Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting
Approved Minutes (Minutes Approved on June 24, 2016)

Truckee Meadows Community College
7000 Dandini Blvd
Sierra Building, Room 108
Reno, NV

Videoconferencing Locations:

University of Nevada Cooperative Extension
8050 Paradise Road, Room A
Las Vegas, NV 89123

Great Basin College
1500 College Parkway
High Tech Center 121
Elko, NV 89801

Public comment will be taken on every action item after discussion but before action on each item, and 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.

NOTE: County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Members and public comment allowed on each action item and regulation workshop items and at the end of the meeting.

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners Members:

Chairman Jeremy Drew	Vice Chairman Grant Wallace	Commissioner Chad Bliss
Commissioner Brad Johnston	Commissioner Kerstan Hubbs	Commissioner David McNinch
Commissioner Pete Mori	Commissioner Paul E. Valentine	Commissioner Bill Young

Secretary Tony Wasley
Recording Secretary Suzanne Scourby

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward
Administrative Assistant III Jordan Neubauer

Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance during the two days:

Deputy Director Jack Robb
Biologist 4 Tom Donham
Division Administrator Habitat Alan Jenne
Wildlife Diversity Administrator Jennifer Newmark
Administrative Assistant 4 Kathleen Teligades
Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed
Fisheries Division Administrator Jon Sjöberg
Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder
Biologist 4 Steve Kimble
Biologist 3 Ed Partee
Wildlife Staff Biologist Cody Schroeder
Wildlife Staff Specialist Matt Maples
Division Administrator of Operations Bob Haughian
Conservation Education Division Administrator Teresa Moiola
Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger
Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox
Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling
Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson
Management Analyst 3 Kim Jolly
Administrative Assistant Natalie Pannunzio
Biologist 4 Mike Scott
Administrative Assistant 2 Kati Harmon
Wildlife Staff Specialist Mark Farman

Others in attendance – Reno Location/two days:

Caron Tayloe
Mark Jensen, USDA, Wildlife Services
Tom Cassinelli, chairman Humboldt CABMW
Sean Shea, chairman Washoe CABMW
Mitch Burns, chairman Lyon CABMW
Joe Crim, chairman Pershing CABMW
Tyler Kuraisa
Paul Dixon, chairman Clark CABMW
Cory Lytle, chairman Lincoln CABMW
Cathy Smith, Washoe CABMW
Ray Sawyer, chairman White Pine CABMW
Don Sefton, Systems Consultants
Monty Martin, Systems Consultants
Josh Vittori, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Lloyd Peake
Genelle Richards, No Bear Hunt Nevada
Jim Puryear, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Marta Bunuel
Kathryn Bricker, No Bear Hunt Nevada
Dan Warren, self
Jennifer Simeo
Pat Miller
Allen Biaggl, Nevada Mining Association
Bob Schweigert, Humboldt County Ranches
Mel Belding
Carol-Anne Weed
Gil Yanuck, Carson County Advisory Board Member (CABMW)
Fred Voltz, public
Stan Zuber, Carson CABMW
Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW
Furn Winder, Elko CABMW
John Allen
Eddie Booth, Humboldt CEMC
Rex Flowers, self
Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance
Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters' Association
Josie Crim, self
Sharon Negrin, Wild Futures
Paul Taggart, Taggart and Taggart, Ltd.
Bobbi McCollum, self
Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation
Constance Howard, Nevada Wildlife Alliance
Jana Menard
Darin Elmore
Tom Fennell, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Bob Cook, Douglas CABMW
Leann Dyer
Joel Blakeslee
Camilla Fox, Project Coyote
Carolyn Stark
Leah Sturgis

Others in attendance – Las Vegas Location/two days:

Stephanie Myers
Fred Voltz
Julius Fortuna, Nevada Firearms Coalition
Karen Layne
Jana Wright
Howard Watts, Clark CABMW
Sarah Bullock
Lisa Puleo

Others in attendance – Elko Location/two days:
None

Friday, May 13, 2016 – 9 a.m.

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

Chairman Drew called the meeting to order and asked the Recording Secretary to conduct roll call of Commissioners' present for Friday, May 13, 2016: Chairman Drew, Commissioners Wallace, Bliss, Hubbs, Johnston, McNinch, Mori, and Valentine.

Commissioner Young was absent at roll call and was marked present at arrival.

CABMW Members Present at Roll Call: Cathy Smith, Washoe; Furn Winder, Elko; Stanley Zuber, Carson; Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt; Mitch McVicars, White Pine; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; Joe Crim, Pershing; Paul Dixon, Clark; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; and Sean Shea, Washoe.

- Employee Appreciation – Secretary Wasley
  Several Department of Wildlife employees will receive awards for various years of service.

Employees recognized by Secretary Wasley: Helen Gilliam and Aaron Meier for 10 years; Katie Simper for 15 years; Shawn Espinosa and Chris Crookshanks for 20 years; Pat Cummings, Chris Drake and Suzanne Scourby 25 years; and Chris Healy for 30 years.

Ted C. Frantz Employee of the Year Award was presented to NDOW Pilot Dale Coleman a five year employee at a regional meeting; Mr. Coleman will be honored further at the June Elko Commission meeting.

2 Approval of Agenda – Chairman Drew – 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 WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3 Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence – Chairman Drew– 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.

Secretary Wasley said correspondence received was forwarded to the Commission.

Chairman Drew said he received correspondence questioning whether a Commission policy for wildlife contests is a priority for the Commission, and he affirmed the policy is a priority that will be addressed through the Commission's policy committee.

Commissioner Bliss said he was there when fish stocked into Comins Lake and he really appreciated the number of fish (10,000) and size of fish as has been many years since the Department stocked fish into Comins.

Commissioner Hubbs said she received correspondence from local groups who want to be part of the ground effort for the new policy regarding killing contests and she provided their contact information to NDOW.

Chairman Drew read the Mineral County letter supporting Mineral CABMW request for introduction of elk to Mineral County. He said all the other received correspondence falls under agenda items with the exception of correspondence received by him on the caliber regulation however that regulation is not on this meeting's agenda.

4 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.

None

5 Approval of Minutes – Chairman Drew – For Possible Action
Commission minutes from the Jan. 29 and 30, and March 24 and 25, 2016 meetings.

Chairman Drew said the minutes will be addressed separately and the reason for the January and March meetings on the agenda is in response to the outstanding Open Meeting Law (OML) Complaint. At the March meeting it had been decided to table the January meeting minutes and he asked DAG Ward to explain.

DAG Ward said the minutes were tabled from January meeting, and he read the section from the litigation report submitted as support material (exhibit file/website). DAG Ward said the Attorney General's Office did not find that there was an OML violation and his recommendation for the future is that all Commissioners be located in one place at the host location and if there are technical difficulties at satellite locations it will not be a OML violation. Again, with all Commissioners in one place, no violation. He said a written request from one of complainants, Bobbi McCollum, was to have their complaint be part of minutes and the text messages requested as well. With the matter dismissed is up to the Commission if they want to include that as part of the minutes.

Commissioner Young said he can't understand why we can't fix this as it should be fixed for people to participate in Southern Nevada as the majority of the population lives in Las Vegas or Clark County. Persons with an interest in this Commission should get good service, he has been on the Commission for four years and we keep wasting time on this, technology not that tough.

Chairman Drew said the issue has been compatible systems and having meeting rooms large enough for these meetings. Chairman Drew requested Ms. McCollum's letter be in the exhibit file for the meeting.

Public Comment on Jan. 29 and 30, 2016, Meeting Minutes -

Fred Voltz said the way to verify the phone records and text messages is to get a copy of the phone records from your provider and he said the Commission should do that to see the communication between Reno and Las Vegas staff, as problem occurred early on in the meeting.

Commissioner Hubbs said she is missing the point of why the Commission needs to research the text messages if no violation due to the fact that the Commission was all together at the Las Vegas location.

Chairman Drew agreed.

COMMISSIONER HUBBS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE JAN. 29 AND JAN. 30 MEETING FOR APPROVAL. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Drew said for the March meeting minutes there is a correction to page 4, Commissioner Hubbs was opposed and she is listed twice - in favor and opposed; the correction is to strike her name from being "in favor." Commissioner Valentine said he will abstain as he was absent.

Commissioner Johnston was absent on the second day, and Commissioner McNinch was absent for part of the first day but is comfortable voting as the agenda items he missed were administrative business.

Commissioner Young said the Commission section with attendance on page 1 is incorrect: Commissioner Valentine was absent, and Commissioner Johnston was absent Friday.

COMMISSIONER BLISS MOVED TO APPROVE MARCH 24 AND 25 MEETING MINUTES WITH TWO CHANGES DISCUSSED. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. MOTION CARRIED 7 – 0. COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND VALENTINE ABSTAINED.

6 Commission Policy 26 – Management Analyst 3 Kim Jolly – For Possible Action
Currently there are two existing Commission Policies that are numbered "26." One is entitled "Transparency (2011)," and the other is entitled "Re-establishing, Introducing, Transplanting and Managing Pioneering Rocky Mountain Elk (1995)." The Department is recommending that "Re-establishing, Introducing, Transplanting and Managing Pioneering Rocky Mountain Elk (1995)" be reaffirmed as Policy 26 and that "Transparency" be renumbered as Commission Policy 26A. The Commission may also take action to review the revised Commission Policy index and numbering system.

Chairman Drew said a CABMW suggested picking a different number for Policy 26A. His answer to their suggestion is that the Commission has an active committee that is reviewing all Commission Policies and before knowing the recommendation on the future disposition of what we are proposing as Policy 26A, that it does not make sense to use up an unused number.

Public Comment Reno location -

Bob Schweigert said he owns a consulting company and his employers brought comment and questions whether Policy 26 existed or not and have not seen the supporting material for this reaffirmation and would like to reserve the opportunity to comment on it pending receipt of that supporting material.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE AND REAFFIRM POLICY 26 ENTITLED "RE-ESTABLISHING, INTRODUCING, TRANSPLANTING AND MANAGING PIONEERING ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELK (1995)" AS POLICY 26 AND RECOGNIZING THE POLICY ENTITLED "TRANSPARENCY AS POLICY 26A. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7 Humboldt County Elk Sub-plan (Second Reading) – Committee Chairman Eddie Booth and Western Region Biologist 3 Ed Partee – For Possible Action
The Commission will be presented with the draft Humboldt County Elk Sub-plan for review and possible action. The draft Humboldt County Elk Sub-plan has incorporated edits from discussion with the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Humboldt County Commission, and at a sub-planning meeting held on April 12, 2016. This draft is provided for final review and possible adoption.

Chairman Drew said at the recent March meeting there was an issue with documents being received and subsequently two drives have been sent to the Commission with the documents and Chairman Drew confirmed receipt of documents by the Commission.

Western Region Biologist 3 Ed Partee said since the March 23, 2016, meeting their committee held one other meeting to address comments of the Commission and they then presented the plan to the Humboldt County Commission. Mr. Partee confirmed that the Humboldt County Commission had received same documentation from Mr. Schweigert and at their meeting they unanimously passed the plan.

Mr. Booth said he appreciates all of the work that the Commission does. Committee made up of Humboldt County citizens and held monthly meetings. He recognized NDOW Administrative Assistant Katie Harmon and Biologist Ed Partee for their outstanding efforts staffing the meetings. Mr. Booth said in spite of objections of Mr. Schweigert he wants the Commission to know that two days prior to their meeting, Mr. Schweigert sent out additional 4,000 pages for them to have at their meeting and he said that was a disservice to the 15 members who have jobs outside the committee to

not only look at the 2,100 pages brought to Commission initially and an additional 4,000 pages two days before. That is not a fair presentation on behalf of the committee and with due respect to Mr. Schweigert, that created controversy with sportsman, and now sportsman on the committee countered that if this continues they are willing to move above and beyond the compromise we have. He said that is not what was agreed to, the agreement was to follow the committee's goals, which were to minimize conflict—which was done. When we got to the meeting, Mr. Schweigert blamed Mr. Booth for not calling him and telling him of the meeting. Mr. Booth said the meetings were noticed in accordance with the OML. At the end they agreed to have Coordinated Oversight Team (COT) Committee and on the COT there was a request to have a guide on the COT, and that will be addressed at first meeting; secondly, he spoke to Mr. DeLong who is represented by Mr. Schweigert and with due respect to all ranchers and sportsmen in Humboldt County, he believes we have a nice compromise and hopes Mr. Delong's concern which is trust, and the trust factor given to them was 15 members on the committee, and have come up with an elk management plan that will serve Humboldt County well. He said it is important the plan is followed and everything is done so that all can know they represented the county.

Biologist Partee said also sent with the plan was recommendation for members of the COT Team, and will request approval. One part that was pending was the appointment of Ron Ceri to the COT and Humboldt County Commission did appoint Ron Ceri at their April 18 meeting.

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Booth if two alternatives provided in the correspondence by Mr. Schweigert were considered and discussed by the committee and is Mr. Partee confident that the committee understood that by adopting this plan, the two alternatives were essentially rejected.

Mr. Booth said no committee member made a motion to accept the alternatives, and it was brought up and explained by Commissioner Mori in public comment to address those. He said the plan in his opinion is a working living plan of the future of elk management will be in Humboldt County, and with the amount of documents provided by Mr. Schweigert (6,000 pages) to be read and understood and to appease the desire of Mr. Schweigert, it was a process not to be completed. He said the committee would address those issues at the first COT meeting consisting of 10 members of the county.

Chairman Drew said one alternative proposes removing all of Area 3 Units from the plan, and the other suggests making no tolerance areas of zero elk populations in those Area 3 Units. He asked if the committee understood that.

Mr. Booth said the committee understood that and had addressed it at previous meetings. He said there was a recall of previous meetings where that was addressed and no desire by any of the committee members or himself to change anything in plan.

Chairman Drew said to Mr. Partee that the Commission directed two clarifications in the plan: One was frequency of review of plan and updates, and the other was what happens when the population objective reaches 75 percent.

Mr. Partee said on page 10 of plan there was statement that in five years the plan be reopened if need be, and since that meeting with Commission suggestions, they had changed that and put that purview under guidance of COT. The COT would take up any issues at their yearly meeting, and if item is substantial enough and cannot be dealt with at local level, the matter would be brought to the Commission for resolution. The other part was trigger, which is on Page 7, and that is ability to effectively manage herds upon arrival of population numbers 75 percent. From there the indication would be aggressive management to make sure the population did not go past the top number.

Chairman Drew said along those lines, he understands where the committee is going, and his question is that he would prefer to have that in management actions of the plan. In particular on page 25, item #3 discusses elk populations will be maintained within population objectives defined within the sub-plan. His suggestion would be to add second sentence that reads “when a population reaches 75 percent of the population objective, NDOW shall work with Commission to implement harvest strategies that limit or stop population growth before the population objective is reached or exceeded.” He thinks that meets intent of sub-committee discussion and for the Commission it makes it very clear going forward what the course of action will be when thresholds met.

Mr. Booth agreed and that it also empowers the plan and the Department with the appearance of trust and understanding for all the individuals in the county, that see the plan and wonder what will happen, this confirms that.

Commissioner Mori said Chairman Drew’s suggestion about trigger is one he asked too at the last meeting, and he attended every meeting but one.

Commissioner Hubbs said she looked through Mr. Schweigert’s information and for her she was trying to assess the issues coming up, and more importantly for ranchers they have the permit to graze cattle on federal land and appears there is fear that if numbers increase perhaps there will be overlap of habitat use and lack of resource to support the current permits and elk that may come into areas. She said she did look at our regulatory framework and does not know if permit holders are landowners, as regulatory structure only addresses landowners if there are disputes or issues. She is not sure how the ranchers will voice their concern with framework if not living on land and only have permits at hand.

Chairman Drew said that discussion came up a lot within the committee, and is confusing that the BLM and Forest Service administer grazing permits, and the state has authority over wildlife. The questions were asked whether BLM had authority to allow elk to establish in those areas, and if resource management plans needed to be updated respectively. All the input he heard from the Forest Service and BLM staff was their belief that they would not have to update either of those plans and they were active

and willing participants in the discussions. He said we will hear more on this in public comment, and is interesting dynamic as to regulation of grazing and who is responsible, and who is responsible for wildlife regulation.

Commissioner Hubbs said during her catching up she did take time to see if her concerns with carrying capacity are taking into consideration in their modeling for numbers that there are already permits issued, and did not see that. She read mention of habitat use near watering holes taking into account cattle grazing in that area, but really nothing else. Commissioner Hubbs said she did not know if another variable being assessed in terms of use and carrying capacity for permits issued today.

Mr. Partee said in the document all private land was removed off the top, and the one-half mile buffer within water came out. After those parameters were taken out, the plan went before a technical review team who assessed it from there as well, and the numbers were cut even further from the habitat assessment, just to start at minimal level with elk and that was recommendation to sub-committee. The sub-committee then took it and cut numbers additionally from there. There is more elk moved from the county then what it can hold, and also brought up several times at meetings, that many areas in the state that have a lot more elk present then what Humboldt County has or plans to have, and nowhere else in the state has there been a loss of AUMs for permittees.

Chairman Drew said if issues crop up the COT should be able to deal with the problems.

Commissioner Hubbs asked who will represent ranchers on COT. Chairman Drew answered a permitted BLM rancher Hank Dufurrena, and a Forest Service permitted rancher, Tom Cassinelli.

Commissioner Johnston said he wants to understand that we are trying to avoid conflict between water right holders, grazing permit holders, and make sure that this number of elk in a unit do not impact those individuals.

Mr. Partee said that is exactly how it took place.

Commissioner Mori added that on the COT team he has been an advocate for keeping this process local in Humboldt County, and the Committee selected the COT members and as these members need to be replaced, that will be done by Humboldt County Commission, assuring that the COT will always be local.

Mr. Partee said although appointed locally, the Commission will finalize the appointments.

CABMW Public Comment –

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, said they were in total support of plan and thanked Mr. Booth and Mr. Partee for what they accomplished.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, approved this unanimously and thanked them for all of their effort as process is grueling.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they approved plan unanimously, and would this is the most complete and complex plan he has seen in his nine years on the CABMW. He asked if the Commission will update the other elk plans to be consistent with level of detail in this plan.

Public Comment in Reno –

Mr. Bob Schweigert, said he owns and operates Intermountain Range Consultants and represent the ranches, RDD Inc. or Oro Vaca Inc., Happy Creek Inc., and DeLong Ranches Inc. He provided his range management educational background and said conflict arose as he heard committee members say in the April 12 meeting that they did what the Commission asked, and he thinks that they did too, to best of their ability. The conflict has arisen from this Commission, in asking the committee to formulate a plan for all of Humboldt County, although not all of Humboldt County has elk occupying it. The Alternative 1 he presented accounts for elk where elk exist in Humboldt County – Unit 051, and no elk exist in the 03s units. This alternative is in direct compliance with Policy 26 which the Commission just reaffirmed. He said he and his clients believe that the April 12 plan is not in compliance with Policy 26 and therefore they request that Alternative 1 should be selected. Alternative 2 that they presented presumes for planning for elk outside of where they presently exist under Policy 26 can proceed. All they have done is simply ask for the edits to the plan to have no established population in ranches particular areas of use in permitted use and private lands, and permittees own lands as in packets provided, these people own thousands of acres and they are permitted on hundreds of thousands of BLM acreage, in response to Commissioner Hubbs' question. He continued that there has been discussion on triggers and 75 percent resulting in aggressive action by NDOW, and referred them to April 12 plan that reports two counts on Santa Rosa Range for existing population there. The first count located 21 bulls, second count found nothing including collared animals, so that gives pause to assurances that the number of animals can be tallied or effectively controlled. Secondly, these aggressive management tools were used in the Jarbidge population, and Jarbidge population rose on average at 8 percent and at 15 percent when released from aggressive hunts. Concerned that numbers should be established at all, considering the harm these animals can create, and concern that they can be effectively controlled at numbers prescribed. He said in response to Commissioner Hubbs that her observation that there is no accounting for present allocated AUM's is correct. The plan developed carrying capacity based on one to five animals per square mile, and he is familiar with BLM and Forest Service manuals and that methodology is not there.

Provision for one-half mile buffer around water is meaningless, because elk use within the one-half mile and cattle use outside the one-half mile.

Paul Taggart said he is an attorney and he represents Happy Creek Ranch and Oro Vaca Inc. His comments focus on potential impact on water rights from the elk plan. His suggestions will be to add concerns for water rights to the plan. He said the plan indicates it was intended to address impacts to adjacent private land resources, and his comment is that it does not seem to intend to address water resources and his clients think it is important that be included. And include in the plan a way to address impacts to water resources if that were to occur. He cited a NRS statute that allows "customary" use/access by wildlife. However, the water rights he is concerned about were initiated prior to 1905, which means that they are water rights that existed before statutes were adopted – they are "vested." The situation and law in Nevada today is on public land a private individual can own water rights at a spring, even though they don't own the public land. Happy Creek Ranch has vested water rights that cannot be impacted by new activity, and the elk being discussed are not wildlife that has customarily used these water resources, and when additional populations are introduced to these water resources, that will be a concern that they want addressed in the plan. Also, impact to water resources can be mitigated the same as land. On page 7 bullet points and factors listed to amend the plan for management of elk in the area. His suggestion is to add additional bullet point stating: "Impacts to private land, grazing permits or water rights," that should be a factor to analyze whether an amendment is needed to management plan. In the carrying capacity section, on page 7, they would like included that NDOW would consider the availability of water resources when determining carrying capacity, and if carrying capacity is re-analyzed, they think availability of water resources should be part of that. On page 25, of the plan, NDOW management actions are listed and they want to add language under that part of NDOW's assessment of status of elk populations "in any impacts to private land and grazing permits or water resources." On page 26, series of management actions for private and public lands, and suggest in #3, under where it states: NDOW is authorized to pay for elk damage including losses to crops, grazing reductions and privately maintained improvements, they want it to also say "losses to water rights." Last amendment is on page 33, has list of programs to prevent damage for elk and item #2 says compensate landowners or permittees for elk damage on private or public lands and want that to include "or to privately owned water rights." They hope no negative impacts to water resources but if there are they want the understanding that water resources are important and need to be addressed.

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Taggart if these comments had been provided to the committee or the Humboldt County Commission or anyone else locally.

Mr. Taggart said comments submitted but they did not provide the specific amendments that he just described.

Discussion and questions on water rights ensued (10:28 a.m.)

