stop individuals from gaming of the system. He stated this is in place because individuals are doing this therefore the regulations are modified based on individual's actions in gaming of the system.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated there are ways to detect electronic gaming of the system and this is harder to detect he feels.
- Chair Paul Dixon gave another example: He stated if an individual's wife applies and returns tag and receives her bonus points back, he stated there is a connection therefore people talk meaning bragging about doing this.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated there are specific reasonings as to why which he cannot go into details on, but it is created on the unfair advantage therefore depriving 99% of the individuals First Come First Served (FCFS) system.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he feels the language is good.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 510, First Come First Served (FCFS) Exchange to Obtain a Tag as written.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

d. Commission General Regulation 506, Possession of Golden Eagles Under

Certain Circumstances (*For possible action*): The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 503 to allow for possession of golden eagle under certain circumstances.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this is for an individual to possess a Golden Eagle either within the state of Nevada or if the person is a falconer and have moved to the state of Nevada, this individual may purchase from another falconer the rights to the Golden Eagle. He stated this was not previously in the falconry regulations before and was not previously done. He stated he feels that this regulation changes were put in place to allow these things to proceed and that the language changes are extensive.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised he received a call from a falconer and this falconer was in support of this proposed regulation. He asked to remember a few years past when falconry was in federal regulations rather than state regulations and this now puts it into state regulations what is already in the federal regulations for the Golden Eagles. He stated it is simply adoption to our state regulations from the federal. He stated nothing seems to be out of line when he was viewing the federal regulations.
- Board member John Hiatt stated there were a few issues he would like to discuss at this time. He stated in **Section 10: (Civil Penalty):** *The Department shall impose a civil penalty of \$1,000 for violations of subsection I of NRS 503.610.* He gave an example of person driving down a highway and the eagle comes down and is struck by the driver and advised that this happened to a friend of his and the friend took the deceased Golden Eagle to the office of NDOW and give the eagle to them. He stated it is not a civil penalty and fines if someone accidentally kills the Golden Eagle and this needs to be defined for clarity.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*):

He stated that the Game Wardens would look at the intent of the individual and stated this does occur quite often with Golden Eagles and if they come into NDOW office and explain what happened and there is no intent, then there will be no legal issue that will happen.

- Board member John Hiatt stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) that he would like to have another word besides the word “intent” in the regulation to make it clear on these situations other than leaving it to the discretion of an officer.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated one must read the statute with governing which applies to you and this statute determines the liability or act of intent of the individual.
- Board member John Hiatt advised in **Section 8: (Rehabilitation Provisions Bullet point #4)**: A rehabilitated Golden Eagle must be released in a location that is close as possible to where it was taken from. He stated if the eagle was just taken or if it was taken days or even couple of weeks, then this make logical sense, but if this eagle has been taken and it’s been over a year, then taking the eagle back to this location may not be in the best interest of the eagle due to the location being occupied by other eagles. He stated therefore it would be in the best interest to take the eagle to the best quality habitat for that eagle and release the eagle at that location.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated the easiest way to decide of the eagles best quality habitat would be to take short cut method with the factor being, how long that the eagle was out of the wild and take it back to another eagle habitat. She stated and this would be placement in a marginal area that could support the eagle or would have to carve out territory of its own in an occupied area that would align with the eagle.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): that board member John Hiatt point was asking if it would be detrimental to the eagle if the eagle was placed back into occupied territory. He stated that he is unaware of Golden Eagles territory and would be speaking on an uneducated position on this issue to give any thoughts.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated that she has not done extensive work on Golden Eagles but stated the Golden Eagles do tend to be territorial therefore if taking a single animal that may potentially be bonded in that territory then that territory could be taken over by a different pair of eagles then it will get more complicated. She stated an area in which an eagle came from originally is a habitat that can support eagles and it would be easier for an eagle to find an adjacent territory rather than the person making the assessment appropriate for an eagle and bringing the eagle to a new area potentially not for the eagle.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised for mountain lions this is not done but for young *Toms* Mountain lions and stated if you put eagles in best quality habitat, they will have to figure out their niche to survive. He stated this is also done with black bears as well. He stated they are trapped and transplanted to be placed in areas with other bears and they must figure out their niche and feels we are asking the eagles to do the same. He stated to add to board member John Hiatt’s point what does not kill these species will only make them stronger.
- Public Comments: (*Erin Wood, Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): She stated yes, she agrees.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it really depends age, and on the type of eagle and

if it is typical eagle then their range is widely and fly thousands of miles and some born in this state will go as far as Alaska therefore making no difference of where they are released. He stated if it is an adult bird which has broken territory then that factor can make a difference. He stated this should be done under the direction of a knowledgeable biologist or eagle specialists.

