

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting

APPROVED Minutes

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

Videoconferencing Locations:

College of Southern Nevada
3200 E. Cheyenne Ave
Main Building Room 2638
Las Vegas, NV

Great Basin College
1500 College Parkway
High Tech Center Building Room 137
Elko, NV

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 present for two day meeting:

Chairman Jeremy Drew	Vice Chairman Grant Wallace	Commissioner Chad Bliss***
Commissioner Brad Johnston	Commissioner Karen Layne**	*
Commissioner Pete Mori	Commissioner Paul E. Valentine	Commissioner Bill Young

* Commissioner David McNinch, Excused Absence March 20 and 21, 2015

**Commissioner Karen Layne, Excused Absence March 21, 2015

***Commissioner Chad Bliss, Excused Absence March 21, 2015

Secretary Tony Wasley

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward

Recording Secretary Suzanne Scourby

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

Deputy Director Jack Robb	Chief of Operations Bob Haughian
Biologist 4 Ken Gray	Conservation Education Division Administrator Teresa Moiola
Division Administrator Habitat Alan Jenne	Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger
Administrative Assistant 4 Kathleen Teligades	Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling
Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed	Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson
Fisheries Division Administrator Jon Sjoberg	Kim Jolly, Management Analyst 3
Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox	

Others in attendance/two days:

Mike Reese, Clark CABMW, S. Nevada Wildlife Coalition	Don Sefton, Systems Consultants
Monty Martin, Systems Consultants	Joe Crim, Chairman Pershing CABMW
Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW	Cory Lytle, Chairman Lincoln CABMW
Jana Wright, Clark County	Fred Voltz, recreationist
Bob Rittenhouse, Member Douglas CABMW	Sean Shea, Chairman Washoe CABMW
Stephanie Myers, Mt. Charleston	Don Molde, Reno
Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW	James A. Schmidt
J. Fortuna	Peter Hussman
Fred Voltz, Carson City	Bert K. Gurr, Elko CABMW Member
Dona Fong	Rob Jacobson, Lyon CABMW
Diana Miller	Ron Miller
Tanya Lessellet	Robert Lessellet
Terry Sullivan	Brad Block, White Pine CABMW
Trish Swain, Trail Safe Nevada	Carmen Rhoda
J. Stewart White	James Greil, Washoe Springs
Caron Tayloe	Connie Howard
Valerie Andersen	Danette Dean
Linda Milliron	Jane Grossman
Debbie Kladney	Rebecca L. Harvey
Janis Halleret	Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters Association
Jana Hofeditz	Amanda White
Walt Gardner	John Carpenter
Michael D. Gowan	Anita Hatch
Deborah McBride	Charles Albright
Bobbie McCollum	Mike Reese, Clark CABMW
Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW	Tyler Nall
Rex Flowers	Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW
Leroy Dougherty	Jeff Turnipseed, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU)
Sandra Kell	Jessica Courts
Carol Freitas	Jean Molde
Mitch Buzzetti, Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association	Jake Neuffer
Jessica Garnder	Fauna Tomlinson
Ernest Schwanon	Cheyenne Neuffer
Miranda DeGuidice	Carolyn Van Stralen
Anita Chittenden	Carl McGregor
Genelle Richards	Carol-Anne Weed
Elaine Carrick	Willski Plant
Catherine Cheosakul	Leah Sturgis
Fredrik Egemmo	Bobby Arroyo
Rosemary French	Jeff Wolfe
Leslie Mix	Tina Nappe
Anita Lahey	Jan Nachlinger
Nate Phillips	Lloyd Peake
Don Sefton, Systems Consultants	Mark Holt
David Freitas	Mel Belding
Sylvia Tilton	Karen Boeger, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers
Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW	Joel Blakeslee
Sheila Kaufman	Darin Elmore
Wes Emery, Douglas CABMW	Louise Klarr
Susan Kaufmann	Linda Church

Friday, March 20, 2015 – 8:30 a.m.

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

Commission roll call: Chairman Drew, Vice Chairman Wallace, Commissioners Bliss, Johnston, Layne, Mori, Valentine, and Young. Commissioner McNinch excused absence for the two day meeting.

CABMW roll call: Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Rob Jacobsen, Lyon; Sean Shea, Washoe; Mike Reese, Clark; Doug Martin, Douglas; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; Bert Gurr, Elko; Brad Block, White Pine; and Cathy Smith, Washoe CABMW.

* Wayne E. Kirch Award Presentation – Chairman Drew

Mr. Jim Rackley of Winnemucca was the recipient of the 2014 Wayne E. Kirch award. Mr. Rackley was nominated by non-profit organization Nevada Muleys for the award. Chairman Drew said Mr. Rackley has an impressive record of work towards the improvement of habitat for Nevada's wildlife, and he read of Mr. Rackley's many achievements from the nomination packet.

