

**APPROVED Meeting Minutes**

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting

Nevada State Capitol Building

Capitol Assembly Chambers

Second Floor

101 N. Carson St.

Carson City, NV 89701

*Videoconferencing at the following Location:*

Grant Sawyer Building

555 E. Washington Ave., Fifth Floor, Suite 5100

Las Vegas, NV 89101

Public comment will be taken on every action item and regulation workshop item after discussion but before action on each item, and at the end of each day's meeting. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person. The chairman, in his discretion, may allow persons representing groups to speak for six minutes. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers. Persons are invited to submit written comments on items or attend and make comment during the meeting and are asked to complete a speaker card and present it to the Recording Secretary.

To ensure the public has notice of all matters the Commission will consider, Commissioners may choose not to respond to public comments in order to avoid the appearance of deliberation on topics not listed for action on the agenda.

Forum restrictions and orderly business: The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks that antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.

Please provide the Board of Wildlife Commissioners ("Commission") with the complete electronic or written copies of testimony and visual presentations to include as exhibits with the minutes. Minutes of the meeting will be produced in summary format.

Members Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners:

Chairman Grant Wallace  
Commissioner Tom Barnes  
Commissioner David McNinch

Vice Chairman Brad Johnston  
Commissioner Jeremy Drew  
Commissioner Paul Valentine

Commissioner Jon Alberg  
Commissioner Kerstan Hubbs  
Commissioner Bill Young

Secretary Tony Wasley  
Recording Secretary Suzanne Scourby

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward  
Management Analyst III Jordan Neubauer

Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance during the two day meeting:

Deputy Director Jack Robb  
Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed  
Vasey

Deputy Director Liz O'Brien  
Conservation Educator Administrator Chris

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling  
Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Sollberger  
Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne  
Administrative Assistant 2 Rheena Am-Is  
Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger  
Wildlife Diversity Division Administrator Jen Newmark  
NDOW Biologist 4 Mike Scott  
NDOW Biologist 3 Cody McKee  
Staff Game Warden Mike Maynard

Carson City Meeting Location Attendees:

Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW  
Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW  
Bobbie McCollum, self  
Brian Beffort, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter  
Fred Anderson, Secret Pass Outfitters  
Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW  
Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW  
Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW  
Judi Caron, self  
Madi Stout, self  
Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation

Monty Martin, Systems Consultants  
Donald H. Sefton, Systems Consultants  
Fred Voltz, recreationist  
Chase Whittemore, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU)  
Korin Carpenter, Nevada Bow Hunters Association  
Gene Green, Carson CABMW  
Jason Graham, Nevada Sporting Dog Alliance  
Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW  
Shannon Greene, Nevada Sportsman's Unlimited  
CJ Ellingwood, self  
Jennifer Simeo, self

Mike Laughlin, self	Elaine Carrick, self
Doug Martin, Carson CABMW	Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW
Chrissy Pope, Nye CABMW	Shane Madziarek
Mike Cassidy, general public	Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW
Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW	Jacob Harris, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers (BHA)
David Gough, (BHA)	Ryan Hughes
Steven Bohrn, Nevada Houndsmen Association	Tina Nappe, self
Josh Vittori, NBU	Carol-Ann Weed, No Bear Hunt Nevada
Travis Gibson	Jonathan Lesperance
Matt Dixon	Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance
Mitch Bailey, Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association (NOGA)	Sherwin Von Tobel, BHA
Darcy Shepard	Josh Bice
Darin Elmore	Karen Boeger, BHA
Brett Clarke	Nick Brooks, BHA
Carl Erquiaga, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partners	Lindsay Dugas
Richie Bedowski	Jennifer Woodman
Garret Woodman	Rob Boehmer, Carson CABMW
Elaine Carrick, self	Lydia Peri, self
Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League	Ron Pierini, Douglas County Sheriff
John Brummer, self	David Bobzien, BHA
Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife	Ken Brooke, Representative Mark Amodei
Jason Barnes, Trout Unlimited (TU)	Mike Caltagirone, TU
Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters' Association	Erik Johnson
Nic Nelson, Ducks Unlimited	Renee Aldrich
Elizabeth Mason	Remi Warren

Las Vegas Location Attendees:

Stephanie Myers	Jana Wright
Robert Gaudet, president Nevada Wildlife Federation	

Friday, Feb. 10, 2017 – 10 a.m.

- 1 Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call of Commission and County Advisory Board Members to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) – Chairman Wallace

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order; all nine Commissioners present.

Roll call of CABMW Members conducted: Craig Burnside, Douglas; Rob Boehmer, Carson; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas; Chrissy Pope, Nye; Sean Shea, Washoe; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Joe Crim, Pershing; Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt; and Gene Green, Carson.

- 2 Approval of Agenda – Chairman Wallace – For Possible Action  
The Commission will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Commission may remove items from the agenda, continue items for consideration or take items out of order.

Chairman Wallace said he would like agenda item #4, NDOW Project Updates, to be at call of the chair, preferably before or after Department activity report.

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA WITH AGENDA ITEM #4, NDOW PROJECTS TO BE AT CALL OF CHAIR. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

3 Nevada Lands Act

- A Nevada Land Management Task Force, Senate Joint Resolution 1 (SJR 1) of the 2015 Nevada Legislature and Subsequent Federal Legislation Update – Commissioner Drew – Informational  
Commissioner Drew will review the history of the Nevada Land Management Task Force, SJR 1, and subsequent federal legislation in regards to the transfer of no less than 7.2 million acres of public lands currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service to the State of Nevada.

Commissioner Drew reviewed the background for the agenda item: Assembly Bill 227 passed in 2015 legislative session. The bill established the Nevada Land Management Task Force to study the potential transfer of public lands under federal ownership to the State of Nevada. The Task Force had a member from each of Nevada's 17 counties with Mr. Demar Dahl as chairman of the Task Force. Mr. Dahl will address the Commission during the next agenda item, and the Task Force's final report was included in the support material for this meeting for everyone's review. He continued that in the 2015 legislative session, recommendations from the report were incorporated into Senate Joint Resolution 1 (SJR 1). SJR 1 (support material) proposed two phases. Phase 1 would transfer 7.2 million acres of BLM and USFS managed land to the State of Nevada. Land identified in that phase included land designated for disposal from the federal agencies, checkerboard lands, geothermal resources and solar energy zones. He said the purpose of that transfer would be for the state to manage those lands for long-term actualization of net revenue as stated in SJR 1 for education, mental and medical help, social senior med services, programs for candidate and listed species under the ESA. Commissioner Drew said the Commission adopted a platform opposed to SJR 1 in 2015 because of the inconsistency with Commission Policy #64. Policy #64 states that the Commission will support those land transactions or other activities attendant to public land the either directly or indirectly to preserve, protect, or enhance wildlife habitat, in addition to maintaining or improving public access to the public lands. In order to accomplish these objectives, the Department should consider the following listed criteria in providing written or verbal comment on public land transactions: 1) Public lands providing high wildlife values should remain in public ownership to insure the future protection of these values unless higher values for wildlife can be attained through a sale, transfer, or exchange. 2) Land exchanges should be supported only when the wildlife values on selected lands are equal to or greater than those wildlife values or potential wildlife values on offered lands. 3) Input on all public land transactions should consider the need for public access to and through both the offered and selected lands. 4) All land transactions must be in the public interest from a wildlife habitat protection and wildlife use standpoint. Commissioner Drew said Nevada Congressman Amodei introduced a bill, HR 1484 mirroring SJR 1 in December 2016; however when the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress convened in December the bill died. Yesterday he attended a listening session Congressman Amodei held, and the Congressman said that HR 1481 was introduced at the request of his constituents and that he intends to introduce another bill in the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress to identify these lands. The new bill will have a smaller footprint and different focus. The process is open to additional input. Issues discussed were the federal government's lack of ability and slow action in terms of lands identified for disposal, and resolution of the checkerboard pattern lands along the I-80 corridor. He advised the group that the Commission opposed SJR 1, and personally believed that SJR 1 and HR 1481 were too large of an attempt for the State to succeed. Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act money allocation discussed and he noted the difference between that Act and SJR 1 being vastly different in how the money would be spent in Nevada. If checkerboard lands are to be transferred we need to look at preserving those high value wildlife habitats and wildlife movement corridors as public lands to insure access (proposing no net loss of public lands for checkerboard access). Commissioner Drew said Phase 2 should be dropped in its entirety.

- B Nevada Lands Council Presentation (NLC) – Demar Dahl, NLC Director – Informational  
NLC Director Demar Dahl will provide a presentation to the Commission regarding the efforts of NLC to support federal legislation that would transfer federally managed public lands to the State of Nevada.

Nevada Land Council Director Demar Dahl said all this started as access problem. Lots of misinformation going around that this would cause Nevada to be sold and end up like Texas with “No Trespassing” signs everywhere. Idea for the need for the bill was an access problem when USFS went to Elko County Commission asking them to have cooperating agency status in 2009 for travel management plans for roads. They stated there would be no road closure and found out later there would be many road closures. That started a lot of issues which led to AB 27 leading to the Task Force. Initially at a Task Force meeting one-half of the members thought bad idea to transfer federal land to state, they then went through one year of monthly meetings, and heard testimony from all the stakeholders, at the end of the year they had complete agreement by all counties to transfer federal lands to state/supporting SJR 1. He said they decided to not consider the National Park, National Monuments, Wilderness Areas, native lands, and military lands, and they wanted to protect existing uses and rights after the land transfer which would be hunt, fish, camp, graze, prospect, and those existing rights would transfer. All were in agreement that they didn’t want to see public lands sold. From SJR 1 evolved HR 1484. Language in Phase 2 is specific that none could be sold. Mr. Dahl said the question is, “Do we believe state can manage our public lands as good as our federal government does?” He said most here who pay attention know that there could be a lot of improvement over the way the federal government handles our public lands. He hears over and over state can’t manage it and would ask “why not.” Mr. Dahl answered questions from the Commission:

Commissioner Drew had the following questions: Was NDOW part of the Task Force or asked questions, and if so what was their input? Mr. Dahl mentioned earlier in his testimony that none wanted public lands sold, and specifically mentioned Phase 2 and he is curious about selling lands in Phase 1 proposal as there is a whole lot of checkerboard which concerns many people in this room, along with Right of Ways.

Mr. Dahl answered he knew State Lands and Nevada Department of Environmental Protection were involved, and is sure NDOW was. Mr. Dahl said HR 1481 died and the bill will be reintroduced. He said the new bill is in a state of flux with changes. Language in the bill said up to 7.2 million acres will be transferred in Phase 1 as State determines “what and how” to do the transfer. Included in that is land already designated for disposal by the federal agencies which is a million plus, easements, and land along the corridor. In Phase 1 the bill stated land will be transferred to State doesn’t say it will be sold and it states land in Phase 1 can be sold. Naturally you would want to sell the land already designated for disposal. Mr. Dahl said there is Recreational and Public Purpose Land (RPP) which would be sold. There are also lands along the railroad corridor, there are two bills in Washoe and Pershing Counties, to try and fix long-term problems in the corridor. Also, lands along corridor in Elko, and they have companies looking for land for private development, and that would be land that be sold, as well as and along the cloverleaf by freeways. There is about 4 million acres and of that, a lot would not be sold. Areas such as hunting areas can be carved out. The corridor is 20 miles on each side of the railroad.

Commissioner Drew asked if land is sold in Phase 1 where will the proceeds from land sales be directed. He said when land in Las Vegas was sold through SNPLMA the funds were reinvested in conservation.

Mr. Dahl answered for education.

Commissioner Drew said some of the land is migration corridors which are important to hunters were identified in Phase 1 but no map. He said no one will disagree with BLM land between highway ROWs, but haven't taken that step. The concern is all of this is moving so fast and taking such a big bite we will be setting up State for failure. He is not saying federal government is best manager, but being asked the question if state can do better, right now he would say no. Nevada does not have revenue or funds to manage. State Land agency has seven employees and to go to 97 is a stretch as Nevada always struggles to find money for conservation but historically not happened. Without funding identified he does not see how that would happen.

Mr. Dahl answered that bill is work in progress, suggested all figure out what lands need to be kept in multiple use and attach maps to the bill. As far as funding when this was done that was big concern with transfer and eventual management, that is why included that land can be sold and whatever costs to do transfer and money would come from sales. Could also securitize and borrow on the land.

Commissioner Drew said he would need to see mechanism in resolution, and that raises another question for him as from his own personal experience he knows there is huge cost to transferring land. The costs are hugely under-estimated in the proposal. Fears if we have to sell 2 million acres to get money to manage that would more likely be 4 million acres.

Commissioner Johnston said he read through the Task Force report and saw there are assumptions in the report that Nevada could generate net revenues comparable to other states such as Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. But he did not see how net revenue is generated in the report. When he looked at the comparison particularly in Table 2, it showed the highest absorbed expense per acre was for Idaho and reflected the management of commercial timber tracts and related harvest. He said some of the assumptions on revenue generated are that revenue comes from commercial usage on the land and sale of property which won't occur here. Where will the revenue come from in the estimate used?

Mr. Dahl answered revenue coming from grazing and ROWs. He would like to invite Mike Baughman who prepared the report explain further.

Commissioner Johnston said he agreed with frustration of management of federal lands but if land transferred to the state, the state land would still be subject to federal regulations for example, wild horses and burro. He asked how the state could manage the land when a big impediment to managing the land in some people's view is the regulatory burden enacted by federal government.

Mr. Dahl agreed with Commissioner Johnston. He said there is a provision in Wild Horse Act that management can be given to another entity. That has to happen or the federal government has to do something, as that is a problem we can't live with. NACO will have hearing in 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals soon on wild horse litigation, if lawsuit won, believes State of Nevada could solve wild horse problem if in a management position.

Commissioner Hubbs asked for explanation of timeline and when will bill be heard. If bill passed and approved ultimately, how soon would land be transferred to state.

Mr. Dahl answered that the bill will be reintroduced by Congressman Amodei and up to him when that is done. He is aware that a map will be included to show areas discussed, all in process. The timeline for the transfer in the last draft he saw was a breakdown of Phase I would transfer, and instead of Phase 2, it is broken down into 16 years divided by four where the state would report back to Congress as to how it went.

Commissioner Hubbs said her concern in Nevada is that there are not “state laws” in scope or breadth that cover environmental impacts and studies that need to be made. Concerned that Nevada will not have infrastructure or manpower in place to properly manage or make sure that environments are not harmed.

Mr. Dahl said NDEP does a really great job and in most instances NDEP administered regulations are stricter than federal laws. Does not know why we can't manage or own lands. The enabling Act is the same as Nebraska and they only have three percent federal land and we have 87 percent.

Commissioner McNinch said there is language in the report that is of concern to him such as “fiscally neutral but maximize net revenues” and some other words. Commissioner McNinch asked what ultimately the goal is. Is the purpose to remove federal government from Nevada? He understands growth and supports that, but when it comes to fire suppression the state could not match fire suppression. Rehabilitation done by the federal government may not be perfect but does not see state being able to match that. He did not see NDOW mentioned in the report and they were not at the table. Many unanswered questions for him and is not sold on concept as a whole scale.

Commissioner Johnston said in regard to money being directed to public education could a scenario arise later that there is a hole in the state's education budget and they have to sell land to address needs of education. Not suggesting education should not be funded but is concerned with that.

Commissioner Valentine asked why the bill was not modeled on Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act with vetting and public input on what land is sold. A process to look at value of land is needed.

Mr. Dahl said parts could be worked that way, this is work in progress, could do that with lands determined to be disposed. No need for those lands to be public could be privatized.

Commissioner Drew said he appreciates Mr. Dahl attending the meeting and believes vision is noble. He wishes the state could manage its land but does not support the bill or previous version. A lot of work needs to be done for state to succeed and being set up for success.

- C Nevada Lands Act – Commissioner Drew – For Possible Action  
The Commission may take action to develop a policy platform and/or designate Commission representative(s) to keep the Commission updated as to the development of new federal legislation related to SJR 1. The Commission may choose to develop correspondence identifying its concerns or desired clarifications to further develop or refine its position on proposed federal legislation.

Chairman Wallace asked for public comment before Commission discussion.

## Carson City Public Comment -

Don Molde said not sure if he agrees that this all began with Forest Service travel plan because as a resident of Nevada since the 1970s, he saw the issue surface in 1980s with Rhoads and others who started this with Sagebrush Rebellion. This looks like a redo to him. He likes Commissioner Valentine's suggestion with modeling on SNPLMA which has been successful. Transfer of public lands has been occurring from 87 percent to 81 percent. Worst case scenario is "takings" as will lose and gain nothing in return. Grazing fee on news and fee is \$2, livestock grazing is large industry and wonders what grazing fee would be, probably not \$2.

Tina Nappe, former Wildlife Commissioners, said of the comments made, it has been overlooked that the four states used as examples have been owned as state lands for over 100 years and are not covered with all rights and uses that we now have on Nevada public lands. Not same situation in Nevada, as more complex and income derived would be far less due to those rights. She read her comments for the record: The Nevada Department of Wildlife is responsible for the management and well-being of Nevada wildlife, except endangered species. Wildlife is dispersed throughout the state. Many species are vulnerable to habitat impacts and may have no fiscal value. NDOW, and Nevadans, are dependent on, in particular, big game species, which are widely dispersed. The proposed legislation assures us that all existing rights will be protected under the transfer of lands to Nevada. These rights pertain to livestock grazing permits, mining, rights of way and maybe wild horses in designated herd management areas. Wildlife, except for endangered species, has no existing rights. NDOW and wildlife interest groups must advocate for wildlife through an EIS, an EA, and various legislation which the federal government has put in place over the years at our request to ensure the future of wildlife. Concurrent with these systems are requirements for documentation and an inclusive public process. The State of Nevada, and particularly the counties, which, under this legislation have the last word on the future of public lands in their counties are not required to invest in or make provisions for wildlife. The goal of this legislation is to negate current protections for wildlife. The proposed legislation recognizes that lands must be managed for their highest and most productive use). As we know, the legislature, session after session, has confirmed that NDOW is starved of general funds and must be dependent upon sufficient excess game species and interested sportsmen to provide most of the financial foundation. With so many species of wildlife providing no income, or dispersed income, how can wildlife be regarded as highest and best use at the state or county level? Under the current county based public land legislation, 85 percent of the sale of lands is returned to the federal agencies for the purpose of re-investing in natural resources, i.e. acquisition of property, development of recreation, urban interface management, etc. Under the proposed legislation, any "profit" from the sale will be transferred to the state for administration of public lands or invested in some very worthy educational and education projects. The legislation requires that the state collect sufficient revenue to pay for Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILT). The cost of administering these public lands at this point is unknown; some costs will be unexpected such as fires. There will be pressure to balance the budget on land sales. No funds will be returned to reinvest in post fire restoration or weed management. In Washoe County, for instance, land might have to be sold so that Washoe County can contribute to its own share of PILT or pay for another county's PILT allocation. Since some lands will probably cost more to prepare for sale than will be collected in revenue, there will be pressure to sell lands in urban areas such as Washoe and Clark counties. Please note that livestock grazing permits which double or even triple under the state lands used as examples are not proposed for fee increases in the Public Lands Management Task. The federal government is a partner in many range improvement projects, trails and wildlife studies. There is no such recommendation in the public lands report. NDOW and sportsmen may be the primary nonfederal investors in habitat improvements. Under this legislation, NDOW and

sportsmen will be the only investors. On behalf of the state and counties, the federal government using the 85 percent of funds raised from the sale of public lands in Clark County has per legislation reinvested in land acquisition, range restoration or tree thinning. There are lands in Washoe Valley, the Virginia Range, and northern Washoe County acquired as open space and wildlife habitat at the request of counties and with approval of the state. These lands appear to be included in the transfer to the state where they may be resold. I believe that Washoe County, if it sells lands, should receive that 85 percent for re-investment in the urban interface, land acquisition, trails etc. Finally, I would like to point out the many skilled staff that federal agencies bring to Nevada, who will be lost on a transfer of land. Counties quite rightly point out that they can manage the counties with fewer staff. I think of the botanists, the archeologists, the GIS experts, the skills in coordination and public process, wildlife biologists, etc. Yes, of course, the state can do it cheaper. The Public Lands Management Task Force and the limited public process they initiated documents how cheaply information can be collected and deployed. The infusion of the federally skilled staff in our communities, especially the rural communities will be lost. The financial loss would be huge. For 50 or more years this federal investment has been coming to Nevada. We haven't had to give the Feds a tax break; in fact through PILT they contribute free unencumbered funds to counties. We don't have to hold our breath hoping that companies like Tesla and Apple will provide the high paying jobs they promised or that Cabela's will successfully attract new out of state customers to justify their tax credits. Year after year they have partnered. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I would urge you to oppose any legislation which seeks to implement SJR 1 as it now stands. And a letter listing all those concerns be included with that rejection.