- Board member Brian Patterson stated this possibly only gives impact to three people in the state if that because there are only probably 25-30 falcon permits given out in the state.
- Board member John Hiatt stated this does not likely affect falconers, maybe one to two rehabilitators.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that part of this is rehabilitation and in the state of Nevada there is lack of rehabilitators and there is somewhat of an influx of federally protected birds that NDOW does not know what to do with.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the language that is used is “**as close as possible**” he feels this gives the mass falconer or the rehabilitator some form of flexibility in their release.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated going back to Chair Paul Dixon’s previous comments I found the following: NRS 503.610 Section 1 (Protection of bald eagle and golden eagle: 1) Except otherwise provided in subsection 2 it is unlawful for any person, firm, company or corporation or association to kill, destroy, wound, trap, injure, possess dead or alive, or in any other manner to catch or capture, or to pursue with such intent the birds known as the bald eagle and the golden eagle, or to take, injure, possess or destroy the nests or eggs of such birds.
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked the question of why it is repeating sections of code.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that comes from Legislative Counsel Digest, and the words have been extracted from original. He stated that the code board member Jacob Thompson just read (NRS 503.610, Section 1) is stating that the persons knowingly did something but in example board member John Hiatt stated of driving and accidentally hitting a bald or golden eagle is not knowingly doing something.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated there is no intent involved if person is driving down 95 and kill an eagle.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated no, there is no intent involved and the driver is not planning this on his drive. He stated to board member John Hiatt that his concern of how the language is written cannot be changed to reflect the intent, and accidentally hitting an eagle is not intent. He stated it would be very hard to show hitting an eagle with one’s car with intent unless the individual was in a campground spot and ran over the eagle that would be different.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated if you swerve on the highway.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the amount of people who swerve to avoid hitting an animal is a large amount and they simply leave the animal there, no intent.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he feels that words need to be defined if they are not of common use and there is a very good job of this toward the end on certain words and the one word he sees that is not defined is located on Page 2 (NAC 503.265) Section 12, which includes the word “imping” (FYI- Section 12 provides that a master falconry licensee who has an eagle permit may only possess primary wing feathers and not more than 12 tail feathers of a golden eagle for **imping** purposes). He stated that most people do not know what this word means.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised to board member John Hiatt that is part of the Legislative Digest Council.
- Board member John Hiatt stated no it is part of this.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated this word is in Legislative Digest but is not in the regulation.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised that he is going to word search in the regulation for this word.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked board member John Hiatt what does imping mean.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that the word meant when the bird has a broken feather and want to repair that feather, the feather can be cut off and take the feather in the same location on another bird and strip the feather portion away from the shaft, sticking it inside and gluing it into place therefore repairing the feather, this is what this word “imping” means. He stated that ordinary individuals should be able to read this and understand this, but he reiterated that they did define quite a bit of words as well.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that Section 11 on Page 2 has many definitions.
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised on Page 12, Section 6 (it discusses “imping” it read as follows: 6) Raptor feathers that are molted or are from raptors held in captivity that die, may be retained, and exchanged by falconry licensees for **imping** purposes only and subject to the following conditions: (a) Raptor feathers may not be purchased, sold, or bartered. (b) A falconry licensee may: (1) Possess feathers for each species of raptor he or she lawfully possesses or has possessed, except that a master falconry licensee who has an eagle permit may only possess primary wing feathers and not more than 12 tail feathers of a golden eagle.
- Board member John Hiatt stated so Page 12 is where they discuss imping.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated they discuss the word “imping” but do not define what the word means. He stated and it discusses that individuals are not allowed to possess a feather.
- Board member John Hiatt he thinks that it is insane and feels if we were to give out tickets for people that have a feather in their hat in rural Nevada, then there would be many tickets. He stated there is a vast number of feathers just floating around and, on the ground, and it does not hurt anyone from just picking them up.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated we could ask for imping on Page 12 Section 6, to be defined.
- Board member John Hiatt stated yes, we could.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that is easy enough to do.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that it needs to be recognition that individuals, if they see a beautiful red-tail hawk tail feather on the ground they cannot be prohibited from picking any feathers up and keeping it, and this maybe beyond the states capabilities to deal with due to it being federal regulation.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated there are federal regulations about dealing with eagle tail feathers.
- Board member John Hiatt advised to board member Jacob Thompson that a red tail hawk is not an eagle.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he was stating raptors, meaning any raptors. He stated raptors could mean a spotted owl.
- Board member John Hiatt stated it is extremely hard to locate feathers from a spotted owl, they are very rare, to board member Brian Patterson.
- Public Comments: (None)

- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 506, Possession of Golden Eagles Under Certain Circumstances as presented with the following recommendation: That imping is defined on Page 12 Section 6 for better clarification.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**
- **FYI- NRS 503.610 Section 2: (Protection of bald eagle and golden eagle) 2)**
The Department may issue permits to take bald eagles or golden eagles whenever it determines that they have become seriously injurious to wildlife or agricultural or other interests in any particular area of the State and the injury complained of is substantial and can only be abated by taking some or all of the offending birds. The issuance of such permits must be consistent with federal law.

e. **Commission General Regulation 509, License and Vessel Product Refunds (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 and 488 to allow the Department authority to provide refunds on licenses and vessel products.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic
- **FYI-Purpose:** The Commission will hold a workshop to consider amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 and 488 to allow the Department authority to provide refunds on license and vessel products. **Summary:** This is a temporary regulation allowing for the return of all, or a portion of fees collected on license, permit and vessel related products.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the Department could allow for the return of all, or a portion of fees.
- Board member John Hiatt stated the Department could say in so many words “to bad”.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that the Department can say “too bad go away” and can give partial refunds. He stated this is the added language to Commission General Regulation 509. He stated he feels this is a good thing.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 509, License and Vessel Product Refunds as presented.
- Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

f. **Commission Regulation 23-02, Taking of Raptors for Falconry for 2023-2024 (For possible action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider and approve the 2023-2024 season dates, species, quotas, limits, closed areas, application procedures and deadlines, and take of raptors for falconry.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised this simply is stating the quotas for these raptors. He stated he has seen Northern Goshawk, Red-tailed Hawk, Cooper’s Hawk here in the state of Nevada.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he did not have a problem with the permit quotas and species quotas.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he has a problem with the quota for Merlin, they are rare and question if there are 50 Merlin in the state of Nevada, feels

the quota is too high due to these objectives.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated he doesn't have the answer for this.
- Board member John Hiatt stated he would be fine with maybe 1 one Merlin a year. He stated he has never seen more than two Merlin in a season therefore he stated this seems excessive.
- Board member Therese Campbell stated she would have hoped for a comparison between the recent quotas and the proposed quotas.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there were no changes from the previous quotas in 2021-2022 season.
- Public Comments: (*Dan Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated there is one change only and that change is lowering the Kestrel from the quota of 50 to 15.
- Board member John Hiatt stated that there are more Kestrel than there are Merlin's.
- Public Comments: (*Dan Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that Kestrels are part of the (SCGN) Species of Greatest Conservation Need and are new to this edition and have an increased focus on them nationwide. He stated they have had a decline for three years on these species hence the quota change decrease.
- Board member John Hiatt reiterated that Merlin's are very rare, and it is excessive the species quota of 50. He asked if (*Dan Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*) if he had ever seen a Merlin here in Nevada.
- Public Comments: (*Dan Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member John Hiatt that Merlin's are rare.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated according to the internet to only be part of the Merlin's winter range.
- Public Comments: (*Dan Horowski, Wildlife Diversity Biologist, NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member Jacob Thompson, that is correct.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised to the CAB he would like to ask the question of why they have high species quota of 50 per Merlin in his report when the Merlin have low numbers in Nevada and Merlin only winter here in Nevada.
- Public Comments: (None)
- Board member John Hiatt advises a motion for Commission Regulation 23-02, Taking of Raptors for Falconry for 2023-2024 as approved apart from the Merlin quota, which seems excessive in view of the rarity of the Merlin in Nevada and not a large population in being here.
- Chair Paul Dixon seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**
- *FYI- (Season): All seasons are open during the following specified period or until a species quota is met:*
- *2023 season- Eyes season-March 1 through August 31, 2023, Passage season: January 1 through December 31, 2023*
- *2024 season- Eyes season: March 1 through August 31, 2024, Passage season: January 1 through December 31, 2024.*
- *FYI- 2023 and 2024 Seasons and Permit Quotas for Taking Raptors for Falconry:*
- **Species- Northern Goshawk (Eyas-March 1-August 31); Permit Quotas: Resident (10) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (10)**