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 BLISS MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. MOTION SECONDED MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 8 - 0.

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 will also be discussed.

Chairman Drew said the Commission received correspondence on agenda item #7 which will be discussed when the Commission reaches that item; and he received an annual report (entered into exhibit file) from the Community Foundation of Western Nevada in regards to the Dream Tag program.

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.

Doug Martin, Carson CABMW, said in Carson City a local working group composed of citizens, NDOW and county staff, has been formed to address urban mule deer population problems. He said this is an emerging item as there has been an increase of wildlife encroaching into the urban areas over the last three years.

Mike Reese, Clark CABMW, said at their meeting they discussed feral cats of which there are 200,000 to 400,000 feral cats in Clark County. He said they have reports of coyotes carrying off cats which have been identified as a food source, and the CABMW approves of the feral cat program but they want more information on the effect the program has on wildlife and coyote populations as a food source. He said they want a deputy attorney general (DAG) to look at validity of statute as it pertains to wildlife.

Glenn Bunch Mineral CABMW, said information for the upcoming hunts needs to highlight that there is no hunting with drones. He recently heard of a hunt filmed entirely with a drone by a guide. He said the Department needs to get the word out that you cannot do that.

- 5 Approval of Minutes – Chairman Drew – For Possible Action
Commission minutes from the Feb. 6 and 7, 2015, meeting.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER BLISS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH ABSENT.

- 6 Bear Video Documentary – Environmental Health Specialist Supervisor Jim English, Washoe County Health District – Informational
The short documentary “Urban Bears, Keeping Nevada’s Bears Wild!” funded by the Washoe County Health District and produced by Nine Caribou Production, LLC. will be screened. The film focuses on reducing urban bear interactions by removing attractants or unsecured garbage.

Jim English of Washoe County Health District presented the short documentary video https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dm7KKfYzJD4&list=PLozNE4RG4InPSeDj5TUQT0AnvgxMCi_P6. He said the intent is to assist with keeping bears in their own habitat and away from residences.

- 7 Petition – Don Molde and Fred Voltz – For Possible Action
Don Molde and Fred Voltz have submitted a petition to the Commission, requesting that the Commission take action to ban coyote killing contests in Nevada. The Commission may accept the petition and initiate regulatory action or deny the petition.

Chairman Drew said Mr. Molde and Mr. Voltz submitted a petition to ban coyote killing contests in Nevada and there are two actions that the Commission can take today, accept the petition and initiate rule-making or deny the petition and no regulatory action will be initiated.

Don Molde said Fred Voltz will provide the introductory comments, and Stewart White a retired Reno attorney will discuss the NRS/NAC, and he will provide the concluding comments as to why coyote killing contests are different from other contests.

Petitioner Fred Voltz provided his introductory comments for the record:

Coyote-Killing Contest Petition—Introduction—Fred Voltz—Nevada Wildlife Commission

March 20, 2015

Last December a coyote-killing contest occurred in the North Valleys area of Reno with no reaction or subsequent limitations imposed by the Wildlife Commission. This inaction is the genesis of today's petition. Other coyote-killing contests around the state have been similarly ignored by the Commission. Threats to public safety, damage to wild lands and habitat by people racing around attempting to maximize the number of coyotes killed, and an utter disregard for living creatures that play an integral role in the inter-species food chain are some of the negative outcomes of such contests.

Unrestrained, unregulated 'killing for kicks' does not suggest wise public policy nor reflect appropriate oversight by the Wildlife Commission. We would expect such behavior at World War II concentration camps or when neighborhood street gang activity kills humans for vengeance, money, drugs, and power, but not toward wildlife held in trust for the public's benefit.

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence joined forces with the American Humane Society to study the links between animal abuse and domestic violence. Among their findings: 71% of pet-owning women entering women's shelters reported that their batterer had injured, maimed, killed or threatened family pets for revenge or to psychologically control victims. 32% reported their children had hurt or killed animals. Abusers kill, harm or threaten children's pets to coerce them into sexual abuse or to force them to remain silent about abuse. Disturbed children kill or harm animals to emulate their parents' conduct, to prevent the abuser from killing the pet, or to take out their aggressions on another victim. Sanctioning wildlife-killing contests with no purpose but blood lust and momentary amusement cheapens the value of life and creates a gateway to other violent acts against animals and people.

A coyote-killing contest is nothing more than violent slaughter of defenseless creatures where the trigger pullers seek illusory glory, not protein.

People who claim to follow the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation and science-based management of wildlife in the public interest have no rationale for the cold-blooded, indiscriminate slaughter of coyotes in contests; they can't even legitimately claim they are protecting property or people. Each Commissioner's petition package contains photographic proof of a literal mountain of coyote carcasses piled by the side of a road after a coyote-killing contest. Would this happen with any other wildlife species subject to a wildlife-killing contest where express limits on the numbers killed apply?