Chairman Drew said discussions and meetings he attended water was brought up and discussed. He said the assertion that there are no elk in Area 3 in his mind is a false assertion as he has personally seen elk in Area 3 and there have been documented observations from NDOW. Commission Policy 26 item #7 on page 3, states the Commission will retain ultimate authority on the course of action to be taken following identification of successful elk colonization. He said the Commission asked the Humboldt County Elk Sub-plan to develop a county wide plan for a county where elk have colonized and is comfortable with that direction. Chairman Drew said what concerns him that these specific comments while productive and collaborative were not provided to either the local planning committee or Humboldt County Commission.

Commissioner Mori said his perspective on the plan goes back to when he first was appointed to Wildlife Commission, and discussion on re-opening an elk plan. The Commission got bogged down, and the director at that time, said we don't want to jam elk down anyone's throat. The reason it stuck out in his mind, is when we discuss elk and plans that issue always comes up as some people want elk and some don't. He said he gets that feeling here that if we approve the plan, we will be jamming elk down some people's throats. With that being said we did follow the process and looked at units, the sub-plan went from higher numbers to final lower conservative numbers. When the committee got done, there were advocates for higher numbers who were not happy, and some wanting zero elk and they were not happy. The committee was in the middle, and while not perfect, there may be problems that arise and COT can bring those issues to the Commission and he does not have a problem with adding language Mr. Taggart would add and will defer to Chairman Drew.

Chairman Drew said he has a comment and concern with suggested change to page 33, adding water rights, as that actually is a NAC and cannot change that, as there is a whole separate process to do that. He said going forward, one thing to clarify concerns raised is on page 7, one of the triggers is property damage and in parentheses we say "loss of crops" and a fix would be to add within those parentheses "damage to other private property and or water rights." That would clarify for the committee and COT as to what to look for going forward, and has no major concern with adding bullet point on list of triggers simply stating "availability of water resources." Chairman Drew said the committee already discussed these to some degree and those additions bolster plan, and he asked Mr. Booth if he any concern with those additions.

Mr. Booth said water rights were discussed at their meetings as a result of Mr. Schweigert's presentations. He said he is not a water rights attorney and his recall is that there were various factors within the whole process, and that was why they had 15 members on the committee to bring those perspectives. He appreciated Mr. Taggart's comments to make the plan stronger and his perspective would be to get a legal opinion from NDOW to insure that the proper procedures are followed regarding water rights.

Chairman Drew said his questions relate to triggers on page 7, when we say property damage and in parentheses we say “loss of crops.” He asked if that is consistent with committee’s direction and going forward to add “damage to private property and or water rights” in that list.

Mr. Booth said he is afraid to put something in there with there with water rights interpretation as he does not have the background on what those water rights really mean.

Chairman Drew asked Mr. Booth if adding a bullet “considering availability of water going forward.”

Mr. Booth said that is reasonable.

Commissioner Johnston asked Mr. Taggart if it is all clients with water rights that have a concern or is there one specific concern? He asked what their concern is.

Mr. Taggart answered that the NAC discusses damage being any change to quantity of private property. He said private property is water rights, and they did not go through each ranches’ water rights to determine which one may be impacted. Fair to say more concern with those on public lands in grazing allotments and thinks the plan did a good job addressing physical improvements and harm to them. He said resources on public lands and springs in mountain area.

Commissioner Johnston said the plan addresses private property and with water rights being private property the issue has been addressed in administrative code and in the elk management plan.

Mr. Taggart disagreed, as the NAC is clear that damage and protection of damage can include water rights, it is within NDOW’s authority to mitigate for impacts to water rights. The plan itself is focused on land resources and does not have additional reference to water resources.

Commissioner Hubbs said she sees no problem mentioning those rights in the plan themselves and obviously any changes to NAC would need to go through the workshops.

Chairman Drew said the first bullet on page 7 of the plan is property damage, and property damage includes that, and availability of water is a good addition. Chairman Drew asked the Commission how they wish to proceed.

Commissioner Young recommended referring plan back to committee and to work with Mr. Taggart.

Commissioner Johnston said he can understand people who hold water rights would have concerns and does not know if there would ever be a position where someone could say there is a certain amount of elk in an area and they are entitled to damage and does not see a problem addressing those issues as he would rather get this right the first time.

Mr. Partee said the committee did talk extensively about water rights and did not feel committee responsibility to deal with water rights. Mr. Partee said they had understanding that wildlife has access to water rights no matter who has the right. The committee did not tackle that as that issue was out of their purview, and if another meeting needed then we can have another meeting. He is concerned that the comments were provided at the eleventh hour and not four or five meetings ago.

Mr. Booth said no issue with water rights, and documentation provided by Mr. Schweigert of who holds water rights in the 2,100 pages. If damages occur to someone's water rights who is to say that elk caused the damage as it could be drought, the deer, coyote, and if this returns to their committee they need legal direction and time to give it thought. It is a good issue but what resolution will you find if spring goes dry and who determines who is at fault.

Commissioner Hubbs said the plan needs trigger to respond, as NDOW will manage elk populations, if permittees are denied for a permit then NDOW would be notified and the agency would manage the population accordingly. She said she does not think NDOW would go out and be liable for every loss of property that would occur as that is too much liability to take on. NDOW would respond to manage elk population.

Chairman Drew said that is why he is comfortable approving the plan with the addition of one bullet in terms of availability of water. For a few reasons: Living document and a local team, so if an issue arises they have the local team where that issue can be brought and resolution sought. If role for Commission, that role is managing harvest strategies and other issues NDOW could take action. He said he is comfortable advancing the plan today with the addition of the one word as he believes flexibility in plan.

Commissioner McNinch agreed with Chairman Drew, with all due respect today water rights have been brought up, what will be next. The committee has taken it as far as they can, and now time to move forward.

Commissioner Valentine agreed with moving forward with addition of bullet point on page 7. He said with the COT in place if problems arise, resolution will be available.

Commissioner Young said he would like to hear from the experts hired by the ranches for water rights.

Mr. Taggart said he appreciates suggestion of making that change and the other changes he suggested are important too. It is the interest of the private ranchers and

their hope that the population is managed with numbers presented; but if population explodes and impact occurs, that is what they are worried about. That is why they want these changes included.

Secretary Wasley said there are many challenges with species management planning, in this instance with elk management it is being able to determine what the likelihood of occurrence is. There is a lot of speculation, a lot of "what ifs" and he thinks an element missing from this discussion is what has happened elsewhere. We have 29,000 elk in Nevada, and have we documented where there has been a loss of that right. He said we are not talking about cows going thirsty because of consumption of water, there is greater likelihood of impact from wallowing activity in those spring sources. He said he is not aware of any instance where we have seen an infringement on that property right as a result of elk at much higher densities that we are talking about here in habitats that are equally dry. Secretary Wasley said it is a good contingency to consider and that some of the language we are considering for an acknowledgement of that water right as property hopefully would cover that concern, but given the history and where we are with 29,000 elk elsewhere in the state and the absence of that materializing as a serious issue should provide a level of comfort.

Commissioner Johnston said he is at different point and if they went through water rights at each meeting and this is best they can do, he is not inclined to send it back to committee. He said page 26 states NDOW is authorized to compensate for elk damage and with additional bullet point on page 7 he recommends moving the plan forward.

Further discussion on suggested language changes: Commissioner Mori asked on #3 on page 25 would be added in, population management. Chairman Drew said that was his suggestion on sub 3 at bottom of page after first sentence adding: "When a population reaches 75 percent of the population objective the Department shall work with the Commission to implement harvest strategies that limit or stop population growth before the population objective is reached or exceeded." Commissioner Mori brought up the other change from Mr. Taggart, and Chairman Drew said essentially what the COT is set-up for.

CHAIRMAN DREW MOVED TO APPROVE THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY ELK SUB-PLAN AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMISSION BY THE COMMITTEE AND ENDORSED BY THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY COMMISSION WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES THAT ARE ADDITIONS: ON PAGE 7 THAT THE FIRST TRIGGER READ "PROPETY DAMAGE INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CROPS, LAND, GRAZING AND WATER RIGHTS." THAT AN ADDITIONAL BULLET BE ADDED: THAT WOULD READ "AVAILABILITY OF WATER RESOURCES." THEN ON PAGE 25 UNDER NDOW POPULATION MANAGEMENT, ITEM #3, IMMEDIATELY RIGHT AFTER FIRST SENTENCE ADD LANAGUAGE THAT READS: WHEN A POPULATION REACHES 75 PERCENT OF POPULATION OBJECTIVE, THE DEPARTMENT SHALL WORK WITH THE COMMISSION TO IMPLEMENT HARVEST STRATEGIES THAT LIMIT OR STOP POPULATION GROWTH BEFORE THE

POPULATION OBJECTIVE IS REACHED OR EXCEEDED. NO FURTHER CHANGES TO THAT PARAGRAPH. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Mori said he would have liked language added on those other pages and does understand Chairman Drew's point on the addition of language on other pages, and he will support the motion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Drew appreciated all the work by staff and staff in Winnemucca.

Mr. Partee had question if separate motion for appointment of COT could be made.

Chairman Drew read the proposed COT members and noted that most participated on the plan development.

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COT MEMBERS AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8 Nevada Department of Wildlife Project Updates – Secretary Tony Wasley – Informational

The Commission has requested that the Department provide regular project updates for ongoing projects and programs as appropriate based on geography and timing of meetings. These updates are intended to provide detail in addition to summaries provided as part of the regular Department report and are intended to inform the Commission and public as to the Department's ongoing duties and responsibilities.

Secretary Wasley said at the March meeting a brief update on the Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations was presented. Secretary Wasley and Administrator Newmark prepared a PowerPoint presentation for this meeting showing what the Blue Ribbon Panel (exhibit file/website) is and specific recommendations that have come forward from the panel. The Blue Ribbon Panel effort is to find broader and additional funding for wildlife.

Division Administrator Jennifer Newmark discussed what Nevada's Wildlife Action Plan (WAP) is and explained the plan through a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file/website). She notes that one challenge will be finding the state match of 25 percent.

Commissioner McNinch said this is a once in a lifetime opportunity and has the potential to affect many generations. This is the most important thing that moves the needle and need to work through having others at the table, find ways to engage with State Legislature to get the match. This is significant amounts of money, and really wants to engage.

Commissioner Hubbs said she is impressed with the WAP being the keystone plan, and asked about surveys for America's Wildlife Values survey.

Secretary Wasley said the survey of society was done in 2004 and drives national discussion, and now is the time to re-administer the survey and assess if change of direction needed or other issues.

Chairman Drew said in his personal job he uses the WAP almost daily, and thanked Administrator Newmark and encouraged people to read it as you can see how challenging wildlife management is in Nevada. Willing to help and push that trend. Funding estimates mentioned and he asked how you estimate for Nevada.

Administrator Newmark said based on nationwide formula land/species that state's already used.

9 Presentation of Fiscal Year 2017 Draft Predation Management Plan (Final Draft) – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson and Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action
The Commission will review with the Department the third and final draft of the Fiscal Year 2017 Draft Predation Management Plan. The Commission may take action to modify or endorse the plan.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson presented a 52 page PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file/website). He said with passage of AB 78 in the last legislative session the Department is mandated to spend 80 percent of the revenues from the $3 predator fee on lethal removal and are allowed to use a portion to monitor the effects of the lethal control. Mr. Jackson reviewed the projects.

Commissioner Bliss said he has a question on Project 22-074. At the committee meeting the projects were approved as presented and gave direction to staff to add more detail on the triggers but when he reads Project 22-074 it is quite a bit different then project the committee approved. What was approved was a lion removal project around the sheep and now the project has changed to monitor sheep and maybe conduct lion removal.

Mr. Jackson said at the meeting he understood he was instructed to discuss with area biologists the project and had the understanding the committee wanted to understand the progress of these projects and when they would be ended. When he had discussion with the biologist they felt predation was not an issue and that we should continue lion monitoring instead of lion removal and felt that was a natural process.

Commissioner Bliss said he understands that but his issue is with this coming to this meeting for adoption and would have liked to know that and why would $90,000 be designated for this project as the money could have been used statewide.

Mr. Jackson said it could have and staff intend to purchase GPS collars with these funds to deploy on bighorn sheep as a monitoring component.

Commissioner Bliss said he does not want to overstep the bounds on monitoring and what he read into the record from Senator Goicoechea was to monitor projects as they went along, and not go out and have big expenditures to buy collars. He would hope in the future when we are at this final meeting that we are closer without drastic changes.

Commissioner Hubbs said this plan has been hard and in the Department's defense there was a lot of input for timing restrictions. She said that everyone is struggling with the plan in general and what makes good biological sense over time for predation management.

Chairman Drew said everyone needs to keep this in perspective with the new change from the legislative mandate and still updating Policy #23, and whether you agree with the plan, this is probably the best plan ever presented. He thanked staff for their work.
Commissioner Valentine said at Clark CABMW meeting there was quite a bit of discussion on Project 41, raven study, and decrease in funding and he asked where additional funding was transferred from.

Mr. Jackson said on page 49 is the fiscal information and the ending balance for 2017 is almost $300,000 which is being spent down. He said these funds are a combination of reallocation from 2016 and to increase ability to track ravens across Nevada. Project 41 on page 33, and most agree Nevada is faced with raven challenge and the agency is limited by permit issued by USFWS for raven take. Raven movement has been studied very little and there are two types of ravens – migratory and a mature pair. The mature pair is most problematic for sage-grouse as they stay in area and cache sage-grouse eggs. Migratory ravens are understood very little, such as if they are territorial or migratory. Increasing our understanding of raven's fine scale movements will help utilize the permit more effectively and also to be able to petition USFWS for an increase in the permit.

Public Comment Reno Location –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they approved the plan on a 4 – 1 vote. As mentioned previously would like to know more about the raven project to see progress, which would help in the future.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, approved the plan 5 – 1 and he asked for briefing packet on raven control projects for the CABMWs to have so people understand what is being done with those funds.

Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters' Association, requested his comments be included in the minutes:

Commission Meeting May 13, 2016
-1-

GERALD LENT REPRESENTING NEVADA HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

IAW Nevada's Open Meeting Law, I hereby request that all my verbal and written testimony be included in all the distributed minutes of this meeting.

1. ITEM #9 ON AGENDA:
After the final draft of the Predator Plan came out, why was there no Predator Committee meeting to review it as there were significant changes?

I would have thought the Commissioners and the committee would want to have their last comments on the plan along with the public's comments.
ARE THEY TRYING TO AVOID THE PUBLIC?

POLICY 23 even says "The Department shall prepare a Final Draft Predation Management Plan (Final Draft Plan) and present it to the WDMC at their May Meeting. This was not done!

The Predator Committee has met, with public comments at each revision prior, to report to the Commission any recommendations new or old. Why did they chose NOT to have a Committee Meeting for the Final Draft Plan? That is an injustice to the public who you work for.

* Did they assume the Commission recommendations would be accomplished? If so you assumed wrong. We just want to see a good plan!

x SEE ADDENDUM #6 (P.2)

PROJECT 22 - RECOMMENT FOR DISCONTINUATION:
All 4 subprojects related to sheep now - nothing for DEER!
Emphasis for mule deer is going away with this plan even tho it is the Bread & Butter of this agency and Sportsmen. NDOW sells thousands of deer tags but only a few hundred sheep tags. This plan is totally going in the wrong direction!

ADDENDUM -1-

1. 22-01 Calif Bighorn Protection
Still don't say they want 100 Sheep there - i.e. no goal.

2. 22-074 Rocky Mtn Sheep Protection

NDOW says 15 sheep in 074
with 15 sheep - they will never make it - 7 are rams
This is below the number to sustain the population
* But willing to spend $90,000 to protect 15 sheep is a waste of Sportsmen dollars!
Table 2 is a Farce

3. Project 32 Lion, Bear, Deer Interactions
Nothing in this project to develope methods to control predators as written in AB78 and Spending $40,000 + $120,000.

4. Project 37 Big Game Protection Mtn Lions
where is this project? They don't identify any units that meet their Criteria in Table 3 (P.74)
what units meet this criteria?
If NDOW has these indices to initiate predator removal and they have their Big Game Status Book why don't they say where they are going to do predator projects?

5. Big Game Protection - Coyotes
no goals or objectives - only State wide - no ID on any units
If ID units below this criteria on P.74, then need coyote projects

ADDENDUM

in units that are below criteria in Table 3.

6. NEWLY PROPOSED PROJECTS: PROJECT 41

No research protocol as per PARC Committee recommendations
No hypothesis
No Study Areas
No Public meeting for input
This is a blank check for $100,000/yr for the project manager
I can't believe chief pgam + director would have the nerve to submit a proposal like this especially after the public outcry with the Coyote den study project - recommended to be discontinued. This plan does NOT meet the requirements for a predator project, to spend $100,000.

7. Project 42 - Lion Harvest Data Analysis
what private contractor - who is going to do this.
No Criteria
Do they need to pay a private contractor to analyze their own data for $10,000 to develope a harvest model
NDOW supposedly developed their Deer Harvest model as they have staff biologists!

8. Discontinuation Project:
Project 22-16 (Coyote Study)
How much did they spend? No accounting how this money spent!
Are there any results as P. 23 requires No later than Aug 1!
Other contractors are required by NDOW to do this.

ADDENDUM -3-

Study used (FLIR) foreward looking infrared to discover coyote den locations. They found zero dens and at what cost to us? We desire to know this! Also in this study a private contractor was able to only locate one, I say one, active den. Again, at what cost? We need answers to this flawed project!

Commissioner Johnston on P. 6 of the March 24 Commission meeting minutes says; (AND I QUOTE): "recurring comment at these meetings expressed is that more detail in the specific project goals, and greater transparency on expenditures is needed."
The Director also confirmed NDOW would be more transparent.
Wildlife Staff Specialist for Predators said and I quote from P. 8 of the minutes: "He does not need additional information as the motion was clear at the Committee meeting."
So what are you Commissioners going to do now — since you were severly MISLEAD?
Let me show you what is needed to be transparent:
PROPOSED PREDATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET FY 14
This was done for past Commissions for Transparency!
MAKE THEM DO THIS! THIS IS TRANSPARANCY!

Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation, said since the last meeting, Mountain Lion Foundation supporters throughout Nevada and the world have submitted letters asking the Commission not to endorse this plan. The Commission received a petition with 49 signatures from Nevada and another 1,083 worldwide, totaling 1,132. Ms. Cullens said 56 letters sent from Nevadans, 987 letters sent electronically in opposition, 200 letters in the mail asking that the Commission not endorse the plan for a variety of reasons. This demonstrates there are people out there who care deeply about mountain lions in Nevada (letters in the exhibit file). She said 2,375 people total are asking the Commission why. The human caused mortalities of lions in Nevada is well above the accepted norm of 11 to 14 percent, even before adding additional kills added with the 2017 predator plan. Ms. Cullens said it would be useful to know the number of mountain

lions that have been killed under the predator plan and in each project within each predator plan. She challenged the Commissioners to be able tell her the number of lions killed in each project in 2014 and 2015, and without that information it is difficult for the public to provide common sense responses in terms of their understandings and opinions of this plan. Ms. Cullens said there is a slush fund in the plan, because as parts and projects have been reduced due to public objections to them, the money was moved into Projects 37 and 38 which are basically slush funds to kill predators, mountain lions and coyotes any place in the state that someone thinks is a good idea.
In conclusion the establishment of slush funds negates the value of planning in the first place. She said they have provided a simple choice, which is not to endorse a plan that does not meet any of the criteria established in the legislation for monitoring consequences before and after lethal removal.

Connie Howard, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, she read letter submitted by her organization:
On behalf of the Nevada Wildlife Alliance, we are writing to ask you reject the FY 2017 Predator Management Plan that will be presented at this week's NBWC meeting as agenda No. 9. Although NDOW has revised this plan several times, the Plan fails to meet its own policy guidelines as clearly stated in the Plan's introduction. The Plan states on page 3, "NDOW maintains a philosophy that predator management is a tool to be applied deliberately and strategically. NDOW intends to use predator management on a case-by-case basis, with clear goals, and based on an objective scientific analysis of available data." Throughout the development of this Plan, proponents both for and against "predator management" have harshly criticized this plan for its lack of: 1) clear goals 2) scientific data justifying the plan's 11 projects and 3) sufficient rational for the lethal projects proposed. Even Mark Jenkins, Director of Wildlife Services in Nevada, has repeatedly asked for a better Plan, knowing that Wildlife Services will be open to harsh criticism and possibly legal action. While we appreciate the legislative mandate of AB 78, there is no reason for the 2017 Plan should be so draconian in terms of their impact on Nevada's predators, particularly without the justifications and scientific underpinning mandated by NDOW itself. The 2017 Predator Management Plan embodies an outmoded management approach to predator populations, and one that is contradicted by contemporary understanding of biodiversity and ecosystem function. Many of projects presented in the Plan represent the worst possible approach to wildlife management and, if implemented, will do immeasurable harm to our wildlife resources and to Nevada's remaining biodiversity. The 2017 Plan particularly targets the mountain lion, an apex predator that deserves our active concern and protection. Moreover and perhaps most importantly conservation biologists today know that lethal predator control is not a successful

approach to depredation. The continuing assumption underpinning this plan that the "lethal removal" of mountain lions and coyotes will somehow enhance big game species is false. Killing our native predators does not help our game species, but in fact hurts their populations as the natural checks and balances are removed. It is possible that some of the disease issues currently being faced by the over-population of bighorn sheep might be held in check should we allow depredation by their natural predators. To quote from *Conseroation Letters* 2014 article, " Since 2000, Wildlife Services (WS), an agency of the US Department of Agriculture, has killed 2 million native mammals, predominantly 20 species of carnivores, beavers, and several species of ground-dwelling squirrels, but also many non-target species. Many are important species in their native ecosystems (e.g., ecosystem engineers such as prairie dogs and beavers, and apex predators such as gray wolves). Reducing their populations, locally or globally, risks cascading negative consequences including impoverishment of biodiversity, loss of resilience to biotic invasions, destabilization of populations at lower trophic levels, and loss of many ecosystem services that benefit human society directly and indirectly. Lethal predator control is not effective at reducing depredation in the long term." What is further alarming is the total absence of conservation concerns or philosophy. NDOW could have proposed projects that would benefit Nevada's endangered and sensitive species and would have still met the intention of AB 78. For example, these projects could propose bullfrog eradication to protect populations of the Relict Leopard Frog or cowbird eradication to assist threatened songbird species. Instead, the Plan proposes the same old "kill all the predators" approach, with a new increased and very alarming focus on our mountain lions. Both the Nevada Wildlife Alliance and the Mountain Lion Foundation have great concerns regarding the focus on the "removal" of mountain lions for as the attached addendum shows our current kill rate has exceeded the 11-14 percent kill rate above which it is difficult to sustain a stable population in half of the years since 2000. The Nevada mountain lion population may well be in decline already and the implementation of the projects proposed in the 2017 Plan might then be devastating to the population. At the very least, the Commission could consider rejecting those projects that will have significant inimical impact on Nevada predator populations and are presented without sufficient justification, data or rational. Specifically, Project 22-01 which proposes killing mountain lions near Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge to enhance California bighorn sheep; Project 37 which provides unlimited latitude to kill any mountain lions that "prey on sensitive game populations" with absolutely no justification,

data, geographic specifics or rational except that it is expedient and which has a substantial budget of $125,000; and Project 38 which similarly provides a carte blanche approach to the removal of coyotes and has a similarly large budget of $125,000. While these may be the most damaging of the projects proposed in terms of impact on predators, it should be re-emphasized that not a single project is adequately presented. The overall Plan is deficient and should be rejected. The notion of spending $839,000 in 2017 to recklessly kill Nevada's predators ought to be extremely alarming to you as the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners who are charged with the careful and correct management of Nevada' s wildlife resources. We ask that you carefully review this draft Plan and demand the justifications and data required before you commence this massive unprecedented and irresponsible slaughter of Nevada wildlife. In conclusion, the Nevada Wildlife Alliance is asking you to reject the 2017 Predator Management Plan and to direct the Nevada Department of Wildlife to develop a plan that meets the requirements of AB 78 and proposes projects that will enhance our precious wildlife resources. She said she reflected on the overall budget picture, as earlier today that out of a $40 million budget you have about $800,000 for conservation and thinks it is interesting that we will spend $800,000 looking after 256 species that need conservation but will spend $840,000 in one year for predator killing.