David Bobzien, Back Country Hunters and Anglers, provided his statement for the record: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and members of the Wildlife Commission, not only for the work you do on behalf of our state wildlife resources and the Nevadans that enjoy them, but specifically for your time today considering this important matter. As a board member of the Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, the sportsmen's voice for our wild public lands, waters and wildlife. BHA has chapters in 24 states and one Canadian province, and seeks to ensure North America's outdoor heritage of hunting and fishing in a natural setting, through education and work on behalf of wild public lands and waters. I have some history on the report referenced earlier in the presentation. While serving in the Assembly, I voted against its authorization as a state-sponsored endeavor undertaken by an entity other than the state's Legislative Counsel Bureau. I have great respect for the Nevada Association of Counties, who commissioned the study, and in my life in local government appreciate working with them on a range of issues. But on this, their predetermined outcome, that our federally-managed public lands should be transferred to the state, inevitably contaminated the report's conclusions. Much testimony was offered last legislative session as to the report's flawed conclusion that somehow the state would get a good deal in this scenario, all the while ensuring full public access and environmental quality to the lands so important to our state. I encourage each of you to review this report and the legislative testimony, and to ask the tough questions that the report seems to dodge. No amount of dressing up the numbers solves the essential problem of this whole scheme- lands managed for multiple use (and all the costs associated to provide the range of opportunities available as a result, including hunting and fishing) that are transferred to school endowment fund status, where management is driven by the need to maximize return, inevitably squeezes sportsmen out. Look to Idaho, Montana, and other western states with longer histories with state school lands and you will find over and over again examples of restricted access and problems for wildlife. Indeed, history shows in Nevada that time and time again, public lands granted to the state are often sold into private ownership the need for a quick financial return repeatedly wins out over the long-term costs needed to maintain public ownership. As a former chair of the Assembly Ways and Means subcommittee charged with

building the natural resources agency budgets (NDOW and State Lands, State Parks, etc.) I can reinforce what all of you as Wildlife Commissioners already know- our state is hardly flush with cash to manage lands and wildlife. But specific to your charge today...“The Commission may choose to develop correspondence identifying its concerns or desired clarifications to further develop or refine its position on proposed federal legislation.” I would urge you to listen to the voices of sportsmen and other Nevadans who use America’s public lands and who object to these risky transfer schemes. Beyond the philosophical reasons for keeping public lands in public lands, and the negative impacts such proposals would have on our state’s outdoor recreation economy, which generates \$14.9 billion in consumer spending, 148,000 direct Nevada jobs and \$1 billion in state and local tax revenue, I’d encourage you to focus on the potential for detrimental impacts on funding to the management of our state’s wildlife resources. If faced with ever-more restricted access for the harvest of wildlife, what will be the impact on licenses and tag sales in Nevada? I’d like to end my comments on how these proposals for our public lands run roughshod over how Nevada currently excels when it comes to the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. The core principles of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation are elaborated upon in the seven major tenets: Wildlife as Public Trust Resources, Elimination of Markets for Game, Allocation of Wildlife by Law, Wildlife Should Only be Killed for a Legitimate Purpose, Wildlife is Considered an International Resource, Science is the Proper Tool for Discharge of Wildlife Policy, and Democracy of Hunting. The seventh tenet is what is in the crosshairs with these proposals for our public lands: the Democracy of Hunting. As sportsmen, we have a right to hunt and fish, regardless of wealth, land ownership, or other special privileges. As Teddy Roosevelt said back in 1912: “We do not intend that our natural resources shall be exploited by the few against the interests of the many. Our aim is to preserve our natural resource for the public as a whole, for the average man and the average woman who make up the body of the American people.” I urge you to oppose this proposal, and in doing so, identify the very real concerns the sporting community and general public have about these schemes for our public lands, and to pose needed questions to the members of our federal delegations that are proposing them. (Myers, Dennis, 2015, “Never land: Why state efforts to grab federal land keep failing’ 2 Roosevelt, Theodore, 1913, Progressive Principles: Selections from Addresses Made During the Presidential Campaign of 1912.)

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League, said all of issues and great question brought up in 2015 and still do not have answers such as will wildlife be harmed. The report and SJR 1 are deeply flawed. 11:15 a.m. Revenue for checkerboard lands, revenue based facts from other states are vastly different from Nevada. Reasons and resources for state to manage better than federal government have not been answered. Stewart Indian school renovation is being financed by selling state lands. SJR 1 and HR contemplates complete sale of checkerboard lands in Phase 1, Phase 2 contemplates transfer. Promise of lands being accessible cannot be guaranteed. Opposed to what is being proposed.

Karen Boeger, member of Back Country Hunters and Anglers is speaking on behalf, provided her written comments for the record: She is a board member of the Nevada Wildlife Coalition and the Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, these organizations will be presenting official comments to you, so today am speaking as a concerned conservationist. Nevada surely does have a wealth of public lands in comparison to other states. The impetus and desire to allow physical expansion of our communities, as well as provide local recreation opportunities, through sale and/or other means of relinquishing public lands to local entities is understandable and longstanding. My objection to SJR 1 is the wholesale approach it proposes and the undemocratic process to do so. There are proactive ways to accomplish the same end within existing structures and models. Checkerboard lands: SJR 1 Phase 1 proposes wholesale release for sale. Checkerboard lands have been a management nightmare since their inception.

It will be a benefit to public and private both to resolve the problem. The current Pershing County Lands Bill is a perfect model of how to do so. It was created by stakeholders who went to considerable lengths to examine the county checkerboard lands, on site-specific basis, creating sensible blocks of these lands for community, private and public purposes. Result: a win-win for all interests, including wildlife. To release all checkerboard for sale, without site-specific scrutiny, could result in loss of valuable wildlife habitat, sportsman opportunity and access, potential access loss to existing private owners and to communities unable to afford to purchase appropriate parcels. Disposal lands: SJR1 phase 1 proposes wholesale release for sale: Again, the Nevada model of county by county public lands bills provides the appropriate model for careful site-specific scrutiny by all stakeholders of potential disposal lands for sale to private or community entities, rather than a wholesale release for sale. Not all disposal lands are equally appropriate for sale. Each parcel, owned by, we the public, deserves our scrutiny for the highest, best use of each through a NEPA process. For example, some are more valuable to be kept for public purposes, such as those adjacent to important special management areas to which they can be added. Increased protection for critical wildlife habitat and increased sportsmen's opportunity are potential benefits of retaining certain proposed disposal areas. All public lands not under current special designation: SJR 1 Phase 2 proposes wholesale release to the state: Our state at times has had insufficient funds to keep some state parks open, let alone wild horse populations at AML. It is a task beyond imagining that the state could afford management of this vast amount of acreage, let alone just one aspect such as wildfire. The likely default choice would be to sell the most valuable parcels, likely to also be the most valuable wildlife habitat. Here is an example close to home for me: This past November, Nevada Forestry had not sufficient staff to keep a skeleton mop-up crew in Little Valley the night the fire blew up, roared down our riparian canyon, took out pines and pasture on our ranch, 22 of our neighbors were not so lucky as to escape their homes burning. Nevada's sportsmen, and recreationists of all kinds, are proud of the advantage of our free public open acres of opportunity provide, compared to tiny plots of public land available back east or in states like Texas, where hunting and recreation occurs primarily at a price and behind fences. Folks from those states come here for those purposes and bring tourism dollars with them. That said, there are occasions when certain specific public acres make sense for trade with private when the benefit is to both, such as was accomplished with the Pine Forest bill of 2014 which exchanged land to augment both the Wilderness and a private ranch headquarters. Done in a carefully vetted public democratic process such as this, these site-specific transactions make sense and are what the public deserves. The existing Nevada model of public lands bills protects our democratic principles: Management decisions on state lands have no institutional legal avenue for public participation in decision-making. Case in point at the Elko CAB on 2/7: attendees were told a controversial proposed decision to close South Fork Reservoir State Recreation Area to hunting can legally happen unilaterally without any public input, although the manager said he would take comments back to the administrator. Because there is no legal process for public comment there is thus no legal handle for an appeal of any land management decision. Further, there are two other key democratic "insurance policies" missing from state land use plan decision-making: 1) No NEPA requirement to ensure all resource values are thoroughly considered and uses of those will minimize impacts to other resources and users. 2) No state multiple use / sustained yield mandate to ensure a range of opportunity for all resource uses and users, to be implemented in such a way as to be sustained over time. Our current democratic public land use decision-making processes, enfolded into the County Public Lands bill model, may be flawed, cumbersome and lengthy, but they are the pillars of our American democracy in action. Our American public lands heritage, unique in the entire world, deserve nothing less than this. SJR1 remains a simplistic, extremely costly solution to the highly complex "problem" of our invaluable public lands which deserve nothing less than our careful site-specific consideration and adherence to democratic processes.

David Goff, representative for Back Country Hunters and Anglers, said the idea of transferring public lands to the State of Nevada is a terrible idea for wildlife and the American people. The State of Nevada does not have the fiscal elasticity to manage large tracts of public land due to the cost of wild fires, litigation, and maintenance. State land as most of us know is not public land. If federal land is given to the state, public access will be lost. Congress has the ability to improve the BLM and USFS, it won't be easy but Congress has power to dissolve bureaucratic red tape and to provide adequate funding to the federal land management agencies.

Chase Whittemore, representative for Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU) and Tom Fennell of Reno Chapter of NBU will read their comments. Mr. Fennell said they have multiple concerns: Management of wild fire on the land for wildlife and potential loss of key wildlife habitats; funding for both wild fire and feral horse management as state does not have financial revenue to suppress wild fires when they happen and to restore habitat after the burn. For example the Hot Pot fire that occurred this year cost millions of dollars to put out and millions needed for restoration. State does not have money or personnel or apparatus on state level, the federal government has the resources to keep the west and the state from turning to cheatgrass. The state's lack of funding and capacity for feral horse management is a concern, and lastly they have a concern with the actual land disposal process and land identified to be available for sale, as those areas are poorly defined. He said they are worried that if transfer happens the acreage not meant for disposal will be liquidated to the highest bidder as soon as the state is in a budget crisis. The public land system is uniquely American and is a resource that no other country in the world has and steering that resource toward eventual privatization on a large-scale takes away a public resource from all citizens. Although the federal government is slow and bureaucratic, they feel it is the lesser of two evils in this case. If the bill is passed we need to make sure there is no net loss of public lands or net loss of access to those lands.

Ernie Ward, sportsman of Nevada, said he cares deeply about public lands. He read through paperwork and wants to reiterate that nothing in document states otherwise that land won't be sold. Reason this was started was losing road access, but seems like Mr. Dahl meant road access. Mr. Dahl's example of Nebraska and the other four states are having sportsmen pay the bill. Nebraska is a horrible example and is reason not to do the transfer for state management. He asked the Commission to continue to oppose the bill as sportsmen still have access and don't have to worry about lands being sold off.

Jason Barnes speaking for himself addressed comments by Mr. Dahl that NDEP could potentially manage lands, and knows that entire bureaus of NDEP funded by EPA, and with new administration there could be massive reductions ahead. Resents Mr. Dahl using passion we have for state from multi-generational Nevadans to re-focus our attention from the issue by saying we are proud and could manage better than federal government. In his job he works with a ton of different state wildlife agencies and he is incredibly proud to be in Nevada and to work with NDOW who does a stellar job with limited resources, and coming here to this Commission meeting he is incredibly proud of the Commission who represent public as the Commission has the sportsmen interest in mind and hopeful the Commission will continue its good work.

Ryan Keys, representing UNR Chapter of Back Country Hunters and Anglers, said they are opposed to any transfer of public land. He thanked the Commission for recognizing the use..

Larry Johnson, president Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, said after yesterday's meeting with Congressman Amodei they are cautiously optimistic that Phase 2 may be deleted, Phase 1 downsized and will be seeking local input before drafted and resubmitted. He testified one

month ago in Fallon at town hall meeting and felt a county lands bill would be more appropriate for checkerboard land issues. Lands identified for disposal should be recommended by county before sale or transfer, through county land process. He also heard yesterday that Nevada Cattleman's Association and National Cattleman's Association are opposed to transfer of lands. Well-meaning promises but no guarantee by individuals that lands won't be sold and access denied.

Carl Erquiaga, field representative for Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, said in response to Mr. Dahl that he served on Task Force, and was person referred to by him who changed. Said he was victim of group think and he read definition of "group think." He appreciated Commissioner Johnston pointing out shortcomings of report. He and his organization are opposed to Phase 2, support promises to counties to sell land and support thoughtful solution to checkerboard. If work in progress do work before bill drafted.

Darrin Elmore, representing himself, said big picture what will this be like for future generations. The two issues where future generations will hold us accountable for two things: The notion that we can apply a value on flats of Imlay where checkerboard issues exist, or the treetops of the Pequops. Because his value to take his bird dogs and run around in no less than the kid who goes out to fly drone in Las Vegas desert. We as sportsmen often lose sight of that, also take stock today that he never has agreed with so many people that I have disagreed with before, something to be said for that. The notion that high ground and low ground have different value is a notion to be careful of. Second notion is we will be held accountable for sticking finger in dyke to solve education problems in Nevada. Until all Nevadans want to take ugly look behind curtain of what happens in state on education level, setting up other plans for money, is all for naught. Future generations will hold us accountable for ignoring ugly realities. Probably we do need to sell public land but selling land under the notion it will solve bigger problems is not long-term reality.

Paul Dixon speaking for himself said the audience is saying to go into this with eyes wide open as many times as we are all at odds at Commission meetings that we are united on this. Use power of this camaraderie that if we do sell lands do that in a measured fashion.

Public Comment Las Vegas –

Robert Gaudet, president of Nevada Wildlife Federation, said he sent a letter to the Commission stating their opposition.

Jana Wright, opposed to SJR 1, and opposed to any transfer of public lands. Encourage Commission to stay on top of issue.

Stephanie Myers echoed Mr. Dixon's comment of all being on same side and having consensus on an issue.

Commissioner Drew appreciated the attendance today and is clear mandate that the Commission should develop letter for review by Commission so CABMW members and public can see the letter and sort through input received.

Commissioner Young said he too appreciates the attendance on this issue.

Commissioner Johnston said not opposed to transfer in totality if transfer done right, detail not in report that he needed for assumptions in report. He can assist Commissioner Drew with letter.

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO DRAFT LETTER THAT OUTLINES POLICY OF THIS COMMISSION AS PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED IN RESPECT TO FEDERAL LAND TRANSFERS. THAT OPPOSES AND VOICES ITS OPPOSITION OF PROPOSALS THAT WOULD ALLOW WHOLESALE LAND TRANSFERS STATEWIDE ON A COUNTYWIDE BASIS WITHOUT DETAILED ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS TO WILDLIFE AND PUBLIC USE; PUBLIC ACCESS; HOW THOSE LANDS WOULD BE MANAGED; AND HOW THE FINANCES OF THAT MANAGEMENT WOULD BE DONE. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. COMMISSIONER DREW CLARIFIED THAT HE AND COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON WOULD BOTH DRAFT A LETTER AND HAVE LETTER FOR ACTION AT THE MARCH MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Agenda item #4 follows Department activities.

- 5 Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence – Chairman Wallace – Informational  
Commissioners may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. The Commission will review and may discuss correspondence sent or received by the Commission since the last regular meeting and may provide copies for the exhibit file (Commissioners may provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record). Correspondence sent or received by Secretary Wasley may also be discussed.

Commissioner Drew attended Legislative Commission meeting and reported that the Commission Regulation related to large caliber weapons and smart rifles was deferred back to the Commission. The Legislative Commission identified that the last two provisions were controversial and asked that those provisions be removed and the regulation be returned with only portions specific to muzzleloaders and handguns. The Commission Regulation relating to the Truckee River was also deferred because of concern with powered motor craft, and intent was to restrict hovercraft. Concern was the new regulation would prohibit someone with a small electronic trolling motor using lower reach of river. Recommendation was to simply state “hovercraft” if that is truly the intent. Two regulations are officially in limbo and will need to be addressed at future meetings. Yesterday was invited as Commission representative, as approved by Chairman Wallace, to address joint legislative committees for Natural Resources to present an overview of NDOW and was good to meet new legislators and present the overview.

Commissioner Johnston said he finalized and NDOW mailed Nellis AFB and Fallon Range letters with assistance from Division Administrator Jenne. Received telephone call from hunter with 20 bonus points for sheep tag whose mother passed away. Mailed tag before deadline but postage deficient and hunter called to ask if there could be restoration of bonus points.

Commissioner Hubbs contacted by trapper who was cited for violations and forwarded information to Harry Ward.

DAG Ward said in regard to the tag and restoration of bonus points currently there is litigation pending. NAC prevents what remedy can be taken if tag not delivered back to the Department in a timely manner. When Commissioner’s individually contacted by individuals who are cited, his recommendation is for the Commissioner to make it a public record that you have some information and then you make your own determination. Whether you have to recuse yourself or not and give an explanation as to why or why not.

Secretary Wasley said he received letter and petition with 142,000 signatures requesting Commission to end Nevada bear hunt at this meeting; received letter from Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association (NOGA) supporting black bear season in Nevada but did not support

proposal to standardize season prescriptions and NOGA in support of mountain lion season and harvest limits; and a request from Project Coyote to present a video at some time in the future.

- 6 County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Member Items – Informational  
CABMW members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action will be scheduled on a future Commission agenda.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said the state has decided to end sale of hides that NDOW obtains through vehicle collision, seizures, or from Wildlife Services. He would like to know why. NDOW has image problems every once in a while and the sale of hides shows something being done with animal and would like to know statistics of what has been done with animals and hides. He wanted to know who made the decision and would like to see something done with hide rather than scrapping them. He would like the Commission to be aware and explain.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said Utah is closing statewide antler gathering and concern is that they will come to Nevada and create problems for wildlife.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said with the March meeting if the Commission is considering touring the day before different sites.

- 7 Approval of Minutes – Chairman Wallace – For Possible Action  
Commission minutes may be approved from the Nov. 18 and 19, 2016, meeting.

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

8 Reports – Informational

- A Wildlife Heritage Account Report – Deputy Director Liz O'Brien  
A report will be provided on the funds available (interest and principal) for expenditure From the Wildlife Heritage account in the upcoming year.

Deputy Director O'Brien presented the Wildlife Heritage Account Report: There is \$785,913.92 available for distribution, which is the highest amount when looking back 10 years and is up from the prior year of \$688,231.51 in the report. That is an increase of \$97,682.41 in funds available to spend this year from last year. To further explain the balance, the fiscal year 2017 total revenue amount has been corrected by the following two amounts: \$76,742.16 and \$912.66 = \$77,654.82, as this adjusts for revenue which was deposited incorrectly in fiscal year 2016 which is now closed. A correcting journal voucher is being done in fiscal year 2017 to place those two amounts noted back into the Heritage Account.

- B Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Mid-Winter Conference – Secretary Wasley and Commissioner McNinch  
A report from the conference held in Litchfield, Arizona, will be provided by the attendees.

Commissioner McNinch listed and explained topics discussed by Commissioners at the mid-winter WAFWA meeting: Blue Ribbon Panel; Colorado's Hug-A-Hunter program; and applying treaty rights to hunt on non-tribal lands.

Secretary Wasley reported on the meetings he attended in conjunction with WAFWA: Intermountain West Joint Venture Communications Forum; Colorado River Fish and Wildlife Council meeting; Sagebrush Executive Oversight Committee meeting; Director's Forum; updates from industry at meetings; discussion of Blue Ribbon Panel, and noted he is proud that Nevada Wildlife Commission was first state to adopt a Blue Ribbon Panel resolution; three R's discussed - recruit, reactivate, and retention; and wildlife governance, noting Arizona's effort to obtain public agency acceptance at a cost of \$2 million. In regard to treaty rights, a letter sent to Nevada and other western states, from the Northwest Shoshone Band of Native Americans received and discussed. Nevada's letter has been directed to the Nevada Attorney General's office.