- **Species-Northern Goshawk (Passage January 1- December 31);** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (15)*
- **Species- Cooper’s Hawk;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (50)*
- **Species- Sharp-shinned Hawk;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (50)*
- **Species-Prairie Falcon;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (15)*
- **Species- Merlin;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (50)*
- **Species-American Kestrel;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (15)*
- **Species-Red-tailed Hawk;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (50)*
- **Species- Ferruginous Hawk;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (5) & Nonresident (1); Species Quotas (5)*
- **Species- Great Horned Owl;** *Permit Quotas: Resident (Unlimited) & Nonresident (3); Species Quotas (50)*

g. Commission Regulation 23-03, Noncommercial Collection of Reptiles and Amphibians for 2023-2024 (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider and take action to approve 2023-2024 season and limits for noncommercial hobby collecting of live, unprotected reptiles and amphibians.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that there are no new changes everything previously from two years ago is still the same in this regulation.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that Common Chuckwalla and he has not seen this lizard in quite a long time. He stated that they are many individuals who collect Chuckwalla and that they are rare.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated to board member John Hiatt that Chuckwalla is one of the reasons that Commercial collection ended.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated he will make the same statement he did when commercial collection was stopped four years ago, the valley has 2.5 million with 10% are 10 years old or younger and they are collecting lizards possibly 250,000 with the authority to catch two of each type of lizards. He stated just from that population of kids there is half a million lizards gone. He stated yet the commercial collection is slammed since they have collected a few thousand a year. He stated again reiterating that a young kid can catch a couple hundred and let them die then go back out and repeat and nothing is said yet we cannot allow 12 reptile collectors to gather any without having an issue. The numbers from the collection of the non-commercial versus the commercial were staggering yet the commercial is put out of business.
- Board member John Hiatt advised that collection of lizards by non-commercial has changed, it is not as it was fifty years ago. He stated with the kids of that age they need transportation from their parents to go to the desert to collect these lizards and they will probably not be collecting a large

amount. His concern with this regulation is the lack of mechanism for enforcement therefore he feels that having this regulation or not having this regulation is irrelevant.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated he thinks the difference is and I think (Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region) can say is, if individuals feel that another individual is over collecting this will give them the power as opposed to not having this regulation, they have no ability to report if someone is abusing the regulations.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised that NDOW social media is what drives the enforcement. He stated they are monitoring quite a few collection sites making inquiries to those they felt were doing some commercial collection selling and previously with the commercial collection, the collection was not a big deal but the way the commercial collection was collected is the issue. He stated that law enforcement does not activity go out to individual's homes and knock-on doors and search to see how many collections they have. He stated law enforcement has the stability for utilization if needed to act upon what is viewed on social media.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated that there is a reptile convention yearly in Las Vegas for three to four days.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated that law enforcement attends this as well. He stated there are uncover officers and they have made contact and found quite a bit of illegal species or protected species that were being sold. He stated he could dedicate up to ten officers alone in the valley on this.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) that he stated he could dedicate up to ten officers for the amphibian reptile collection.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson just a reptile collection, it is illegal possession and or sale illegally of reptile.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated of threatened species.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated regular species and protected species.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) when you discuss handling these guys, he stated he did not know that there was dog in the fight pertaining to the commercial collectors burying the five gallon buckets and collecting but each one of these guys felt this was ridiculous due to using this same trap to catch scorpions and scorpions will be in the same bucket as well and when the lizard goes into that same bucket the scorpion kills the lizard. He stated as a collector it is idiotic for them to use this method of collection.
- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He stated to board member Brian Patterson that he felt it is, but you can go to Goggle Earth, and he remembers using this previously and looking around the valley to pick out the buckets and use them.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated just because it is idiotic doesn't mean that method should not be prohibited because individuals are not doing it.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated to (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) that he did not believe that a 5-gallon bucket could

be viewed from Goggle Earth.

- Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*) stated you can to board member Brian Patterson. He stated the way the individuals have set them, and if one knows what they are looking for and the plywood as well as lots of sand, one can find it, especially over in the west side especially the non-commercial. He stated that law enforcement will utilize this regulation to investigate social media that they feel needs to be investigated.
- Chair Paul Dixon feels this is not an active enforcement but a reactionary enforcement to bad behavior. He stated if no law for bad behavior, then this behavior will continue without being punished.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked member of the public (*Ron Stoker*) if his children have a collection.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*) advised to Chair Paul Dixon that his children see in their backyard geckos, scorpions, and horny toads and stated that his kids catch, and release and they do not keep. He stated it is too hard to give these species a viable habitat. He stated that there are a lot less Chuckwallas he has seen since he was a kid.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that when he first moved here in Nevada to the north he use to walk, and he would see many Chuckwallas and now subdivision have been built over these entire areas and he does not hardly see Chuckwallas anymore and there is no concern that you were destroying Chuckwallas.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated he knows non-collectors who will pick out the Chuckwallas before they development is done.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that he worked with certain group who did all the work to show the facts of the impact on the habitat for the Chuckwallas, and the decision was still made that the project was still going to happen, and he felt it was frustrated.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated there would probably be a lot more kick back if it was mule deer in that area.
- Board member Brian Patterson advised he only heard noncommercial.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that they are asking that Chuckwalla be taking off this list only.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to approve Commission Regulation 23-03, Noncommercial Collection of Reptiles and Amphibians for 2023-2024 as presented with the exception that Chuckwalla numbers are low in the valley therefore, they should be removed from noncommercial collections all over the valley.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

h. Commission Regulation 22-12 Amendment #1, 2022-2023 & 2023-2024 Upland and Furbearer Seasons (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider and take action to approve the proposed changes amending the spring turkey application period and draw dates for the 2023 season.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon read the following: **(Brief Explanation of the Proposed Regulation:** Annually the Department meets to schedule application periods

and draw deadlines in preparation for the Application Deadlines Commission Regulation presented to the Commission every January. A major overlap was detected between the set 2023 Spring Turkey application period and the 2023-Non-resident Guided Hunt application period. The proposed regulation change will open and close the Spring Turkey application period earlier than originally adopted to limit overlap of the two application periods.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated the changes are in CR 22-12 Amendment #1- (Page 7) the dates for the applications being accepted has changed from the first Tuesday in February to Monday, January 30, 2023.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated the changes in CR 22-12 Amendment #1- (Page 7) the dates to apply for bonus points has changed from the second Tuesday in February to Monday, February 6, 2023. He stated their release date will be on or before Friday, March 17, 2023
- Board member Jacob Thompson asked Chair Paul Dixon if this was the only change.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated these are the only changes. He stated they missed the overlap between Spring Turkey and the non-resident hunt guide application period, they wanted to separate that, therefore it is just an amendment.
- Board member Brian Patterson asked was there any information on the Heritage Tag.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised no, Heritage Tag is in March, but this is all after these changes, the ceiling date and everything else has not changed, this is simply an amendment that was done when it was realized that there was an overlap to possibly a personnel support issue with NDOW license.
- Public Comments: (Kensen Lee): He stated Page 9 Seasons for Moapa Valley (Wild Turkey 2023 & 2024 Spring) he is in favor of the dates of March 18-March 24, 2023 & March 25-March 31, 2023 & April 1-April 7, 2023; but he stated he dislikes the dates for 2024: March 23-March 29, 2024 & March 30-April 5, 2024 & April 6-April 12, 2024. He stated the dates in 2024 have been moved further in the week and he would like to see these dates changed from listed date of March 23-March 29, 2024, to (March 16 -March 22, 2024) also change March 30-April 5, 2024, instead to (March 23-March 29, 2024). Next, he suggested a change to April 6- April 12, 2024, to (March 30 – April 5, 2024). He stated it becomes hot in April on turkeys and when looking in the 2023 season the third Saturday of March was open and in 2024 they proposed opening on the fourth Saturday. He stated he is proposing that the dates for 2024 be moved up by one week.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that is something that was not caught prior to approval when this was completed earlier in the year in 2022 for 2024 and he can make notes of this.
- Public Comments: (Kensen Lee): He reiterated that it does get hot up here.
- Public Comments: (Joel H): Is that a typo or is that a reason that this was done.
- Chair Paul Dixon asked the gentlemen to repeat his question.
- Public Comments: (Joel H): He reiterated is this a typo or is there a reason of why this was shifted.
- Board member John Hiatt stated there is a reason for this
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the CAB could request to know why this was done and request for the dates to be moved back and NDOW can defend why the choose those dates.
- Public Comments: (Joel H): He stated at least an explanation of why.