Camilla Fox, founder and executive director of Project Coyote, is speaking on behalf of Nevada members and supporters. She said she is also a member of Nevada Wildlife Alliance. Ms. Fox commended the Commission for the proposed WAP as very proactive with evaluative measurements for wildlife that are absolutely critical, based on best available science, also diametrically opposed to proposed Predator Management Plan. They testified on issue of wildlife killing contests, submitted letter on behalf of more than 70 scientists who made argument that indiscriminately killing predators is not effective in reducing populations to reduce conflict between predators and livestock, or to boost ungulate populations which is the primary basis for the predator management plan. Ms. Fox said she just returned from meetings in Washington D.C., where issue of predator management at state, county and federal level were discussed. They also discussed that in many Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) that a proper analysis of what the impact of removing predators to the ecosystem has not been done. This has made government entities subject to litigation, challenges to EIS and EA, and when you look at the management plan there is a distinct failure to make these proper measurements. There have been no basic measurements of what it means to remove a coyote or mountain lion from the ecosystem. State, county and federal agencies will need to look at impact of these management plans.

Josh Vittori, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, board met and discussed this agenda item and felt Department would not propose projects that are not scientifically viable. NBU supports the plan and on behalf of himself is glad to spend the amount to conserve bighorn sheep.

Cathy Smith, speaking for herself, said she learned that depredation permit issued by USFWS requires non-lethal activity to be performed prior to killing ravens. These non-lethal projects on ravens can be used to meet that requirement. She said at the Washoe CABMW meeting she appreciated changes made in the Department's predator management plan, but still do not understand why the older format was changed as very clear when projects were initiated and when stopped and what type of animals killed. Also, she is concerned that categorizing these projects into implementation projects is a way to avoid determining whether they determine long-term benefit. Long term benefits used to be listed at the beginning of every project, continuing projects with no demonstrate long-term benefits is equivalent to many non-consumptive killers as killing without a cause. There should be detailed statistical analysis of these projects, and may take more time and money up front but worth it in the long run to see if projects worked. Ms. Smith said all of the money does not have to be spent it can be kept in the account in the event of legislative changes. Ms. Smith said we hear from wildlife agencies that the base needs to be broadened but these predator management plans continue to be supported in direct odds of those goals and your leadership will be needed to help others understand the importance of predators in ecosystem and leadership will be needed to move predator policies into the 21st century.

Leah Sturgis, congratulated Department on WAP and is contrary to predator plan. She said she is appalled at predator management plan and the idea of killing predators to increase deer and bighorn populations is short-sighted in her opinion and as Ms. Fox pointed out does not work. Department's own studies show that – Project 13 and 14. What does this accomplish, already 10,000 coyotes killed and no reliable data on coyote populations. Violence is senseless and hypocritical. Loss of habitat is main reason for decline in populations. Non-consumptive wildlife users are not represented and plan should be rejected.

Jim Puryear said he supports the predator plan and would like it increased. In the 1990s on the Sheldon they collared 100 antelope fawns and there was 93 percent mortality. He said obvious if you spend time out in the hills and if look back 30 or 40 years there were hardly any mountain lions in Nevada.

Jana Menard, supporter of Project Coyote and business owner, said people ask her where to see wildlife. She would like to address the proposed predator plan as it is presented as a cure for Nevada's declining populations of mule deer. She spent years living in wilderness and rural areas and in absence of human intervention animal populations self-regulate and humans are what tip the scale. As discussed today, predator management or culling, is being recommended by the Commission to counter the ill effects of puma, coyote, and bears, on mule deer populations. A variable that has not been addressed and is of relevant importance is effect of human activity on mule

deer populations, without accounting for this effect how can we accurately assess the population decline. No account of human behavior is taken into account. Why spend tax payer money on killing predators potentially unjustifiably, why not limit influence of people on mule deer populations. Recommendations for culling of predators will have a scientific rather than anecdotal basis. She would propose and suggest limits on human mule deer interface created by a full ban on hunting of mule deer and ban on motorized vehicle access and stricter limits on non-motorized access in mule deer sensitive areas.

Rex Flowers, said he has hunted since 1961, has lived through droughts and the good and bad years. He said we are in a position of mule deer numbers being extremely poor especially in northern Washoe County. There was a project, but was discontinued in Granites, during the project mule deer increased as did hunter success. Thinks predator project continuation is necessity.

Public Comment Las Vegas Location -

Jana Wright said she appreciated additional information on projects but much more information needed as other speakers indicated. Ms. Wright objects to adoption of plan, and will use Project 22-01 as an example, she cited page 16 of the plan. This tells her they are going to remove all the lions in an area, not “problem lions, but “all lions.” That does not make sense to her and she hopes the Commission will support a bill that will counter the changes made by AB 78 to reduce or eliminate the $3 predator fee or expand the $3 fee for habitat restoration, appropriate research projects and education of general public on wildlife.

Stephanie Myers, said the Commission is tasked with work of wildlife management and simply killing predators is not wildlife management, and does not work and disturbs the ecosystem. Hope you reject the plan.

Karen Layne, said she supports many of the comments made here and seems we are back in 2010 again and recreating situation where we have all this money, to kill predators, and continually use the money unwisely. She said we complain about it and back to beginning, just because you have a rural senator and rural Commissioners who see this process as one to devote huge sums of predator money to kill lions and coyotes does not make it right for the rest of population. Ms. Layne said we are not accomplishing what needs to be done as there is habitat loss, there is climate changes, and these are major factors that have to be addressed. She agreed with Ms. Wright that we need to get away from this fee and the Commission should eliminate the fee as never will resolve the problem.

Fred Voltz, said he would echo concerns and opposition that has been raised in public comment. He said looking at raven project and amount of ravens killed for the amount of money and no link between cost and benefit of doing that project. Additionally on Projects 37 to 38 there is concern for using private houndsmen/trappers and private contractors to be killing our wildlife. There is little supervision or regulation to control and

neither the Department or Commission can exercise control over these people who can do rouge activities and no one would be the wiser.

Julius Fortuna, hunter and naturalist, Nevada Firearms Coalition, read his letter for the record: I am the Conservation Director of the Nevada Firearms Coalitions which is the state chapter of the NRA. We represent over 36,000 NVs firearm owners and thousands of sportsmen and women. And while many of my constituents do not actively hunt mule deer, they all buy lots of firearms and millions of rounds of ammunition every year. They contribute 11 percent on those purchases which goes directly to our Pittman-Roberson fund. The purpose of this emergent wildlife "call to arms" is to bring cognitive recognition to the plight of our mule deer, and to look at three suggested ways to begin augmenting their recovery. One look at then Biologist Tony Wasley admirable research… which culminated in his 2004 *NV MD Population Dynamics* stands as proof of my concerns, and validity to my six minutes today. First, I took the liberty to draw an unscientific extension from Director Wasley end point 2000 to 2015. But the current population estimate at 94,000 deer is correct. And while we have more mule deer than we did 100 years ago, our mule deer population is currently in the midst of a 25+ year downturn. And what's most concerning is that we have not dropped below 100k deer since 1975, or potential not since mid-1930s, well at least not until last year! Moreover I'm troubled by current signs that we are relying too heavily on "hope" that few years of "perfect storms" with above average summer rains will fix it. Which is not going to happen; not with the human encroachment, increased predation, and many other challenging habitat issues facing our mule deer! Mule deer have been provisioning our hearts, tables, traditions, and wildlife budgets for decades, unfortunately we have taken more from this animal then we have given, and it's time to change that. We need more from NDOW, we need more from this Commission; we need more determination, more single minded species focus, and an emergency level prioritization for its recovery. Every person in this state with any interest in wildlife biodiversity should be scared to death of the ramifications of another 20 years of "downturn"! The only way to preserve Nevada business of wildlife, economically and culturally is to keep mule deer with us, and in good numbers…175-200k! There is no other solution, there's no other way to describe it. It's very simple we either have them with us… or we don't. If we encourage/grow good deer numbers we have lots and lots of options…if we don't we could be risking everything…and I mean everything! Especially as NDOW gears up to try and solve the emergent decline in hunter license numbers with the "4 X R" "*retention/recruitment/reengagement/relevance."* And while sage grouse emergency conservation measures are important, we must not go down the slippery slope of under appreciating our seven big game species that pay "to keep the lights on for us" and thus NDOW ability to manage all 892 species! We cannot let ourselves be lulled to sleep with conjecture, or old wildlife myths… in other words we cannot let "sleeping mule deer lie." We cannot "hope" that mule deer with nothing more than of couple of great summer rains are going to transport us "back in time" to 225,000 deer. No sir, not today, not with human encroachment, decadent woody browse, fire suppression effects, invasive weeds, growing elk populations, and due to all of the above enhanced predation! Mule deer will either exist in good numbers… or not by what you do over the next decade to help manage them. And if you think this is hyperbole consider this; 1916 we had 26,000

deer…today 94,000 that's a slim 68,000 animal spread. Now consider from 1985 – 2000 in 15 short years we lost 150,000 deer! Even with my old school math… that still adds up to a catastrophic wildlife event like never witnessed before! Mule deer are the glue holding big game hunter's interest, they are the relevance. And while your constituents are diverse with diverse needs, your supply and demand…product and buyers are not! And right now your "product" is 70 percent low in stock then it was 25 years ago, and your buyers are not buying as much as a result. So if the 4xRs is the end goal…mule deer expansion is the answer! Finally, what would Nevada Firearms Coalition, and NV sportsmen want you to take away from this conservation call to arms? Just three things! For the Commission to specifically recognize the sensitivity of this critically important species, which begins with the specific inclusion in NDOWs official "Major Priorities List" for the next biennium. And I can assure you from personal experience with our legislatures that you're *Commission* for the *Budget Sub Committee* is going to be a lot more cantankerous if one of the top earners for wildlife funding, and sportsmen time afield falls off the cliff…then let's say, the sage grouse going on the threatened list.

1. When your deciding on how to spend big game hunters self-imposed predator management fees, and matching federal P&R monies totaling $1.2 million this year please, please be thinking MULE DEER and #1---#1---#1,
   #1 big game species
   #1 income generator
   #1 declining big game population.
   Which means steering clear of $500,000 raven studies, and quickly changing the current ratio of mule deer projects in the predator management plan which accounts for barely 25 percent of our current $1.2m. More Projects 39, 40s and less 21s!
2. Develop management objectives, add resources, and show prioritization toward declining mule deer populations. Hold biologists, deer survey teams, principle investigators accountable to bring *S.M.A.R.T* (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound) deliverables for this species! And that includes removing/reducing the current extensive predatory "steel lid" hanging over our tropic cascade, so when God willing the rains come, or habitat improves mule deer will have a fighting chance to get back to reasonable populations.

Further discussion and individual Commission comment on Predator Management Plan continued.

COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED TO ADOPT THE 2017 PREDATION MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL DRAFT AS SUBMITTED. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

10 Consideration of Revisions to Existing Commission Policy 23 on Predation Management (Second Reading) – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action

On March 24, 2016, the Commission heard a proposed revision to make existing Policy 23 consistent with provisions included in Assembly Bill 78 (AB 78) from the 2015 legislative session and current practice. The Commission moved the policy forward with removal of predation policies in subsection B.6. and B.7. on page 3

of the policy because these dealt with expenditures on habitat management, which had been specifically excluded through AB 78. The Commission may take action to modify or adopt this revision of Policy 23.

Division Administrator Wakeling noted the changes to the policy from the last meeting and recommended approval by the Commission, noting one correction that Wildlife Damage Management Committee needs to be spelled out on first reference then abbreviated.

Public Comment –

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE POLICY #23 FINALIZING WHERE ABBREVIATION OF WDMC IS FIRST USED TO SPELL OUT THEN ABBREVIATE. COMMISSIONER BLISS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER YOUNG WAS ABSENT FROM ROOM FOR THE VOTE.

11 Administrative Procedures, Regulations and Policy (APRP) Committee Report and Amendments to Commission Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission – Commissioner and Committee Chairman David McNinch and Management Analyst 3 Kim Jolly

A APRP Committee Report – Committee Chairman David McNinch and Management Analyst 3 Kim Jolly – Informational
A report will be provided from recent APRP Committee meetings.

Commissioner McNinch reported that the committee has met twice since last Commission meeting to discuss Policy 1 and Policy 3. He said in regard to Policy 3 they reached consensus related to appeals and hearings, and the intent is to have language submitted to LCB by the Department to draft language for a regulation that could move forward for approval by the Commission. The committee plans to meet prior to the Commission's June meeting.

Chairman Drew asked that the committee start entertaining wording for wildlife contests and anticipated discussion pertaining to Policy #1 in regard to expectation and interaction with the CABMWs. He said in reading support material for Policy 1 he is not sure if that would be proper place to add, and would like that item added to list of future new policies.

B First Reading, Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission – Committee Chairman David McNinch and Management Analyst 3 Kim Jolly – For Possible Action
The Commission will have a first reading of Commission Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission, and may take action on changes to Policy 1 as recommended by the APRP Committee. Recommendations include changes to reflect current practices and standards, including a section on

Commission Policy record-keeping, and spacing the number of a Commission Policy's "first and second readings" from one meeting to the next before a change to a policy is adopted. The Commission may advance Policy 1 to a second reading for possible adoption at a future meeting.

MA 3 Jolly said the committee had four minor additions/changes to Policy #1 and she reviewed the policy and recent changes.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO ADOPT WITH FOUR CHANGES AS NOTED AND STRIKEOUT. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

12 Duck Stamp Contest Sponsor – Publications Coordinator Aaron Meier – For Possible Action
In accordance with Commission Policy 50 the Commission will be asked to select a sponsor for the 2017 and 2018 duck stamp contests.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO SELECT THE NEVADA WATERFOWL ASSOCIATION. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

13 Regulation Update – Chairman Drew – Informational

A report will be provided on outstanding, pending and future regulations that may require Commission consideration over the next year.

Chairman Drew gave an update on the regulations before the Commission.

Changes have been made to the trail camera regulation. It was resubmitted to the Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) and there will be a revision. It is unclear if that information will be back before the June Commission meeting.

The trap visitation regulation was deferred by the Legislative Commission. It was then presented back to the Legislative Commission and adopted. There is a shorter trap visitation interval in place around Reno and Las Vegas. At the same meeting the trap demerits regulation was discussed and deferred until the next Legislative Commission.

The elk arbitration regulation is back before the Commission again today.

The regulation regarding electronic triggers, caliber and cartridge length, and smokeless powder restrictions is at LCB for revisions. He is hopeful it will be back in time for the June Commission meeting. The regulation on drones is in the same situation.

The spike elk, hull numbers, and industrial artificial ponds regulations are being heard today.

There is a regulation on boat drains that is being drafted by the Department. There will be regulations on changes to appeals and petitions. There are outstanding recommendations from the Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee and the Bear Committee, three each.

14 Commission General Regulation 456, Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel, LCB File No. R031-15 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

Chairman Drew introduced the regulation.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling explained the reason for the change. The Commission has repeatedly heard testimony regarding CGR 456, Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel. This regulation was initiated by concerns brought by the White Pine CABMW, which had been involved with some of the arbitration processes. The way the arbitration process operated required participation by a local businessman, local livestock producer, and a local CABMW member. While those individuals were very familiar with the local situation, there was difficulty navigating personal relationships at the local level. The proposed amendment to NAC allows for the Commission to act as the arbitration panel or to appoint an arbitration panel that may be developed from a broader geographic area of the state rather than the local community. In June 2015, the Commission did address one arbitration request using this process under temporary regulation. During adoption of permanent NAC, LCB and the Legislative Commission have questioned specific language choices recommended by the Department that directly influence the application of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). The primary concern expressed by the Legislative Commission deals with the ability of an arbitration panel to issue a final and binding decision without providing a means for appeal. In short, an appointed panel may be able to provide such a decision, yet when the Commission acts in this capacity it may be deemed an administrative act that must be consistent with the provisions of the APA. LCB has provided language that will be shared at this meeting to address this nuance.

He asked the Commissioners to look at page 3 of the proposed regulation. The LCB asked the Department to change the language. Instead of reading, “The decision of the Commission, or the arbitration panel appointed by the Commission, is final and binding subject to judicial review on the parties if it complies…” they want it to read, “The decision of the Commission, or the arbitration panel appointed by the Commission, is final and binding on the parties, for purposes of judicial review, if it complies….”

Chairman Drew clarified the language.

CABMW Comment and Public Comment – None

Chairman Drew said to move this regulation to adoption tomorrow with one change.

15 Commission General Regulation 461, Industrial Artificial Pond Permits (IAP), LCB File No. R014-16 – Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

Chairman Drew introduced the regulation.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne reviewed a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file), which explained the regulation. He explained the tiers and payment schedule.

Chairman Drew said he went through the regulation and did not catch any editorial changes. He had a question on the fee assessment, but the presentation answered it.

Commissioner McNinch did not pick up how Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne explained the tiers in the regulation. He will reread the regulation again. He does not understand how it works.

Chairman Drew asked to be pointed to the section where the tiers are located in the regulation.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne pointed out the fee schedules and the tiers at the bottom of page 7 and on page 8 and 9. He read it. He said this is the language that came back from LCB. Initially there was language trying to spell out the greatest fee schedule.

Commissioner McNinch said sites will fall under several fee schedules. How does the Department pick what fee schedule to assess? He thinks it needs to be changed back to what the Department initially requested from LCB. He thinks LCB twisted it around.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said that is what the Department initially had in the language. He said he could return the regulation to LCB to make it clearer.

Chairman Drew thinks that would be a good idea. He was also confused about the fee schedules.

Commissioner McNinch said on page 5 towards the bottom, subsection 3, the whole idea of changing this regulation was to recoup the costs that are expended by the Department. There is a reference to a reduction in the fee for a temporary permit or permit for less than one year. He has dealt with fees a number of times and the Department will be putting the same amount of time and effort into a temporary permit as they do for the others. He would suggest that the Department charge everyone $125. It is the same effort.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said that cannot be changed at this time because it is in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS).

Commissioner Mori asked what the mining industry thinks of this regulation.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said he received minimum comment at the stakeholder meetings. The mining industry is the least impacted because they are already paying the assessment. This captures the other industries that are not currently paying the assessment. The Department addressed the concerns of the Nevada Mining Association and came to a consensus.

Commissioner Young asked about the nexus to wildlife. They are artificial bodies of water. Is there fish in the water? Is wildlife utilizing the water? Are there chemicals in the water?

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said they are potentially lethal to wildlife.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment –

Allen Biaggi, Nevada Mining Association, said it was refreshing that the Department came to them early in the process. There were some issues that the Association had with the proposed regulation, but with dialogue the concerns have been satisfied.

Chairman Drew asked about page 7 and the fee schedules. He asked if there were concerns from the Association to make it abundantly clear that the assessment would be the highest tier.

Allen Biaggi, Nevada Mining Association, said they would not have a problem with the change.

Fred Voltz asked about the Silver Peak groundwater lithium concentration project. He is curious to know if in the program history they are going to be co-opted into the new changes. If that is the case, he is concerned about how many other artificial industrial ponds have a similar exemption.

Chairman Drew said one of the intents of this update was to close the loopholes or pick up the folks that have these ponds, but are not covered by the current regulation. Is this regulation going to loop them in or is that apples and oranges?

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said this regulation was modified to cover every permit holder. Every permit holder will pay an assessment. Rockwood Lithium Corporation does not process ore, so it did not have a fee structure. Forty-five percent of the permit holders are not currently paying. This will close that loop.

Chairman Drew said the regulation does apply to the specific project that Mr. Voltz mentioned, but it does not pay under the current structure but would pay under the revised structure.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said yes, they would pay under the new fee structure.

Chairman Drew asked for the original language submitted to the LCB on the structure of the fees.

Chairman Drew said Commissioner Valentine needed to step out for a family emergency at 4:36 pm and he is going to be absent for the remainder of the meeting and possibly tomorrow.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne explained the original language. It originally said, "…specifications for the design of any facility associated with the artificial or artificially created body of water according to the highest qualifying payment tier within the following schedules:." He restated the change.

Chairman Drew verified the language change. He asked for that language to be advanced out of this workshop for adoption at the next meeting.

Commissioner McNinch said that it still implies only one schedule. He explained what would make the language clearer. "…according to the highest applicable payment tier within any of the following schedules:."

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne said that language would work.

Commissioner Johnston agreed with Commissioner McNinch's change.

Chairman Drew clarified the change Commissioner McNinch is proposing. He said to advance this language to the next meeting for adoption.

16 Commission General Regulation 462, Issuing and Verifying Hull Numbers of Vessels, LCB File No. R015-16 – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

Chairman Drew introduced the regulation.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger explained the regulation.

The regulation addresses changes associated with vessels that the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) is requesting states to implement pertaining to hull numbers, the verification and issuance of hull numbers; the content of applications for certificate of number and certificate of ownership, additional definitions and descriptions and personal identification information of owners.