## C Department Activity Report – Secretary Wasley

The Wild Sheep Foundation and the Fraternity of Desert Bighorn recognized Peri Wolff as the 2017 State Statesman for her exceptional and selfless efforts serving the wild sheep of Nevada, the wildlife conservation community and for her work towards the conservation and enhancement of wild sheep throughout North America. Peri's long list of prior experience includes time as the wildlife veterinarian for the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the director of veterinary services and animal health at Walt Disney World in Orlando and the director of biological programs at the Minnesota Zoo. She currently serves as the President of the American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians. In accepting the award from WSF, Peri noted that there are many amazing wildlife professionals within NDOW and across the western states that are working every day for conservation and wild sheep, and expressed her honor at being able to work among them.

California bighorn sheep in the Snowstorm Mountains in north central Nevada were captured and tested for respiratory disease. Several bighorn sheep tested previously were recaptured to determine if they remained positive for respiratory diseases. Six Nevada ewes were transported and transferred to South Dakota State University as part of the ongoing studies into "super shedders," or bighorn sheep that became chronic carriers and spreaders of respiratory disease despite their lack of clinical symptoms.

Nineteen herds have been tested for respiratory disease so far during fall and winter 2016–2017. While the Department has yet to receive the results on five herds, two herds displayed no evidence of exposure, five herds displayed indeterminate or inconsistent results, and seven herds had evidence in both blood titers and PCR confirmation of the presence of the disease agent in at least a single individual. This is largely consistent with the exposure levels that have been observed recently within Nevada.

Deer and antelope compensation tag counts in the Southern and Eastern Regions are concluding, and there is some concern that the 2016 statewide total of compensation tags may exceed the 1.5 percent cap for the first time due to the steady increase in interest in the program by landowners. In the Eastern and Southern Regions 109 landowners requested counts in 2016, that is a noticeable increase from 2015 when only 76 requests were received. Of the 109 requests, 95 counts were scheduled and conducted. A combined total of 14,281 deer and antelope were counted in 2016 compared to 10,982 in 2015, and 255 total landowner compensation tags were qualified in 2016 compared with 193 in 2015. Preliminary totals have not yet been prepared in the Western Region.

Eastern Region biologists traveled to Roseburg, Ore., to pick up 100 wild-trapped mountain quail provided by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The quail are being held at the Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area in holding pens until later this spring when conditions are more favorable for release in the Fish Creek Mountains. Mason Valley personnel have been invaluable in preparing the holding pens as well as caring for the birds. This interstate coordination is another example of the mutual benefits received by cooperating states in managing across administrative borders.

The Game Division continues to coordinate with the Colville Confederated Tribes in eastern Washington to deliver about 50 pronghorn and obtain about 50 wild turkeys from tribal lands. These birds will be going to the northern Toiyabe Range in Lander County. The National Wild Turkey Federation is providing funding to assist in the capture and transport of the turkeys.

Staff at Gallagher Hatchery completed the first successful egg take from the new Eagle Lake strain Rainbow Trout brood stock in November and December. Most of the eggs were processed using our new equipment for producing triploid trout. This new broodstock will help reduce our reliance on outside sources for rainbow eggs, including federal hatcheries.

Earthwork to complete the new community fishing pond in Winnemucca finally started in early December but then was put on hold due to weather conditions. We still plan on completion by late spring so that the facility will be available for the public this summer.

Willow Beach National Fish Hatchery has begun stocking rainbow trout into Lake Mohave again for the first time in at least three years. They plan to stock 1,000 trout at Willow Beach weekly on Friday's year around. NDOW will be conducting creel census to assess angler success and satisfaction.

The new Walker River Recreation Area should have great potential to develop fishing opportunities but we have little information on much of the Flying M and Rafter 7 properties because of past access issues. Fisheries staff will be evaluating the properties and working with the Division of State Parks to identify next steps.

Southern Region staff is working with management at Desert Shores in Las Vegas to use their lakes as grow-out ponds for endangered razorback suckers, under the Programmatic Safe Harbor Agreement we have with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The water development biologist position in Winnemucca was filled by Robert Zeyer. Robert comes to us with experience as a fisheries biologist, land surveyor and research technician in Nevada and Alaska. He graduated from UNR with a Bachelor of Science degree in Biology in 2006 and a Master of Science degree in Biology in 2013.

Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area (WMA) staff are currently working on updating the WMA map to update access roads, ponds, parking areas including recently donated property from NFWF.

A record amount of Wildlife Heritage funds are available to reward to projects for FY18: \$785,913.92. NDOW management has received a significant amount of FY18 project proposals from NDOW personnel and these proposals are being reviewed and refined. Additional proposals from outside parties are also expected and are due to NDOW by March 1.

The Department and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) have been working to reseed this year's wildfires with seeding occurring on the Overland, Pinto, Strawberry, Maggie, Wally, Dixie, Deer, Stag and Hot Pot fires.

This wet winter has had beneficial results in increased river flows and reservoir storage levels. The Walker River is expected to reach Walker Lake by the end of the week and Lahontan Reservoir is so high that TCID is considering sending flows to Carson and Stillwater wetlands to make room in the reservoir for spring runoff.

Game wardens are handling a large number of wildlife investigations from the last five months of hunting seasons and three months of trapping season:

Southern Region game wardens are investigating a string of poached deer shot and left to waste in the Spring Mountains/Mount Charleston area. At least eight deer have been discovered left to waste. The case has seen a great deal of media coverage and total reward money has reached \$18,000 with donations from NBU and HSUS, as well as Operation Game Thief. A Winnemucca game warden investigated a case in which a person was bitten by a coyote at a mine site near Midas. At least one coyote has been euthanized for rabies testing. It is believed the coyotes were emboldened by mine workers who have been feeding them.

An Ely game warden investigated a large 7x7 bull elk that was found dead. His investigation determined the bull was a rut mortality killed by another bull.

Western Region game wardens have handled a huge number of mountain lions caught in traps this season, including at least seven from one family of trappers. Most of these lions were released back to the wild.

A Canadian man was sentenced Dec. 20 to almost \$3,000 in fines and penalties after pleading guilty to four separate misdemeanor counts of illegal possession of raptors. Dana Morely Mclvor, 31, pled guilty to two counts of unlawful possession of a golden eagle and two counts of unlawful possession of a bird of prey. In addition to his total fine of \$2,955, Mclvor was given a 30-day jail sentence, suspended for two years. Mclvor was in possession of parts from at least eight individual raptors, including 6 eagles when he was arrested earlier this year. There is a large black market for eagle and other raptor parts, including feet and feathers.

Eastern Region game wardens are seeing antler gathering activity, and are working on one investigation for harassing deer with a motorcycle. There is great concern about shed hunting this year, as the eastern side of Nevada has large snowpack and Utah has instituted a shed hunting closure to protect vulnerable deer herds trying to survive a harsh winter.

Three new game wardens graduated from the POST academies in November and December and are now in the NDOW mini-academy. Two more new wardens started POST academies in January. Training all of the new wardens we've hired in recent years has become a monumental effort, but we're all very excited about the young new talent in the Law Enforcement Division.

The Operation Game Thief (OGT) program is having its raffle again this year with the help from Sportsman's Warehouse. They are donating most of the prizes (.30-30 rifle, Yeti coolers and Mathews compound bow are the bigger prizes).

The boating education coordinator completed a new video public service announcement on safe boating that will be distributed via social media and other channels throughout the state of Nevada.

Conservation Education staff along with the director attended the 2017 Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation's (RBFF) annual conference in Atlanta, Georgia, with 49 states in attendance this year. NDOW staff members represented the marketing, publications, social media, angler education, R3 (recruitment, retention, and reactivation), and division administrators. Staff participated in workshops for three days identifying successes, failures, opportunities and road blocks to achieving our goals. Additionally, each state was challenged by RBFF to raise angler participation and reach 60 million anglers nationwide in the next 60 months.

Aaron Keller was chosen to fill the outdoor education coordinator position at Headquarters.

The 2017 Nevada Fishing Guide and 2017 Spring Turkey Regulations Brochure were printed and delivered to license agents and NDOW offices statewide.

Conservation Education staff developed a series of short informational videos between 15 and 30 seconds designed to help educate the public on some of NDOW's success stories and have begun promoting some of the videos on social media and local television stations in eastern and western Nevada.

Headquarters staff launched a campaign to entice anglers and get people outside. Any anglers that purchase a Nevada fishing or combination license between Feb. 1 and June 15 will be automatically entered to win recreation-themed prizes, including a three day houseboat rental at the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, sponsored by Forever Resorts.

Staff continues to take an active role in the national R3 plan developing new programs and evaluating existing programs to recruit, retain, and reactivate anglers, hunters, and wildlife supporters.

In January the National Archery in the Schools Program (NASP) reached a milestone this quarter by going over 100 schools with active NASP programs in the state of Nevada. Nevada now has active NASP programs in 11 counties. So far this school year NDOW has assisted each new school with purchasing the equipment needed by distributing over \$9,000 in grants. The grant funds are provided by Nevada Bighorns Unlimited and the national NASP organization. Each new school was provided between \$500 and \$1,500 in grant money. The archery education program is currently preparing for the NASP state archery tournament; we are finalizing registration for the event. There are over 642 archers, from 31 schools, registered to participate at the Las Vegas based tournament or virtually at their home school. Schools from as far away as Fallon, Reno, and Carson City are competing in Las Vegas on Feb. 8.

Eastern Region Conservation Education welcomed Julie Hughes as the new Conservation Educator to the Eastern Region. Julie has been a Hunter Education Instructor for more than 15 years and was most recently the general manager at KRJC Radio Station. She also writes articles for the website "Women Hunters." She is a great addition to the team and will be responsible for Wildlife Education and the Volunteer Program. She will also be participating in the Angler and Hunter Education programs.

A shooting range grant for White Pine County was finally approved by the USFWS for the amount of \$35,000. Staff met with the county and the Bristlecone Archers to prepare for work as soon as weather permits. The Hunter Education classroom in Ely was lost due to the building being condemned for asbestos. Arrangements have been made to hold the classes at Great Basin College in Ely.

Trout in the Classroom was officially kicked off January 25 with the delivery of eggs to the teachers for kids from third grade through high school.

Diversity biologists took the opportunity to provide several presentations to the public on work the Division as well as the Department routinely conducts. In Tonopah, a talk was provided to the Tonopah Rotary Club regarding conservation and stewardship of Nevada's wildlife. The Red Rock Audubon Society was provided with two presentations on Peregrine Falcons and the Nevada Wildlife Alliance hosted an event that featured a presentation on implementing the Wildlife Action Plan, including several projects such as Muddy River restoration, mountain beaver studies, Golden Eagle tracking, and pika research. Currently, staff are attending The Wildlife Society Western Section annual meeting and providing several talks on current studies and survey efforts the Division is engaged in.

Across the state, Diversity biologists are conducting White Nose surveillance efforts and hibernation surveys on Nevada bats. Although we have not detected the fungal disease that kills bats in Nevada, we are monitoring many sites across the state with data loggers, including one new high elevation site that was established this past fall. These ibutton data loggers are placed in various locations throughout a mine or cave to passively collect information on temperature and humidity throughout the year to provide information on microclimates within a site as well as seasonal and weather changes. We are also swabbing individual bats at specific sites looking for fungal spores. Although we have not found any evidence of the disease, with presence detected in Washington State, we are stepping up our detection efforts.

Annual winter raptor surveys were conducted in January. Survey routes are all over the state and are conducted by both NDOW Diversity biologists as well as volunteers. These surveys are part of an effort to document the abundance of various raptors throughout the winter in various habitats. Data are being compiled from all the routes and will be analyzed this spring.

The current status of some key boating access projects include: The design for the gate repair for the Muddy River diversion project is complete, to be followed by solicitation documents going out for bid. The design alternatives for the rehab of Cave Lake Dam have been determined. The selected alternative will be accomplished in phases, thereby minimizing the impact to Cave Lake recreationists. The boat ramp design for Comins Lake is near complete. The next step is grant application. The design for Zunino-Jiggs boat ramp and public amenities is complete. Construction could be completed by the end of this year.

The language for the Department's housekeeping bill (Senate Bill 75) has been released. This bill will eliminate reporting requirements of reports to the Legislature, Governor, and other bodies. The Governor's Office encouraged state agencies to identify unnecessary or outdated reporting requirements for elimination, or for opportunities to amend statutory language so that a worthwhile report is simply posted online without hard copies being delivered to various offices. This bill also eliminates publishing the proposed game seasons and quotas in local newspapers and it develops a confidentiality statute to protect reporting party information when seeking assistance from the Department.

The Department has one more bill, our license structure simplification bill which is still in the drafting phases at the Legislative Counsel Bureau and language has not yet been released. This also includes simplification to the Aquatic Invasive Species Fees to set them by motorized and non-motorized, regardless of residency; as well as an option to purchase for multiple years both boat registration and the AIS decal.

The Department presented the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Biennial Budget to the Legislative Commission's Budget Subcommittee on February 1, 2017 and presented a Department Introduction and Overview to the joint meeting of the Senate Natural Resources Committee and the Assembly Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining Committee.

The Friends of Nevada Wildlife Legislative Luncheon is scheduled for April 10, 2017. Commissioners are encouraged to attend if available.

In December 2016 the Legislative Commission passed four regulations adopted by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners. The regulations standardize elk and antelope waiting periods, make the transfer of bonus points automatic when a person changes their state of residence, require owners/operators of vessels to drain the water from their vessel, and impose certain tackle and bait restrictions on the Truckee River.

Auditors of the Legislative Counsel Bureau completed the Performance Audit of NDOW. This audit focused on evaluating the strategic planning process, including relevance and reliability of performance measures. The audit report contained four recommendations to strengthen the agency's strategic planning and performance measure processes. As a result on the audit, the Department is in the midst of a major strategic planning overhaul from the bottom up. This includes training and facilitation of a new plan along with assistance to implement the plan with buy-in throughout agency personnel. The Department hopes to develop a new plan by July 2017.

#### 4 NDOW Project Updates – Secretary Wasley – Informational

Power Point presentation presented by Division Administrator Sjoberg on collaborative conservation (exhibit file).

#### D Litigation Report – Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward

DAG Ward read the section on Mark Sooy litigation as written in report (exhibit file).

- 9 Nevada Department of Wildlife Report about Hunting Near Dwellings and Residential Areas – Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed – For Possible Action  
The Department will provide an update on recent complaints and incidents involving people hunting in or near residential areas.

Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed said his report as submitted in support material is for possible action if the Commission chooses to resolve complaints and incidents involving people hunting near or in residential areas with archery equipment. The incidents occur statewide, and support material provided included discharge of firearms ordinances for Carson and Douglas Counties.

Douglas County Sheriff Ron Pierini provided an overview of what has occurred in Douglas County relative to urban wildlife.

Commission discussion of action to take resulted in the following motion:

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO PROVIDE THE DEPARTMENT DIRECTION TO DRAFT NAC SPECIFIC TO BOWS AND CROSSBOWS IN RELATION TO DISCHARGE NEAR PUBLIC ROADWAYS AND OCCUPIED DWELLINGS, AND THAT THEY USE THE DOULGAS COUNTY ORDINANCE FOR FIREARMS AS A FRAMEWORK FOR DOING SO. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 10 Nevada Department of Wildlife Update of Guidelines for Harvest Management in Nevada – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action  
The Department will provide an update on the status and process of refining the draft harvest guidelines for consideration by the Commission. The Department will provide a briefing on revisions since the first reading of the current draft presented at the November 2016 Commission meeting. This draft for possible adoption includes only the segment addressing big game management; the segment addressing upland game will be addressed at a subsequent Commission meeting. The Commission may vote to amend or adopt this draft of the harvest guidelines.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling presented a power point presentation that outlined the process undertaken to provide the harvest guidelines. The Department is requesting affirmation on how the Department manages wildlife, not trying to challenge CABMWs or local perspectives on what seasons should be. The agency objective has been to work together with everyone to reach agreement.

Commission comments on update of harvest management guidelines:

Commissioner Drew said he embraced harvest guidelines from the start to provide understanding of how the Department makes recommendations. As the process moved along he is less comfortable with the product. He said the Department wanted clear direction from the Commission in regard to season setting and quotas. Just dealing with season setting, believed that we already had that with the 2015 - 2016 seasons. He said he will take partial blame for this, but it was never captured what we do now. That is where he stopped understanding where we were going, and question is how to approach the document today. The options are to not adopt, adopt but non-binding, adopt section for quotas and have seasons as an appendix. Commissioner Drew said he disagrees with black bear portion of the harvest guidelines as written.

Chairman Wallace said as process moved along he has received public comment from sportsmen. Nye CABMW contacted him and he would like to hear their input and input from the public.

Commissioner Almberg supports guidelines for transparency and demonstrates conservancy.

Commissioner Valentine agreed with Commission comments so far and has no problem with harvest guidelines. But would like to continue season setting every two years. Would like to know carrying capacity in 22 and 23 for doe hunts and projections based on trend and range conditions.

Administrator Wakeling explained carrying capacity (4:13 p.m.) which is very complex.

Commissioner Barnes likes the guideline part as far as management but for season setting it creates a lot of confusion. He attended the Elko CABMW and there was much confusion over the seasons. Supports management portion but not seasons, important to keep flexibility in there. Nevada is so diverse in each geographical region.

Commissioner Johnston said the cover memorandum had the informational statements requested from last Commission meeting. When he read the guidelines the statements that explain it to you are not there. The memo told him more about quota setting then the guidelines. The guidelines say nothing about seasons only quota recommendations. He does not want to see standardized season setting as has not been explained how that achieves management guidelines. There is disconnect between what he is reading and what I am told I am reading.

Commissioner Drew said at the last meeting he made a specific motion with direction to the Department, and for Commission adoption those items should have been included. He cited the example of black bear harvest which was to be ultra-conservative and read that the plan will allow "moderate" harvest. In his opinion that is totally disparate with the Black Bear Committee report and fails to see how that is conservative management. He is not comfortable with the quota guidelines and does not believe the Commission direction from the last meeting was fully incorporated specific to the black bear.

Commissioner Hubbs said if plan not in alignment with the original black bear report, the plan should be revised or remove that portion for now of the guidelines.

Public Comment – None

CABMW Public Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said the purpose is to lessen paperwork but this is adding. If Commission goes forward he can break down their recommendations by species.

Commissioner Drew said personally he does not see the Commission adopting this and should focus on the quota portion.

Secretary Wasley said for clarification of process there is challenge to what the guidelines are accomplishing. Mr. Shea's comment underscores the misunderstanding. The Department is tasked with bring recommendations to CABMWs and the Commission, and when stated by Commissioner Drew that he would like to see these changes relative to what we do now. The problem is we are not consistent now, the incentive in seeking input is to provide consistency with the recommendation. This is not the end or intended to circumvent engagement or involvement but is to provide side boards to the Department in generating the recommendation brought forward to the process of season setting. Presently what has been done is not consistent across species across the state. It could simply be that the Department needs to retreat and develop a document for internal purposes. Administrator Wakeling had the desire to get input into establishing the guidelines for internal use setting initial recommendations that would be brought forward for discussion. The Department would like to know where to start from Commission and CABMW perspective for consistency and transparent awareness of where that discussion begins. He and Commissioner Drew discussed that starting with the quota process may be a better place to have started.

Chairman Wallace said his recommendation is to proceed with tomorrow as in the past, and use harvest guidelines for quota.

Further Discussion by Commission on Harvest Guidelines – 4:33 p.m.

Resumed CABMW Public Comment – 4:39 p.m.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, reviewed his CABMW's season prescriptions per species not using the dates (4:41 p.m.) Mr. Shea said the black bear season should end Dec. 31, 2017, and he had edits to mule deer section.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said the plan draws us into a corner and details will change year in and year out. Lincoln CABMW opposed to plan.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said conceptually agree but would like set of guidelines, and that population data would be appropriate to be included

Chrissy Pope, Nye CABMW, read email sent by Chair Kevin Strozzi: "Support system that makes sense for quota recommendations such as consistency throughout the state, but we are not in support of harvesting animals just because there may be a certain amount of animals in a particular herd. Deer herds in central Nevada have a lot of room to grow, does not think killing female deer will do anything positive to the population. Biologically may impact herd as taking female out but do not want herds to be size they are now. Want them to grow, not opposed to antlerless hunts but those hunts should be used to reduce or stabilize herd sizes. We can't kill the moms if we want herds to grow. Am not a biologist but seems like simple math, and does not have words to describe how opposed to an antlerless mule deer hunt in Central Nevada." She said there needs to be a guideline but not in support of guideline as presented today.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, voted to oppose. Believe have guidelines in place. Don't see what is wrong with how they were doing it as there was flexibility. Scrap the guidelines.