- Chair Paul Dixon stated and when the CAB receives an explanation the CAB will have that information.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated the first season normally opens on the third Saturday which it does on March 23, 2023, and it does not on March 23, 2024.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he believes the reasoning for this is as the years are shifted the first day of March of 2022 was on a Tuesday, and the first day of March in 2023 is on a Wednesday, and the first day of March in 2024 is on a Friday and going further in 2025 the first day of March is on Saturday therefore he believes this is an attempt to catch up due to the factors that the first day in March seems to be later and later in the week. He feels by doing so it will help them bounce back in 2026 to the third week. He stated that there will always be the number of extra days in subsequent years.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated traditionally there have always been started the first time on a third Saturday of the month.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated if it is the third Saturday of the month who cares what the date of the year it was.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated it does not matter what date it is, he stated it is the third Saturday, and the third Saturday of the month in 2024 is March 16, 2024, therefore he advised he is simply asking for the Commission to consider moving 2024 dates for the Southern Valley up by just a week.
- Public Comments:
- Public Comments: (*Brian Burris*): He stated that he felt that member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) who is very knowledgeable on the subject matter of the turkey population in the Overton Management Area, and caution against anything pertaining to the disapproval of the member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) and feels that he has harvested a vast amount of turkeys off the WMA (*Wildlife Management Area*) with himself or others that he has assisted along the way therefore when having opinion from expert in the field either from NDOW or member of the public such as (*Kensen Lee*) caution needs to remain when going against their wishes.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the saying “smarter than Kensen”.
- Board member John Hiatt stated on Page 3 Sage- Grouse, there is a continuous decline in Hunt Units: 062, 064, 067, 071, 072, 073, and 074 in Elko County therefore he suggests a bag limit of (2) per season, a quota of (2). He felt the amount could still be achieved with still hunting but not several times only a week season and after few days the hunters should get lucky. He stated to do anymore is a bit obsessive, given where Sage-Grouse begin.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that these changes are dealing with making improvements to regulations. He stated this will have to be brought back as a second amendment #2 and comment on the draw for the turkey for the Spring Turkey Hunt and if putting in both remarks from board member John Hiatt and member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) this will have to be brought back as a second amendment. He stated this is how this must be presented to the Commission. He stated the Commission may state to NDOW that they like their idea and need an amendment #2 with these changes or state thank you for your input. He is not sure which option will happen but does know that the only change that the Commission will act upon right now is Amendment #1. He stated making it clear that it doesn't mean the CAB cannot give these suggestions but if so, they will have to come back with Amendment #2 for

these requested changes to accept.

- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to accept Commission Regulation 22-12 Amendment #1, 2022-2023 & 2023-2024 Upland and Furbearer Seasons as presented with the following recommendations to be considered as a second Amendment: 1) The word Game should be put after Upland as it is not there in the title. 2) The Moapa Valley 2024 Season for wild turkey should be moved one week ahead to be consist of the start of the third Saturday in March 2024 and consideration to reduce the Sage-Grouse limit and instead of current bag limit of (2) and a possession limit of (2) which is a bag limit of 2 per season.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