States are required to report vessel data to the USCG. The USCG amended 33 CFR Parts 173, 174, 181 and 187 as an effort to modernize and standardize vessel database information and terminology collected by all of the states. This effort has a direct impact

on state requirements and must be implemented by Jan. 1, 2017. In Nevada, the effort to meet the USCG requirements started in the 2015 legislative session with the passing of Assembly Bill 35 (AB35). AB 35 addressed requirements for the state to verify that the hull numbers meet the requirements prescribed by the USCG and issue a new state hull number if the hull number on a vessel does not meet the requirement.

Pursuant to AB35 and USCG direction the Department drafted language amending a significant portion of Chapter 488 of Nevada Administrative Code (NAC), which pertains to vessels. The draft language was presented to the USCG for review to ensure we were on track with our efforts and after review subsequently submitted to the Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau for finalization into the formal NAC format being presented for this workshop.

The regulation amendment tackles a significant portion of Chapter 488 of NAC, which is the watercraft chapter. Since the goal of the USCG is to improve reporting, boating safety efforts, enhance law enforcement efforts and clarify requirements for all of the states, having uniformity of the data at the state level will help in this effort. As a result, much of what is being amended involves, as mentioned, standardization of terminology. There is a host of new terms and definitions as provided by the USCG. Adding new terminology results in language "housekeeping," which occurs throughout the amendment. Further, the USCG is requesting additional data regarding owners, and those changes are located in those sections associated with applications for certificate of number or certificate of ownership (registration and titling). Such information includes physical address, date of birth of registered owners and driver's license numbers are being added in addition to employee identification number if the applications are made under a business name.

Implementation will include programming changes to the Department's licensing database, Nevada Wildlife Data system (NWDS) for both our counter and online consumer sales sites for the input and output formats for the new data being requested. To include but not limited to updating all layouts to process transactions and documents generated out of those transactions, registrations and titles. There will be programming the hull number formatting to meet the USCG requirements and addressing changes to the tables associated with propulsion, fuel, hull types, and operation. Additionally, reports associated with the vessel registration and titling program will be reviewed and updated to meet the agency's data reporting requirements. As part of the hull number requirements we are researching new state hull number stickers, for when we have to assign a state hull number, when the department determines a hull number does not meet new the USCG requirements. These state hull number stickers must be durable and we have been communicating with other states regarding products they use. Then of course, we are planning to notify Nevada vessel owners impacted by the hull number requirements. There are a significant number of vessels that do not meet the requirement of which many have not been registered for a number of years. Our internal discussion has been to start with registered owners from the last three to five years since they may have the most current contact information. Those vessels that have not

been registered for many years will have the new requirements addressed at the time they surface during a transaction.

The Legislative Counsel's digest, pages 1 to 3, provide explanations to several of the sections with substantive changes.

There are some edits from staff. Most are housekeeping changes. In section 2, remove "original" in the first sentence on the bottom of page 8. The Department might have an owner attesting to the hull number which is not the original. In the same paragraph on page 9 put a period after application and remove the rest of the sentence. The last portion is redundant and not necessary. On page 10, section 3, subsection 1(o)(4) add "of number" after certificate. This clarifies that it is the certificate of number that needs to be carried on board. That same language would be inserted in section 3, subsection 2 and 3, "A certificate of number issued for…" and change the word "used" to "operated" later in that sentence in subsection 3. That was one of the changes the USCG asked states to change the word "used" to "operated" throughout. On page 12, section 7, subsection 4, "shall" will be changed to "may" because not all boats are destroyed, some are abandoned. Another change to section 7 is removing the new subsection 5. It is not necessary. On page 16, section 13, subsection 1, strike "month and" so it will just be the year. On page 20, section 19 deals with the certificate of ownership. In the new subsection 12, it says "The type of fuel;" and the Department would like it to say "The type of fuel or power;" there are electric motors, electricity is not a form of fuel, it is a form of power. On page 22, section 20, the new subsection 3 has a typo, "(g)" should be "(i)." On page 24, section 21, subsection 1(g)(1) should read "An inspection of the vessel…" replacing "A certificate of" with "An." The same change would also occur on page 26, section 22, subsection 1(e)(1).

Chairman Drew asked if the USCG reviewed the regulation, and if it included the editorial changes she just went though.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said yes, and does not recall that.

Game Warden David Pfiffner said the USCG has not responded to the changes. He said the USCG went through part of it and everything seemed to be fine with them. They have all 50 states and the territories that are asking them for the review of regulation changes.

Chairman Drew asked about the requirements on page 8. There are a lot of documents listed. Are there issues where those documents cannot be found?

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said they are only for evidence. The Department may only need a few of them, not all of them. This is a laundry list of the things the Department can accept for the applications.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

Chairman Drew asked if everyone was comfortable with the changes. He would like to move it out of workshop. He asked that the Department to make sure the USCG is fine with the changes.

17 Reports – Informational

A Black Bear Hunt Status Report – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling
A report will be provided on the status of the black bear hunt and ongoing population and harvest monitoring.

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling provided a PowerPoint presentation (available in exhibit file and NDOW website).

B Big Game Hunt Status Report – Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox
A summary report will be provided on the status of big game.

Wildlife Staff Specialists Cody Schroeder and Mike Cox presented a PowerPoint presentation (available in exhibit file/website).

C Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) – Commissioner and Committee Chairman Brad Johnston
A report will be provided on the committee's recent meeting.

Commissioner Johnston provided a report on the TAAHC committee: They discussed antelope waiting period for residents, and bull elk waiting periods which currently are five years if unsuccessful and 10 years if successful. The committee discussed return of tags because some are hearing of anecdotal abuse but no desire to penalize people who had legitimate reason to return tag. Commissioner Johnston said they will next meet in conjunction with the June Commission meeting.

D Wildlife Heritage Committee – Commissioner and Committee Chairman Wallace
A report will be provided on the recent Wildlife Heritage Committee meeting.

Commissioner Wallace said they met and reviewed Heritage tag vendors and project proposals and action will be taken at the June meeting. He said every project was funded to full amount except the Spruce Mountain Restoration Project.

Secretary Wasley thanked Nevada Bighorns Unlimited for their donation to NDOW for the helicopter purchase which allowed furthering of Heritage funds to fully fund projects.

E Wildlife Trust Fund Semi-Annual Report – Deputy Director Liz O'Brien
A report will be provided on the investment and expenditure of the money in the Wildlife Trust Fund for the periods of July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015, and July 1, 2015, to Dec. 31, 2015, pursuant to NRS 501.3585.

Deputy Director Liz O'Brien said the Department is required to submit semi-annually to the Commission a report of the money in the Wildlife Trust Fund pursuant to NRS 501.3585. The first report is an update to SFY 2015, to now include the entire year. The Department received $169,319 in donations and expended $231,251. The second report is the first six months of SFY 2016; the Department received $219,362 in donations and expended $91,342. Attached in each of those reports are the details of every gift we have received during that time period. Donations are received from a variety of conservation organizations, industry, and private citizens in support of the Department. These donations save state funds (mostly sportsmen fee revenue) and in many instances can be used as match for federal dollars at a rate of up to three dollars for every one dollar donated.

F Sage-grouse Update – Secretary Wasley
Secretary Wasley will provide an update on the status of sage-grouse.

Secretary Wasley said two issues remain the main area of focus, one is implementation of Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA), and LUPA was the amendment that BLM and Forest Service put into place that had provisions that allowed the USFWS to conclude sage-grouse was not warranted for protection under a ESA listing. He said NDOW is engaged with BLM on a regular basis and has taken significant staff time and energy and has been the single biggest issue for Game and Habitat Divisions. The other issue is Nevada remains in negotiations with the Department of Interior and BLM with respect to the mineral withdrawal fees. Presently there is an area designated in Nevada for withdrawal from mineral activities and the State has put forth notion that we have better boundary for consideration and those discussions are underway.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO RECONSIDER THE AGENDA FOR TODAY. MOTION PASSED 8 - 0. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE ABSENT.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO TABLE AGENDA ITEM # 17 G AND TO BE HEARD AT THE CHAIR'S DISCRETION. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 8 - 0. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE ABSENT.

H Litigation Report – Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward

DAG Ward said the report was submitted and provided an update on lawsuit added: Mark Sooy is suing the Department. Plaintiff hunting on elk tag in November 2014, allegedly broke leg, allegedly went to NDOW office to return tag and get points. Allegedly letter and tag returned to him but no restoration of bonus points and Mr. Sooy

has filed lawsuit against Department to get return of tag, bonus points and monetary damages to $10,000 and above.

18 Public Comment Period

Public Comment Reno Location -

Gerald Lent said he would like his comments on the record: In the support material there is a Litigation Report memorandum that is a public record written by Harry B. Ward Deputy Attorney General, and in second to last paragraph it states that a companion OML complaint was filed by “Mr. Lentz” was submitted to the Nevada Attorney General’s Office. He said that is not his name, his name is misspelled in the litigation report in support material. As an attorney if you cannot read or spell your litigant’s name correctly, you probably have a big professional problem. Another item he wants to comment on is Project 22 on Predator Plan entitled “Mule Deer Enhancement,” and it was recommended for discontinuation, and all four sub-projects related to sheep now. The emphasis for mule deer is going away with this plan even though mule deer are bread and butter of this agency and sportsmen. NDOW sells thousands of deer tags, but only a few hundred sheep tags, and this plan is going totally in wrong direction. Everybody pays a predator fee, not just sheep people, and there are far more deer hunters and tags then sheep tags. The predator plan is sheep, sheep, sheep. The legislative intent of the predator fee was to protect mule deer. He can prove that any day you want him to, as he was original sponsor in 1992, and believes you are all aware of that. Lastly he heard chairman and a couple sportsmen representatives say there are lots of public meetings and time for public comment on the predator plan, but not when it keeps changing every time, and that is what it did. Example Project 41 is new today, new to you and new to all of us, there was no prior public comment. All of the predator projects in the plan did not get a good hearing in the public comment period as some of the Commission said, and who knows what final plan will look like, there is no guarantee they will listen to you again, as no guarantee it will stay the same, will before interesting to see final version of the predator plan is.

Stanley Zuber, Carson CABMW, said no CABMW rep from his board will be present tomorrow but their CABMW voted to support the Department’s recommendation.

Fred Voltz read statement for the record: Things change, Commissioners. You have seen growing and overwhelming opposition to the bear hunt since you revived this unnecessary activity. This hunt has consumed an excessive amount of Commission time. Today's informational report lends little support for more bear hunting. The state's hunting and trapping licensees are static or in decline because of changing public attitudes and deteriorating demographics toward destruction of and interference with wildlife species. Two of the specious, illogical statements recently made by Carson CAB members supporting more premeditated bear deaths deserve attention. One board member suggested that more bears are killed by cars than by hunters. Because we have irresponsible drivers speeding and paying insufficient attention, that's supposedly a valid justification to kill more bears via sanctioned hunting regardless of how it tears

apart bear families or needlessly disrupts the environment? The word 'ludicrous' comes to mind. Another Carson board member suggested that 89 percent of killed bears had their meat consumed. Unless this individual was standing over each hunter while he killed, butchered and consumed the hapless bears, how would the board member know this fact with such certainty? Given the poor self-reporting by trappers of the non-target species their traps destroy, how would any self-reporting about dead bear use be remotely reliable? Does killing a bear mean the hunter never uses a grocery store? Hypothetically, if all the bears in the state were killed, how long would that feed the state's residents? There is a path forward for this Commission tomorrow. Disallow the killing of female and young bears. Set the total 2016 quota at one, allowing the Commission to retain paid application fees and hold a hunt with minimal impact to the state's bears.

Meeting recessed 6:31 p.m.

Saturday, May 14, 2016 – 8 a. m.

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

Chairman Drew called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. Roll call of Commissioners conducted and Commissioners present on Saturday, May 14, 2016: Chairman Drew, Commissioners Wallace, Hubbs, Johnston, McNinch, and Mori.

Commissioners absent on May 14, 2016: Commissioners Bliss, Valentine and Young.

Roll call of CABMW Members: Furn Winder, Elko; Ray Sawyer, White Pine; Mitch McVicars, White Pine; Sean Shea, Washoe; Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt; Joe Crim, Pershing; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; Paul Dixon, Clark; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; and Bob Cook, Douglas.

20 Approval of Agenda – Chairman Drew – 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 JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, ONLY CHANGE IS CHAIR'S DISCRETION FOR DEPARTMENT ACTIVITY REPORT. MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS ABSENT BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG.

21 Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence – Chairman Drew – 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.

Chairman Drew said he appreciates all the persons who stayed yesterday until the end, and due to the late hour was the reason the Commission moved the Department Activity report to Saturday.

22 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.

None

23 Commission General Regulation 460, Definition of "Spike Elk," LCB File No. R013-16 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action

Chairman Drew introduced the regulation.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling provided a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file), which explained the regulation change. Photos of legal and illegal animals were shown. He provided information from Utah. Their definition is, “Spike bull means a bull elk which has at least one antler beam with no branching above the ears. Branched means a projection on an antler longer than one inch, measured from base to tip.” They said their definition seems to work fairly well. An alternate definition was presented by Darin Elmore and Game Division Administrator Wakeling read it. He provided the pros and cons. The Department thinks either definition will reduce the chances of inadvertent errors. The definition presented by the Department has already received review from the LCB, the Commission, and the CABMWs. The alternate proposal limits the take of older bulls of which Commissioner Bliss was concerned about. It is unlikely it would be a substantial harvest or influence under the Departments recommended definition. It could be a three point bull. There may be challenges this fall if this regulation does not go forward at this meeting.

Chairman Drew asked about the timing.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said it will not be approved in time to be put into the hunt book. He said the Department does send a letter to the spike tag holders each year and that is how they would be informed.

Chairman Drew said we are going to be in a letter sending mode. He said at least two CABMWs have seen the alternative language and it was talked about at the last meeting.

Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed said either definition works from an enforcement standpoint.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they went over the alternative language and they supported it.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they talked about this at their last meeting. They wanted a branch, but there is not a definition of a branch in the law. They changed it to two or fewer points, which is the same as the alternative language.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they are happy with getting a solid definition. They do not need any certain definition, just a definition that is enforceable.

Bob Cook, Douglas CABMW, said they did not come to any specific decision but they would like to see it again.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, said they did not discuss the alternative language. They are comfortable with whatever the Commission decides.

Public Comment –

Darin Elmore said he is concerned about getting this right, not getting it done right now. This is going to be a long term issue and we need to get it right. The Utah definition is good, but they even said it is imperfect. The biologists have signed off on this. It makes law enforcement easier.

Commissioner Hubbs asked to clarify the language.

Chairman Drew read the alternative language.

Darin Elmore said that is correct and explained the reason for the alternative language.

Commissioner Johnston clarified the language.

Chairman Drew repeated the alternative language, and said LCB may change something so he would like to bring this regulation back in June.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said there are a lot of avenues this can take and he described them.

Secretary Wasley does not think the Legislative Commission would meet before the June meeting.

Commissioner Hubbs finds the two definitions very different. Is there a difference between the animals that are taken under each definition?

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said no, there is not a big difference. They are both yearling elk. He showed photos from the PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Hubbs said if she went out and hunted she would be confused.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said this is what the Department has been wrestling with. We want to find the definition that a hunter can identify in the field and not make a mistake. People are going to make mistakes regardless. Either definition meets biological needs and enforcement needs.

Commissioner Hubbs said to err on the side of caution.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said the Department is not inundated with violations on this. There are probably less than five issues per year. There is a very low harvest rate. Hunters want to liberalize the definition. Points are defined in the law (NAC 502.006) which he read.

Chairman Drew said either one meets the objective. Hunters make mistakes though. Most of these hunts are in Elko County. He likes the alternate proposal. He wants to bring it back in June.

Commissioner Johnston was confused with the way it was presented. He likes the alternate definition.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about intertwining both definitions since both are acceptable.

Commissioner Johnston clarified the language adding an “or” and using both definitions.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said they discussed that. Using the alternate definition eliminates the chance to take a 375 bull with a broken antler. Biologically it is not expected to be an issue. The Department said it is a viable alternative.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said we can put photos in the regulation to show what is legal. He also wanted to remind everyone that this is a means to an end. The spike hunt is a Band-Aid approach. It is not the best tool, but it is the only tool we have. The Department has been concerned about maintaining quality. We harvest so many cows that we have bull ratios above 100 bulls per 100 cows so we need to put a lot of pressure on the bulls. This puts hunting pressure on another segment, a younger segment of bulls. The Department has not solved their management problem with this hunt.

Chairman Drew does not know how he feels about the “or” option.

Commission Hubbs said she knows it is wordy, but add both definitions if the Department and Commission want to liberalize it.

Commissioner Johnston thinks it is a little wordy but it will accomplish the objective. Make it easier on the people in the field. He would like to see both definitions. When the regulation is finalized provide pictures.

Chairman Drew said he would accept a motion. He would like it to go back to the CABMWs.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO REVISE COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 460 TO READ “SPIKE ELK MEANS ANY ELK HAVING AT LEAST ONE ANTLER WITHOUT BRANCHING ABOVE THE EARS OR ANY ELK HAVING NO MORE THAN TWO POINTS ON EITHER ANTLER ABOVE THE EARS.” COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew clarified the language, and asked, if we need to add “above the top of the ear.”

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said Utah said there was confusion with the relation of the ear.

Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed said either way is fine. The top is implied.

Chairman Drew said today is not a final vote. He wants the Department to ask LCB if we need a formal rewrite.

Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed said to pick one definition. Combining the two would mean full review from LCB. The two definitions are conflicting.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling provided another alternative.

Commissioner McNinch asked about the challenge of removing spike elk from the field.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said it does help. He wants to remove more spike elk.

Commissioner McNinch said there seems to be a pull between the two.

Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed said Darin Elmore makes a 2x2 legal and Game Division Administrator Wakeling makes a 3x1 legal. He would rather kill the 2x2 and they are more common.

Chairman Drew asked if they want to advance the language or withdraw it. He is concerned about the “or” because it might cause more confusion.

Commissioner Wallace withdrew his second; Commissioner Johnston withdrew his motion.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO REVISE COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 460 WITH THE ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE TO READ, "SPIKE ELK MEANS ANY ELK HAVING NO MORE THAN TWO POINTS ON EITHER ANTLER ABOVE THE EAR." COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Chairman Drew said this is not a final approval. It will be advanced to the June meeting for adoption. The Department will check with LCB on the need for a rewrite.

Secretary Wasley said we cannot control when we get things back from LCB.

Chairman Drew said that is understandable.

24 Commission General Regulation 456, Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel, LCB File No. R031-15 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action

Chairman Drew introduced the regulation. A workshop was held yesterday. New language from LCB was presented and the support material was edited. He read the new language.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling did not have anything to add.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE CGR 456 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT THE WITH FINAL INPUT FROM LCB ADDING "FOR PURPOSES OF JUDICIAL REVIEW." COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND WALLACE WERE ABSENT.

G Department Activity Report – Secretary Wasley
Secretary Wasley will provide a report on recent Department activities.

During April 6 through 16, 2016, 50 sharp-tailed grouse, were captured near Malad, Idaho and successfully released within the Bull Run Basin in northeastern Nevada. This is part of ongoing project to reintroduce sharp-tail grouse to Nevada. Sharp-tail were a native species that were extirpated sometime ago, unlike sage-grouse they can eat

grass seed, and we have seen establishment of some leks with successful recruitment of birds and offspring from previous release.

The 2015 mule deer teeth collection and analysis is finally complete and results were posted on the NDOW website on May 6, 2016. The average age for male mule deer harvested in 2015 was about 3.4 years based on 360 samples, whereas the average age for females was 3.3 years based on 45 samples. The average antler spread reported for males was 20.3 inches.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has proposed adding the North Fork Little Humboldt River and South Fork Humboldt River to their list of impaired waters based on fish averaging greater than 0.3 mg/kg of body weight for methyl-mercury. We are currently reviewing the proposed notification change with Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP). NDOW already has in place voluntary consumption advisories for certain sport fish species in these waters.

Fisheries Division biologists continue to monitor conditions at Rye Patch Reservoir in Pershing County where a major fish kill occurred last October due to an apparent bloom of toxic golden algae in the reservoir. Fisheries surveys this spring have indicated that the fish kill was not complete and some sport fish species have survived. We are pursuing strategies to restore the sport fishery and 1.5 million Walleye fry from Gavins Point National Fish Hatchery were stocked into the reservoir in April.

The pH level at Comins Lake finally dropped in April and after testing, approximately 10,000 trout were stocked beginning in late April, including several thousand large excess brood stock from Gallagher Hatchery. Additional trout and largemouth bass will be stocked later in 2016.

NDOW will also be conducting specific surveys in 2016 to collect better data on the status of the Arizona toad in southern Nevada. Little is known about this Amphibian in Nevada and the USFWS in Arizona recently determined that Endangered Species Act listing could be warranted for the toad.

Staff met with Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge in mid-April to address a number of ongoing concerns. We now have a good understanding going forward on management of the dike units to maintain some bass fishery while the units undergo renovation, as well as on a number of other issues.

Truckee Carson Irrigation District (TCID) Board of Directors has set water allocations at 85 percent this year for the Carson Lake Wetlands with water deliveries expected to run through October. NDOW will start taking water deliveries in early August and will focus on management of the Big Water, York, and Rice units this year.

NDOW Habitat Division, through the Private Lands Program, continues to work closely with the DCNR State Conservation Commission and the Conservation Districts Program to develop and implement habitat restoration projects on private lands across the state.

NDOW recently provided financial match for conservation district projects in Lincoln, and White Pine counties, complementing funds provided by the Legislature to the Conservation District program for sage grouse related projects.

We have been exceptionally busy trying to meet the needs of the BLM and USFS in implementing the sage-grouse land use plan amendment. NDOW is lead on developing sage-grouse seasonal habitats for all ground disturbing activities that BLM permits, including grazing permits. However, cross divisional coordination has been commendable given that other demands for staff time have not been relaxed.

With the recent hire of Stephan Allen to the Southern Crew, the water development crews are now both fully staffed and are in the midst of a busy construction season. The program continues to be very successful due to the cooperation and support of multiple sportsmen-conservation organizations. To date four volunteer projects have been completed in the north and three other new constructions in the south. In one instance, Mineral Ridge Mine funded a large-volume water development project as mitigation for the loss of bighorn sheep habitat with a mine expansion.

The City of Henderson's Bird Viewing Preserve Project has grown into a joint effort involving the City of Henderson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Audubon Society, Nevada Division of Forestry and volunteering public. Removal of the invasive tamarisk, as well as dead and decadent plant material has opened areas where perennial native nursery stock and willow cuttings have been planted. Initial monitoring of the new plantings has shown a high survival rate most likely attributable to the availability of water given the high water table, manual watering efforts, and timely precipitation events.