Public Comment Carson City –

Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters' Association, wants written comments in the record per OML. (Attachment B).

Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, thanked NDOW for transparency and agreed with Mr. Dixon to include population data. No confidence is age/sex without some idea of population estimate. Seen for 40 years update age/sex ratio, concerned due to large carnivore and omnivore population bear is lowest number.

Fred Anderson, Secret Pass Outfitters, attended CABMW meeting and is here to caution everyone on creating guideline number to fit the whole state. Caution on having one number for the whole state.

Public Comment Las Vegas –

Jana Wright thanked Drew for his comment on bear. Appreciates comments from Don Molde and Paul Dixon. Objects to year round mountain lion season. (Audio barely audible 5:05 p.m.).

Commissioner Johnston supports the guidelines for quotas and they don't preclude taking units on a case by case basis (5:07 p.m.).

Further discussion ensued from the Commission (5:11 p.m.).

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF REVISED HARVEST MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR HUNTINGS SEASONS AS FOLLOW: DOCUMENT BE RETITLED "HARVEST MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR SETTING HUNTING SEASONS AND TAG QUOTAS." SECONDLY, DELETE ALL TABLES IDENTIFYING THE SEASON DATES; THIRDLY, INCLUDE IN SECTION ENTITLED "HARVEST MANAGEMENT AND TAG QUOTA PRESCRIPTIONS," THE INFORMATION INCLUDING THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN ADMINISTRATOR WAKELING'S JAN. 22, 2017, MEMO. TO IDENTIFY THE PARAMETERS THAT WOULD CAUSE THE DEPARTMENT TO MAKE ITS TAG QUOTA RECOMMENDATIONS AND ANY INCREASES OR DECREASES IN TAG QUOTAS. INCLUDE A NOTICE ENTITLED SEASON PRESCRIPTIONS THE PARAMETERS UPON WHICH THE DEPARTMENT WILL MAKE ITS SEASON RECOMMENDATIONS. REVISE THE SECTION ON BLACK BEAR FOR SEASON PRESCRIPTIONS AND HARVEST MANAGEMENT RESTRICTIONS BASED ON COMMISSION'S DETERMINATION THAT BLACK BEAR HARVEST BE CONSERVATIVE OR LIGHT RATHER THEN MODERATE. COMMISSIONER DREW SECONDED THE MOTION AND SAID SERIOUS INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE GUIDELINES AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE BLACK BEAR COMMITTEE. HOPE WOULD BE NOT ONLY GOING FROM MODERATE TO LIGHT BUT ALSO WORKING TOWARD MORE CONSISTENCY WITH THE REPORT THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPTED. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON AMENDED HIS MOTION THAT OFFICIAL REVISION OF BLACK BEAR SECTION BE CONSISTENT WITH BEAR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION. (5:16 P.M.)**

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. (5:20 P.M.)**

- 11 Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Predation Management Plan – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson – For Possible Action

The draft Fiscal Year 2018 Predation Management Plan will be presented to the Commission for initial review. Following this review, the draft plan will be updated and shared with the State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee (PARC). All comments from the PARC, County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife, and any other interested entity will be compiled and shared with the Wildlife Damage Management Committee (WDMC) for their consideration at their March 2017 meeting. The Commission will receive an update at the March 2017 meeting from the Wildlife Damage Management Committee and may provide additional direction at that time.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson presented the first draft of the Fiscal Year 2018 Predator Management Plan (2018 Plan) to the Commission for their initial review and comment at this meeting. The final report for activities undertaken under the Fiscal Year 2016 Predator Management Plan was presented to the Commission at their November meeting. The current draft of the 2018 Plan is presented for Commission review and comment. In accordance with statute and Commission Policy 23, the Department intends to present this initial draft to the Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee (PARC) for their review and comment. The Department has reached out on at least three separate occasions to inform PARC staff representatives of our availability and willingness to present this information before the March meeting of the Commission. All comments from PARC, County Advisory Boards, or general public will be shared with the Wildlife Damage Management Committee (WDMC) for their review and counsel prior to the March Commission meeting. The WDMC will provide a report to the Commission at the March meeting, and the Department will review and revise the 2018 Plan based on the collective feedback received. The Department will present a final draft for Commission consideration at their May meeting. The Department does not propose initiating or terminating any of the individual projects from the 2017 Plan. This proposed 2018 Plan is

essentially identical to the prior plan, although the formatting has been restructured for brevity. The Department will brief the Commission on some of the obstacles to implement the current and future plans, including USDA Wildlife Services Settlement Agreements and aircraft safety challenges. The Department will also provide a briefing on the use of private contractors to attempt to overcome the challenges, while meeting stated objectives in the 2018 Plan and statutory obligations as amended by 2015 Assembly Bill 78. The Department recommends that the Commission vote to provide the Department with counsel on revisions to the fiscal year 2018 Predator Management Plan. The Commission asked questions of Mr. Jackson and commented on specific projects (5:59 p.m.).

Public Comment at Carson City –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said Project 22-071 was great and saw the goal. They are very happy.

Gerald Lent, Hunters' Association, provided his comments for the record (Attachment B).

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, commented on the report and plan as the two should be parallel so that they can be connected. He said they asked for more specificity in the report and cited example of Project 22 – 07 and some asked for more detail on the collaring to evaluate if that is correct disbursement of predator funds. Would like staff at meetings to answer those type of questions or add to report so everyone is aware.

Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, said program has been political not biological when AB 291 passed by Legislature. About \$6 million has been spent on this endeavor and not one single statistic showing any benefit after 14 years and who knows how many dead animals. NDOW has done its best to show statistical significance in two projects. The East Humboldt Secret Pass which was un-productive in respect to mule deer production. The other was Project 18 in the Granite Range trying to show benefit after eight or nine years – unable to do so. Not surprising no benefit as not biologically based and expensive.

Public Comment Las Vegas –

Jana Wright referenced page 9 of report. Comments inaudible on FTR recording (6:16 p.m.).

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED THAT THE DEPARTMENT PREPARE A REVISED DRAFT OF THE FY 2018 PREDATOR MANAGEMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE BASELINE DATA AND CORRESPONDING MEASURE OF GOALS SET FORTH FOR PROJECTS AS DISCUSSED. IF POSSIBLE BY WEDNESDAY IN ADVANCE OF THE PARC MEETING AND BEFORE WDMC. COMMISSIONER DREW SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Hubbs asked if we are projecting the number of predators we are removing. Are we removing and looking at response.

Mr. Jackson answered no we are not projecting and the second answer is yes.

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chairman Wallace said the Commission has two more action items. Commissioner McNinch said Policy #26 A is not time sensitive and could be tabled. Commissioner Drew asked proper procedure to deal with Agenda items #12 and #13. DAG Ward said a motion.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO TABLE AGENDA ITEMS #12 AND #13 AT THE CALL OF THE CHAIR AND REQUEST PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE FINAL VOTE. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Public Comment - None at either location.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOSLY.**

14 Public Comment – None at either location.

Meeting Recessed 6:25 p.m.

Saturday, Feb. 11, 2017 - 8:30 a. m.

15 Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call of Commission and County Advisory Board Members to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) – Chairman Wallace

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 8:42 a.m. All nine Commissioners present at roll call.

CABMW Roll Call: Craig Burnside, Douglas; Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas; Sean Shea, Washoe; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; Chrissy Pope, Nye; Douglas Martin, Carson City; Ray Sawyer, White Pine; Joe Crim, Pershing; Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt; Paul Dixon, Clark.

16 Approval of Agenda – Chairman Wallace – For Possible Action  
The Commission will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Commission may remove items from the agenda, continue items for consideration or take items out of order.

Commissioner Drew reminded the Commission that agenda items 12 and 13 were tabled from yesterday.

Public Comment - None

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTION OF ITEMS 12 AND 13 THAT WERE TABLED. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

17 Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence – Chairman Wallace and Secretary Director Wasley – Informational  
Commissioners may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. The Commission will review and may discuss correspondence sent or received by the Commission since the last regular meeting and may provide copies for the exhibit file (Commissioners may provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record). Correspondence sent or received by Secretary Director Wasley may also be discussed.

Chairman Wallace said this is DAG Ward's last Commission meeting as he is moving away. DAG Ward was thanked for his service to the Commission. Chairman Wallace has received numerous emails on the bear season which were also sent to the other Commissioners.

Commissioner McNinch he received a wildlife survey that asked questions related to trapping issues in Nevada, wildlife contests, and animal parts coming into the country. He suggested that if we run into this during Legislature that the survey questions must be laid out in their entirety to see how the questions were asked. The survey seemed biased.

Commissioner Johnston received a letter from No Bear Hunt Nevada. He did not see that NDOW was copied. He forwarded that letter to NDOW to be included in the meeting record.

Director Wasley said as mentioned yesterday, NDOW received letter from NOGA with their positions: Membership in full support of the black bear season; they do not support the proposal to standardize the season prescriptions in the guideline discussion yesterday; and they strongly support the mountain lion season as recommended.

- 18 County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Member Items – Informational  
CABMW members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action will be scheduled on a future Commission agenda.

Public Comment – None

- 12 Legislative Committee Report – Commissioner and Committee Chairman Jeremy Commissioner Drew – For Possible Action  
A report will be presented on the committee’s recent meetings. The Commission may review bills of interest, consider legislative committee recommendations and may take official positions on those bills. The Commission may also choose to develop platforms on bills by supporting or opposing general concepts contained within bills rather than specific language. The Commission will consider and may approve a spokesperson(s) who will relay Commission positions and platforms to the Legislature. (Support materials are as of the Legislative Committee meeting held on January 23, 2017. These materials may be updated at the Commission meeting based on the outcome of the February 8, 2017 Committee meeting. Bill and BDR language may be viewed online at: <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017>)

Commissioner Drew said at the last committee meeting the committee took action to recommend him as the Commission’s designated spokesperson. Commissioners Johnston and Wallace were recommended as alternates if he (Commissioner Drew) is unable to participate.

Public Comment - None

**COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED TO DESIGNATE COMMISSIONER DREW AS THE SPOKESPERSON FOR THE LEGISLATIVE MEETINGS WITH COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON AND CHAIRMAN WALLACE AS ALTERNATES. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Drew reviewed the legislative bill process, and the legislative schedule. There are over 15 Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) specific to water which could have ramifications for wildlife. The most current version of a bill on our tracking list will be on the legislative website. The committee is trying to find the best way to have the most current version available. The committee did recommend a platform on Senate Bill (SB) 74. The part that the committee took interest in is the part “providing for the collection of rainwater under certain circumstances and there is much more information about drought, drought planning and drought preparedness. The committee is suggesting that we support the concept that guzzlers do not need a water right or approval by the state engineer in order to collect rain water. However, we do want

clarification how a potential conflict would be determined. The question the committee had is that if you are not going to require a water right, who actually would determine that conflict?

CABMW Public Comment -

Sean Shea, Washoe County CABMW, speaking for himself, said he wants to clarify this because he believes that it is in place on the Sheldon. Should there be something for USFWS in there because it is out at Sheldon. Wants to be sure everything was covered.

Paul Dixon, Clark County CABMW, asked how the jurisdiction of the military would affect this bill. We have active guzzlers on mountain ranges now and if they take over that mountain range, how do we have access, because there would other entities involved.

Commissioner Drew agreed that is a good point and will look into it with USFWS. That is something we can question whether it is in our platform or not, we can also adopt that into the platform. Commissioner Drew said in terms of withdrawal lands, not certain that this bill will speak to that at it is specific to water rights and water law, not necessarily jurisdiction. Commissioner Drew does not feel there is anything in this bill we can actually speak to since it water rights specific.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO SUPPORT THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT A PLATFORM ON SB 74, THAT WE SUPPORT THAT WILDLIFE GUZZLERS DO NOT NEED A WATER RIGHT OR APPROVAL BY THE STATE ENGINEER TO COLLECT RAIN WATER AND TO REQUEST CLARIFICATION ON HOW A POTENTIAL CONFLICT WOULD BE DETERMINED AND REMAIN SILENT ON THE REMAINDER OF THE BILL. IN ADDITION TO MAKING SURE USFWS GUZZLERS WOULD FALL UNDER THE SAME CATEGORY. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SENCDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Drew read document about SB 75 which revises provisions relating to the confidentiality of certain information obtained by NDOW revising provisions governing the preparation and dissemination of certain reports and statements regarding the Wildlife Trust Fund, the Dream Tag Program, Upland Game Bird Projects and certain energy development projects. The portion of the bill this committee was most interested in was that provision of confidentiality. Essentially our recommended position or platform is to support the confidentiality portion of reporting parties. The committee did remain silent or at least neutral on the rest of the bill.

Director Wasley stated that this bill does several things. The Department has to comply with Public Records Request laws to provide information when issues are reported. There are only small amounts of information that can be redacted from those reports presently, like social security numbers. We have had several issues where individuals have requested that we stand-down due to conflicts with neighbors. The Department is looking to protect personal information and encourage people if they need assistance to be willing to call us for help. Director Wasley noted a couple scenarios: You may have one neighbor who is putting food out, knowing there are laws against wildlife feeding, but some people in Las Vegas are feeding coyotes. A neighbor may hate them, and have small pets and the coyote can potentially kill their pets or have had pets killed. There are also cases where people have significant investments in their landscaping. Spring Creek is noted for this very thing. One resident may have \$30, \$40, \$50,000 in landscaping; and an adjacent neighbor lays food out. The deer come in and ruin the landscaping and a conflict arises with that neighbor wanting to call and say someone is feeding

these deer illegally; however, they are reluctant to do so if we are required to provide their personal information. Staff are looking for opportunities to have NDOW intervene and protect wildlife and personal information.

Public Comment –

Don Molde, Reno, said the blue section should then read “any ***personal*** information obtained by the Department.” It seems to him that the other side of this coin is that the Department in the past has at least on occasion taken either a phone call from someone alleging problems with a bear or bears, or perhaps even just a casual conversation somewhere in the town or region that somebody’s complaining about a bear having done something and there’s no paper record of whatever the substance of the complaint was. It seems to me, given the controversy that’s gone on for a long time regarding this matter; that the department has some obligation to have a written record of some kind about every complaint that comes in that results in some action with a bear. It only seems reasonable to me that that would be the case. That information does not necessarily have to include the reporting persons, or the complainants’ name or personal information, but it seems to me the public has a right to know what kind of information results in activities or actions against bear. He doesn’t think a phone call to the Department alleging some sort of bear activity without a written record is sufficient. The person complaining can certainly be protected but there ought to be some indications to what that information was, what sort of damage, where did it occur; roughly, if not at a specific address. We need to know that information in order to try to diminish the amount of rumor and speculation conspiracy theory and so on that goes around this stuff. My suggestion would be that you amend that to include the word ‘**personal**’ as the second word in the blue section.

Jana Wright, said for the record, that in Section 1 she personally feels that there should be an exemption for law enforcement or animal control, which have access to “confidential information.” Reading from a document, Section 5, bullet point 6, line 32, information on registration of a trap etc. the Department shall not disclose that information unless required to do so by law or a court order. She is confused as to why that should be stated.

Commissioner Drew said in response to Mr. Molde’s point, Section 1 reads, “any information obtained by the Department or agent of the Department concerning a person who has requested assistance.” Commissioner Drew can see where adding “personal” in there would maybe clarify the language but he also thinks it is redundant. He believes the language at this point speaks specifically to a person, not to the confidentiality of the information that has been provided.

Commissioner Johnston said what is deemed confidential is the information concerning a person who has requested the assistance or reported something. The only information that remains confidential is the information that’s concerning the reporting party not the actual incident that prompted the report.

Commissioner Drew also points out that the committee recommended platform says, “To support the confidentiality of those reporting parties who report nuisance wildlife claims.” The platform is specific to “those parties” not necessarily the information.

Director Wasley said the Department has no desire or intention of keeping the details of the specific incidents confidential rather the purpose is to protect the reporting party’s identity.

Commissioner McNinch asked Director Wasley if the Department responds to anonymous complaints.

Director Wasley said yes and no. If there is an issue of public safety that warrants investigation regardless of whether or not a reporting party identifies themselves, requires action from the Department since we have now been made aware. However there is dialog and exchange if someone wishes to stay anonymous, they usually do not engage any further in the conversation. We have several instances across a myriad of species throughout the state, where when we are finally engaged, whether it's one neighbor after another, or the bear situation, a coyote situation, a deer situation, often times we are told, "Well I didn't want to upset my neighbor, I didn't want to be the one etc." This stems from the availability of that personal information. Department is trying to encourage people to give us the opportunity to become involved sooner rather than later.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT THE RECOMMENDED PLATFORM OF THE COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO SB 75 TO SUPPORT THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THOSE REPORTING PARTIES WHO REPORT NUISANCE WILDLIFE CLAIMS AND REMAIN SILENT ON THE REST OF THE BILL. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 13 First Reading, Commission Policy 26A, Transparency – Division Administrator Brian Wakeling – For Possible Action  
The Commission will conduct a first reading of Commission Policy 26A, Transparency, and may take action to amend or repeal. The policy is outdated and unnecessary.

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling said SB 417 was passed in the 2015 legislative session. SB 417 essentially provided protections dealing with Public Records Requests or specific location information for wildlife, providing a one year protection of wildlife by not releasing sensitive information immediately before a hunt, or during a sensitive time of year for a particular species such as locations for sage-grouse leks. After passage of SB 417 there was a direct conflict with Policy 26 A that we would present our survey data on the website immediately. The Big Game Status Report has the summary information that has all the data. This policy is in need of revision and ultimately the Department deems it no longer necessary.

Commissioner Drew asks that under procedure that the Department will post on the website, however it is his understanding that this information can be requested through any Public Records Request and then we could pull out the information that is pertinent to the bill passed last session, is this correct?

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling confirmed that understanding is true and accurate.

Director Wasley said that it is really the specificity of the location data. Part of this is driven by the technological advancement with GPS collars. We are willing to share as much as we can without putting those animals in jeopardy. We should not be able to show the specific locations of animals. We feel a year is an adequate timeframe to protect the specific locations of those animals.

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling shared about an individual that had requested in the fall of 2014, this individual had a ram tag in a particular unit and the surveys were conducted just before the hunt. He specifically requested the location of the GPS locations of all Class 3 and 4 rams.

Public Comment - None

CABMW Comment -

Craig Burnside, Douglas County CABMW, feels this is no longer compliant with NRS. They recommended that the Commission reword policy 26A to bring it into compliance with NRS.

Public Comment -

Gerald Lent with Nevada Hunter's Association submitted his public comment – (See Gerald Lent written testimony Attachment A)

Don Molde, Reno, said, "I agree with one of the CAB members who spoke that the Department should probably have some kind of policy on transparency, whether it is this one or some other one or something because that concept is somewhat current in our political life. I think part of what generated this policy in the beginning was some skepticism on the part of some hunters in this state as to whether the Departments deer number populations were correct and how they were arrived at. So there was a question as to how the population numbers were determined. I have had the same concern specifically regarding bobcats for decades. How the bobcats seasons and recommendations are arrived at and based upon what population is being assumed has been probably the most opaque area of your business that I have been involved in for a long time. I have never understood nor been provided access to any part of the deliberations that go into making season recommendations. To me I should be able to have some access to that. I am aware that there is freedom of information opportunities, but it seems to me that population status animals that are being killed, particularly trapping, where there are no quotas. This population estimate and how it relates to season recommendations should be available in some fashion as part of the transparency policy or perhaps if we want to badger you with freedom of information. Similarly with the mountain lion, I am reading your information that there is a formula for determining lion populations in this state. I have never seen it. I have asked for it before. I don't know why it can't be part of a transparency effort so that we can know how the recommendations are based and what population status. I think the quota thing and population estimates dovetails into this transparency issue that you are talking about. So I would like you to continue with the transparency policy of some kind and keep the step in mind that we've talked about."