In the Commission's Wildlife Damage Control Committee meeting yesterday, the repeated mantra was kill, kill, kill. The proposed allocation of resources reflected an overwhelming bias toward funding wildlife-killing projects. The clear theme: If we don't understand it and can't otherwise control it easily, let's kill it. Human negligence toward providing supplemental coyote food sources and human denial of

coyote biological truths have heightened coyote presence. Why isn't this state widely employing successful, non-lethal predator control methods toward coyotes that have worked elsewhere if indeed they are a recurring problem?

As Mark Twain wrote in his novel *Pudd'nhead Wilson*, "Few things are harder to put up with than the annoyance of a good example." This state has that example in the regressive practice of coyote-killing contests without any legitimate public policy or science-based wildlife management purpose. This Commission needs to constructively apply its regulatory powers to immediately ban coyote-killing contests in this state.

Commissioner Johnston asked Mr. Voltz questions, as during his comment he referred to wildlife killing contests but as he understands the petition you want to limit scope of petition to coyote contests? Would it be acceptable to the petitioners if the Commission were to adopt a regulation that put a bag limit on coyote contests? The petition is not asking the Commission to re-classify the coyote from an unprotected animal to some other classification? Reference is made to action by California Fish and Game Commission in adopting Title 14 of California Administrative Code Section 465, but that code section referred to furbearers and that is not what we are talking about here nor is that what the California Commission was talking about there. In both California and Nevada the coyote is not considered a furbearer. So when he looks at the petition you would want something similar to that regulation, so would furbearer be stricken and insert coyote? Commissioner Johnston read the California section, Fish and Game Code Section 203: Unlawful to offer any prize, or other inducement as a reward for the taking of coyotes in an individual contest, tournament or derby, and that would no way prohibit people from getting together under Nevada law and hunting coyotes. His question is that adopting that regulation is he wants to know where does lawful activity cross over into what Mr. Voltz views as unlawful, and his meaning is under Nevada current law five individuals can get together and go out and hunt coyotes with no limit on take, and when do petitioners suggest that lawful activity would become unlawful under your proposed regulation?

Mr. Voltz answered Commissioner Johnston's questions: The nature of the petition speaks to coyote killing; personally as a co-petitioner, the answer is no to bag limit because if no science to back-up the reason behind the killing then there shouldn't be the killing; as to classification, in a perfect world he would, but given the nature of this Commission he would say no as unrealistic expectation; and in response to furbearer designation, you could reasonably do that. Mr. Voltz answered Johnston's reading of Section 203 that is fair, and that there would be no limitation to gathering and hunting coyotes under Nevada law; and at that point which there is a contest where there are prizes, publicity and intent of large group of people to do this in an unsafe, hazardous way to the public, which is what the coyote contest consisted of last December.

Commissioner Johnston asked him to define large group.

Mr. Voltz said he will stay with the definition offered by Commissioner Johnston of five individuals and would defer to Dr. Molde if he has different perspective as his involvement is longer.

Commissioner Johnston clarified that there would have to be five people involved, publicity and prizes for participation. He said he is trying to understand what the petitioners want the Commission to ban.

Mr. Voltz said all three of those criteria are reasonable and would advocate for them, the ultimate decision comes back to what public purpose is served and that should be in the statute or any regulations that come out of this Commission. What public purpose is served by having people going out and killing any animal in a large number without any scientific justification? He said that is the approach that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has taken, the Commission has taken, and the organizers of these contests. That flies in the face of anything the Commission represents, supposedly science based work and managing the public's wildlife.

Stewart White, retired attorney, said he will present in their view the applicable laws and NRS to the petition. He read NRS 501.100, 501.105, 501.181, and said the primary one is NRS 501.100:

NRS 501.100 Legislative declaration regarding wildlife.

1. Wildlife in this State not domesticated and in its natural habitat is part of the natural resources belonging to the people of the State of Nevada.

2. The preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife within the State contribute immeasurably to the aesthetic, recreational and economic aspects of these natural resources.

NRS 501.105 Commission to establish policies and adopt regulations. The Commission shall establish policies and adopt regulations necessary to the preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife and its habitat.

NRS 501.181 Duties; regulations. The Commission shall:

1. Establish broad policies for:
 - (a) The protection, propagation, restoration, transplanting, introduction and management of wildlife in this State.
3. Establish policies for areas of interest including:
 - (a) The management of big and small game mammals, upland and migratory game birds, fur-bearing mammals, game fish, and protected and unprotected mammals, birds, fish, reptiles and amphibians.
1. Establish broad policies for: control of wildlife depredation.