Pinyon-Juniper (PJ) thinning and removal work continues across the state with approximately 1,300 acres treated on Spruce Mountain in Elko County and over 2,000 acres treated in 2015-16 on the Combs Creek in White Pine County. Additional thinning and removal work on the Atlanta Road, Patterson Pass and Overland Pass projects will be underway in the coming weeks with these three projects accounting for approximately 20,000 acres of PJ removal.

Southern Region game wardens were busy on the Colorado River at Laughlin the last weekend in April for the Laughlin River Run motorcycle rally. This included our first arrest of the season for operating under the influence with a boater that had used a combination of alcohol and prescription drugs. Game wardens also investigated several boat accidents associated with the bike rally weekend, including a prop cut incident.

Eastern Region game wardens are working with Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources on a case involving the illegal killing of a large bull elk in the Ely area. This investigation is ongoing and will likely involve charges in both Nevada and Wisconsin.

Four years of drought may have caused some folks to forget about fishing licenses as Western Region game wardens have been issuing several citations for fishing without a

fishing license as spring fishing picks up. This is by far our most common wildlife citation despite the fact that, in most court jurisdictions, it carries a $100 bail, $50 civil penalty, and $95 in court costs, for a total of $245; over eight times the cost of a resident annual fishing license.

The Western Region game warden lieutenant responded to a reported animal attack in which the reporting party insisted that he had been attacked by a wild animal. Despite the man's insistence, this turned out to be a black and white housecat that had scratched his arm. All three regions are dealing with high numbers of calls regarding mountain lion, bobcat, coyote, and black bear encounters in urban areas, some of which are probably actual wildlife.

The Law Enforcement Division is moving forward with a hiring process attempting to fill six game warden vacancies. Conditional offers have been made, following interviews in April.
Nevada boating education has partnered with California and Arizona to promote boating safety on the Colorado River. The kickoff event is scheduled for May 21, where state entities will distribute hundreds of free life jackets while promoting boating safety on this heavily used waterway.

Nevada will kick off National Safe Boating week with a press conference on Lake Mead on May 27, followed by a podcast and several smaller events around the state. The Memorial Day Event is the traditional start of boating season, and NDOW personnel will spend the week talking about life jackets and reaching boaters through social media, press outreach and other communications tools.

The Las Vegas City Council honored Nevada Department of Wildlife Aquatic Education Coordinator Ivy Santee for her outstanding work with angler education and support of City of Las Vegas fishing derbies which encourage residents to enjoy angling at the stocked ponds throughout the community. Ivy was sponsored for the honor by Councilman/Mayor Pro-Tem Steven Ross and Councilman Ricki Barlow. In addition, Mayor Goodman proclaimed April 20, 2016 "Nevada Department of Wildlife Day" for the commitment of the agency to provide the citizens of Las Vegas with outreach activities that inspire residents to value natural treasures, education that wild animals should be treated with caution and preservation of wild spaces throughout the state of Nevada.

In April, the Southern Region Conservation Education staff coordinated NDOW participation in the Clark County Fair Youth Outdoor Experience. Assistance was provided by Con Ed staff from the Eastern and Western Regions, NDOW staff from all other divisions and volunteers. Preliminary estimates show volunteers logged nearly 500 hours and nearly 7,000 miles valued with match at $95,100. License sales at the event totaled over $5,000, a 25 percent increase over the prior year. Despite heavy rains, nearly 2,650 kids cast a line at the catch-and-release fishing tank.

In March, staff attended the Region 8 Aquatic Education Workshop hosted by the Wildlife Sport Fish Restoration (WSFR) Grants Management Specialist. The purpose of the Aquatic education workshop was to help foster networking and program improvement within the WSFR funded aquatic education programs throughout Region 8. Topics included state-specific Program Highlights, Aquatic Ed Program Issues and Trends, Invasive Species, Geospatial/GIS Ideas for Aquatic Education and Innovations.

Eastern Region Con Ed Staff with the help of Game, Law Enforcement, Habitat, Fisheries and Western Region Con Ed Staff developed and staffed the Kids Outdoor Korner at the 1st Annual Sportsman's Expo in Elko the last weekend of February. More than 500 youth and their parents took advantage of the opportunity. Participants could tie flies, learn about wildlife through skins, skulls and scat, visit with Hedwig the owl and decorate a wildlife T-shirt. The OGT Trailer outside the facility received heavy visitation. A 30 minute formal presentation on raptors was held on the main floor stage of the expo.

Diversity biologists, Division of Minerals personnel, and volunteers surveyed 75 abandoned mine features around Ely, Nevada to determine the wildlife value and use in these features. Recommendations for closure methods were presented to the BLM State Office Abandoned Mine Lands lead for closure decisions. Two sites with hazardous safety conditions were reported to the White Pine County Sherriff and the Bomb Disposal Unit from the Elko Police Department disposed of hazardous dynamite. Vandals breached two wildlife gates in other mines; these were repaired and strengthened to hopefully avoid another breach. Both of these mines have previously been documented to have bad air and were a high priority for us to address.

Throughout the state, Wildlife Diversity staff are conducting aerial surveys for stick nest features in aspen habitats for nesting raptors, particularly Northern Goshawks. In the Eastern Region, five days of flights surveyed seven mountain ranges in Elko and White Pine Counties. During the flights 247 stick nest in trees, 42 active raptor nests and 90 raptors were observed on the flights.

Golden Eagles are again being monitored and outfitted with satellite tracking transmitters. Three new transmitters have been deployed on nestlings, four nest cameras have been installed, and five nestlings were banded in Lincoln County. We are now actively monitoring 11 territories for breeding activity and nesting success in Dry Lake Valley in anticipation of renewable energy development projects.

Other survey activities underway include surveys for secretive marsh birds in the southern region, water birds and shorebirds in the western region, spotted frog egg mass surveys, Gila monster radio-tracking, and peregrine falcon occupancy/breeding attempts. In the coming months, we will also be surveying for California Spotted Owls, pikas, shrews, and Burrowing Owls.

Finally, in partnership with Conservation Education Division, Diversity will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act that provides critical protection to migrating birds in Mexico, the U.S., Canada, Japan and Russia. We presented at the Wetland Wetbird Coalition in Fallon this past March, and are planning a summers-long event of bird tweets, podcasts, and other educational activities.

The Operations Division's engineering staff is working on a number of key improvements and construction projects, anticipating many will be completed by the end of this calendar year. Key projects include: Renovation of the JOIN office (Job Opportunities in Nevada), located across the parking lot from our Winnemucca office, upon completion this larger office will serve as our new Winnemucca office, with office space shared with NDOT and Division of Water Resources staff. Elko temporary housing for seasonal employees: Housing units have been purchased (trailers) and the engineering design work for the pad site, roadway, handicap parking, utilities, walkway and landscaping is underway. Housing units could be occupied by late summer. Cave Lake Dam – the engineering assessment to determine design alternatives will be done this year, with rehabilitation construction in 2017.
Comins Lake boating improvements – Design work is underway to improve access road and new boat ramp, dock, parking and picnic ramadas. Construction expected to commence this fall. Jiggs–Zunino Dam and Reservoir – Construction on rehabilitation and outlet structure was completed previously. Underway now is the design work for facility amenities, to include boat ramp and dock, road improvements, restrooms and handicap parking. Construction is expected to commence this fall.

Staff is working with the Division Administrators to prepare some high-level goals and objectives to add to the Governor's 2017-2020 Strategic Priorities to represent Wildlife and Boating safety.

NDOW is due for the regularly planned LCB audit, and staff have been working with auditors going over the formation and process of developing policies and procedures, Strategic Plan, and Performance Measures. Performance Measures are included in the Budget Submission and are updated every two years in alignment and under the direction of the Budget Division in the Governor's Office.

Additionally, Director's Office staff is working on budget preparation, compiling biennial performance measure data, and preparing bill draft concepts for approval by the Governor.

<u>Commission Regulations – Adoption – For Possible Action – Public Comment Allowed</u>

25 Commission Regulation 16-12, 2016 Big Game Quotas for the 2016 - 2017 Season – Wildlife Staff Specialists Mike Cox, Cody Schroeder, and Pat Jackson – For Possible Action

Chairman Drew wants the Commission to review each Commission Regulation one hunt at a time, and if there is an opportunity to cluster the hunts he will do that.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson introduced Resident and Nonresident Black Bear Quota – Either Sex – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 6151 and 6251 as well as the harvest objectives for both hunts.

CL: Agreed with the quota, but felt the harvest objective should be raised to 30.
DO: Voted to increase quota to 51, 46 for residents, 5 for non-residents, plus a Governor's Tag.
EU: Increase resident tags by 5 and increase quota by 5.
HU: Supports WA CAB recommendations.
WA: Resident Hunt increase tags from 41 to 47 and Nonresident Hunt increase from 4 to 5.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said the Department feels that the black bear population is growing and we could be issuing more tags, but we are staying in line with what the Black Bear Committee recommended. The quota is staying the same. At the January Commission meeting the season was shortened.

Chairman Drew said the close date was moved from December 31 to December 1 at the season setting meeting.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they had a lot of discussion on this. They passed a recommendation of 47 resident and five nonresident tags. They kept the harvest objective at 20. They had several motions. We are still taking way less than 10 percent of the bears. It is very conservative. They wanted to increase the opportunity without increasing the harvest objective.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they also had significant discussion. There was a split vote. They ended up agreeing with the number to tags, they wanted the take to be increased from 20 to 30 to give more opportunity and there are plenty of bears. The dissenting votes were from members who felt there was no basis for changing the take number because the harvest objective has not ever been met.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, said they supported Washoe CABMW's recommendation.

Bob Cook, Douglas CABMW, said they voted to increase the tag quota to 51. They want to create a Governor's Tag. They want the harvest objective to remain the same.

Public Comment –

Stephanie Myers said yesterday a Commissioner said that he did not believe that there was any project under the predation management plan that animal advocates would like. She suggested that there is no big game hunt that this Commission would not like. The black bear hunt should be banned. It is immoral and a trophy hunt. It is not popular

with the public. Problem bears can be dealt with without hunters. Please make the quota one bear with no females. A mother bear should never be allowed to be killed by hunters. When a mother bear senses a threat she is going to hide her cubs. After the hunter kills the mother bear the cubs will almost certainly die. How can you live with yourselves when you allow this?

Lisa Puleo said that she supports Stephanie Myers' statement. She thinks trophy hunting is immoral. Since Cecil, the public is against trophy hunting. You will see an increase in protesting.

Genelle Richards read a letter:

Nevada Wildlife Commissioners:

NoBearHuntNV.org opposes the NV bear hunt in totality.

In recognition that a 2016 season has been set, we request:
1. Quota of one.
2. Female bears be excluded from the hunt.

Why a quota of one?
The well known bear biologist Dave Garshelis stated, "Despite our rapidly increasing knowledge of black bears, there are few places in the world where we really know how black bear populations are faring. I argue that bear conservation would benefit from highlighting rather than hiding this uncertainty. Assessments of bear populations often are based on records of dead animals and trends in habitat availability. These data produce dubious indications of population trend. Case studies relating to the trade in bear parts, sport harvests, and nuisance kills indicate that records of human-killed bears may not be accurate and may not necessarily reflect changes in population size" (Garshelis 2002).

What do we know about the Nevada bear population?

1. Nevada's bear population is no longer increasing.

The Nevada bear population is no longer increasing in ranges with the highest bear densities- the Sierra, Pine Nut, and Virginia Ranges. As estimated in the 2015 big game status report, the Nevada bear population was 456 +/- 39 in 2011. A more recent estimate of 445 +/- 14 was given for 2014. It would be irresponsible to assume that the bear population was increasing in other less habitable mountain ranges when it is at best stable in ranges with better bear habitat. The bear is one of the slowest reproducing mammals, second only to the musk-ox. Nevada does not have calculated densities of bears within specific hunt units, possibly resulting in local overharvest. Exploitation of bears in hunt unit 291 has continued to increase. During the last 2 years 23 of 31 bears were killed in the Pine Nut Range, an unconscionable 74%.

2. Drought and fires are negatively impacting the bear habitat.
The drought has resulted in a significant decline in the quality of the bear habitat. Multiple fires involving pinyon pines have worsened this decline. A pinyon pine reduction plan is also underway in the Pine Nut Range. A study in 2012 by Redmond et al. demonstrated a 40% decline in pinyon pine seed cone production from 1974 to 2008 in New Mexico. The decline was most pronounced in areas of greatest warming. This suggests that seed cone production will become a future bottleneck for regeneration and will result in a decline in wildlife species that rely on them. According to a couple of companies who collect and sell pine nuts, the pine nut crops have been poor in Nevada (Liston Pine Nuts and Wholesale Pine Nuts). The National Climate Data Center reports a continuing trend of rising average temperatures for the state of Nevada.

3. Harvest data, especially when sample size is limited, may not accurately reflect the bear population.
It is inherently risky to hunt small populations of carnivores, a fact that is well known in the scientific literature. Typically age-sex harvest data is used to detect a severe population decline without an in-depth analysis. Many studies have found harvest data to be misleading (Caughley 1974, Bunnell and Tait 1981, Garshelis 1991, Clark 1999). Age-sex structures of a declining population may be the same as an increasing population. Additionally, there can be a delay between a decline and evidence on harvest data (Harris 1984). Due to the small sample size of Nevada's harvest data, the matrix currently used by NDOW to determine viability of the bear population, although interesting to look at, does not tell us anything of statistical significance. Harris et al. determined that only by comparing severely overharvested populations of grizzly bears with equilibrated populations could the probability of detecting a significant population decline be raised to greater than 60% with a sample size of 72-153 animals.

4. Hunter selectivity can have broad implications.
Implications of hunter selectivity may be greater in small populations of carnivores. To paraphrase Milner et al., hunters tend to prefer a larger body size and greater trophy value. Selective harvesting can destabilize social structures and the dominance hierarchy. There may be loss of social knowledge, increased infanticide, and habitat changes among reproductive females. A common feature of these mechanisms is that they can ultimately depress recruitment and in extreme cases result in total reproductive collapse.

Chairman Drew said that her time is up and the Commission received the letter she is reading (exhibit file).

Kathryn Bricker said she will make a personal comment in support of No Bear Hunt NV's position to exclude female bears from the hunt. No Bear Hunt NV has long argued that a deficiency of the current bear management system is its failure to recognize and protect the dynamics of the developmental history of mother and cubs. At the time of the hunt, while approximately 50 percent of the cubs might be weaned, and the mother labeled "dry" in a mortality report, the importance of that mother to her cubs still exists. Researchers agree "Mother bears provision for and protect their cubs until they are 16-

17 months old." The motion to exclude female bears from being hunted failed to advance form Bear Committee by a tie vote of 2 - 2. Proponents of this exclusion argued that the intent of current NAC to protect bear families in light of current research on bear behavior, fails to do so. NAC, as you know, does not allow the killing of a female bear who is accompanied by a cub(s). However, current scientific studies demonstrate mother bears routinely leave their cubs in a safe place while they independently forage for food, et cetera without them. This fact was exemplified in the 2015 hunt, when a hunter harvested a lactating female, who was later shown to have a dependent cub. We have listened to sportsmen claim that using hounds allows them to sex a bear and be selective. Yet despite the use of trail cameras, ATV's, and dogs equipped with GPS tracking collars, in this year's hunt, with a reported ratio of 2:1 males to female bears, six of the 14 bears harvested were female, one lactating, the other five weighing only 150 pounds, one of whom was described as "ribs poking out, stomach sucked up into body cavity, not fat, not good especially for this late in the season." One has to wonder about the population, as these are hardly trophy animals by Boone and Crockett standards. Female bears are the cornerstone of Nevada's small bear population. At the time of the hunt, those of reproductive age are either pregnant or with dependent cubs. Until and unless it can be shown how hunting female bears is helping to protect and conserve Nevada bears, we ask the Commission to exclude female bears from being hunted.

Lloyd Peake said in reviewing the support material for this meeting noted with interest the following statement from Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling as follows, "NDOW is a state agency that must balance the biological needs of wildlife, statutory mandates and social desires of the public." This statement certainly seems consistent with the applicable Public Trust Doctrine and, aspects concerning public opinion are particularly important regarding the black bear hunt in light of the fact that, he thinks it is fair to say, the hunt has, since its inception, been amongst the most controversial and contentious hunts in the history of Nevada. I appreciate the statement given by Mr. Wakeling yesterday to have the human dimensions questions concerning the bear hunt in Nevada possibly included in a broader national survey of public opinion on wildlife issues. However, at this time there is no such data whatsoever in terms of any proposed survey or scientific data to accurately and scientifically assess public perceptions about hunting black bears and the methods of doing so in Nevada. Recall, that this issue has been before this Commission now for over three years but yet here we are about to set a quota for yet another bear hunt without any such information. In light of these circumstances, I respectfully request that the quota for the 2016 black bear hunt be set at one.

Tom Fennell, NBU, said that he does not think anyone in this room ever wants to see black bears go away from the spectrum, and he certainly does not. They do feel that the bear population should be managed objectively. Our black bear population is at an all-time high and bears are expanding numerically and geographically. We are not talking about harvesting an animal that is facing population growth challenges. The Department has one of the longest running black bear studies in the county and he believes that we should listen to these experts. He said they support the quota as proposed.

Don Molde said he could not resist going after NBU suggesting that we should not make an iconic animal out of an ordinary wildlife species when they represent bighorn sheep, which are, of course, the most iconic animal that the Department manages. The fact that the Department feels that the bear population is increasing is meaningless. There is no basis to assume that the population is increasing because of the habitat, the drought, and all suggest otherwise. We are killing more than 10 percent of our bears per year. The most recent population numbers he has seen is around 450 bears and historically the last four years we have been killing 50 bears per year from all mortality sources that the Department lists. Although there is not a comparable number for bears we know with recent mountain lion research that the mountain lion population, a stable population, can sustain a kill rate of more than 11 percent in Colorado or more than 14 percent in Washington and there is no reason to assume bears reproduce more rapidly than mountain lions. In fact, they are probably slower reproducers. We are currently killing over 10 percent of our bear population. There is no reason to assume the population is increasing. Given that the sample size is so small and the bears are killed according to hunter preference and not random it seems it is time to reconsider the matter.

Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation, said they have 300 supporters in Nevada and hopefully growing. They support the request to reduce the black bear quota to one this year. Bear populations are very, very slow to increase. Her organization is concerned about the hunting of large carnivores and large omnivores that are major predators in our ecosystems. Birth rates are low. Mother bears and mother mountain lions spend up to two years with their offspring. She said they are not here objecting to the quota setting or even pretending they are experts in the area of quota setting for many other big game species, prey species that were traditionally prey for not only humans but also for these large predators. There is a difference between trophy hunting and the hunting of other species. They oppose the hunting of bears, cougars, wolves, coyotes and other mammals that serve in the predator role in our ecosystems. Animal advocates are often accused as approaching these issues emotionally and without concern about population management. They are very concerned about population management and if they felt and believed that these populations (bears, mountain lions, etc.) in Nevada were adequate and that the oversite of those populations was given a great deal of concern they would not be standing at the podium. They are literally worried about the populations. Let’s go to a motion. She is emotional when we lose a bear or a mountain lion. Let’s not pretend that emotion does not drive the sport and the trophy hunt because it does. We are all here to hear the views of all of Nevada. Not only those of the hunting community, not only those of the community that believes that animals have rights that extend beyond them being hunted as a trophy animal, and not only to hear the views of scientist that will share facts and figures. There is an emotional, human, psychological, and cultural significant to these decisions. She wants to urge the Commission to consider that potentially the decision to establish a bear hunt in Nevada in the first place was simply a bad decision. It is moving backwards in time. There is not ever going to be a time where there will be a sufficient amount of bears to satisfy the need for someone to want to have a trophy of a bear in their living room that is going to

be able to keep up with the population growth in Nevada. Given the public outcry against this hunt she would urge the Commission to consider potentially seeing us work together to do away with this hunt in future years and setting the quota at one today.

Cathy Smith read a letter: I request that the Commission decrease the bear hunt quota to one. We heard yesterday that the population is increasing at a rate of 6 to 10 percent per year. However, again we are given population estimates in 2011 and 2014 that demonstrate, if accurate, that the population is not increasing at even half of that even when using the lower confidence level in 2011 and the higher confidence level in 2014. If you cannot back into prior year's population estimates or predict future population estimates, what function does calculating lambda serve? The last three bears killed between 11/12/15 and 12/2/15, were small female bears. A bear killed on 11/12/15 was a female weighing 175 pounds. There was a comment that the bear had little fat, so little fat she was almost given a two for condition. The last bear was a small 6 year old female bear weighing 150 pounds. Her condition was rated as a three, average. Here is the description of her condition and I quote, "dry female, not in good shape, ribs poking out, stomach sucked up into body cavity, not fat. Not good especially for this late in the season." Out of the last seven bears killed, five were females weighing an average of 165 pounds. If these hunters could kill a large boar, don't you think they would prefer it? These are small female bears, some of which may have been pregnant, which means they would be entering hibernation at a low weight. Bears lose 15 to 30 percent of their weight during hibernation. If they are lactating weight loss can increase to 40 percent. Low weight bears can and often will lose their pregnancies. These small female bears are being chased by hounds around the pine nuts, adding just one more level of difficulty for survival. 75 percent of the bears killed in the last two hunts were killed in unit 291, a unit that we do not know the density of bears nor the population. A recent talk presented through the wildlife society discussed the problems that can develop when the large boars are killed in an area. Sows will choose the large boars they prefer, but will choose a substandard younger mate who may be related. Without large boars juvenile bears do not disperse normally. I was at in the Washoe CABMW meeting last week while we went over different quotas for each unit involving many different game animals. Many, if not most, other states hunt bears by units as well. Kentucky even mapped the area where the majority of their female bears denned to exclude the area from their hunt. In Nevada, small female bears are being killed. Our state can do better. Please give the bears a break and vote for a quota of one. "Bringing the animals too close and keeping them too distant are equally bias inducing, if what you need to do is see them in true focus." -- Carl Safina. She provided a photo of a bear (exhibit file).

Dan Warren said that the Department has intelligent biologists and is hoping that not everyone thinks we just roll the dice, they have made determinations. He encourages the Commission to approve this science based information and to go along with the recommendations of the biologists.