Las Vegas Public Comment – None

Commissioner Johnston takes issue with the state of basis for appealing this policy. He read the Legislature amended 503.010 to preclude the release of specific location information for one year after collection. When he reads the statute, it does not preclude the dissemination or release of information. The statute said it is unlawful to use such information in taking any animal. It specifically says in 503.010 sub section 6c, it is unlawful to use any location information obtained from records maintained by the Department within one year after the date on which the information was collected to harass or take any game animal, game bird or other wildlife. He does not see how the statute precludes the Department from disseminating such information it only prohibits the use of such information to take a game animal unlawfully. Does not feel that the statute as it was adopted, requires abandonment of this transparency policy.

Deputy Director Robb said we strive to be transparent but must protect wildlife species by not having specific information out there. He provided examples of Gila monsters in Southern Nevada and bears in Tahoe. The purpose is to protect wildlife not the data. Wildlife should not be harassed.

Commissioner Drew said there are several issues with the current policy and he is not in agreement to repeal the policy completely. Transparency is good, and policy should address some of concerns Deputy Director Robb and Commissioner Johnston have stated. There is a scope issue, and at this time this should only apply quotas for ungulates. He is leaning to suspending Policy 26 A until we develop a new transparency policy under a new number.

Commissioner McNinch said it is very specific to ungulates. Reality of actual time to get these websites up, there will always be something not satisfying for the consumer. The records are available, but needs to balance meeting the needs of the public and using a process to get such information. Not supportive of a policy that is only specific to one particular aspect.

Commissioner Valentine suggested Policy 26A be returned to Administrative, Policy, Procedures and Regulation Committee (APRPC) for review and update.

Commissioner AlMBERG is in complete agreement with Commissioner Drew and McNinch. Commissioner Young agreed.

Commissioner Hubbs is aligned with Commissioner Drew. There is a duty to keep information protected; supports expanding a policy for all species that the Department manages.

Commissioner AlMBERG says that one year may not be sufficient, may have to be species specific.

Commissioner Hubbs agrees some cases are just too sensitive for specific species, like the Gila monsters.

Director Wasley says the policy is well intentioned. Does not feel it is unique from the Public Records Request process. Like Commissioner McNinch's point, that data is available. The specific location data is the Departments largest concerns. To the Department, "All Survey data" includes specific location data. With the increase of military technology into civilian life including satellite tracking collars that people have ready access, they can get a location of every ram or buck every 15 minutes. We are not trying to be secretive or avoid transparency, we are simply trying to protect those wildlife resources that we are charged with protecting.

Commissioner Hubbs wants to clarify that this be sent to the APRPC for review, revision and revamp this policy vs. repealing it, perhaps suspending it until it has been revised.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO SUSPEND POLICY 26A, UNTIL SUCH A TIME, THAT IT CAN BE REVISED UNDER A NEW NUMBER AND IS CONSISTENT WITH CURRENT NRS FOR ALL WILDLIFE DATA. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

19 Commission General Regulations – Adoption – For Possible Action – Public Comment Allowed Persons Wishing to Provide Comment on Regulations are Requested to Complete a Green Regulation Speaker’s Card and Present it to the Recording Secretary

A Commission General Regulation 464, Appeals, LCB File No. R074-16 – Administrative Procedures Regulations and Policy (APRPC) Committee Chairman and Commissioner David McNinch – For Possible Action

The Commission will consider adopting amendments to Chapter 501 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). This regulation revises provisions relating to practice before the Commission. It provides more efficiency in scheduling appeals, will define that "calendar" days are used for calculation of deadlines, and more clearly notify the appellant in advance of a hearing that the Commission has limited jurisdiction. It will also provide for two, separate Attorneys General (one for the Commission and one for the Department) to avoid conflicts with one attorney advising two sides of the appeal. It also requires the appellant to give the agency advance notice of legal representation to improve scheduling for a separate lengthier time needed on agendas.

These changes were approved at the May 12, 2016, meeting of the Board of Wildlife Commission’s APRPC Committee which included relevant suggestions from the public and legal counsel. The Commission held a workshop in Reno on AUG. 12, 2016, where the Commission asked to include information regarding the notice to the appellant and also to insert language that if a party fails to file certain information within 14 days they may waive their right to a hearing on the appeal. A revision of the regulation was requested from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB); which, contained additional edits. No Changes were suggested by the Commission at the November 19, 2016 meeting.

Public Comment - None

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE CGR 464 APPEALS, LCB FILES NO. R074-16 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B Commission General Regulation 467, Special Assistance Permit, LCB File No. R105-16 – Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed – For Possible Action

Administrative Code (NAC). Through Assembly Bill 136 of the 2015 Legislative Session, the Nevada State Legislature mandated the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to adopt regulations prescribing the circumstances under which a person may assist a licensed hunter with certain disabilities in the killing and retrieval of a big game mammal.

The Commission held a workshop on this regulation on AUG. 12, 2016, where several changes were considered. The Commission held another workshop on September 23, 2016 to consider public comment and changes that were implemented at the last meeting.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed explained changes in the CGR which is in line with Assembly Bill 136 which made changes to the Commission’s authority and mandated in NRS 501-181. Captain Mike Maynard read a summary of the language that was received back from the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Commissioner AlMBERG said some CABMWs brought up what constitutes paralysis or disability. We would not want to unintentionally exclude someone with a handicap that is not covered by this.

Captain Maynard said it is defined basically by the physician as being either qualified or not.

Commissioner Drew looked at Section 4 on page 2(c)...has suffered a paralysis of one or both legs which severely impedes the tag holders walking. Feels the language should have a broader spectrum of the language that is there now.

Captain Maynard says that the law itself defines that already so we have to go with that. NRS would not allow for addition of the language. He also stated if we are looking for additional allowances that would be at the physician's discretion if it qualifies. Looking at this as it is written, the LCB would have issue with expanding beyond the statutory allowance. The physician has the latitude to interpret not the Department's determination.

Commissioner Drew stated that at end of day no matter what the language is, they will need a physician's note, which is the intent of the NRS.

Commissioner Valentine on section 3(c) there is mention about being accompanied in the field, he asks if Law Enforcement comfortable with that?

Captain Maynard said this mirrors similar language in NRS 502.149 we had to leave overly broad language as far as how we were interpreting 'accompany.' Concerns of undo restrictions for example like a stated distance. The language for enforcement is one the tag holder needs to be in the field. Tag holder cannot be in camp or at home need to be actively in field hunting, and then assistant can go out and do additional pursuit and retrieval, attaching tag, bring the animal back etc. There is not a clear way to define the distance but should not go beyond someone's disability restrictions could reasonable hope to pursue that animal; for example, over a mountain range or into another valley. The designated licensed assistant would still be deemed to be accompanying that person as long as the tag holder was in the field. He does not feel that big game pursuits go past a mile or two at best with a poor shot. It should not be interpreted as driving distance 30 or 40 miles away from the tag holder. This would not be accompanying the tagholder. Captain Maynard wants to be sure officers are briefed on new the new NAC as well as our departments interpretation of that is going to be as far as enforcement. There will be as little ambiguity as possible. Officers will be trained to that standard.

Commissioner Hubbs said are the any concerns that there could be worker's comp fraud or doctor's writing bogus prescriptions for their friends. What if there is a friend that writes the hunter to qualify for partial paralysis, what is the enforcement in place if you find such information out?

Captain Maynard said that if tag and license fraud is suspected, there will be an investigation. There is always a potential that a physician could issue a fraudulent certificate. As the law is written, we must rely on the physician and the medical process that evaluates whether someone is disabled or not. He said with any investigation of this nature it brings other issues potentially involving confidentiality laws, medical records etc. He does not see this being a huge issue and would deal with it on a case by case basis.

Public Comment – None

CABMW Comment –

Doug Martin, Carson City CABMW, appreciates the two comments of the Commissioners. They feel there may be other inflictions that affect a person's walking. Has a friend that has an inner ear issue that causes imbalance with walking. Noting that he is not familiar enough with statute whether that could be included, but if it could, consider it as written and include an or statement

to not limit it to the loss of one or both limbs. The other thing we saw in Section 5, that the assistant must use the firearm or whatever it is in archery, but when you read it, it is clear you not use a weapon. The wording should say 'firearm.' Under (d) it says that they may discharge his or her weapon, I think it would be clearer for the reader of this, instead of his or her weapon, it would say he special assistant permit tag holder's weapon. The language "his or her" is confusing, should read "the special assistant permit for the tag holders" weapon" to not cause confusion.

Commissioner Drew states it is referring to the weapon class. If the hunter is using a rifle, then the assistant hunter needs to use a rifle, or a bow etc.

Commissioner Johnston understands desire to expand Section 4, but the enabling statute is clear 501.181 sub 9, "This Commission was directed to adopt a regulation in which a person who is a paraplegic has one or both legs amputated or has suffered a paralysis of one or both legs, which severely impedes the persons walking." That's the regulation that the statute directed this Commission to adopt. Does not feel there is any room to expand unless the Legislature would give broader discretion to Commission.

Commissioner Young said paralysis has a varying degree and the word paralysis means a couple different things, lose the ability to move, also to lose the ability to feel. He does not feel we need to be overly specific with this, however an MD has a determination based on our regulation should be able to make a written decision that we could live with.

Commissioner Johnston understands. However the way in which the statute it written, it clearly states a paralysis of one or both legs, not of other parts of the body.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said the way it is written we can't change it but what about blindness. You can still walk, but someone must help lead you, but if you can't catch up with that animal does that person still need a special use permit. He believes they do, but it limits people. He doesn't like to limit anything so we have a problem with that.

Craig Burnside, Douglas CABMW, said they were unanimous in recommending approval. However there was one of our members condition to expand to other disabilities.

Public Comment Las Vegas – None

Commissioner Johnston would support regulation being broader but again the statute was adopted. He does not feel the Commission has the authority to change it at this point and time.

Captain Maynard looked at several states while researching this and their laws assisting disabled hunter laws. There are some really good statutes in other states that do give a broader view, however we would have to go back to get statutory authority to expand. Stated example if you have something in your neck causing paralysis in the legs and the doctor said yes that is causing paralysis in legs then that is applicable. If there was a statute that went forward, he feels it would easily be done.

Commissioner Young said he will vote to oppose adoption as regulation not expansive enough. He feels there are many veterans coming back from service that have disabilities. He shared stories of friends that are part of the Wounded Warriors program. He feels we should send this back to legislature, since it is in session, because there needs to be a bigger picture. Those that

have severe disabilities, hunting is a way for many of them to still participate. Commissioner Bliss educated them all to that. He opposes this.

Commissioner Drew said there are no guarantees with the Legislature, so by opposing the adoption of this, we could be denying access by those that have already been defined an opportunity.

Commissioner Young agrees, but just feels it needs more work and could be an attention grabber for the legislators.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed accepted responsibility that the language is not more inclusive in the statute. He feels there is room to expand that legislatively. We took that language from two other statutes, 503.010 and 503.165. Statute 010 allows a paraplegic to shoot from a vehicle and the 165 is the one that provides an exemption for the loaded gun in a vehicle for the same people.

Commissioner Johnston said he feels strongly about going forward today.

Commissioner Hubbs agrees to reach out to legislature and expand for other disabilities.

Commissioner Drew agreed the regulation needs to be expanded but need to move this regulation forward.

Commissioner Hubbs agrees that Commissioner Drew reach out to legislature and expand the language.

Commissioner Barnes agrees that it does need to be expanded, however we don't want to lose what we have.

**COMMISSIONER BARNES MOVED TO ACCEPT CGR 467 BUT ASK THAT IT BE LOOKED INTO TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF PARAPALEGIC OR THE DISABILITIES FURTHER. COMMISSIONER DREW SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Hubbs commented and is hoping that when and if it is expanded they put more protective measures if the regulation is willfully violated.

Commissioner AlMBERG stated that when we go to the Legislature we expand this language to include the two statutes cited, 503.010 and 503.165, to make the language consistent across the board.

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 20 Commission Regulation 17 - 03, 2017 Black Bear Seasons – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson, Staff Specialist Jackson – For Possible Action ion  
The Commission will consider adopting 2017 hunting season dates, open management units, hunting hours, special regulations, animal sex, legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and dates and times for indoctrination courses for black bear.

Game Division Administrator Brian presented CR 17 – 03, black bear season.

Commissioner Drew asked if the season is same as last year. Administrator Wakeling confirmed the recommendation is for the same season as 2016.

Staff Specialist Jackson presented a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file). He mentioned an error; should read 46 out of 82 bears not 57 out of 82 on presentation.

Commissioner Valentine asked what are the three different units based upon.

Commissioner Drew asked if there are any biological reasons to warrant closing the bear hunt at this time.

Staff Specialist Jackson said if there is any issue with this small sample size, it does not make an accurate count to suggest any red flags.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if based on guidelines yesterday, what are we using to come up with the bear numbers.

Administrator Wakeling said that this is the same way as before and we are not ignoring the 10 year trend, so we look at three parameters. This year is looking at the mean age of the females. We don't look at the population on a yearly basis, more like every two to three years.

Commissioner Hubbs asked what the condition of the bears were, such as were any bears emaciated, or show indications that they had cubs.

Administrator Wakeling does not recollect every report that comes in, however, one bear was in excess of 700 lbs. Body condition is generally standard or better than standard for that time of year.

Commissioner Hubbs said more female bears were harvested than males. Were any of the sows suspected of having cubs or indicative of lactating.

Administrator Wakeling and Deputy Director Robb both said they did see any reports that the females had cubs or were lactating.

Public Comment -

Craig Burnside said they voted to not recommend season as presented because they want the season extended to Dec 31, and the boundary of hunt units be included in Great Basin, part of the action was to recommend that the harvest be limited.

Elaine Carrick said she is still in opposition to the bear hunt. After seven years of the black bear hunt, it is acknowledged that it is simply a trophy hunt. She said Cecil the lion brought to light that it was a trophy hunt, and she quoted Shane Mahoney. A petition has been signed by 144,381 people from Nevada and across the nation. The trophy hunt is not acceptable to the public. Two hundred ninety-one bears, 55 percent, have been killed in the Pine Nuts. Other states have limited how many can be taken in one area. The number of females does not take into consideration that a female bear may be pregnant and that bear number is not included. That female also may have cubs that stay with their mother up to 18 months.

Paul Dixon, Clark County CABMW, said they supported the black bear hunt. The take is a nominal amount of bears out of the population. The redeeming grace of the hunt is that we have learned more now than ever.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they approved the hunt; however, would like to push the season's end date to Dec. 31.

Public Comment –

Fred Voltz said he wants to disallow hounding as a means of pursuing and killing bears. Disapproval to “too many to please the few.” Decades of data from Oregon, Washington or Colorado does not disqualify the rate of helping the bear population. Shorten the season due to the fact of the habits of the bears. They support NDOW's shorter season. However, NDOW Bear Committee findings, serve as no management control. Just because the quotas have not been met does not mean they are justified. Unnecessary chasing of bears by hounds throws the bears system out. Females can lose their embryos. Too much stress can kill the bear long after the hunt is over. About the trash, it is most decidedly out of control, no one in this agency has been able to do anything on a wider basis.

Steven Bohrn of Nevada Houndsmen Association says we do see a need for the change of the seasons and the areas being split into groups, however, when it comes to hounding, other methods would need to be implemented like baiting. You are limiting the ability to hunt the bear.

Don Molde is concerned with the number of females and the age of the bears taken. This is the same dogma with bobcat trapping to convey there is some sense of this management. Older female bears are the ones that have the young, the younger female bears do not. What is a heavy harvest to the Department? What indicators do we use? He is pointing out that it is not as smooth as we may seem.

Jennifer Simeo said she is opposed to the hunt due to the heavy harvest, keep season to Dec. 1 for the Christmas season. She shared that there are 144,300 signatures on her petition.

Shannon Greene of Nevada Sportsman's Association supports the bear hunt as presented.

Jason Graham supports the bear hunts. They misrepresent that hounding is wrong. They say they don't care about the animals that they pursue. It's not about the hunter or killing something, it is a picture with your dogs. The hound hunt has been under attack for some time. Example of two cubs in a tree and that their mom was killed, wants to educate the public of what they do with their dogs and families. This posting is not the norm for bear hunters that use hounds.

Josh Vittori of Washoe County supports recommendations. This will also alleviate hunter densities. Consumptive use is very enjoyable with many other bear hunters. The vast majority of hunters are taking that meat and eating it, not just a trophy hunt.

Jonathon Lesperance of Washoe County supports the hunt. Good model of conservation. We have more than 600 bears, only 15 have been harvested, less than 1 percent of the population. He personally was able to help a gentleman with his hunt. His perception had changed about the bears, their resourcefulness, etc. He was very excited about bears after being a “hunter”. Hounds afforded them that opportunity.

Travis Gibbson said he is a hound hunter, supports the hunting and bear hunting. Supports it being split in three units.

Chrissy Pope, Nye CABMW, supports the bear hunt and owns hounds. She said hunting with hounds provides the opportunity to choose what bear to shoot or not and what conditions that bear is in. More bears killed on the highway than a hunting season.

Matt Dixon, of Washoe County, supports the hunt and the hounding. He appreciates dedication that the houndsmen have.

Las Vegas Public Comment –

Ms. Aldridge stated that her board chooses to shoot animals with cameras not guns. They do not see that a bear hunt should be allowed. Cubs become collateral damage when the mothers are killed. Opposed to the bear hunt. Appreciate the Department changing Unit 291 for the bears.

Stephanie Myers said there has been a public outcry for black bear hunts. Since Cecil the Lion there has been an outcry of killing animals that are not warranted. This public sensitivity will not go away.

Commissioner Johnston asked if there was any consideration by the Department of Eureka County CABMW's request to add Unit 203 to the bear hunt.

Administrator Wakeling said the Department has not recommended a hunt in Unit 203.

Commissioner Johnson asked if opening a hunt in Unit 203 would alleviate the pressure in Unit 291, and if the suggestion to add shotgun with a rifle slug as a legal weapon for the hunt was discussed.

Administrator Wakeling said there is no real survey information to go off of now and Unit 203 was not included in the Department's recommendation. He said in respect to the weapon change that would require an NAC action.

Commissioner Drew agreed with Commissioner Johnston that allowing a shotgun with a rifle slug would need to be addressed through an NAC change as would hunting with dogs (hounding).

Commissioner Young said the Commission should address CR 17- 03 as presented.

**COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17-03 BLACK BEAR SEASON AS SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Discussion on the motion –

Commissioner McNinch said to Mr. Shea's comment: The length of the season was a big conversation. He feels that the season should be shortened on each end. If you have the season, you have to have the quota. He has about hyperplasia.

Administrator Wakeling said the ability to acquire calories when in hyperphasia that there has not been any conclusive documentation that any animal was harassed to such an extent that it was in a substandard health situation. One can imagine that an animal if daily harassed, could conceive of it being an issue. Based on movements that we have observed, satellite collars, etc.; there is no evidence within Nevada seeing this level of harassment. A bear does not end up being bayed, or treed every time hounds are placed on a trail. In his biological opinion he does not believe this to be an issue.

Commissioner McNinch said there is some impact at some level. When bears are trying to obtain 25,000 calories per day there is larger impact to the bear. He is not in favor of the bear hunt, and taking pressure off of those areas is needed.

Commissioner Hubbs says that the public needs a voice. She does not support this hunt and has respect for the hunters and houndsmen.

Commissioner Drew said there have been substantial amounts of correspondence on both sides of this issue. He does not want the public to feel ignored.

Commissioner Johnston said in support of hounding that he believes the use of dogs gives the hunter the opportunity to judge the condition of the bear or animal. Conservation through hunting benefits the bears which is a positive impact not negative. He would have added Unit 203.

#### **MOTION PASSED 7 – 2. COMMISSIONERS MCNINCH AND HUBBS OPPOSED.**

- 21 Commission Regulation 17 - 04, 2017 - 2018 Mountain Lion Season and Harvest Limits – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson, Staff Specialist Jackson – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider adopting 2017 - 2018 mountain lion hunting season open units, harvest limits by unit group, hunting hours, and special regulations.

Staff Specialist Jackson presented the regulation. Mr. Jackson said there has been no evidence of overharvest of lions to date. The Department's recommendation is for a statewide harvest limit of 247 animals, the recommendation is for two in Unit 091. He answered questions from the Commission during his PowerPoint presentation.

Public Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they supported CR 17 - 04 in a 3 – 2 vote and increase the tags to two.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they had a split vote of 5 - 1. John Hiatt felt that we had the majority of kittens in the spring time. Feels the 245 is too high. CR 17-04 should include that the season for mountain lions is a 365 day season that allows the use of dogs and the hunt is 24 hours a day. People should not have to go all the way back to the NAC to see that.