i. Commission General Regulation 508, NAC 502 Antler Point and Spike Elk Defined, LCB File No. R090-22 (For possible action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes that would clarify the definitions of “antler points” and “spike elk” for certain big game mammals and reduce the likelihood of inadvertent infractions.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that the CAB gave previous recommendations in the 9/20/2022 meeting: to accept this regulation with the recommendation that the hunt book have graphics for the definition of meaning of nor more than three points on either side defining to give clarification of the exact meaning of what the hunt guide is stating exactly. He stated he wanted to repeat that the CAB feels strongly the same with the same previous recommendation therefore they are looking for this to be adopted.
- Public Comment: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated he loves the idea of the pictures in the hunt book and advised that Utah hunt book shows graphics of a legal spike and what is not considered a legal spike. He stated that Utah shows a spike as being two single points or one single point and one forks and if it has two forks this is not considered a spike in the state of Utah. He advised he does not like how NDOW is calling a spike hunt a three-point hunt. He advised if we are indeed doing a three-point hunt which he is not opposed to do then change should be done to the word “spike only” too “three -point or less”. He stated he believes that a spike is one point not a three.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated he agrees with member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) and stated the reasoning of why it stays spike is because the NRS definition is already approved therefore if it is spike but does not have three point or less to adopt that the NRS would have to be changed and this information, they are simply defining what they mean by spike.
- Board member Jacob Thompson stated he agrees with member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) that it would be cleaner and better for the case and common-sense basis, but NDOW is pressing this button because it is easier right now for work balance of the bull cow’s ratio in places where a lot of people take younger bulls that are desired. He stated this is the way that NDOW gets around having to create a new category in which they would have to lobby legislature and create new laws, instead state here is a new category in which we will put it all under.
- Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated to him a spike is one by one or one by two not a two by two and not a three by three and not a one by three. He stated the definition of a spike is completely incorrect based upon this

- proposal. He stated it should simply state three pointers.
- Board member Brian Patterson stated three pointers on one side or the other.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that would have to change a lot of things.
 - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated change it. He stated they can change the name of an airport.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised it takes time and money. He stated he understands and advised to board member Jacob Thompson that this is something that could be brought up as a side comment on this.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson stated yeah.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated pictures certainly helped.
 - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated that Utah has this right with having pictures showing a legal spike which is one and one and one by two and next showing a picture of two by two with slash marks showing that this is illegal, without the pictures he stated a hunter will think they have the correct three by three, but it is a four by three.
 - Public Comments: (*Lt. Chris Walthers, Game Warden NDOW, Southern Region*): He advised that a three by three would not be considered a spike.
 - Board member Brian Patterson advised that three on one side, or three on either side, he reiterated three or less on one side.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised three other points on either antler. Not more than three other points on either antler.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated it could be three by two but that is it.
 - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated it could be three by six.
 - Board member Brian Patterson stated no, not more than three on either side. He stated not more than, but it can be broken off on one side.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised there could be a six-point broken off, but this does not make it spike.
 - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*) asked Chair Paul Dixon why not it is less than three points.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised to the member of the public (*Kensen Lee*) on one side but not the other.
 - Public Comments: (*Kensen Lee*): He stated it might have been a six at one time.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised we don't reduce the number of young bulls that will be all that we will see is six broken.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised a motion to accept Commission General Regulation 508, NAC 502 Antler Point and Spike Elk Defined, LCB File No. R090-22 as presented.
 - Board member Brian Patterson seconds the motion.
 - **Motion passes 5-0.**

j. Commission Policy 11-Heritage Grants-First Reading (*For possible action*) The

CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 11.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that this action item will not be discussed tonight due to time constraints.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion that Commission Policy 11-Heritage Grants will be tabled due to time constraints and discussion on this action item will be on our next meeting date of January 24, 2023.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

k. Commission Policy 23-Predation Management-First Reading (*For possible action*)

The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 23.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon stated that this action item will not be discussed tonight due to time constraints.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion that Commission Policy 23- Predation Management will be tabled due to time constraints and discussion on this action item will be at our next meeting date of January 24, 2023.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

l. Commission Policy 24-Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groups-Third Reading (*For possible action*)