Rex Flowers is concerned about the quota. He thinks it should be higher. All other game species quotas are set by prior three year averages. The bear hunt has been going on for five years now. We have never met harvest objectives. When you average the last

three years together that is an average of 15 bears per year, 75 percent of what the harvest could be. That equates to a much higher quota, around 60. He is not asking for that but he does ask to support Washoe CABMW. He sent a request for 50 resident tags and five nonresident tags. Please take into consideration that we no longer hunt bears in the last 30 days of the year. There is room to increase the quota without doing damage to the bear population.

Carol-Anne Weed read her statement into the record: I am speaking as a member of the majority of Nevada residents who do not hunt and do not want Nevada's small and declining bear population to be even further decimated with a continuing trophy bear hunt. A 'trophy' bear hunt means killing the biggest and healthiest bears possible for their fur, feet, claws, head and organs. My family, friends and other people with whom I come in contact at events such as Nevada Day, Earth Day, etc. do not understand how this trophy bear hunt can be justified to accommodate a minority of Nevada residents while endangering the sustainability of a declining population to reproduce healthy offspring. This is referred to as 'low genetic diversity because of a small population.' Although black bears typically produce cubs every two years, when their natural foods are scarce during a four year drought such as Nevada is experiencing, it may take three or four years for mothers to build up enough body reserves to be able to produce the next litter. Females especially should never be trophy hunted in a small, let alone a declining population. Even though it is against the law to hunt a "lactating" female, we have an eye-witness account that these females are taken and in one case killed along with her cub. Laws are broken, of this we can always be sure. Females nurture and train their cubs for about two years, and may keep them hidden in a den while foraging for food. A trophy hunter may then guess that this female is available for killing, but they will in reality have just killed a mother and one or two cubs who will not be likely to survive without her. Bears in Nevada are not just trophy hunted, however, they are also in danger of being killed by vehicles and the Nevada Department of Wildlife. The Nevada Department of Wildlife also chooses to kill some bears because human residents make a choice to not behave responsibly in the proper handling of their personal garbage. This available garbage then becomes an attractant to bears who are residents of the same region. These bears could be saved if irresponsible residents who chose to move into bear country were mandated by the Nevada Department of Wildlife to have bear-proof garbage containers the second time their trash attracted a bear, thereby eliminating the need to remove the bear from his historic habitat or finally kill the bear because of repeat offenses encouraged by humans. If there must be a trophy bear hunt to accommodate a minority of hunters, then let it be one bear; one male bear, and zero females. Let's behave responsibility with our black bear community and keep it healthy for future generations to enjoy.

Bobbie McCollum said she is concerned that this Commission will render a decision about the bear quota based on guesses, maybes, and what if's of Nevada's bear population. In the three-year Black Bear Management report, the bear population for the area encompassing the Carson Range, Virginia Range, and Pinenut Mountains was:

- In 2008 - 262 plus or minus 31;
- In 2011 - 456 plus or minus 39; and
- In 2014 - 445 plus or minus 14, which is a decrease in the population from 2011

If you compare the population figures in the three-year report with those reported in the annual Big Game Status Book figures you will see the population numbers are inconsistent. In the 2010-2011 Status Book, the bear population was estimated to be "between 200-300 adult animals at the end of 2008." No population figure was quoted for the year 2010. In the 2011-2012 Status Book, the 2008 population was 253 plus or minus (27) not the 262 plus or minus quoted in the three-year report. Further, the Population Status section of this annual report does not indicate whether that population estimate covers the entire state or a portion of it. In the 2012-2013 Status Book, the bear population in western Nevada was estimated to be 400 to 700. That is an extremely wide range and obviously a guess. It tells the public that the bear population is unknown. In the 2013-2014 Status Book, the 2008 population figure reverts back to the figures quoted in the 3-year report and makes those figures specific to the area encompassing the Carson Range, Virginia Range, and Pinenut Mountains. The statewide bear population was 600 at the end of 2013. Moving on to the 2014-2015 Status Book, the Bear population remained at "600" indicating no increase in the population at the end of 2014. There is a bear management program in place to handle problems and there is not documented increase in the population. There is no reason to continue the bear hunt as in past years. She would support the quota of one.

Carolyn Stark said from the bear status report she read there is an 8 percent growth in the bear population. We might be reaching the maximum population carrying capacity. The Department is doing the most extensive study on the bear population in the U.S. Fifty-five percent of the bears killed last year were in hunt unit 291. If the bears are increasing at 8 percent, why, in 2011, does the study say there were 456 bears and 2014 there were 445 bears, that is not an increase, it is a decrease. Another thing that she does not understand is with the most extensive capture study in the U.S., why is it that the Commissioners and the Department are not asking for bear density populations by unit number and why has that not been provided. The Department has gone on record in the media saying that there are 200 to 300 bears in the Tahoe Basin, which includes the California side. Why can’t the Department break out bear populations by unit number? They are required for all other species that will be discussed today except for bears, why not? Until the bear population densities are reported by unit number she asks that the Commission error on the side of caution for this year. After five years of drought please give the bears a break this year and set the quota at one.

Sean Shea said there are eloquent speakers today. The Department’s research is great. Bear populations are exploding right now in the U.S. and that is positive. He wants to see a healthy population as he goes out looking for bears and would hate to see the population crash.

Jennifer Simeo said she emailed her comments (exhibit file). She wanted to reiterate that she would like the bear quota set at one.

Bob Cook said that hunters are the largest group of conservationist. They value every animal that exists. He said they followed the original recommendation from the Bear Committee, which was done by scientists and biologists. He does not know why they are calling it a trophy hunt. He values all of the opinions. If there is a sick or extremely undernourished bear, he would rather see it taken than one that was healthy and going to reproduce. The Department compromised with No Bear Hunt Nevada and there is no bear hunting allowed on the Tahoe drainage side. He said they still have problem bears in all of the areas at Lake Tahoe, which is where he lives. He said they still hunt everything else there. He would like to talk about opening the Tahoe drainage side back up because it might reduce the human bear conflicts. Hunters know the rules about hunting around personal property. He would like to reconsider it moving forward.

Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, said this hunt is not a biological event, it is a political event. There was no bear hunting in Nevada for some 80 years and then a Wildlife Commission appointed by Governor Gibbons decided it would be a good idea. The public has overwhelmingly opposed this hunt. Nevada has the smallest black bear population in the country. The numbers are debatable, and the sample size of the bears that are killed is so small that there is no statistical significance. This is nothing but a hunter opportunity event. He is not sure that is sufficient enough to trump the public opposition. By the way the public owns these animals. There is no mandate to kill these animals in the law. There is no reason that we have to do this. He is tired of the hunter opportunity. In this case the public has clearly spoken. Dump the bear hunt. He said a quota of one is making sense.

Commissioner Hubbs said her stance has not changed since the season was set. She said this conversation is uncomfortable. She has issues and questions with the way we are managing large predators as game species. It seems to be different than the way we manage for deer and elk. She asked about setting a quota for mountain lions.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling explained the way state wildlife agencies manage the top predators, it is extremely different from ungulates. Ungulate species tend to be much more numerous. The Department is able to conduct surveys and visually observe them. It is more challenging to do so with a predator species or any species that is smaller in numbers. There is a variety of techniques and with the bear populations we manage in Nevada we are affording ourselves two different approaches. One is by looking at the harvest statistics over time. Then try to determine whether the level of exploitation is at a level of which the Department would expect to see that population in decline. There are three parameters the Department looks at within the harvest characteristics. Based on the proportion of adult females and the age of males that are harvested, all those indications are that we are harvesting this population lightly. The other aspect of that is we continue to radio tag and monitor the population. This is a small population. It is important to recognize that Nevada's population is part of the Sierra Nevada population so there is a substantial portion of the population that also occurs within California and extends into Oregon. We are seeing the ebb and flow of population growth. We have deer, elk and migratory birds that move between states and

we have a similar situation with our bear population. When you look at the overall population that is interconnected the estimates are between 10,000 and 15,000 animals. California hunts this population and they annually harvest about 1,000 animals. We are looking at a very small segment of the population and it is interconnected with a larger area, but we are doing the monitoring and looking at the harvest demographics. Both of those aspects indicate that this is not, at any level, exploitation.

Commissioner Hubbs said this subject is more sociopolitical. She thinks that the Department has stepped on the public toes and the public is letting the Department know that it hurts. She is supporting the public's stance. She hopes that the Commissioners will not increase the numbers at this time. She thinks that will elevate angst.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said there is a Bear Management Plan and the Department would be coming forward with a recommendation to increase tags at this time; however, because of the three year comprehensive review that was submitted to the legislature by the Bear Committee and approved by the Commission, the recommendations were that everything be held static. The Department is hoping, through the Harvest Guidelines process, to get the Commission to reaffirm or provide new direction to the Department. The recommendation today is consistent with the three year comprehensive review.

Chairman Drew said he is a proponent of keeping things static because this is a new hunt and because of the sensitivity on all sides of this. He said if there would have been a huge drop off in the population or a huge increase in take of female bears he would have raised a red flag and had no issue with cutting quotas or seasons. He sees the argument for increasing the quota based on the fact that one month has been removed from the season and based on the fact that we have never reached the objective of 20. His personal concern is we get to a point where there is a heavy focus in harvest in Unit 291. He said when we started the bear hunt there was a female quota of six statewide. The concern with that is a lot of the harvest took place early in the hunt and the thought was that tag holders were concerned that we were going to reach the quota of six and the season would be shut down. In 2012, they removed the statewide female quota and it worked, only one female was harvested in 2012, and four in 2013. In the last two years that approach has not worked. In 2014 there were six harvested and in 2015 there were also six harvested. One strategy that Nevada has not tried, but other states have is setting female harvest objectives by unit. He would like to Department to explore this. He thinks the concern will still be there for tag holders being less selective with what they harvest. He understands, but at the same time it will be a safety valve to make sure we do not have an overharvest female bears in any one unit. He explained his concept. The Department has not recommended that strategy but without a strategy and safety valve he is not comfortable increasing quotas. He would like to see the Department seriously consider that approach next year. Today he would like to stay static.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said the suggestion to use a harvest limit within specific units is a strategy that was employed by Arizona. There is an analysis that he has recently completed. He is not sure he is prepared to respond, but he will prepare a response to the Commission and include it as part of the Harvest Guidelines.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the mountain lion quota.

Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling said yes, there is a harvest limit established for mountain lion. It is part of the season setting that occurred back in January. It is established on a regional basis. According to NAC, the Commission must establish that quota. Currently, the Department is looking at harvest characteristics of the mountain lion population as well. Mountain lion populations are much more ubiquitous than the bear population and less sensitive. Based on the level of removal and the harvest characteristics the Department has seen there is no indication that the mountain lion population is being overexploited at this point.

Commissioner Hubbs said there was mention in the Eastern U.S. where they were taking smaller cats and they were unsure as to why. She said she was thinking they were being overharvested in the east. She did not see the quota of mountain lions in the status book.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said the Commission establishes lion quotas at its first meeting of the calendar year.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if the only way to hunt a bear is with a dog. She knows the use of the dogs really disturbs the general public.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said no, it is not the only way to hunt bears. In a lot of other states the more common way to hunt bears is to sit and blow a call; also, spotting, stalking, et cetera. There are a lot of different approaches to how bears maybe hunted. There are other options.

Commissioner McNinch said he has made his stance clear over the past few years. The further down the path we go the more this hunt becomes a liability. There are a lot of unanswered questions in his mind. He has a lot faith in the Department's biologists. The nature of the beast is that a lot of the science associated with predators in general is challenging and subjective. He understands the concept of being conservative, but we are dealing with small sample sizes. He is not convinced that we can detect a significant change in the population. He is frustrated with the suggestions of raising the quotas. He would like to know what science that is based on. He is concerned about the female take and he has expressed his concerns about the hunt units. He has concerns with the methods of hunt. He will not be in support of a bear quota today. The social side is weighing more on him. There are bigger things to pursue.

Commissioner Johnston went through a few points. There was a suggestion that there is no hunt that this Commission would not approve and that is a false statement. They have taken time to look at seasons for the bear hunt and they have done the same with respect to elk seasons. He said they painstakingly go through the quotas as they will today. The suggestion that this Commission will approve any hunt without limitation is false. Some of the public comments seem to suggest that Nevada's an outlier because it has a bear hunt. Bear hunting occurs throughout the United States, in Canada, and throughout the world. The notion that Nevada is out there by itself with this hunt is not true and we have limitations. He said he has never applied for the tag. In some states and Canadian provinces, you can bait bears, but not in Nevada. We have limitations that do not exist in other areas. He would never apply for a bear hunt in Nevada because he is not interested in it. Just because he is not interested does not mean that he is opposed. He had the opportunity to hunt in Alaska last November and one of the neatest things about the deer hunt was being able to see bears on a daily basis. When he looks at the numbers and hears from the CABMWs and other groups, 2,339 people applied for this hunt last year, so there is support for it. The public is not overwhelming opposed to the bear hunt. There have been comments about the amount of harvest in the Pinenut Mountains, but yesterday Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling said even with the number harvested in the Pinenut Mountain the harvest is light compared to the population numbers. The Department presented that the harvest was light and the population continues to grow. The hunt is not having an impact on the population growth. This is one of the most studies black bear populations in the country. The Department is doing the studies and the studies were occurring before the hunt existed. He fears that if the hunt is ended, will the sportsmen continue to support the Departments extensive studies of the black bear population in Nevada? The Department relies on sportsmen's revenue to operate. He believes that conservation through hunting occurs not only in the United States but throughout the World. He has had the opportunity and privilege to experience it and see it with his own eyes. He has the confidence that if this is the most studied population and the Department is saying that these quota numbers and harvest objectives will not negatively impact the black bear population in Nevada, he accepts that. The presentation from the Department yesterday was great. Because of the public reaction to the CABMWs requesting an increase in the quota, he is going to stick with the harvest objectives and quota as presented by the Department.

Commissioner Wallace said Commissioner Johnston covered it well, and he is in support of the Department and using their biology and presentation yesterday. He is not going to entertain an increase in the quota. It is set very conservatively.

Commissioner Hubbs has been in the community talking to people more and she found out that many people do not know the bear hunt exists, and they are appalled.

Chairman Drew said Nevada is not on an island with having a bear hunt. Other states and counties do too and they are controversial as well.

Commissioner Hubbs said she understands that. She has talked to outdoors people and they are aware of the ungulate hunting in Nevada. They cannot believe the bear hunt exists.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT BLACK BEAR, EITHER SEX, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 6151, 6251 AND THE HARVEST OBJECTIVES FOR BOTH AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner McNinch will not be supporting the motion. He does respect the Department's biologists. He would like to see more information. He is not comfortable moving forward today. He would like to see the quota set at one.

Commissioner Hubbs will not be supporting the motion either. She would like to reduce or eliminate the take of females or the use of dogs.

THE MOTION CARRIED 4 - 2. COMMISSIONERS HUBBS AND MCNINCH OPPOSED THE MOTION. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Antelope – Horns longer than ears – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2151. The Department will support the change from Mineral CABMW.

MI: Unit 205-208 no reduction, keep at 25.

CABMW Comment –

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said that Unit 205 - 208 is a really large area. The antelope are all over out there. It is hunter opportunity, so they wanted to keep the quota at 25 in Unit 205-208.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they approved all of the quota recommendations for all of the antelope hunts.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS LONGER THAN EARS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 2151 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH ONCE CHANGE: UNITS 205-208 THE QUOTA WILL BE 25 AS REQUESTED BY MINERAL CABMW. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Antelope – Horns longer than ears – Muzzleloader Hunt 2171 and Resident Antelope – Horns longer than ears – Archery Hunt 2161. There were not any alternate recommendations from the CABMWs.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS LONGER THAN EARS, MUZZLELOADER HUNT 2171 AND RESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS LONGER THAN EARS, ARCHERY HUNT 2161 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Antelope – Horns shorter than ears – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 2181. He said the alternate recommendations are not huge differences.

EL: Amend Units 101-104, 108-109, 114B quotas from 110 to 90 tags.
PE: Quota should remain at 40.

CABMW Comment –

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, explained the reason for the requested change in the recommendation.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, explained the reason for the requested change in the recommendation.

Public Comment – None

Commissioner Johnston asked about the changes with Elko CABMW and Pershing CABMW. Does the Department have an objection to the alternate recommendations?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said his answer is applicable for all of the recommendations. The Department looked at their information and objectives and felt that these quotas would do whatever needed to happen; whether it be a higher buck ratio or lower because of impacts from the drought or depredation on alfalfa fields. The Department is always giving and taking. They would not have come up with it if they didn't think it was a reasonable quota.

Commissioner Johnston asked his question again.

Commissioner Hubbs clarified.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said wildlife management is not physics. There is not an exact formula. There is variance around every single aspect. He will let the Commission know if there will be a catastrophic event.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if the Department is fine with the small changes.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes, they are reasonable.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS SHORTER THAN EARS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 2181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE REQUESTED CHANGES FROM PERSHING CABMW, UNITS 041 & 042 A QUOTA OF 40 AND ELKO CABMW, UNITS 101-104, 108, 109, 144[B] A QUOTA OF 90. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Nonresident Antelope – Horns longer than ears – Any legal Weapon Hunt 2251 and Nonresident Antelope – Horns longer than ears – Archery Hunt 2261. He said the 5 tags that were added to Hunt 2151 they do not bump the fraction up at all, it would still be 10 percent if we made no change.

MI: No reduction in Units 205-208, recommend 3, same as 2015.

CABMW Comment –

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said they did not have a problem with the reduction, they just felt that since they were able to acquire the increase for the resident that they should treat the nonresident the same.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE NONRESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS LONGER THAN EARS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 2251 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH ONE CHANGE FROM MINERAL CABMW: UNITS 205-208 A QUOTA OF THREE, AND NONRESIDENT ANTELOPE, HORNS LONGER THAN EARS, ARCHERY HUNT 2261 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep – Any Ram – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3151 and Nonresident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep – Any Ram – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3251. Nye CABMW requested changes. The Department has been consistent with those units. The average age in those units are above six years old. It is a remnant herd that has small bases. He is not sure if trying to increase the average age is going to increase the score. The Department is

following the statewide management plan in terms of setting quotas at 8 percent of the total rams not to exceed 50 percent of the mature rams, six years or older.

NY: Unit 211 - 7 tags; Unit 212 Early - 8 tags; Unit 212 Late - 7 tags; Unit 213 - 10 tags. These quotas will allow more rams to reach the 8-10 year old range, a requirement for harvesting a quality ram from these herds.
NY: Unit 213 - 2 tags; see above explanation for Hunt 3151.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the bighorn sheep. She wants to know what the plan says regarding the disease. Are the areas modified in terms of the quota?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said it depends on what it does to the herd. It depends if there are effects on the adult males and females. The Department will do their best to account for the impacts to the herds in the estimate. Disease does exist within all three herds, so buyer beware. They do take into account the effects on the herds. It reflects all of the information the Department has to date. The Department is comfortable that they have accounted for all the different mortality factors that could affect the mature rams.

Commissioner Wallace asked about splitting Units 211 and 213 with an early season and a late season as the Department did with Unit 212. It seems like a lot of tags in one area.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said he asked the biologists if there were complaints about congestion because they would say so, the Department is open to the splits. Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said he would like to discuss the herds that have ewe hunts. There is a similar issue with elk. When you harvest so many females you get an imbalance of males to females. The Department has discussed the need to look at specific ram ratios. The total number of rams is going to increase. The 2, 3, and 4 year old rams are the ones that go on walkabouts, primarily. This may increase the probability of disease transmission.

Chairman Drew said that is his concern. He spent 20 days or more in the field in Unit 268. He thinks we are falling victim to some of our own conservatism. He understands that we have a high ratio, but when he does the math, we have somewhere in the neighborhood for 250 rams and 89 lambs observed in the unit. There is a unit where there is concern over resource allocation. This year is drastically different than years in the past. He still looks at 250 disease vectors running around in a unit where there is a resource concern. There is recommendation to drop the quota from 25 to 23. He said they can look at the social aspect and say there was concern with hunter congestion, which may be true for 20 percent of the unit. In 20 days, he said he only ran into one other hunter. His concern is he thinks we have a resource and we are well under what we could be issuing in terms of tags per the management plan and we have a world class opportunity. The hunt opportunity is unbelievable; he cannot even put it into words.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the population becoming sick, and what about the individuals who drew a tag for that area.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said in the past the Department let it ride and apologized.

Chairman Drew said there is an option to return a tag too.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes, and it does provide a huge out for the tag holder.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the alternative recommendations from Nye CABMW. Their goal is to harvest more quality rams from those herds in those units and they think that reducing the quota is going to achieve that by increasing age and quality. You said reducing the tag numbers as proposed by Nye CABMW might not be consistent with the objective they are trying to achieve.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said if you reduce harvest you will have older age rams, just like with elk and deer. He said the Department is following the formulas in the statewide plan.

Chairman Drew asked about the parameters in the statewide plan.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said there is a model that estimates the age structure of each herd. They are estimating the number of rams in each age class. The criteria in the management plan says, based on population estimates, the tag recommendations should be based on 8 percent of the total rams that are estimated, yearling and older, and it should not exceed 50 percent of the 6-years-old and older rams that are estimated in the population. If the Department happens to have a hole in lamb recruitment years ago and a lot of mature rams are missing, the amount of tags could be lowered because there are not as many mature rams as normal.

Chairman Drew asked about the 8 percent, is that the recommended harvest or quota?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said the Department assumes 100 percent success. Typically 50 percent of the mature rams are less than 8 percent of the total.

Chairman Drew said we are actually close to the guidelines for Unit 268.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said Unit 268 could handle three or four more tags.

Secretary Wasley asked Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox about the ewe hunt compared to the elk hunt. One of the challenges with elk is that the Department has population objectives and a state elk plan that describes a range of bull ratios and there are challenges with keeping those populations within those ratios. The way the Department is managing elk is by monitoring the bull ratios. With the ram quotas being

driven by absolute value of rams independent of the ratio, it is a little bit different. Are you anticipating a density dependence response with having more rams in the populations? What are the similarities or comparison with setting a bull quota versus a ewe quota?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said there is not antler breakage on horns. He thinks when you have an unbalanced number of rams relative to the social structure and the breeding systems that bighorns have we are probably going to start to see some more pioneering and dispersal of rams. That is probably why we are seeing bulls in Area 10. There are elk herds to the north and east of Area 10. Bulls cannot compete during the rut and it might be the same thing with rams. The Department's biggest concern is dispersal of rams from the metapopulation that do have disease. Even though a herd has been exposed to a certain strain they may be doing very well today, but if they get a second or third strain it can have totally different impacts on a herd. The concern is having an excessive number of rams relative to the base population of ewes and having them not be able to participate in the rut. They may seek out other ewe populations 30, 40, 50 plus miles away and potentially sharing their disease to a heard that is potentially clean.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they agreed with the Department.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they agreed with the Department. Three members are also on the Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep and they agreed on the quotas too.