Don Molde lions can have young all year round. He said this was done as a political move in an effort to kill more mountain lions. Not a biological issue. With respect to Mr. Jackson's report, one parameter he did not mention is the last mountain lion research that has taken a different point of view in other states. Nevada's numbers since 2000, out of the 16 years, four years, (25 percent) we have killed more than 14 percent of mountain lions when including the depredation

kills. Include modern science. The social aspect of the mountain lion is extremely important concerning the resident male. Female lions lose cubs, transient males cause issues.

Lynn Collins, Mountain Lion Foundation, said in the past year that she has been working with the Department. NDOW has taken a good hard look at how mountain lions are being considered. However, still believes that the harvest limits are far too high. Supports a comprehensive plan, but still not at a point where we have good mountain lion numbers. The mountain lion is completely for trophy only. What is the management the harvest serves. The most recent studies, and heavy harvest, this creates issues with humans and domestic animals. Realizes the Commission has no ability to change the season, nor change the number of dollars spent in the predator plan, but the Commission can reduce harvest limits and establish harvest limits within specific regions and units. She recommends a reduction in the mountain lion harvest.

Las Vegas Public Comment –

Stephanie Myers states that NDOW and Wildlife Services are good at eliminating issues of mountain lions. She recommends that we include more science when deciding.

Jana Wright supports a moratorium on mountain lion hunting. Also, harvest limits put forth for in different hunt units. Report should break down where these lions are taken from.

Commissioner Drew said last year it was suggested to potentially open a hunt in the Sheldon – Unit 033. There would have to be a request from the Department and include analysis population and whether they had staff available to analyze a new hunt.

Commissioner Hubbs referring to last year, certain areas were disproportionately harvested. Wants to know how easily the units can be split up.

Pat Jackson, Staff Specialist says we could manage unit by unit basis, however with the available literature, Andreasen et al 2012 study, we recommended that we manage on a genetic sub-population that constitutes more than one unit.

Commissioner Hubbs needs clarification of what study the Department is using and if in compliance.

Staff Specialist Jackson said that the Andreasen Study identifies the genetic sub-population and is in compliance. The Department prepared the 2017–2018 mountain lion hunting season open units, harvest limits by unit group, hunting hours, and special regulations in anticipation of the adoption of harvest guidelines that presented at the February 2017 Commission meeting. The harvest guidelines currently call for a year-long season, and the guidelines also provide for the ability to combine harvest limits when harvest characteristics do not indicate overexploitation of mountain lion populations. The proposed seasons for mountain lion in 2017–2018 include a combined harvest limit of 245 for the state, excluding Unit 091 and closed units, but uses criteria developed through published, peer-refereed research to identify genetic population structure within Nevada. These genetic population structures indicate areas where genetic interchange is most frequent, but does not indicate that genetic interchange is nonexistent among areas. Interchange occurs, but is more limited among individual areas. Harvest limits may be established for individual genetic population delineations in future years if harvest demographic data indicates that exploitation is excessive and the management objective is to maintain mountain lion populations.

Commissioner AlMBERG asked if you can come up with a quota for these existing unit groups.

Pat Jackson, Staff Specialist – yes we could do that. Game Division Administrator Wakeling concurred.

Commissioner Hubbs are there any units that seem to have lower density or abundance that in the past or appear to be problematic as for diminishing sizes?

Staff Specialist Jackson states that they are a wonderful animal however they have a large habitat and are difficult to track and perform a census on due to their cryptic natures.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if people want to hunt those units?

Commissioner AlMBERG said we need to get the data and then we can go that way. Mountain lions are very transient in nature.

Director Wasley shared that the Department has history 10-12 years ago, hunt unit to a regional quota. The guidance has changed historically. Home range size has an effect. The population of the lions has to do with the prey that is available for the lions. These quotas are now based on legitimate science.

Commissioner Hubbs wants to know if the size of cats are smaller and smaller each year and if so, why?

Director Wasley explained when they went from the hunt unit scale to the regional scale, the first year, Unit 7 where there were 45 lions harvested. The following year we did not have the harvest. It dropped down to five to seven animals. It is a more accurate biological representation of animal distribution.

Staff Specialist Jackson said in discussion with Biologist Woolstenhulme he observed that when you place a smaller restriction on a smaller area, there is a potential to increase harvest on a smaller scale.

**COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO PASS CR 17 - 04 OPEN MANAGEMENT UNITS AND HARVEST LIMITS 2018 SEASON AS PRESENTED WITH ONE ADDITION THAT UNDER THE ASTERISK HUNTING HOURS ARE ANY TIME OR DAY, THAT WE HUNT 365 DAYS PER YEAR. MOTION SECONDED BY ALMBERG. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Commissioner Drew expressed the need to be careful of the 365 days a year that if we were to reach the harvest limit, it would assume it is closed. So it should include 365 a year unless or until the harvest limit is met.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling states that the NAC specifies that the season will be 365 days unless the harvest limit is achieved. Does not feel that part of the motion is necessary.

Commissioner Johnston thought that the actual tag has the valid dates on it, so does not feel the need to cause more confusion. The tag has the information on it.

Commissioner AlMBERG agreed.

**COMMISSIONER VALENTINE RESTATED HIS MOTION TO APPROVE CR17 - 04 OPEN MANAGEMENT UNITS AND HARVEST LIMITS 2017 MOUNTAIN LION SEASON AS PRESENTED. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ALMBERG. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 22 Commission Regulation 17-05, 2017 - 2018 and 2018 - 2019 Big Game Seasons – Wildlife Staff Specialists Mike Cox and Cody Schroeder and Staff Biologist Cody McKee – For Possible Action

The Commission will consider adopting 2017 - 2018 and 2018 - 2019 hunting seasons and dates for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, and mountain goat, including limits, hunting hours, special hunt eligibility, animal sex, physical characteristics and legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and legal weapon requirements, and emergency depredation hunt structure and statewide quotas.

The Department prepared the 2017–2018 and 2018–2019 big game seasons and dates for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, and mountain goat, including limits, hunting hours, special hunt eligibility, animal sex, physical characteristics and legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and legal weapon requirements, and emergency depredation hunt structure and statewide quotas in anticipation of the adoption of harvest guidelines that will also be presented at the February 2017 Commission meeting. The seasons and structures are intended to be consistent with the harvest guidelines.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling presented a PowerPoint presentation and said if the Commission permits, he would like to change the order of presentation. He wanted to be sure to inform the Commission of the asterisk used for the surveys conducted in various units. Invariably there are challenges to the survey schedule and the hunting seasons. Often time the asterisks and the footnotes can be inaccurate. We will be removing those asterisks that reference helicopter surveys and place a comment in the initial portion of the seasons.

Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder also presented a PowerPoint presentation and noted that some new hunts added: New hunt unit group for antelope 202, 204, for nonresident horns longer than ears, Hunt 2251 -- proposing three new unit groups for resident antelope horns shorter than the ears for Hunts 2181.

Public Comment Resident Antelope 2151 and include Nonresident Hunt 2251 -

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they approved the whole thing with modifications: Big game season hunts 2151 and 2251, change seasons dates to Aug. 25 to Sept. 7. There are muzzleloader seasons at the same time. Give the hunter the same hunt times for each season wherever there is a muzzleloader season, generally for Washoe County hunts. Also, change the rifle season. Muzzleloader proposes 15 – 24. Archery would stay 1-14. For any legal weapon start on the 25th instead of 22nd and still end on Sept. 7. Hunt 2181 propose to not have any doe hunts in Unit 012 - 014. There is no definition of a doe other than horns shorter. Does the Department agree with this or either sex as long as it is under the ear?

Korin Carpenter, representing Nevada Bowhunters Association, wants to reduce the archery and muzzleloader by 30 percent as presented on the plan. To preserve days for both archery and muzzleloader hunts they propose to stick with the season as they were last year. Last year's dates were muzzleloader Sept. 25 through Oct. 4. Archery was Aug. 1 through 20.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, accepted the recommendations of 2151 and 2251 because they mirrored the recommendations of last year. They want to mirror 2016 seasons set forth.

Commissioner Drew asked Mr. Shea if there was any discussion to return to 2016 structure for muzzleloader.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, answered they still want to stay under guidelines and did not talk about going back to 2016 seasons.

Commissioner Johnston asked the reason for the proposed change.

Staff Specialist Schroeder, said the rationale was provided in the Harvest Management Guidelines. They have noticed that muzzleloader has had low rates of harvest so they are going with the more diversified version.

Commissioner Johnston asked if it will cut out archery hunters to harvest?

Staff Specialist Schroeder answered yes, it could have the potential.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17-05 SPECIFIC TO RESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS LONGER THAN THE EARS ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 2151. COMPANION HUNT NONRESIDENT ANTELOPE HORNS LONGER THAN THE EARS ANY LEGAL WEAPON 2251 BOTH AS PRESENTED. RESIDENT ANTELOPE HORNS LONGER THAN THE EARS MUZZLELOADER HUNT 2171 AS PRESENTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES, THAT THE TOP FIVE UNIT GROUPS REVERT BACK TO THE SEPTEMBER DATES SO 011, 012-014, 015, 021-022 AND 033 WOULD ALL BE SEPT. 25 TO OCT. 4. RESIDENT ANTELOPE HORNS LONGER THAN THE EARS ARCHERY HUNT 2161 THOSE SAME UNITS WOULD REVERT TO AUG. 1 THROUGH THE 21 FOR UNIT 011, 012-014, 015, 021-022 AND 033. TWENTY-FIRST IS WHAT IS PROPOSED FOR 2017-2018. NONRESIDENT ANTELOPE HORNS LONGER THAN THE EARS ARCHERY HUNT REFLECT THE MOTION FOR THE RESIDENT HUNT. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Johnston has a question to make sure he has the motion correct. The any legal weapon hunt 2151 and 2251 will be as presented, the muzzleloader hunt would be back to the Sept. 25 to Oct. 4 dates for the units in Washoe County. The resident antelope archery hunt goes back to the Aug. 1 to Aug. 21 dates?

Commissioner Drew agrees, as well as 033 is split, Washoe and Humboldt Counties. The eastern units, the changes proposed would stand.

Cody Schroeder making sure if the motion included the nonresident antelope horns longer than the ears archery 2261. He may have failed to point out that they did add a unit in 161, 162 with the dates of Aug. 1 to Aug. 21.

**COMMISSIONER DREW CLARIFIED THAT THE MOTION WILL REFLECT THE ADDITION OF 161 AND 162 AND THOSE AUG. 21 DATES THAT WERE CHANGED ON THE RESIDENT COMPANION WOULD BE MIRRORED IN THE NONRESIDENT. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Antelope Horns Shorter than Ears 2181 -

Cody Schroeder would like to point out the 114, 115 Baker Ranch hunt is in bold, however, it is not a new hunt. It is a typo. The 3 new hunt units, 012 to 014 in area 7 and the area 18.

Public Comment – none

Commissioner Hubbs was unclear if this was for straight does or bucks with horns shorter.

Staff Specialist Schroeder states that the intent of the hunts is primarily as Mr. Shea noted; however historically it was easier to identify antelope with horns shorter in the field.

Commissioner Drew asks Mr. Shea if their discussion around the fact that you felt there was confusion in the definition or that you simply do not want a doe harvest in 012-014?

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said it would be nice to see a definition of a doe and a buck for antelope, for that reason alone. They figured they will put those yearling bucks into the buck “take” however, it may be some older gentleman do not want to shoot a younger buck. Washoe would like a “clean up” of definitions.

Commissioner Drew wants to know what is the guideline that triggered wanting that hunt if Washoe County concern is valid in terms of whatever triggered that, if you kill some portion of young males is that problematic biologically if they are counted as does.

Cody Schroeder said that specifically on the Washoe hunt, they are using greater than 2 year old bucks, they will account for both. Feels this is sustainable to have a female hunt in those areas.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said the designation of definition is in NAC for the “horns shorter”.

Commissioner Hubbs believes we are bound to the definition that stands for now.

Director Wasley states that the Department strives to make things easier for the hunter. In response to the inadvertent take of a young buck, he comments on the identifying black patches on males, not all hunters can easily identify these markers. The horns shorter identifier works well in the field.

Administrator Wakeling mentioned that cow moose have been taken on a cow elk tag. Hunters do make errors, however we need to make more information available to the hunter for identification.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ANTELOPE HORNS SHORTER THAN THE EARS ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 2181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Bighorn Sheep –

Administrator Wakeling showed presentation, noting corrections. One was leaving out the nonresident ewe hunts. After speaking with DAG, we were under the 10 days to renote, however the CABMWs would not have the information for their meetings. The Department's

intent is to place the nonresident ewe for desert sheep in the application guide with a provisional note, pending approval of the Commission at the March meeting. It will be provisionally marked within the application guide.

Public Comment -

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said last year there was proposal for unit 195, what is the update or will we ever see a hunt for this area?

Deputy Director Jack Robb says the language does not fit with where the Department wanted to go. It was restrictive to where the hunter could go and didn't quite marry up to where we knew the sheep were. He did get an email from Nevada Bighorns Unlimited and he will try to get with others to get movement as NBU since they worked with the guzzler placement and transplanted sheep in there. May have a different outcome next year, but not off the table.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT NELSON DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP ANY RAM ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 3151 AND COMPANION NONRESIDENT HUNT 3251 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE UPDATES ON 212 AND 213 EARLY AS NOTED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO MAKE SURE THEY MIRROR THE RESIDENT SEASONS. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT NELSON DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP ANY EWE ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 3181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY TO PUBLISH APPLICATION HUNT WITH THE COMPANION NONRESIDENT DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP ANY EWE 3281 HUNT AS PRESENTED BY WAKELING. MOTION SECONDED BY VALENTINE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

California Bighorn Sheep –

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING HUNTS AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT RESIDENT CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP ANY RAM ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 8151 COMANION HUNT NONRESIDENT CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP ANY RAM ANY LEGAL WEAPON 8251. RESIDENT CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP ANY EWE ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 8181 AND RESIDENT ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP ANY RAM ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 9151 WITH ONE EDITORIAL CHANGE OF UNIT 91 TO 091. YOUNG SECONDED. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mountain Goat –

Administrator Wakeling states the only change that was made was to add a nonresident season for 2017 only at this time. Comment as to why not for both years? Routinely try to provide a nonresident 10 percent of the opportunity.

Public Comment – None

Commissioner Drew asked the hunt should end on Oct. 30 and not Oct. 31.

Administrator Wakeling said it is a 60 day hunt.

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESIDENT MOUNTAIN GOAT ANY GOAT ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 7151 WITH THE CHANGE THAT THE END OF THE SEASON BE OCT. 31 AND THE NONRESIDENT MOUNTAIN GOAT ANY GOAT ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 7251 WITH ENDING DATE OF OCT. 31. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mule deer seasons –

Staff Specialist Schroeder shares changes on the PowerPoint, changed season dates, trying to be more consistent with the public input. For 1181 we did add nine new hunt units.

Discussion of season dates and changes and overlapping dates.

Public Comment –

Mike Laughlin is very concerned with the deer populations. He is concerned for the kids and the future of hunting with the youth. Feels we need to provide more hunting opportunities for the youth.

Joe Crim, Pershing CAB, said they accepted all recommendations except for Hunt 1181 the antlerless hunt in 043-046. The population is below 2,800. Delete the doe hunt to help replenish the herds.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, said they want the 2017 season to mirror the 2016 seasons. They would like Nov. 5 closed and have single seasons like in 2016. There will be more opportunity to harvest. Hunt units in Area 5 – 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 051 and they share one with Pershing.

Paul Dixon, Clark County, agreed with all Department recommendations but did have opinions for two hunts. Most people in Clark County hunt in Lincoln, Nye or White Pine County and some into Elko. For Hunt 1181, antlerless resident mule deer, dissenting opinion was not in favor of doe hunts in 221, 223 and 231. Same comment for nonresident hunts in 1235.

Cory Lytle Lincoln CAB wants to stretch that hunt to the end of month Oct. 31 for the junior hunts. (listed their units) for the 1181 hunt they would like to see more data on this. Oppose the doe hunts. 1235 nonresident hunt wants to stay consistent with Oct. 31 end date. 1331 again end Oct. 31 and same with nonresident.

Commissioner Drew asked Mr. Lytle why change it from Nov. 2 back to Oct 31. Will two days be significant?

Cory Lytle said that this does put strain on that area.

Commissioner Drew trying to include landowner tags.

Chrissy Pope, Nye CABMW, sees one problem was the 1235, antlered and antlerless. Does not agree on was resident mule deer antlerless any legal weapon hunt 1181. Does not agree with hunt units 161-164 and 171-173 for a doe hunt.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, recommends to move the antlerless hunt with any legal weapon into the any legal weapon time frame of Nov. 1 through Nov. 15. They did not speak for areas 201 or 204, however, those areas are lumped into 1181, recommend any legal weapon season would be the same as the muzzleloader season. Recommend that unit 207 be taken out of their antlerless hunt.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, recommended that all hunts end on Nov. 2, to afford young hunters opportunity through Sunday of the Nevada Day weekend. Listed numerous units. Opposed to Hunt 1181 antlerless hunt in units 111-113, 121, 131-134, 221-223 and 231. Not sufficient data to support these hunts. Hunts 1235, 1331 resident and nonresident suggesting that early and late hunts mirror the other units with early hunt Oct. 5 - 20, late hunt being Oct. 21 – Nov. 5 and eliminating the mid hunt.

Commissioner Drew has questions for Cody Schroeder. Wants clarification of 1331 late hunt in the Sheldon, is there a typo, should that be Oct. 21 through Nov. 5 on the late hunt?

Staff Specialist Schroeder said that is correct, causing an overlapping of early and late hunts.

Commissioner Drew discussed dates and asked Mr. Lytle about their opinion of the split seasons.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, expressed that they will no longer have a nice trophy hunt. If we look at our cow elk seasons we take a large percentage in the three-way split seasons. Lincoln voted for the three-way split.

Commissioner Young recognized Mr. Laughlin's comments and concurs with them. Where are the deer that used to be so numerous, noting Lamoille Canyon.

Staff Specialist Schroeder said we did some experimental methods in the Ruby Mountains and it resulted in flying less area in area 10, and have actually counted more deer than before. They counted over 6,000 deer in about four days.

Administrator Wakeling feels it is unrealistic to remove some of the interstates that now provide those challenges.

Commissioner Young says that the young hunter population needs to grow in order to sustain it.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if the numbers are historically lower.

Director Wasley explained the numbers may look as if they have declined, however if you look at the 1960s, the average mule deer populations were somewhere 110,000. Nevada then went into a catastrophic drought. In the 1970s, roughly the same number; 1980s we were hit with El Nino and had significant weather and the deer responded. There was roughly over 200,000 deer. This is the standard at which all deer populations have been measured. In the 1990s we had a 100 year winter event and the winter of 1992 - 1993 took those populations down and they did not recover to the level of the 1980s. Quotas were set based on that optimism which further hampered the deer population's ability to respond. If you take a 50 years span, there is still a long-term carrying capacity around 100,000. He agreed the Ruby Mountains are down, however, we are still asking ourselves what is driving that herd. Reasons could be habitat, lack of disturbance, predation, disease, diarrhea, etc. We are presently investigating. Over the span of decades, number of deer have increased and decreased, however we are still measuring

over 110,000 deer which is consistent to years past. Nevada numbers have just dropped under 100,000.

Commissioner Young again wants to encourage younger hunters for the benefit of the youth and the wildlife, the Department is doing a good job.

Commissioner Barnes sat in on the Elko County meeting and looked at the recommendations. As far as mule deer for Elko County the big thing was the cancellation of late archery hunt. He heard the reasoning behind it was there were concerns with the population, but there were a lot of archers that showed up to the meeting and would like to put that hunt back in and adjust numbers when we get to the quotas. In Area 10 where there are three seasons, Elko would like to shorten that up.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT MULE DEER ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 1331 AS WELL AS THE RESTRICTED NONRESIDENT HUNT 1235 AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES, 031 AND 032 END DATES WOULD MOVE TO NOV. 5, 033 LATE WOULD BE OCT. 21 TO NOV. 5, 034, 035, 051 WOULD ALSO MOVE TO END DATE OF NOV. 5, 101-109 LATE END DATE ADJUST TO NOV. 8. THE SAME WITH 221 - 223 LATE END DATE WOULD MOVE TO NOV. 8. 231, 241-245 END DATE MOVE TO OCT. 31. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Muzzleloader Hunts -

Commissioner Drew stated that there were two counties, Elko and Humboldt, requesting the same 2016 dates. The change there would be whether or not to end on Sept. 30 or Oct. 4.