The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 24 on Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groups.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that this is a third reading and the only changes on this is on Page 6 (Mule Deer- Allocation of Projected Harvest by Weapon Group) The Demand-Tag Success process for determining antlered mule deer hunting quotas will be as follows: 2) *Apportion the desired harvest into the various weapon classes based on demand from previous years for standard hunt units.* 3) (a) *Junio hunts may be divided into Any Legal Weapon class and Archery/Muzzleloader combination to allow for increased Junior participation.* (b) *Junior deer tags will be considered antlered deer tags except in areas that have been antlerless deer hunts, where they will be considered either-sex tags.* (c) *Juniors can apply for five years and be awarded a maximum of three junior tags before the age of 18.*
- Chair Paul Dixon advised the CAB this is just policy, and the Commission General Regulation is where the meat and the leg to the policy comes from. He stated it is pointing out the demand for success and their usage by adding archery and muzzleloader for increase in junior participation for kids. He stated underneath the policy this is where it stated only three tags before the age of 18 and five years you can apply.
- Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated if there was equal exchange giving more opportunity for youth and there are many ways to increase the youth tag

- such as shorter than ears, cow elk, etc.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that 25% of the desired harvest goes to junior tags.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He asked Chair Paul Dixon is that per deer.
 - Chair Paul Dixon stated for deer, that is 25% of every quota goes for Junior tags of any unit.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He stated he was talking about other species and stated there are other species besides deer.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised the CAB discussed that other species such as elk junior tag, antelope junior tags, these other species have been discussed and it is before the Nevada Board of Commissioners (TAG Allocation and Application Hunt Committee) and the Chairman is Tommy Caviglia and he has stated to Chair Paul Dixon as well as Vice Chair Dan Gilbert that he is predisposed to state that this is a great idea to push this and bring as regulation change through the Commission this upcoming year 2023.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He asked if this could affect the three tags that his kid could draw.
 - Chair Paul Dixon this is something that he will need to find out and stated if doing multiple species then if we are doing turkey and deer separate then the amount should be three tags for each species.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson advised that there are more elks than turkeys.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised a lot more elk and a lot more antelope. He stated his point that was mentioned earlier is if there is scheduled doe removal in certain area the youth hunt should be given the same opportunity as the adults if not harvesting does in that area, then that means that we shouldn't harvesting in that area.
 - Public Comments: (*Brian Burris*): He stated in the documents in the youth regulation it already states that there are three tags per species. He stated it specifies that the three tags are per species. He stated if archery and muzzleloader is going to added we need to make sure that the same number of tags are not given. He stated the reasoning told behind not giving the same number of tags is too give additional opportunity but he gave example: if he gives separate tags for each species this is not increase for opportunity and if there are 3,000 deer and the tags are divided equally for each species 1,000 muzzleloaders, 1,000 rifles and 1,000 archery etc., there still would be 3,000 tags and 3,000 opportunities therefore he does not think this changes the opportunity for kids, he just wanted to clarify.
 - Public Comments: (*Ron Stoker*): He asked the question for the reasoning behind the archery and muzzleloader being added is due to the metrics being lower therefore giving opportunity to give out more tags.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised that he cannot state that is the sole reasoning, but it is a one of the outcomes.
 - Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to accept Commission Policy 24-Hunting Opportunities Among Various Weapons Classes and Hunter Groups as presented.
 - Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
 - **Motion passes 5-0.**

m. Commission Policy 62-Mitigation Policy-First Reading (*For possible action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss, and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 62.

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised that due to time constraints that the CAB will not have adequate time to discuss this action item.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised motion to table Commission Policy 62-Mitigation Policy due to time constraints therefore discussion on this action will be at our next meeting on January 24, 2023.
- Board member Jacob Thompson seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

X. Authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its November 4, 2022 & November 5, 2022, meeting in Reno, NV (*For possible action*).

- Chair Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chair Paul Dixon advised a motion to authorize Chair Paul Dixon to prepare an action report for all recommendations from today's CCABMW meeting and board member Jacob Thompson will present these recommendations at the Wildlife Commission meeting on November 4, 2022 & November 5, 2022.
- Board member John Hiatt seconds the motion.
- **Motion passes 5-0.**

XI. The Next CCABMW board meeting will be scheduled for January 24, 2023, at the Clark County Government Center (Pueblo Room) 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155. The meeting will be in support of the Commission meeting on January 27, 2023 & January 28, 2023.

XII. Adjournment.

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

- Nevada Department of Wildlife: 3373 Pepper Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89120
- Clark County Government Center: 500 Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, 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