Public Comment –

Mel Belding said he agrees with Chairman Drew and disagrees with Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox on the wandering of the rams. He talked about a study that was conducted by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). He spoke about a 9-year-old ram that was part of the study and wandered the most. Unit 181 has opportunity too.

Chairman Drew said there are also six specialty tags.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the dispersal and the age group. She heard that the male species are tending to disperse if they feel they are not able to mate. That might be the driving force versus their age.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes, the Department is guessing that. It could be resource availably too. He provided an example.

Commissioner McNinch asked about Unit 268. Can it handle a few more tags?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes, there would not be a deleterious effect. He said the maximum would be 30 total. Right now we are at 27.

Commissioner McNinch asked if 26 tags for residents would be reasonable.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes, the Department knows there will be some specialty tags that will go into Unit 268.

Chairman Drew said it was his personal view from spending time in the area. He respects the area biologists too. He does not want his personal opinion trumping the process. He thinks the Department is being over conservative and in doing that we are removing a really unique and once in a lifetime opportunity.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said with the check-ins of the rams there has been frustration with some of the wilderness areas. They are hard to get to areas.

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT NELSON (DESERT) BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY RAM, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 3151 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH A CHANGE TO UNIT 268: CHANGING THE QUOTA FROM 23 TO 26 AND NONRESIDENT NELSON (DESERT) BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY RAM, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 3251 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew said that motion does not include the recommended changes by Nye CABMW and it would also be in opposition to keeping the status quo as recommended by Clark CABMW in Unit 268.

Commissioner Johnston is going to support the motion with rejecting Nye CABMW's recommendation. After hearing from Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox and talking about a 40 percent decrease in Unit 213 he does not think the alternative recommendation from Nye CABMW is going to fulfill the objective.

MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep – Any Ewe – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3181. Nonresident Nelson (Desert) Bighorn Sheep – Any Ewe - Any Legal Weapon Hunt 3281. There were no alternative recommendations from the CABMWs. The tag quotas are 10 percent.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment –

Mel Belding said he is against the ewe hunt and has been since it was adopted. We should trap and transplant these animals and not kill them.

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT NELSON (DESERT) BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY EWE, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 3181 AND NONRESIDENT NELSON (DESERT) BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY EWE, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 3281 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident California Bighorn Sheep – Any Ram – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 8151, Resident California Bighorn Sheep – Any Ewe – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 8181, Nonresident California Bighorn Sheep – Any Ram – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 8251. There was an alternate recommendation from Lander CABMW reducing the ewe tags from 10 to 5. Utah will receive ewe and ram bighorns from us from the Muddies this fall, so the Department took that into account. It will occur after the season. They will utilize some of the ewes that are harvested for disease surveillance.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about trapping and transplanting. She is trying to understand why we are concerned about dispersal and the fear of spreading diseases and then we are also transplanting ewes from the same area with the disease to Utah.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said the herd they are looking at is currently disease negative. It is probably the greatest sampled herd in this state. Utah was racking their brains because they want to find a release site that is safe and has limited risk of disease transmission. There are internal protocols. They are willing to move sheep with a like strain to an area that is low density and have animals with the same strain or no animals. The Department does not want to be spreading different types of strains.

Chairman Drew asked about the Lander CABMW recommendation. Would the Department consider a transplant to the Montana Mountains?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said there is better moisture this year, but the resources are still not where they need to be. There has been overgrazing in that area. Right now and in the foreseeable future the Department does not think there is going to be a big enough change to allow the carrying capacity to allow the bighorn to grow. The Department would like to keep the population around 100 animals.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they approved the hunts as written by the Department. There was a lot of discussion. He said there was one member who did not like the one nonresident tag in Unit 031.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, said they agreed with the Department.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they discussed this and they approved the Department’s recommendations.

Public Comment –

Mel Belding said the quota of 10 ewes should go to Unit 013 for trap and transplant. There has been mountain lion predation in Unit 013. It is the same story in Unit 011. He said we are losing a lot of bighorn sheep. There has been better moisture and habitat this year than in the past. He wants to see the ewes taken to a place where they are badly needed.

Sean Shea asked about a specific unit and why there are no tags. Is it because of the lack of mature rams? He is a taxidermist and had a couple of sheep come in this year. The customers mentioned that they did not have to bring organs out or swab the nasal cavity. He thinks it should be mandatory.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said they are waiting for the rams to mature in the unit. He said the Department does not want to burden the sportsmen too much with the nasal swabs. The Department is rethinking some of the strategies.

Chairman Drew asked about having sufficient source stock outside of Unit 068 that will meet our foreseeable demand for trap and transplant.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said if nothing changes we are looking great. We are going to continue to consider our translocations opportunities. We do not want to put animals right next door to where they were captured and have them go home.

Game Biologist Tom Donham confirmed the recommendation of 10 ewe tags. Knocking it back by five tags would not have huge impact this year, but next year might need a higher quota.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY RAM, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 8151, RESIDENT CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY EWE, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 8181, AND NONRESIDENT CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY RAM, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 8251 AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep – Any Ram – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 9151 and Resident Mountain Goat – Any Goat – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 7151. The CABMWs did not have any alternative recommendations.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they approved the recommendations as written by the Department. The success is bad in Unit 114. Move the hunt later to pull the animals out of the canyons and heavy trees.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, said they discussed Unit 114 with the Ely biologist and his intent is the split the hunt next year to try to get the sheep where someone can actually kill them. They support the recommendation.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they supported all of the recommendations.

Public Comment – None

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the population decreasing.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said there has been a decline since the disease event. He is taking all of the herds together, but if you were to dissect out each herd, there is a little bit of a dichotomy in a different direction the herds are going. There still is not a hunt in Units 101 and 102. The population in there is doing well. We have mature rams in there and that is why the Department is looking for an increase in tags. Sometimes it takes five years to gather information. The Department overestimated the loss of mountain goats.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP, ANY RAM, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 9151 AND RESIDENT MOUNTAIN GOAT, ANY GOAT, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 7151 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlered – Any Legal Weapon Depredation Hunt 4102 and Resident Elk Antlerless – Any Legal Weapon Depredation Hunt 4107. There were no alternative recommendations on either hunt.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, ANY LEGAL WEAPON DEPREDATION HUNT 4102 AND RESIDENT ELK ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON DEPREDATION HUNT 4107 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlered – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4151. Alternative language was provided from Elko CABMW, Lincoln CABMW and White Pine CABMW.

EL: Units 076-077, 079, 081 - Early 95 tags and Late 90 tags.
LI: Unit 231 Late; 60 tags.

WP: Unit 111-115 Early 115 tags and Late 105 tags, Unit 221-223 Early 80 tags and Late 75 tags.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said in Unit 076 we are still trying to reduce that herd. There are a disproportionate number of bulls as we harvest a tremendous number of cows out of the herd. There is concern about average age and bull quality. The Department is making a commensurate bull quota in relation to the cows. This is the venue to talk about the social aspect of those population objectives and how it affects the bull quality. The Department does realize average age and the other metrics in Unit 076 are not stellar. In Unit 231 there will be movement between the weapon classes.

Chairman Drew asked about reallocation between weapon groups.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said it was a 3-2 vote. It was a heated discussion.

Chairman Drew asked if the spike tags were raised.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said yes.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, said they moved some tags into the muzzleloader hunt and archery hunt. They want to eliminate hunter congestion on the rifle hunt.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said they wanted to line it up with the early hunt. It is a slight increase from last year.

Bob Cook, Douglas CABMW, said to add deer and elk tags in Unit 081.

Chairman Drew said we cannot do that today because it is part of season setting.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4151 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE CHANGES PRESENTED BY THE ELKO CABMW: UNITS 076-077, 079, 081 EARLY 95 TAGS AND LATE 90 TAGS; LINCOLN CABMW: UNIT 231 LATE 60 TAGS; AND WHITE PINE CABMW: UNIT 111-115 EARLY 115 TAGS AND LATE 105 TAGS, UNIT 221-223 EARLY 80 TAGS AND LATE 75 TAGS. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Johnston said that he wanted to go with the CABMWs on this hunt because the Department did not seem to have any issues.

THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlerless Elk Management – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4481 – Option for Antlered Elk Hunt 4151.

CC: Suggest assigning 1,900 elk to Idaho and no longer include them in Nevada population. Recommend coordination with Idaho on these hunts.
DO: Recommends deer/elk tags in Unit 081.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said Carson CABMW had a comment and you already heard from Douglas CABMW about considering next year some cow management tags with the deer hunt and the bull hunt.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS ELK MANAGEMENT, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4481, OPTION FOR ANTLERED ELK HUNT 4151 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlered – Muzzleloader Hunt 4156 and Resident Elk – Antlered – Archery Hunt 4161. He asked for a compromise since the Commission accepted Elko CABMW's rifle tag reductions. Please keep 20 muzzleloader tags in Units 076-077, 079, 081 instead of dropping it to 15 tags as Elko CABMW is requesting now. Possibly throw a few more tags in Unit 231 to offset the five tags. White Pine CABMW for Hunt 4156 recommended increasing tags to offset some that were lowered in the rifle hunt, Units 111-115 change it from 15 to 30 tags, in Units 221-223 change it from 15 to 20 tags and in Units 104, 108, 121 change it from three to eight tags. Nye CABMW wants to reduce the muzzleloader rut hunt from 15 to 10 tags.

White Pine CABMW also has some adjustments to Hunt 4161. They are doing some weapon class shifting. They want an increase in the muzzleloader class and a reduction in the archery class. They would like to raise Units 111-115 from 30 to 35 tags and raise Units 221-223 from 25 to 30 tags.

EL: Units 076-077, 079, 081 - 15 tags.
NY: Unit 161-164, 171-173 - 10 tags. It is a rut hunt and will be 100 percent success even though it is a muzzleloader hunt.

Commissioner Wallace asked if the Department had a conflict with the Nye CABMW adjustment.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said 10 to 12 tags was common but things are doing well in central Nevada. It will be close to 100 percent success. He thinks the herd can support an extra five tags.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they wanted to cut to 15 tags for elk quality.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, apologized for not having their recommendations in on time. He reviewed their requested changes. They are moving tags around to different weapon classes. The total quota stayed the same.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said 12 tags would be good on Hunt 4156 in Unit 231.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said on Hunt 4161 for Units 076, 077, 079, 081 the quota is 40.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, MUZZLELOADER HUNT 4156 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH CHANGES FROM WHITE PINE CABMW: UNITS 104, 108, 121 FROM 3 TO 8 TAGS, UNITS 111-115 FROM 15 TO 30 TAGS, UNITS 221-223 FROM 15 TO 20 TAGS, AND FROM LINCOLN CABMW: UNIT 231 FROM 8 TO 12 TAGS AND RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, ARCHERY HUNT 4161 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: UNITS 076, 077, 079, 081: 40 TAGS AS WELL WAS THE FOLLOWING CHANGES FROM WHITE PINE CABMW: UNITS 104, 108, 121 FROM 15 TO 10 TAGS, UNITS 111-115 FROM 30 TO 35 TAGS AND UNIT 221-223 FROM 25 TO 30 TAGS. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew said the CABMW recommendations that were not approved were two recommendations from the Elko CABMW. He said he understands the quality argument and knows 5 tags probably will not make or break us. They are trying to make sure the overall quotas are not cut too much.

THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Spike – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4651. He said Elko CABMW requested the 076 Unit group go back to the 2015 quotas, which were higher than what is being recommended this year. The Department wants to reduce the spike tags a bit and increase the bull tags. Elko CABMW reduced the bull tags and would like to see the spike tags back up.

Chairman Drew said bull quotas are very close to what was recommended overall.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they would like to use the 2015 quotas on this hunt for bull quality.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, SPIKE, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4651 AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE ELKO CABMW: UNIT GROUP 076 REMAIN AT 20 TAGS EACH. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlerless – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4181 and Resident Elk – Antlerless – Any Legal weapon Hunt 4181 – Wilderness Only. Elko CABMW has recommendations. Elko CABMW recommended Units 061, 071 cow rifle tags as the Department recommended this year, but they would like to go back to the 2015 quota in all other Unit Groups in Elko County. He stepped through the changes. The deer hunts start on October 5 and that has been a problem of hunter congestion.

CL: Recommends Junior Elk Hunt to increase youth hunting opportunities.
EL: Units 061, 071 Early, Mid and Late seasons to 2016 quota recommendations and remaining Elko County units to 2015 quota recommendations.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the aerial surveys. Was there more or less elk?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said some of that is survey effort. The primary goal from the survey is a calf ratio. It is not necessarily if we survey fewer animals there is less in the herd. It is just that we didn't find the entire group or we only flew 60 or 70 percent of what we flew the year before. It is the calf recruitment value which is the primary metric the Department wants to get out of the surveys which drives the population model. We had a fairly high cow harvest last year in most unit groups in Elko County so the Department started moving the populations lower, but not below the population objectives. We still need to put a lot of pressure on the cows. Getting back to October 5, please consider putting tags in before October 5 or in the November-January periods so there is not a ton of hunter congestion.

Commissioner Hubbs said there are a lot of changes that she is not aware of because she does not know the specific location. If they want to revert back to the 2015 quota it would increase the number harvested overall.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes, except the Department did shift some tag quotas out of the October 5 period.

Chairman Drew asked to skip Resident Elk – Antlerless – Any Legal weapon Hunt 4181 – Wilderness Only for right now and just handle these changes.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said some members wanted more elk. He explained the changes. They would put more cows on the ground.

Chairman Drew asked about October 5 and if there was and discussion.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said that was brought up. There has been hunter congestion.

Commissioner Mori said during the Elko CABMW meeting everything did get confusing. If you go to the Resident Elk, Antlerless Elk Management Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4481 and you look at the quota recommendations from the Department in Unit Group 061, 062, 064, 066-068 Early, they doubled the tag quota from 575 to 1,150. In doubling that, the success rate for the hunt was 10 percent and 8 percent respectfully. The success rate of the harvest in Unit Group 062-68 cow hunts were from 21, 27, and 29 percent on the early, mid, and late. The mindset was that in transferring all of those tags with the lower success rate may not be successful and to continuing to reduce the population. As far as the congestion issue, at 10 percent and 8 percent success is the 50 tag difference in the October 5 through October 20 going to create more congestion or is doubling the tags going to continue the congestion?

Public Comment – None

Game Biologist Tom Donham explained the Department's recommendation. The population estimates were 1,200 last year and it is 850 this year. They are still trying to shoot close to the same proportion of that herd because it is a smaller herd and still continue moving towards the population objective. Whether it is last year's quota or this year's quota he doubts that we are going to get to the population objective in one year. It was agreed upon informally that the reduction to the population objective would be done over several years instead of trying to take it all at once. The biggest concern that the Department had with the Elko CABMW going back to the 2015 quotas was Unit Group 072-075 late hunt. The biologist was trying to remove some tags from some of the less successful hunts and move some of them into more successful hunts. The biologist was targeting 32 percent cow kill and with this year's recommendations she was trying for a 35 percent cow kill. It will result in fewer dead elk on the ground, but not as much as it looks.

Commissioner Mori asked about the estimated population of 800.

Game Biologist Tom Donham said the actual population estimate was 825, but the Department rounded up to 850.

Commissioner Mori said there was a group of 175 that spent 47 percent of the time in Idaho. That equates to 85 head of elk that would spend 100 percent of the time in Nevada.

Game Biologist Tom Donham said yes, you can look at it that way.

Commissioner Mori said the 850 population should be 900 or so.

Game Biologist Tom Donham the collar data takes that into account. The 850 is the population estimate after everything is considered.

Commissioner Mori said 800 or more were classified.

Game Biologist Tom Donham said some were in Idaho. They wanted to alleviate some of the hunter congestion.

COMMISSIONER HUBBS MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. THE MOTION DIED. THERE WAS NO SECOND.

Commissioner McNinch asked what the concerns are if the Commission adopted Elko CABMWs suggested changes.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said they have to balance the lack of meeting the population objectives and the hunter congestion. They are trying to minimize the unhappiness of the hunters. He wants to compromise. He explained the population objectives.

Commissioner McNinch said this would help with hunter congestion. He asked about the Elko CABMWs need and desire in getting to the ultimate goal.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said personally he wanted to stay with the Department, the other members wanted to go faster.

Commissioner McNinch said he gets it. He understands the faster pace. Some are miniscule.

Chairman Drew asked if it was a 4-1 vote.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said yes.

Game Biologist Tom Donham clarified that it would be two years to get to the population objective, maybe three years.

Commissioner McNinch is trending towards the Department's recommendation simply because of hunter congestion.

Chairman Drew said he appreciates the Department and Commissioner Mori.

Commissioner Mori said he understands that the congestion throws a snag in things. Put more tags in the higher success hunts, that is what this plan does. He thinks the area biologist is excellent. They have different ideas. He does not want to make an issue of it, but he does believe, for landowners, there is a difference is getting there in five years or three years.

Commissioner McNinch said he understands. He does not think we will get there any quicker going this route.

Commissioner Mori said he is not going to make the motion because he proposed this to the Elko CABMW. If the Commission rejects the Elko CABMWs recommendation he may or may not agree.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said they looked at the sale of the cow management delk tags last year, but the way people apply, the Department will not sell them all. Cannot use the cow management strategy to offset all of the other reduction in tags.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the delk tags. Not everyone selects the option to get a cow elk tag with their deer tag.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said last year the quota was 575 for cow management and the Department sold 540 tags.

Commissioner Johnston said to bump up the cow elk tags in the cow hunt to achieve the management level that the Department wants.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said Commissioner Mori is right, even though there is not an extra person with the cow management tag, they probably do spend a few extra days in the field than if they were to kill their buck and go home.

Chairman Drew said he thinks the middle season is the problem.

Commissioner Mori clarified what he thinks Chairman Drew is thinking.

Commissioner Wallace asked about 325 tags on the early season, 20 tags on the mid-season, and 150 tags on the late season.

Chairman Drew said yes, or even 305 tags on the early season, 20 tags on the mid-season, and 200 tags on the late season to make up the extra 50 tags.

Commissioner Mori asked about the other changes Elko CABMW wanted.

Chairman Drew said he does not have a lot of heartburn with their changes other than Units 072-075 because those are challenging units. There are a lot of private land issues.

Commissioner Hubbs clarified what Chairman Drew was thinking.

Commissioner Wallace said he would be happier with 325 tags on the early season.

COMMISSIONER HUBBS MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH TWO CHANGES: UNIT GROUP 062, 064, 066-068 EARLY 225 TAGS TO 325 TAGS AND UNIT GROUP 062, 064, 066-068 LATE 110 TAGS TO 200 TAGS. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew said he understands that Area 7 is more of an allocation. It is not a huge difference unless we have an epic winter.

Commissioner McNinch said he would feel more comfortable with Unit Group 062, 064, 066-068 late being 175 tags. It keeps it closer to the total number under the 2015 quota. He asked about Unit Group 072-072 Late. There is a big difference between 425 and 475.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox explained that the late season is the most successful.

Chairman Drew said when we have a winter the elk come out of the wilderness area and they are more accessible.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said the wilderness hunt was successful.

Chairman Drew asked about Unit 072 Early and Mid. Is some of the calculation about the pressure that we are putting on in the same time period with the wilderness only hunt?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said he doesn't think so. It was a successful wilderness hunt.

Commissioner McNinch asked about Unit 072 Mid. Change it or leave it? He asked for a friendly amendment to the motion. He would like to change Unit 062, 064, 066-068 Late to 175 tags.

COMMISSIONER HUBBS AMENDED THE MOTION TO CHANGE UNIT GROUP 062, 064, 066-068 LATE 110 TAGS TO 175 TAGS.

Chairman Drew said since Commissioner McNinch seconded the original motion and asked for the amendment, he is not going to ask for a second on the amendment.

Commissioner Mori is fine with that. It is a good compromise.

Commissioner McNinch is still trying to process it.

Commissioner Mori does not like going against the Elko CABMW recommendation. The point was made that the numbers are pretty close.

Chairman Drew said it is more of a shuffle than a significant change. He is supportive of the motion. He reiterated the motion by Commissioner Hubbs with two changes.

THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlerless – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4181 – Wilderness Only. There were not alternative recommendations from the CABMWs.

Chairman Drew asked about the hunter success rate.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox referred to the status book. It was successful.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4181, WILDERNESS ONLY AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlerless Elk Management – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4481 – Option for Mule Deer Hunt 1331.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS ELK MANAGEMENT, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4481 – OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1331 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Resident Elk – Antlerless – Muzzleloader Hunt 4176, Resident Elk – Antlerless Elk Management Muzzleloader Hunt 4476 – Option for Mule Deer Hunt 1371, Resident Elk – Antlerless – Archery Hunt 4111, and Resident Elk – Antlerless Elk Management Archery 4411 – Option for Mule Deer Hunt 1341. He said the only alternative recommendations are for Hunt 4476 Units 101-103 the Department would ask that the quota be 150 tags, which is equal to Hunt 1371 tag quota. In Hunt 4411 Units 101-103 Late the Department would ask for 15 tags, which is equal to Hunt 1341 tag quota. These were also recommended by the Elko CABMW.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they wanted to match the deer tags.

Public Comment - None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS, MUZZLELOADER HUNT 4176 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT, RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS ELK MANAGEMENT MUZZLELOADER HUNT 4476 – OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1371 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH A CHANGE: UNIT GROUP 101-103 REDUCE QUOTA FROM 225 TO 150, RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS, ARCHERY HUNT 4111 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT, AND RESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS ELK MANAGEMENT ARCHERY 4411 – OPTION FOR MULE DEER HUNT 1341 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH ONE CHANGE: UNIT GROUP 101-103 LATE REDUCE QUOTA FROM 20 TO 15. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox introduced Nonresident Elk – Antlered – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 4251, Nonresident Elk – Antlered – Muzzleloader Hunt 4256, Nonresident Elk – Antlered – Archery Hunt 4261, and Nonresident Elk – Antlerless – Any Legal Weapon 4281. He explained the changes in order to meet 10 percent of the resident tags.

Hunt 4251: Unit Group 076, 077, 079, 081 Early – 13 tags, Unit Group 111-115 Early – 14 tags, Unit Group 111-115 Late – 9 tags, Unit Group 221-223 Early – 9 tags.

Hunt 4256: Unit Group 111-115 – 3 tags, Unit Group 221-223 – 3 tags, Unit Group 231 – 2 tags.