Public Comment -

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, asked if there is going to be issues with Area 7 rifle hunters with muzzleloaders looking for deer. This may cause some issues.

Commissioner Drew said people like to see a couple day breaks between hunts.

Biologist Schroeder said seasons have always butted up against each other. There are hunters coming in and out of the field through all seasons. There is no biological reason to have the "rest" days in between.

Commissioner Drew clarifies on the archery side, what are the dates for Area 10 and why are we proposing the removal of that hunt?

Biologist Schroeder said the dates were Nov. 10 - 20 on the late archery hunt, for Area 12 they were Nov. 10 - 30. The rationale was to not have to fly over archers while they are in the field.

Commissioner Drew if Nov. 10 - 20 dates selected will that allow the window needed for survey flights.

Biologist Schroeder said we are trying to notify hunters that there may be helicopter surveys during their hunts. Area 12 has the longer season, the 10 - 30.

Commissioner Barnes said at the Elko CABMW meeting hunters were more concerned with Area 10. Addressing the helicopter flights, hunters do need to know that the flights will be done.

Commissioner AlMBERG commented that the White Pine's recommendation was to add 12 back in as well. They wanted them both back.

Public Comment –

Korin Carpenter, Nevada Bowhunters Association, said unanimous recommends with the bow clubs that the late hunts in 10 and 12 be reinstated. It is very unique opportunity to hunt in late seasons. Most opportunities come in late August. It provides an opportunity for archers to hunt in a different time of the year. As far as helicopter flights go, we would rather have the hunt instead of bar the flights.

Dave Geoff opposes taking away the late season archery hunt. Would rather have helicopter fly over instead of take away the hunts.

Ray Sawyer White Pine CAB they discussed adding area 12, 121 late archery hunt back in. Requests that dates are Nov. 10 - 20 to mirror the Area 10 hunt.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APROVE RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT MULE DEER ANTLERED MUZZLELOADER HUNT 1371 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH NO CHANGES. RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT MULE DEER ANTLERED ARCHERY HUNT 1341 AS PRESENTED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ADDING AREA 10 LATE ARCHERY HUNT, NOVEMBER 10 THROUGH NOVEMBER 20 AS WELL AS AREA 12 LATE ARCHERY HUNT NOVEMBER 10 THORUGH NOVEMBER 20 AND ON ALL THE LATE ARCHERY HUNTS THAT WE INDICATE THE FOOTNOTE THAT HELICOPTER SURVEYS MAY BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS HUNT. COMMISSIONER BARNES SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Discussion ensued regarding antlerless hunts and the need for the hunts on a biological basis; most of the County Advisory Boards opposed the doe hunts.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, was supportive of the antlerless hunt for 201, 202, 204, 206 and 208. Would like to see 207 removed from the unit grouping. They prefer to not have someone out in the field with a rifle shooting over the top of someone trying to stalk a buck and ruin the hunt. Does not feel mixing weapons in units is acceptable. Also change the dates to Nov. 6 through 20.

Commissioner Johnston commented that he does not agree with some of the hunt units in Lyon County for the antlerless deer (doe) hunts.

Commissioner Hubbs asks if it is not biologically necessary, can we do an emergency hunt at the end of the season?

Chairman Wallace shared that if the CABMW's could see what the quotas were, and they were only a handful, maybe there would not be such a concern for the doe hunts. He also reminded the Commission that emergency hunts are usually due to fire or destruction of habitat.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT MULE DEER HUNT ANTLERLESS WITH ANY LEGAL WEAPON 1181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES THAT UNIT 101, 102, 109 DATES BE CHANGED TO OCTOBER 5 THROUGH OCTOBER 20. ELIMINATE 111-113, ELIMINATE 121, ELIMINATE 131-134, ELIMINATE 161-164, ELIMINATE 171-173, ELIMINATE 202, 204, 206-208, ELIMINATE 221-223 AND 231. SECONDED BY MCNINCH. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Joe Crim explained Pershing County's opposition to the doe hunts.

Junior Youth Deer Hunt –

Biologist Schroeder presented the junior deer hunt dates. Would like to keep seasons in line with the corresponding adult hunts. Discussions about the junior deer hunt and emergency deer hunt ensued. Many CABMWs want different hunt dates. Commissioner Drew is very favorable of the November dates and allowing youth hunters to get extra days out to the fifth.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, asked if the Department is going to be black and white on some units, why not for the others?

Ray Sawyer, White Pine County CABMW, wants to give the youth the extra day.

Cory Lytle Lincoln CAB believes November 2<sup>nd</sup> is acceptable if need be.

Chairman Wallace stands with Commissioner Drew.

Commissioner Alberg – 100% in support with youth hunts, there are certain areas that it does affect.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT JR MULE DEER HUNT ANTLERED OR ANTLERLESS ARCHERY, MUZZLELOADER OR ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 1107 AS PROPOSED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES THAT UNITS 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 051, ALL CHANGE THE ANY LEGAL WEAPON CLOSE DATE FROM NOVEMBER 2 TO NOVEMBER 5. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Biologist Schroeder presented the emergency depredation hunts for deer, pronghorn and elk.

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE BOTH THE 2017 - 2018 ANTLERLESS ELK LANDOWNER HUNTS AS WELL AS THE 2017 - 2018 EMERGENCY HUNTS AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Biologist McKee presented the elk season recommendations. The Department proposed a spike hunt and consolidated the antlerless structure. Introduced new hunts for Units 072 076, 077, 081, 108, 131, and 132. Nevada seasons are set with an agreement with Utah. See presentation. All hunts set to end on Jan.31. Trying to be very conservative in the age class of the animals. Need to have a management tool to keep them regulated.

Public Comment – None

CABMW Comments - Many concerns as denoted in CABMW action reports about legal weapons, hunt units, season dates, rut hunts, pros and cons about each.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION.**

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON DEPREDATION HUNT 4102 AS PRESENTED AND TO APPROVE THE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4151 WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES, THAT AN EARLY HUNT ON SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 30 BE ESTABLISHED FOR UNITS 161-164, 171-173, AS A RESULT WHAT IS CURRENTLY IDENTIFIED AS THE EARLY WOULD BE THE MID. THE DATES FOR UNITS 241 AND 242 WOULD BE SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 24 AND DATES FOR UNIT 262 WOULD BE SEPT. 15 THROUGH SEPT. 30. NONRESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4251 WOULD BE ADJUSTED TO MATCH THOSE DATES SET FORTH IN 4151 RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT. MOTION SECONDED (AUDIO UNCLEAR).**

Two changes that Commissioner Drew would like to see that were left out of the motion that there was a proposal to add a November early and late season hunt for unit 051 dated November 6 through November 28. The other change Commissioner Drew suggests on units 076, 077, 079 and 081 early the dates would be November 6 through November 20, the late would go November 21 to December 4.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING HUNT AND REVISIONS: THE ADDITION WOULD BE A HUNT FOR UNIT 051 FROM NOVEMBER 6 THROUGH NOVEMBER 28, THE REVISION WOULD BE FOR UNIT 076, 077, 079, AND 081 EARLY TO BE NOVEMBER 6 THROUGH NOVEMBER 20 AND LATE TO BE NOVEMBER 21 THROUGH DECEMBER 4. SECONDED BY BARNES TO AMEND COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON'S MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0.**

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON STATED THAT THE MOTION AS AMENDED WOULD BE THE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON DEPREDATION HUNT 4102 WOULD BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED WITH A RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON 4151. A LATE NOV. 6 THORUGH NOV. 28 WOULD BE ADDED TO 051. THE EARLY SEASON FOR 076, 077, 079, 081 WOULD BE CHANGED TO NOV. 6 THROUGH NOV. 20. THE LATE SEASON FOR 076, 077, 079 AND 081 WOULD BE NOV. 21 THROUGH DEC. 4. WE WOULD HAVE AN EARLY HUNT FOR 161-164, 171-173 SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 30 AS A RESULT, THE PRESENTED EARLY SEASON WOULD BE MID SEASON; LATE SEASON WOULD REMAIN THE SAME. SEASON DATES FOR 241 AND 242 WOULD BE SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 24 AND THE SEASON DATES FOR 262 WOULD BE SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 30. NONRESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4251 WOULD BE AMENDED AS NEEDED TO MATCH THE SEASON DATES SET FORTH IN HUNT 4151. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4156 Resident Antlered Elk –

Commissioner Drew recommended for Units 076, 077, 079 and 081, along with Elko CABMW, to move the date back to Oct. 22 to Nov. 5. Clark CABMW noted that the seasons for Units 078 and 104, two different hunts, both end Oct. 21 which is a Saturday. They propose moving that

one day to close Oct. 22 only for the 2017-2018 season. Same recommendation for 241 and 242.

Biologist McKee said there are no overlaps yet, but once we start elk cow hunts there will be overlaps.

Public Comment - None

The CABMWs provided their recommendations as denoted in the CABMW handout compiled by Game Division.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED MUZZLELOADER HUNT 4156 WITH FOLLOWING CHANGES THAT FOR 2017-2018 UNIT 078, 105-107 AND 109 CHANGE FROM OCT. 21 TO OCT. 22. FOR UNIT 104, 108A AND 121 CHANGE BOTH YEARS TO OCT. 22 TO NOV. 5. FOR UNIT 241 AND 242 CHANGED OCT. 22 TO NOV. 5. Units 076, 077, 079, 081 WOULD NO LONGER BE SEPT. 1 TO SEPT. 16, CHANGED TO OCT. 22 TO NOV. 5. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. COMMISSIONER DREW CLARIFIED THAT COMPANION NONRESIDENT HUNT 4256 SEASON DATES MIRROR 4156. MOTION PASSED 7- 0.**

4161 Resident Elk Antlered Archery –

CABMW and Public Comment –

Cody Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, are recommending for Unit 241 and 242 to change the dates to Aug. 25 to Sept. 16 and the others to match their modified dates.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, recommends to go back to the rotation in Units 161-164 for archery 4161 and 4261 2018-2019.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, is recommending to adjust archery hunt dates to reflect what they did with muzzleloader dates and change it to Aug. 25 to Sept. 16 for Units 104, 108, etc.

Commissioner Drew clarified that for Area 16 and 17 the rifle rut hunt for bull calendar year was approved correct? If we rotate that, it would be easier on every other year or a two year basis rather alternate.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERED ARCHERY HUNT 4161 AS PROPOSED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES UNIT 076, 077, 079 AND 081 WOULD GO TO AUG. 25 THROUGH SEPT. 16. THE SAME FOR 104, 108A AND 121. THE SAME FOR 241 AND 242 AND WE WILL UPDATE THE COMPANION HUNT 4261 TO REFLECT THOSE CHANGES. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION PASSED 7- 0.**

4161 Resident Elk Spike Any Legal Weapon –

Chairman Drew noted a discrepancy with dates.

Biologist McKee explained that in the season setting meeting there was a hunt that was not presented in the Harvest Guidelines. Some of the biologists wanted to have a mid-spike hunt which was outlined in Harvest Guidelines. They chose an existing antlerless hunt season which was Oct. 1 through Oct. 20 as a placeholder.

Commissioner Drew clarified with Mr. McKee that the easy fix would be to suggest that all the mid-seasons run from Oct. 1 through Oct. 5.

Biologist McKee concurred and said there was a mid-hunt in Units 076, 077, 079 and 081, last year, however our biologist did not feel a mid-season was necessary.

Public Comment – None

Elko CABMW recommended that the dates for the early hunt be Oct. 1 through Oct. 10, mid hunt was Oct. 11 through Oct. 20 and late hunt Dec. 5 to Jan. 15.

Biologist McKee said that we may have to introduce an antlerless hunt for that season now if we will be having a spike hunt. If we had a mid-season antlerless hunt, it will overlap the early season rifle deer hunt.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK SPIKE ANY LEGAL WEAPON 4651 AS FOLLOWS: ALL MID SEASONS THAT ARE LISTED START DATES WOULD CHANGE FROM OCT. 1 TO OCT. 5 FOR UNITS 076, 077, 079 AND 081. THE EARLY HUNT WOULD GO FROM OCT. 1 THROUGH OCT. 20 AND THE LATE HUNT WOULD GO FROM DEC. 5 TO DEC. 15. COMMISSIONER BARNES SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED 7- 0. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

Biologist McKee said after reviewing the changes that have been so far, for antlerless 4181 and 4281 he recommends that we focus on the units that we made previous changes to which includes 076, 077, 079 and 081, 161-164, 241 and 242 and 104, 108A and 121. These units are the ones we have shifted back to last year's seasons.

Commissioner Barnes notices that in area 6 (062, 064, 066) there is no mid-season. It is an area that we are trying to reduce numbers. Where are all those tags going to go now?

Biologist McKee states that the mid hunts were taken out by area biologists, but at this time, since we have been over this many times, we have not remembered why we stopped it in the first place. Re-introducing that mid-hunt may cause cascading effects. There were 20 tags for that middle season in 6. Instead of re-inserting that mid-hunt we can add them to the late hunt.

Commissioner Alberg believed it causes stress on the animals in the White Pine terrain. Recommends avoiding hunts in Units 111, 114 and 115.

Commissioner Drew noted there is a disparity in the CABMW input. Some CABMWs north of Highway 50 tend to be okay going later into January. CABMWs south of Highway 50 want to cut the January timeframe out. It also seems to reflect where the bigger issues are. Commissioner Drew said there also is a recommendation for that not in the support material to add a second hunt for Dec. 5 through Jan. 31.

Biologist McKee agreed.

Public Comment – None

CABMW Comment –

Chrissy Pope, Nye CABMW, brought forth the dates of Oct. 1 through Oct. 20. The overlap should not cause too many issues due to the small amount that will overlap.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said they want to end the season on Jan. 1 because most hunters hunt during the holidays and then they are done. They want to get away from the end of January.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, supports the recommendation of Dec. 5 through Jan. 31. Split seasons.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, addressed the January dates: recommending for Units 111 and 112 Dec. 5 through Jan. 5. Unit 113 December 5 through January 5. Units 114 and 115 Dec. 5 through Jan. 5. 221, Dec. 5 through Jan. 5, Units 222 and 223, same dates. For Units 104, 108A 121, recommend keeping these hunts from conflicting by changing the dates Sept. 5 through Oct. 4 would be the recommended hunt dates.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, adds that Unit 241 and 242 the Sept. 21 date needs to be adjusted to Sept. 25.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4181 AS RECOMMENDED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES. ADD A HUNT THAT IS NOT IN THE SUPPORT MATERIAL, FOR UNIT 051 THAT WOULD RUN DEC. 5 THROUGH JAN. 31. UNITS 076, 077, 079 AND 081 EARLY UNIT GROUP WOULD BE CHANGED FROM SEPT. 17 TO OCT. 4, TO OCT. 1 THROUGH OCT. 20. 104, 108B AND 121 WOULD GO TO SEPT. 25 TO OCT. 4. THE SAME CHANGE WOULD BE MADE FOR UNIT 241 AND 242. UNIT 161 EARLY TO 164 EARLY WOULD BE FROM SEPT. 25 TO OCT. 4 TO OCT. 1 THROUGH OCT. 20. CHANGE THE FOLLOWING END DATES FOR THE LATE HUNTS FROM JAN. 31 TO JAN. 5 FOR 111-115 LATE, 221 LATE, 222, 223 LATE, 231 LATE. ADJUST COMPANION HUNT NONRESIDENT 4281 TO MIRROR THESE CHANGES. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ALMBERG. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION PASSED 7 - 0.**

Resident Elk Antlerless 4181 Wilderness Only Hunts -

Biologist McKee stated they will need to make changes to the 162 wilderness only hunt - dates would be Oct. 1 through Oct. 20.

Commissioner Drew sees a change in 222 late hunt, the dates need to be consistent on the end date making it the fifth.

Commissioner Barnes said that Elko CABMW made a recommendation for Unit 072 split season: Oct. 1 through Oct. 10, mid-hunt Oct. 11 to Oct. 20. There was some discussion of accessibility of those animals. Concerned about the success rates, agrees with the Oct. 1 to Oct. 20 dates.

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4181 WILDERNESS ONLY HUNT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES, UNIT 072A AND 162B WOULD GO TO OCT. 1 THROUGH OCT. 20, 222 LATE END DATE WOULD CHANGE FROM JAN. 31 TO JAN. 5. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON. MOTION PASSED 7- 0, COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

Resident Elk Antlerless Muzzleloader Hunt 4176 -

CABMW and Public Comment –

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, reports that in order to line up rest of the seasons for 241 and 242, we recommend a muzzleloader cow hunt be taken away.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, for Units 104, 108, 121, recommending a Sept. 17 through Sept. 24 hunt to coincide with other dates of the units.

Chrissy Pope, Nye CABMW, states that the September hunts will still give an opportunity for those bulls to be bugled and the cows will be right there with them. Either dates would be okay.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS MUZZLELOADER HUNT 4176 AS PROPOSED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES UNIT 076, 077, 079, 081 WOULD CHANGE FROM SEPT. 1 THROUGH SEPT. 16 TO SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 24. 104, 108A AND 121 WOULD ALSO GO TO SEPT. 17 THROUGH SEPT. 24. 161-164 WOULD CHANGE TO SEPT. 1 THROUGH SEPT. 16 AND WE WOULD ELIMINATE HUNT UNIT 241 AND 242. COMPANION HUNT NONRESIDENT 4276 WOULD BE ADJUSTED TO MIRROR THE ABOVE CHANGES. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION PASSED 7- 0.**

Resident Elk Antlerless Archery Hunt 4111 -

MA 3 Hullinger said that historically the 4107 hunt has been any legal weapon hunt. It is no longer a bonus point hunt, but it was not noticed as a stratified hunt which is what we call those types of hunts with multiple weapon types for a unit. She reminds that it is a depredation hunt and there are limited boundaries in those units. She defers to Harry Ward our DAG.

Public Comment –

Korin Carpenter, Nevada Bowhunters Association, does recognize that the limited boundaries are in place for the animal. The concern they have is the archery bull hunt, but will bring that back to the association.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS ARCHERY HUNT 4111 AS PROPOSED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES; 104, 108A AND 121 THE END DATE WOULD CHANGE TO AUG. 24. THE SAME CHANGE WOULD BE MADE FOR UNIT 241 AND 242. 161-164 WOULD RUN AUG. 1 THROUGH AUG. 15. MOTION SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN WALLACE. MOTION TO INCLUDE THE COMPANION HUNT 4211 BE UPDATED TO REFLECT THOSE CHANGES. MOTIONED PASSED 7 - 0. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS ANY LEGAL WEAPON DEPREDATION HUNT 4107 AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE TWO CLERICAL ERRORS SUGGESTED. MOTION SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN WALLACE. MOTIONED PASSED 7 - 0. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

Resident Elk Antlerless Elk Management any legal weapon hunt 4481, option for mule deer hunt 1331

Commissioner Drew reminded the Commission that all these hunts are associated with the mule deer hunts. We can make a motion to make sure that the seasons are updated to reflect any changes that we have made in the associated mule deer hunt.

Public Comment –

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS ELK MANAGEMENT ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4481 OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1331; HUNT 4481 OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1331 ON PAGE 15; HUNT 4476 OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1371; HUNT 4411 OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1341 AND IN ALL CASES THAT WE UPDATE THE SEASONS TO REFLECT ANY COMENSURATE CHANGES WITH THE PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED MULE DEER HUNTS. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. JUNIOR ANTLERLESS ELK HUNT WILL BE MIRRORED AND TO MATCH THE JUNIOR DEER SEASON. MOTIONED PASSED 7 - 0. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

- 23 Commission Regulation 17-06, 2018 Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2018 Heritage Tag hunt species, seasons and quotas.

Ma 3 Hullinger presented CR17 - 06 Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas. There are no changes to the species seasons and quotas from last year or the special regulations on page 2. The Department is still recommending Unit 041 in the California Heritage Tag to be closed, same as last year.

Commissioner Johnston stated that they have seen it. He has heard that many have not seen this. It was developed through a public process where first in July, at the Elko Commission Meeting, Mr. Deputy Director, Jack Robb and he believes Mr. Wakeling came forth with a proposal they put together in the car to try and come up with 3 proposals. The TAAHC committee then put the 3 proposals that were presented at the Elko Commission Meeting together in writing; we then sent it out to the public, including the CAB's requesting input. We got limited input back, in a future or subsequent TAAHC meeting we went through the input. We came up with a 'hybrid approach'. That was put together in an October 31<sup>st</sup> letter that was then sent out to the public, including the CAB's, asking for input, we got minimal. We then took it to the November Commission meeting and gave a report on it. So the notion that this has not gone out to the public is false.

Commissioner Drew has question in regard to the TAAHC if there was a formal recommendation of the committee in regards to change in unit group for Nelson or California Bighorn.

Discussion on how the TAAHC committee and its role in the setting of seasons are adopted and the Commission changing members in the 2018 year.

Public Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, stated that he has not seen this TAAHC recommendation at the CABS.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, said for the record they did receive that and they sent that information back to the Commission, if not it must have been something internal that did not allow it to get done.

Commissioner Drew expressed that in the future we should be consistent in the course of how each specialty tags are set.

Commissioner Johnston clarifies that the information that Commissioner Drew intended to strike from CR 17-06 is language that the Commission followed the work of the TAAHC would be included for all specialty tags.

Commissioner Drew explained that for Heritage Tags we are setting for 2018, all the other specialty tags are for 2017. This will be an issue next year and it causes confusion when setting these CR's.

Discussion continued.

**COMMISSIONER BARNES MOVED TO ACCEPT CR 17- 06 2018 WILDLIFE HERITAGE TAGS AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSES 6 TO 1. COMMISSIONER DREW OPPOSED THE MOTION.**

24 Commission Regulation 17-07, 2017 Dream Tag Seasons – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2017 Dream Tag seasons.

MA 3 Hullinger presented the Dream Tag season regulation.

Commissioner Drew wanted to be sure he was clear that in previous year's rules on Dream Tag for Nelson bighorn sheep is that the only unit that would have actually be closed was 267 is that correct? He also wanted to be sure that what we are doing different than the Heritage, is we are pooling all the specialty tags rather than just looking at where the Dream Harvest of the year prior, correct?

MA 3 Hullinger said Commissioner Drew is correct.

CABMW and Public Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said the CABMW approved Dream Tag with the only amendment being Unit 267 would be closed.

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17-07 2017 DREAM TAGS AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS THAT UNDER NELSON DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP WE STRIKE UNITS 253 AND 263 WITH DIRECTION**

**TO STAFF THAT FOR THE 2018 RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WE MIRROR THE LANGUAGE THAT WE JUST ADOPTED FOR 2018 WILDLIFE HERITAGE TAGS FOR BOTH DESERT AND CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP. NEXT YEAR WHEN THIS COMES UP IT SHALL STATE ANY MANAGEMENT UNIT WHERE THERE IS AN OPEN SEASON FOR NELSON BIGHORN SHEEP EXCEPT THE HUNT UNIT WHERE THE DREAM TAG WAS FILLED THE PRIOR YEAR, IF THE TAG QUOTA FOR THE PRIOR YEAR FOR THAT UNIT IS LESS THAN 10 AND COMMENSURATE LANGUAGE FOR THE CALIFORNIA ON THE EXEMPTION OF SEVEN TAGS. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTIONED PASSED 7 - 0. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

Discussion period of the tags under the previous system. The previous system would close Unit 267 for desert bighorn and Unit 031 for California. As we move forward there will be more inconsistencies in the years to come.

Commissioner Hubbs personally likes the other tags and how they are handled.

Commissioner Johnston said that those that have already bought Dream Tag tickets, it does not affect them since they do not know what the Dream Tag regulation is going to be until it is set at the Commission Meeting. These tags are done on a season to season basis.

Deputy Director Robb stated that what has been advertised on our website states that limited closure for sheep tags. It does not say for what unit it was killed in before. It is not marketed wrong.

Maureen Hullinger explained the blue lettering in her support material is what is recommended.

Commissioner Drew looking to DAG Ward and wanting the Department to come forward with language for all the tags.

Commissioner Hubbs is the Heritage tag needing deference?

Commissioner Drew depends on who you ask about deference, he is seeking consistency on all of them.

Commissioner Johnston explaining how the specialty tags work. Whoever gets the Dream tag, they will not be upset that there are three units that are closed. He feels that treating it differently is to know what particular unit will be closed.

Commissioner Drew would say that it would be same as last year, but recommend the rules for Heritage be used next year.

Deputy Director Robb said if we left only one tag left, the season would have been closed. We are protecting a very small resource area 031. That is a high take on a small unit.

Commissioner Drew clarified his motion would strike the closure for 253 and 263. The only closed unit for desert Dream Tag would be 267 where we had the harvest last year; there would be no change this year to the California. The proposed closure of 031 and 041 would stay in place.

**MOTION PASSED 5 - 2. COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND ALMBERG OPPOSED. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT.**

- 25 Commission Regulation 17-08, 2017 Partnership in Wildlife Seasons and Quotas – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2017 PIW hunt species, seasons and quotas.

MA 3 Hullinger explained CR 17-08. The Department recommends only two tags, one desert and one California. Closure in 091.

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17 - 08 2017 PIW HUNTS AS PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH ONE CHANGE AND THAT WOULD BE TO STRIKE UNIT CLOSURES UNDER DESERT BIGHORN FOR 263 AND 267 WITH THE SAME REQUEST TO THE DEPARTMENT IN THE RECOMMENDATION FOR THE 2018 SEASONS BEING CONSISTENT WITH BOTH HERITAGE AND DREAM FOR UNIT GROUP ON BIGHORN SHEEP.**

Chairman Wallace confirmed that closing units 253 and 267, and asked if he meant Unit 253 and 263.

Commissioner Drew wants to strike from the proposal to the closure of 263 and 267 so the Unit that would remain closed for 2017 would be 253 which is where the PIW was harvested last year. He confirmed with MA 3Hullinger that is correct.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Hubbs has questions about doing something different with the California tags?

Commissioner Drew states that what the motion was is what they just motioned on Dream Tag.

Commissioner Johnston is not going to support the motion. He feels there is a definite distinction between PIW and the Dream Tags and Heritage tags and Silver State tag. He believes that closing these units as proposed is the best thing for the resource. This would not impact the overall value of the PIW draw and who puts in for it.

**COMMISSIONERS ALMBERG AND JOHNSTON OPPOSED. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION CARRIED 5 – 2.**

- 26 Commission Regulation 17-09, 2017 Silver State Tag Seasons and Quotas– Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2017 Silver State Tag hunt species, seasons and quotas.

MA 3 Hullinger presented the regulation.

Public Comment –

**COMMISSIONER DREW MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17 - 09 SILVER STATE HUNTS AS SUGGESTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH RECOMMENDATION OF SYNCRONIZATION OF UNIT GROUPS DURING THE 2018 RECOMMENDATION. COMMISISONER MCNINCH SECONDED. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG OPPOSED. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION PASSED 6-1.**

- 27 Commission Regulation 17-10, 2017 Big Game Application Deadline Information – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider adopting language regarding the 2017 big game tag application deadline information.

MA 3 Hullinger presented the regulation.

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17-10 AS PRESTENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION PASSED 7- 0.**

- 28 Commission Regulation 17-11, 2017 Big Game Tag Application Eligibility – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider adopting language regarding the 2017 big game tag application eligibility, to include ability to apply for bull and spike elk, and ram and ewe of same bighorn subspecies.

MA 3 Hullinger explained there are no changes, but would like to note there was no antlerless depredation hunt 1101 in the CR for the Big Game Seasons, so there is an exception listed in the deer.

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE CR 17-11 AS PRESENTED. MOTION SECONDED BY ALMBERG. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE AND YOUNG ABSENT. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7 - 0.**

- 29 Future Commission Meetings and Commission Committee Assignments – Secretary Wasley and Chairman Wallace – For Possible Action  
The next Commission meeting is scheduled for March 24 and 25, 2017, in Southern Nevada and the Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change the time and meeting location at this time. The chairman may designate and adjust committee assignments and add or dissolve committees, as necessary at this time. Any anticipated committee meetings that may occur prior to the next Commission meeting may be discussed.

Director Wasley said the next meeting is scheduled for March 24 and 25 at the Clark County Shooting Complex. Staff continues to check for other locations to accommodate videoconferencing. Videoconferencing will not be available at the March meeting. As far as agenda items, the primary order of business at that March meeting will be waterfowl seasons and limits in the new federal framework. Clark CABMW requested a field trip in conjunction with the meeting, and has heard from several persons the desire to better understand the process by which data is collected, modeled and eventually quotas are derived. Perhaps there may be an

opportunity to lead a PowerPoint discussion about that process if this is the desire of the Commission.

Commissioner McNinch suggested having Director Wasley's mule deer presentation on an agenda when time allows.

Commissioner Drew stated that there will be a host more of recommendations coming forward from the Legislative Committee by late March. We may not have the authority to do it but we will get a good idea of whether we prefer April 19 or Friday the 21 for the Legislative Commission Meeting. Any preferences so we can start planning? All agreed that Wednesday April 19 will be the Legislative Commission meeting. For next meeting the lands bill there was direct correspondence to be reviewed. It is anticipated that the Pershing Lands and Washoe Lands bills will be introduced in the next 30 days. There was some direction on the Commission to develop correspondence on the Washoe lands bill as well.

Director Wasley wanted to clarify that the letter they agreed to write would be on the agenda for the March meeting? Commissioner Drew concurred.

Wildlife Damage Management Committee Meeting will be held the day prior to the March Commission Meeting.

Public Comment – None

30 Public Comment Period – None

Note: The meeting has been videotaped and is available for viewing at [www.ndow.org](http://www.ndow.org). The minutes are only a summary of the meeting. A complete record of the meeting can be obtained at the Nevada Department of Wildlife Headquarters Office in Reno.

-1-  
FEB 10, 2017

Attachment A

GERALD LENT NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSION MEETING  
NEVADA HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

Would like my entire written comments put into all the distributed minutes of this meeting.

1. I am opposed to repealing Commission Policy 26 A, Transparency.
2. NDOW is constantly asking the public and Sportsmen to trust their Biologists.
3. In order to gain that trust, NDOW must disclose their information and sources of information.
4. If the Department of Wildlife asks for blind trust, it will lose its integrity and will not be believed.
5. Transparency is important if you are going to ask Sportsmen to buy-in.
6. When NDOW makes a decision, the public has a right to know how and why they make that decision.
7. The best way to disseminate this information to all is on their website.
8. This lack of transparency is what got NDOW in trouble with their Big Game Tag Draw system - no transparency and certain people were doing what was called fraud and abuse.
9. And the Tag Draw System was taken away from NDOW and went to a private contractor. Now if you were around then but you should read the legislative audit.

10. In a Paul Dixon court case, suing the Commission, one of the recommendations from the judge was to increase transparency on heritage projects.
11. The judge wrote the Commission didn't give enough information on heritage projects and told us: we need to, to prevent these problems in the future. CASE NO. 10EW00026 1B DEPT 2
12. The judge said the Commission had to take corrective action to increase the transparency. We did that!
13. Reduced transparency will open the Department of Wildlife to increased litigation.
14. (INSERT #1 HERE) In conclusion, the public and Sportmen need and have a right to know how public officials are conducting their business.

Transparency matters - I am here today because sportmen believe government operates best under transparency.

Transparency Builds Trust.

Thank you.

(INSCRIPT #1)

G. LENT

Even tho the Dept doesn't like to give all the information out to the public and CAB's - it is best then to let the CAB's come to the Commission to disagree - For example there are no deer in our area. etc with their proof.

Transparency is best!

Another Example - when the Director says the deer estimate is obtained by tripling the deer seen from helicopters in aerial surveys - countries might disagree. Like the Director says in this newspaper article

Transparency is best!

#10 GERALD LENT:

Attachment B

Deer Guidelines for Harvest Management.

NDOW addresses populations here:

Sportsmen need to know how NDOW first came up with the original base line deer populations and how does NDOW substantiate the populations today.

That is: how does that baseline number drive their tag allocations today.

P.S says if the populations of mule deer is trending upwards --- from what? where did a base line population originate?  
this needs to be answered,

Thank you

# PREDATION PLAN

GERALD LEBERT:

Project 40:

According to NDOW's report - removed coyotes last yr. ~~575~~ <sup>575</sup>  
Said remove 792 horses!

This year removed coyotes?

what did you accomplish with this?

Do you have a pre + post survey on fawns / 100 does?

If you don't know what you had going in and don't know what had coming out, deer wise, - how can you justify this?

Never seen goals for all the Deer Management areas!

NDOW sure does it for Sheep Management areas - have goals.

\* why don't they do it for deer?

This makes them Observational biologists - that's not Science!

How do you know if you increased the deer numbers if you don't know how many you started with?

\* These numbers would be in the plan if they had them!

I heard 55 fawns / 100 does last yr. - Is this correct?

\* If this is correct - then removing all these coyotes was a huge success AND YOU SHOULD ACKNOWLEDGE IT!

How can the public comment on these projects when you don't give us the data, whether successful or unsuccessful?

NDOW also says in the Predator Plan; private contractors were used.

I would want to see the results of any private contractors:  
Example: predator plan to study coyote dens in the Monitor Range by a private contractor found I believe 1 coyote den and cost many Sportmen dollars. A failure.

Another private contractor failure example was in Eureka County where a private contractor was hired by the County and I believe in the middle of the contract got convicted of a Wildlife violation for not checking his traps, possibly even bringing skulls in from other States.

Prime examples of when you go out onto the street for private contractors.

Predator Control is a very specialized business.

With coyotes have to remove dominant pairs and have to do it in an area where you are trying to do something - not just statewide.

Even 10/80 couldn't get it done.

Publish the results of private contractors.

reviewjournal.com

PRINT THIS

Powered by  Limelight

Vin Suprynowicz



## What happened to the mule deer?

Posted: Mar. 25, 2012 | 2:06 a.m.

In 1988, hunters bought 51,011 deer hunting licenses in Nevada and harvested 26,784 mule deer.

In 2008, the Nevada Department of Wildlife sold 16,997 tags. Hunters bagged only 7,025 deer.

That's a huge decline. Where are the deer?

Oddly enough, whatever the problem is, it seems to affect only mule deer -- the species that generates most of the Department of Wildlife's revenue, when you consider that Uncle Sam matches deer tag revenue three-to-one.

Bighorn sheep populations are up. Antelope tags and harvests doubled over those same 20 years. Elk tags skyrocketed, from 182 to 2,723, with the elk harvest growing from 91 to 1,315.

It's hard to believe all those other species could thrive if the problem were drought or wildfires or fences or roads cutting off migration routes.

A state biologist says the apparent decline is due to cherry-picking 1988 as a starting point -- a wet year and a high point for the state's deer herd. Just six years earlier, for example, 23,053 hunters took only 11,954 deer in 1982. Current deer populations and harvests are only "slightly below" the historic average, according to Tony Wasley, the Nevada Department of Wildlife's expert on mule deer.

But a prominent hunting advocate, along with current and past members of the state Wildlife Commission, disagree. They paint a more ominous picture of a Californian re-appointed to head the agency as a political favor by Gov. Brian Sandoval after that same director, Ken Mayer, had been fired by former Gov. Jim Gibbons precisely for failing to take concrete steps to bring back a deer herd whose numbers have plunged so badly they may now be overestimated in pursuit of lucrative deer tag revenues.

They worry Mayer may have kept from his 27 years with California Fish & Game

<http://www.printthis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?expire=&title=What+happened+to+the+mule+...> 4/9/2012

— a state where mountain lions are experiencing a population explosion because they're no longer hunted, except when they take a jogger — a reluctance to thin out predators, including lions and coyotes.

"For over two decades, NDOW has used 15 different excuses for Nevada's mule deer decline," argues activist Cecil Fredi of the group Hunter's Alert. "For the past few years, NDOW has used the habitat excuse. This is an excuse they can use for several more decades until their retirements kick in. It's hard to blame habitat when elk and deer occupy the same areas. Elk numbers have increased dramatically over the past two decades while deer numbers have dramatically declined," Fredi says. "The reason for this decline is that the main source of food for the mountain lion is the mule deer.

"Most biologists (but not NDOW's) believe that a lion will eat a deer a week," Fredi writes in a recent report with the attention-getting headline, "Nevada's deer will never recover." Fredi's main contention is that the state Department of Wildlife refuses to acknowledge any predator problem.

I called deer hunter and Wildlife Commissioner Scott Raine — the immediate past chairman of the commission — in Eureka, where he runs the town's only grocery, to ask him if Fredi's account is accurate.

"That's exactly correct," said Raine. "The mule deer population has just been crashing like a bomb in the past decade. They say, 'We don't know why it's happening, but it must be habitat.' When in doubt, blame the habitat. When you start talking about predation control, they don't even want to consider that part of the equation."

Gerald Lent, the now-retired Reno optometrist who chaired the Wildlife Commission for two years and served as vice chairman last year, but was not reappointed by Sandoval, recalls the commission approved spending \$400,000 for predator control on mule deer and sage grouse. "Director Mayer fought against all these. He called the feds and shut down the sage grouse study."

Why would Mayer do that? "I don't know," says Lent. "He said the predator project to save the deer he wouldn't go along with. I think he's from California, where they outlaw predation projects."

I tried to reach Mayer for a response. He didn't return my calls, but delegated Wasley to answer my questions. Biologist Wasley says the very fact his position was created 2½ years ago demonstrates the department's commitment to maintaining the species.

"We have several predator control projects ongoing, and have spent millions of

dollars in that arena," Wasley argues. "When we have removed a considerable number of predators, we have not been able to show any positive impact on game populations."

Lent has a different recollection. Under state law, "\$3 per hunter is supposed to go to predator control. It's \$300,000. So we put it into Area 014 west of the Gerlach Desert," Lent remembers. "The project was started in 2005 by (U.S.) Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services. From 2005 when they started, up till now, in the smallest deer management area in the state, they've taken probably 45 lions out of there, killed them. In 2005, the deer population was 850. This is out of NDOW's own book. Right now they estimate 1,400 deer there in 2011 -- that's a 65 percent increase in deer population. ... Right across the road in Area 015, that area is going down, down, down. There's no lion control in there. The lions kill a deer a week."

Mr. Wasley responds, "There was no significant difference in the area Dr. Lent is referring to in comparison to areas where there was an absence of predator control."

I asked Lent if he believes NDOW is inflating the numbers of the current deer herd, which state officials put at about 109,000. "Absolutely," he said. "They cannot prove the deer went up 2 percent from 107,000 to 109,000. The deer tag money is matched three-to-one federally. It's their cash cow."

He went on: "We had a predator conference that we had on the agenda. Ken Mayer brought in his buddies he used to work with down in California, and they basically said predation by mountain lions had no effect on the deer population, and that's not true. See, you can't hunt mountain lions in California, and I think that philosophy comes over the mountains."

Mr. Wasley defends the department's current estimate of 109,000 mule deer in Nevada, arguing that number is arrived at by tripling the deer seen from helicopters in aerial surveys. "So for somebody to suggest that it's as small as half of our published estimate, that would suggest that what we're seeing is close to 70 percent of the deer in the state, which simply is not the case. If the numbers were that small, we would begin to see hunter failure. ...

"I'm not under any constraint," Mr. Wasley says. "The director hasn't come down here and told me, 'We're not gonna kill lions, we're not gonna kill coyotes.' If there was a way that I knew we could increase mule deer, I would do it today, for selfish reasons. I love mule deer. I love to hunt mule deer. ... If there was something we could do to create more opportunity for Nevada's deer hunters, we'd do it."

Vin Suprynowicz is assistant editorial page editor of the Las Vegas Review-Journal and author of the novel "The Black Arrow" and "Send in the Waco Killers." See [www.vinsuprynowicz.com](http://www.vinsuprynowicz.com).

**Find this article at:**

<http://www.lvrj.com/opinion/what-happened-to-the-mule-deer-144133725.html>

Check the box to include the list of links referenced in the article.

Copyright © Stephen Media, LLC. All rights reserved. Any reproduction or distribution (except for personal, non-commercial purposes), in any form or by any means, without the express written consent of Stephens Media, LLC, is strictly prohibited.