Hunt 4261: No changes needed.

Chairman Drew asked about Hunt 4281.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said that we never really had a split for Hunt 4281. He said he did bump it up. It is about 8 percent of the total cow rifle tags.

Chairman Drew said it was based on lack of demand.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox said yes. Next year we can add some.

Chairman Drew said the changes are to ensure that we are staying within our 10 percent nonresident allocation.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE NONRESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 4251 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH CHANGES: UNIT GROUP 076, 077, 079, 081 EARLY – 13 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 111-115 EARLY – 14 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 111-115 LATE – 9 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 221-223 EARLY – 9 TAGS. NONRESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, MUZZLELOADER HUNT 4256 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: UNIT GROUP 111-115 – 3 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 221-223 – 3 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 231 – 2 TAGS. APPROVE NONRESIDENT ELK, ANTLERED, ARCHERY HUNT 4261, AND NONRESIDENT ELK, ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON 4281 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Resident Junior Mule Deer – Antlered or Antlerless – Archery, Muzzleloader or Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1107. There were alternative recommended changes by the CABMWs. The Department would agree with the alternate recommendations for the juniors.

CL: The Junior quota should be equal to the number of applicants.
EU: Does not want to see junior opportunities diminished. Give comfortable number of tags, but do not cut youth tags if not necessary.
ST: Stay at 10 tags for Unit 195.
WA: 15 tags for Unit 034 (same as last year).
WP: 170 tags for Unit 111-113.

Chairman Drew said we are 800 tags short between what we are recommending and what the true demand is for 2016.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said that is correct on a total basis; however, on a unit by unit basis there is more demand for some of the areas near Reno and Las Vegas.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about Storey CABMW staying at 10 tags.

Chairman Drew said yes, they want to stay at 10 tags in Unit 195.

CABMW Comment –

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they would like to match the number of kids who apply for a tag with the amount of tags to give them all opportunity. The tags might not be in the unit they wanted. Maybe have a junior hunt with antlerless elk to make up some of the difference.

Chairman Drew said in the past they tried to do that but an 800 tag differential is going to be tough.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, wants to try it in the future with elk and deer.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, asked for Unit 111-113 to be 170 tags. They want to stay consistent with last year.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they wanted to make sure their change was included. They wanted Unit 034 to stay at 15 tags.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER HUBBS MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT JUNIOR MULE DEER, ANTLERED OR ANTLERLESS, ARCHERY, MUZZLELOADER OR ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 1107 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH 3 CHANGES: STOREY CABMW: 10 TAGS FOR UNIT 195, WASHOE CABMW: 15 TAGS FOR UNIT 034, AND WHITE PINE CABMW: 170 TAGS FOR UNIT 111-113. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Hubbs said Clark CABMW's recommendation would be rejected.

Commissioner McNinch said Unit 111-113 concerns him. He wants to widen the gap for the opportunity for the youth. He asked the Department if they are fine with the change.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said the Department would accept either. It was part of the demand success formula.

Chairman Drew said normally he would make an issue out of it, but with an 800 tag gap we are going to be 800 tags short regardless. He said 30 tags are not going to be a make it or break it for him.

THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Resident Mule Deer – Antlerless – Any legal Weapon Depredation Hunt 1101 and Resident Mule Deer – Antlerless – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1181. He said we didn't have any alternate recommendations for Hunt 1102. There were changes for Hunt 1181.

EL: Units 061-064, 066-068 Early; 100 tags. Units 061-062, 064, 066-068 Late; 100 tags. Units 071-079, 091; 75 tags; Units 101-102, 109; 10 tags
PE: Units 043-046; 50 to 25 tags.

He said he does not have a problem with the Pershing CABMW recommendation, but the Elko CABMW recommendation is a fairly significant cut and we are already coming way down on all of them. He would ask that the Commission consider accepting the Department's recommendation on all of the units besides Units 043 - 046.

CABMW Comment –

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, said as long as the Department is fine with 25 tags he is good.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they asked for more cuts. This went back through the same discussion as elk. Deer numbers are down so why kill so many does. They want more deer back. The major cut was in Units 101-102, 109. This area started out at 1,400 tags and the past three years it has been cut because it is an opportunity hunt. The survey this year came back saying that the deer are not there. The Department is now saying it is not an opportunity hunt because the deer are not there anymore.

Public Comment –

Mel Belding said he wants the Commission to go with the CABMW recommendations.

Chairman Drew asked for the Department to explain why we still need those tags. There seem to be significant cuts proposed by the Department from 2015 to 2016. He knows the Department anticipated a good winter kill.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said the Department will accept the Pershing CABMW recommendation. He said Area 6, 7, and 10 are different. The Department needs the hunts in place as a management tool. In Area 6 we have had challenges with carrying capacity, a lot of the winter range has burned up historically, and we have put a lot of money there and we still have issues with habitat. The goal is to keep the population at 10,000. That is what the quotas are designed to do and setting it back that much would put the Department in a hole for next year. There was a significant winter in Elko County and the fawn ratios were low. In terms of doe mortality; we have not seen significant doe loss. Collared animals are out there and we calculated our survival rates and they are within the normal range. There were reports of doe kill in Area 6. The Department adjusted the population model down again for the second year in Area 10.

The number is inconsequential to the actual total population estimate, which is about 16,000. The doe hunts are viewed as opportunity hunts.

Commissioner McNinch said another concern is the health of the does.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said yes, that is where they are at with this hunt.

Commissioner McNinch takes the reduction to mean that the efforts were successful.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said it is also about recruitment for this year because of the poor fawn ratio.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if these areas are contributing to the decline in general.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said yes. Over half of the deer population in Nevada is in those three units. The Department is trying to adjust the models to reflect harvest trends and what they are seeing on survey.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about what the model is doing.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said if recruitment is below average you will have a decreasing population. We have seen a lower number this year. There were other factors added into the model. It is a combination of the poor recruitment and adjustments to the model.

Chairman Drew understands where the Elko CABMW is coming from. He is not sure he can support that drastic of a cut.

Commissioner McNinch said there is always hesitation added with this doe hunt. It is one of the most important things we can do for this herd. We need to have a healthy herd similar to sage-grouse.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON DEPREDATION HUNT 1101 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT AND RESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERLESS, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 1181 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH ONE CHANGE: PERSHING CABMW, UNITS 043-046: 50 TO 25 TAGS. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew said this rejects Elko CABMW's recommendation.

Commissioner Wallace wants to support the Department on this because the numbers have been lowered a lot.

Commissioner Mori attended the Elko CABMW meeting. He is not sure how the Department ends up with the numbers they do. He does think the Department is on the right track with the doe hunts. Maybe it is a matter of the CABMW being in a bigger hurry than the Department. The CABMW has always wanted a lesser harvest. He asked about Units 101, 102, and 109, the tags are going from 1,000 to 200 and that is a drastic change. This year the Department recognized.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder talked about the collars that were being monitored and the pockets of isolated mortality. We have poor fawn recruitment this year. The Department observed 20 fawns per 100 does. We are not recruiting a bunch of fawns and that is why we are coming down.

Commissioner Mori asked if aerial surveys were conducted in Area 10 last spring.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said yes and this spring too. We were seeing an increase in fawn ratios up until this year which was attributed to the heavy winter.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the numbers and why they were down. Was it because of the drought?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said he does not know why the recruitment was down. They think it was the harsh winter.

Chairman Drew said we are talking about modeling with some of these numbers. It does provide some opportunity. It is not jeopardizing our herd by any means and we are already looking at a significant cut. He is comfortable supporting the motion at this point.

THE MOTION CARRIED 6 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Resident Mule Deer – Antlered – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1331. There were several alternate recommendations from the CABMWs. He said the Department did reduce the number of tags 15 to 17 percent. It was to reflect some of the lower numbers seen out on survey.

HU: Unit 035; 50 tags. Units 043-046 Early, Late, 051, 061-068 Early, Late keep at 2015 quota.
LA: Lower to 100 tags.
LI: Units 221-223 Mid hunt; reduce quota to 150.
MI: Units 202, 205-208; increase to 55 tags; same as last year.
NY: Units 251-254; quota of 42 tags. The decrease in tags is due to a decrease in first choice applications last year and not to survey data. These units have had around 40 tags for many years and the CAB wishes it to remain so.
PE: Units 043-046; quota of 150 tags for Early; 50 tags for Late.
ST: Advisory Board would like to stay at 10 tags.

WA: Units 011 – 013 Early from 100 to 69; Units 011 – 013 Late from 25 to 19; Unit 015 from 35 to 30; Unit 033 Late from 15 to 11.

CABMW Comment –

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, said in Unit 043-046 they suggested 150 tags for Early and 50 tags for Late. They do not feel that unit is capable of the Department's recommended amount of deer to be taken. They only classified 330 deer or so. They want the hunt objective to be 35 bucks per 100 does to let the unit grow.

Tom Cassinelli, Humboldt CABMW, asked for a cut in Unit 043 - 046. They used last year's recommendations and they would accept Pershing CABMWs recommendations. He said in Unit 061 - 068 Early and Late to keep the 2015 quotas. He also said in Unit 035 they would like 50 tags instead of 80 tags.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they did not have any problems with what the Department recommended for the Elko County deer tags.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, he said they would like to have an increase; they want what they had last year or even more.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, explained their changes. It is an increase from last year. It is a social problem.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, voted for last year's quota in Unit 221 - 223 Mid, but they are okay with Lincoln CABMWs recommendation of 150 tags. He said for Unit 111-113 Late they would like to change it from 40 to 50 tags. There is an unwritten rule that the late hunts have 10 percent of the tags. Last year they were over that by three. They would like to move 5 tags into the muzzleloader hunt and 5 tags into the archery hunt.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they would like Units 011 – 013 Early from 100 to 69 tags. They want to keep it in line with the junior hunts. He said Units 011 – 013 Late from 25 to 19 tags. He said Unit 015 from 35 to 30 tags. He said Unit 033 Late from 15 to 11 tags. He said they would like the hunt status book to show each species for each unit group.

Public Comment – None

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said there was a recommendation from Lander County, which would set the Department back more. He understands the social component with Lincoln County. In terms of the alternate recommendations, he is concerned about Lander CABMWs recommendation. In terms of Units 221-223 Mid hunt he understands the social component, but there was not the same justification on the early season. We are coming down 25 tags and the buck ratio is starting to creep up in Area 22. The Department observed around 45 bucks per 100 does on survey. All the remaining recommendations he is fine with.

Commissioner Johnston asked about Area 22. There is a decline in the recommended early tags and then a recommended increase for the mid.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said they are simply shifting some from the early to the mid.

Commissioner Johnston asked if it is allocating the hunter across the three seasons.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said yes, it is to spread them out. It is probably not a huge difference.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERED, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 1331 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH CHANGES: WASHOE CABMW: UNIT GROUP 011-013 EARLY 69 TAGS, LATE 19TAGS, UNIT GROUP 015 TO 30 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 033 LATE 11 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 035 TO 50 TAGS; PERSHING CABMW: UNIT GROUP 043-046 TO 150 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 043-046 LATE 50 TAGS; HUMBOLDT CABMW: UNIT 051 TO 250 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 111-113 LATE 40 TAGS; MINERAL CABMW: 202, 205-208 TO 55 TAGS; LINCOLN CABMW: UNIT 221-223 MID 150 TAGS. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew said the only CABMWs not included in the motion was Lander CABMW, Storey CABMW, and Nye CABMW.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder asked if Humboldt CABMW was included.

Chairman Drew said no, it was not included.

Commissioner Hubbs clarified.

Chairman Drew clarified too.

Commissioner Johnston is confused about Storey CABMW's comment. They want to stay at 10 tags. In Unit 195 last year the quota was 20 and that is what was recommended this year.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said that is referring to the junior hunt.

Chairman Drew said Nye CABMW wanted to increase tags.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said that is correct.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON AMENDED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE NYE CABMW CHANGES TO UNIT GROUP 251-254 TO 42 TAGS. COMMISSIONER WALLACE

ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT AS THE SECOND. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Resident Mule Deer – Antlered – Muzzleloader Hunt 1371. There were alternative recommendations from CABMWs. He said the Department does not have a problem with them.

MI: Units 202, 205-208 - 6 tags.
NY: Units 161-164 - 35 tags. The recommended decrease to 25 tags was due to lack of first choice applications last year and the CAB feels it is an anomaly,
PE: Units 043-046 - 15.
WA: Units 011 – 013 from 7 to 5; Unit 015 from 3 to 2.

CABMW Comment –

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said they went with last year's quota of 6 tags, but they would be happy with an increase to 10 tags.

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, said in Units 043-046 the Department was recommending 20 tags and the would like to cut it to 15 tags. It is to stay consistent to what is being recommended in the rifle hunt.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, Unit 011-013 from 7 tags to 2 tags and Unit 033 would go from 4 tags to 3 tags.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, Unit 111-113 from 15 tags to 20 tags.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they are happy with the Department's recommendation.

Public Comment – None

Chairman Drew talked about the Nye CABMW changes.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERED, MUZZLELOADER HUNT 1371 AS PRESENTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: WASHOE CABMW: UNIT 011-013 FROM 7 TO 2 TAGS AND UNIT 033 FROM 4 TO 3 TAGS; PERSHING CABMW: UNITS 043-046 FROM 20 TO 15 TAGS; WHITE PINE CABMW: UNIT 111-113 FROM 15 TO 20 TAGS; NYE CABMW: UNITS 161-164 FROM 25 TO 35 TAGS; MINERAL CABMW: UNITS 202, 205-208 FROM 2 TO 6 TAGS. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Resident Mule Deer – Antlered – Archery Hunt 1341. There were a couple alternative recommendations by the CABMWs and the Department will accept the changes.

PE: Units 043-046 - 90 tags.
WA: Unit 015 from 7 to 4; Unit 033 from 5 to 4.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, they would like Unit 015 to go from 7 tags to 4 tags and Unit 033 from five tags to four tags.

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, they would like to change Unit 043-046 to 90 tags to be consistent with the other two hunts.

Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW, said they would like Unit 111-113 to go from 30 to 35 tags.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they agreed with the Departments recommendations.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERED, ARCHERY HUNT 1341 AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: WASHOE CABMW: UNIT 015 FROM 7 TO 4 TAGS AND UNIT 033 FROM 5 TO 4 TAGS; PERSHING CABMW: UNIT 043-046 FROM 140 TO 90 TAGS; WHITE PINE CABMW: UNIT 111-113 FROM 30 TO 35 TAGS. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, AND YOUNG WERE ABSENT.

Chairman Drew excused Commissioner Hubbs to leave to catch her flight.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Nonresident Mule Deer – Antlered – Any Legal Weapon Hunt 1331, Nonresident Mule Deer – Antlered – Muzzleloader Hunt 1371, and Nonresident Mule Deer – Antlered – Archery Hunt 1341. He went over the changes after calculating the 10 percent.

Hunt 1331: Unit Group 035 from 6 to 5 tags, Unit Group 051 from 20 to 25 tags, Unit Group 202, 205-208 from 2 to 6 tags, and Unit Group 251-254 from 3 to 4 tags.

Hunt 1371: Unit Group 111-113 from three to two tags and Unit Group 161-164 from three to four tags.

Hunt 1341: Unit Group 043-046 from 15 to 9 tags and Unit Group 111-113 from 3 to 4 tags.

CABMW Comment –

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they talked about the 10 percent and it was a heated discussion. They want 10 percent for their areas.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said their numbers were different.

Chairman Drew asked the Department about the Washoe CABMW different numbers.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder said the Department does not have a problem the Washoe CABMW's recommended change. The Department tries to stay 90/10 in each weapon class. They are not significant changes.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE NONRESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERED, ANY LEGAL WEAPON HUNT 1331 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: UNIT GROUP 011-013 EARLY 5 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 015 FROM 3 TO 2 TAGS. UNIT GROUP 035 FROM SIX TO FIVE TAGS, UNIT GROUP 051 FROM 20 TO 25 TAGS, UNIT GROUP 202, 205-208 FROM 2 TO 6 TAGS, AND UNIT GROUP 251-254 FROM 3 TO 4 TAGS, NONRESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERED, MUZZLELOADER HUNT 1371 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: UNIT GROUP 111-113 FROM 3 TO 2 TAGS AND UNIT GROUP 161-164 FROM 3 TO 4 TAGS AND NONRESIDENT MULE DEER, ANTLERED, ARCHERY HUNT 1341 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: UNIT GROUP 043-046 FROM 15 TO 9 TAGS AND UNIT GROUP 111-113 FROM 3 TO 4 TAGS. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5-0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, YOUNG, AND HUBBS WERE ABSENT.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder introduced Resident and Nonresident Deer and Antelope Landowner Compensation Tags Either Sex Hunts 1115, 1215, 2115, and 2215.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT DEER AND ANTELOPE LANDOWNER COMPENSATION TAGS EITHER SEX HUNTS 1115, 1215, 2115, AND 2215 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT AT 1.5% - 318 TAGS. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5 - 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, VALENTINE, YOUNG, AND HUBBS WERE ABSENT.

26 White Pine County Elk Incentive and Damage Arbitration Panel – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action
The Commission may take action to make three appointments to the White Pine County Elk and Damage Arbitration Panel to serve for the next two years (NAC 502.44283 and NAC 504.430).

Chairman Drew said this item is in response to delay in passing the temporary CGR and the arbitration process has reverted back to the old NAC for the time being. He said the purpose of this item is to assign a local arbitration panel from White Pine County and there are three representatives per that NAC. The following persons are being recommended: Chris Callis, representing agriculture, Mitch McVicars, representing CABMWs, and Wade Robison representing business.

Chairman Drew said recommends formally appointing Wade Robison, Chris Callis, and Mitch McVicars to the local White Pine County Elk Arbitration panel.

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MADE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PANEL AS STATED BY CHAIRMAN DREW. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. COMMISSIONERS IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION: CHAIRMAN DREW, COMMISSIONERS WALLACE, MCNINCH, MORI, AND JOHNSTON IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED 5 – 0.

27 Future Commission Meetings and Commission Committee Assignments – Secretary Tony Wasley and Chairman Drew – For Possible Action

Chairman Drew said he has no adjustment to meeting dates, and he will work with the Department on agenda items for the June meeting. There will be several committee meetings prior to the June meeting – Finance, TAAHC, APRC, and Heritage Committee.

Secretary Wasley said primary agenda item will be setting and revising upland game seasons and limits, and acknowledgment of Dale Coleman as recipient of the Ted C. Frantz award.

Chairman Drew said the June meeting will be the last Commission meeting for Commissioners Bliss and Mori.

Public Comment - None

28 Public Comment Period Reno Location -

Elko and Las Vegas Locations - None

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, said he is aware that Chairman Drew was contacted by Pershing County District Attorney on update on the lawsuit from Pershing County and BLM on the wild horses, and the Pershing County District Attorney will submit a request to the Commission to be on the Commission's August agenda to provide information on

the lawsuit. Mr. Crim provided a copy of the agreement to the recording secretary for distribution.

Lynn Cullens said during discussion of the female mule deer quota, said the spring young ratio for Units 6, 7 and 10, and was at this time 28 to 100 ratio, also that those units represent somewhere between 30 percent and 50 percent of the mule deer population in Nevada. Which means that now the predator plan has been triggered for 30 to 50 percent of the mule deer in Nevada for what she called the slush fund in Nevada. What concerns her is that if that was known yesterday, she feels that should have been made clear to the Commissioners when they were making their decision. She said she is being assured by the Department that they don't intend to remove 50 percent of the mountain lion population of Nevada, and she believes that they don't. But what it says to her is that this points out the problem with our predator plan. Which is now we have a slush fund that can be used to kill any mountain lion that feeds on any one half the mule deer in Nevada. This is why we need better trigger mechanisms, we need to make better decisions within the planning process and either was an intended consequence, because you are actually in some of those areas trying to remove the mule deer population down to carrying capacity, the lions can help with that, but now we have a situation where there is likely to be pressure to kill lions in the various areas where they are needed to help keep a balanced ecosystem, and that is a grave concern to her. She thinks we are making a decision about the lives of these apex predators without sufficient information and without sufficient control on mechanisms being used to kill them. She appreciates the willingness of Department to work with her on this, but it would have been valuable to have that information in advance of this meeting. Certainly would have been valuable to have that information before public comment was closed on the discussion regarding those three units rather than after.

Caren Tayloe, Washoe County resident, representing herself, said she supports Lynn Cullens and the Mountain Lion Foundation regarding that concern that when mule deer populations are lowered for a specific reason what does that do to our predators. She said she wanted to thank Director Wasley and his staff regarding the podcasts that are released on Friday on NevadaWild.org. Also, she would like to thank Sean Shea and the Washoe CABMW as they have been providing some really good presentations at Washoe CABMW. Ms. Tayloe said in regard to double standards, that the activists cannot reference other states or other state's activities without hearing that the Commission does not want to hear how it is done in California or other states – she said by 10:45 a.m. there were five statements indicating reference to other states and how they do things regarding hunting, and had nothing to do with moving sheep to another state, just five references, double standard #1. Second double standard was non-consumptive user is too emotion but as has been said the whole premise of bear hunting is all about emotional and that is how bear hunting came about, hunter opportunity is mostly about emotion. Third reference, all letters and the numbers of people who attend are discounted from the non-consumptive public, but when one hunter writes in it is brought up. Also, if you take out the CABMWs and all the NDOW employees, they have had more people here over the last several general meetings. Your fees to kill animals to reiterate something Commissioner Johnston said, those

animals are theirs to, putting them in the equation for money that is funded for certain projects so we are constantly and consistently saying that we have made suggestions and the Commission has not listened to our suggestions. Yesterday it was said that they don't come up with suggestions, and they have, and they have also done things for wildlife over the state they just don't do them through the Department of Wildlife.

Joel Blakeslee said he is speaking as a conservationist. He said he is going to make a couple of statements about mule deer and lions particularly in Washoe County as he has lots of experience observing lions in Washoe County, just to give perspective, this is the 39th year of him attending Wildlife Commission meetings and he has experience in this. He remembers when we used to talk in terms of 400 deer tags on the Sheldon versus less than 40 now that is 1/10 of the amount from the old days. In those same days they issued three lions tags in Washoe County. Right now if you look at the units in northern Washoe County the amount of tags that are offered in each unit has the potential for one lion to take more deer than entire human tag holders, as he can guarantee there is more than one lion in each of those units. It is out of sight up there as he has watched it for a long time, there is a gorilla in the room in northern Washoe. He wanted to say that so the people who are listening can here that.

Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

Note: The meeting has been videotaped and is available for viewing at 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.