Mr. White said wildlife depredation is thought of as a coyote attacking a ewe or a calf or something like that, but to them wildlife depredation is act of hunting coyotes in these contests. The contestants are the predators. He said there is authority for the Commission to stop the contests, and what happens during the contests is a waste of wildlife.

Commissioner Johnston said to Mr. White that he received a lot of correspondence asking the Commission to follow the lead of California Commission. He said he understands that when the California legislature adopted its regulation Section 203, it banned all contests, tournaments, or derbies involving wildlife. He said the only thing the California fish and game code did when it adopted its recent regulation with respect to furbearers and non-game mammals was to clarify what the California legislature had already done. He asked if that is Mr. White's understanding.

Mr. White said, no that is not his particular understanding. He said if California or any other state had done nothing specifically, that this is Nevada and Nevada law, and this Commission is the body that decides for Nevada, and does not want to get mixed up in that. Mr. White said they are asking that the Commission not interpret anything the legislature has done as it has done nothing. Mr. White said they are asking the Commission to establish a regulation prohibiting a contest for prize money to take unprotected wildlife. He said as soon as you stop killing coyotes they may decide to go out and kill jack rabbits or magpies. The petition's intent is to stop wanton wasteful killing of wildlife just for fun and a contest, and knows staff and your staff attorney can figure out language to stop these contests or whatever you want to call it.

Commissioner Johnston said from that comment you would prefer a regulation that bans all contests, tournaments or derbies involving unprotected wildlife, not limited to the coyotes, and would go further than Mr. Voltz did.

Mr. White said that is correct he would go further.

Don Molde said he will address the question raised as to why are coyote killing contests different from other hunting and fishing contests/derbies. He said there are three ways of thinking about it. In 1964 Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart made statement about pornography that "you know it when you see it," and many of us view photos of end result of coyote killing contest and know in an instance that something terrible happened, we know it when we see it. You know it is wrong, and asked if after trophy hunt for deer and elk the hunters met up and piled their animals up in a pile helter-skelter and stood around and photographed and put photos taken on the internet. We all know there would be controversy on all sides. Mr. Molde said secondly coyote killing contests violate at least two provisions of the North American model of wildlife conservation which has provision not to use wildlife frivolously, second provision that science is to be used in management of wildlife. Those two tenets are obviously violated by coyote killing contests. There is no better definition of frivolous killing of an animal than a coyote killing contest and the photographs that document it. Furthermore the other tenets of the North American model apply, having to deal with public trust issue, which states that wildlife belongs to everybody and the idea that there is democratic rule of law that applies to wildlife management. Those are four of the seven sisters of North American model. The reason he mentioned the last two is the photographs have a strong sense of entitlement embedded in them, that the promoters of the contest can speak, act and carry out these contests, and do so as though the coyote is their own property to do with what they wish, coupled that with unsubstantiated claims that they are controlling population and protecting pets, he thinks these activities in his view amount to nothing more than destruction of public property without any cause. Interesting thing he observed that destruction of public property is a crime except in wildlife management. At any rate that is not what this is really about, the real reason the contests are wrong, and why is the coyote the animal of choice, why not fox or feral cat, etc... something not protected by tags and quotas and federal law. The answer is coyotes are hated by many sportsmen, ranchers, and even some who work in wildlife agencies. The coyote is routinely demonized as justification for killing, and its status of unprotected is not because of biological considerations but because of a long-standing dislike of the animal. He said in a way coyote killing contests represent a wildlife version of a hate crime with the difference being the animal is the victim not another group of humans. With that as a starting point consider the rest of the story, notice the contest participants are not finished until the group photo at the end with coyotes piled up and is done in a deliberate manner to show final disrespect to the animal. Many are dumped in landfill as final trashing and difference between coyote killing contest and other legitimate contests is the coyote participants and promoters have no respect for the animals they killed and by extension you have to wonder if they have respect for other non-

human life. It seems to him you would not want people plundering our wildlife who don't have some respect for the animals they kill. To him that is strongest argument for considering a ban on such contests. Picture paints the magnitude of issue, and the Commission is the agency to address this as charged by law to look after public trust. (Comments in exhibit file).

Commissioner Johnston said many of the emails and correspondence he received referenced what California Fish and Game Commission which is why he went back to that and he wanted understanding of that. He said California legislature adopted a statute in their fish and game code section 2003 that provides with the exception set forth in the statute that it is unlawful to offer any prize or other inducement as a reward for taking of any game birds, mammals, fish, reptiles or amphibians, in an individual contest, tournament or derby. As a result the California legislature via its statute banned all wildlife contests. There is a manner by which you can get a permit such as fishing derby involving game fish, notably the ban appears so broad that subsection C states it does not apply to persons conducting frog jumping or fish contests in Pacific Ocean waters. So the California Commission felt the need to clarify that nongame mammals were covered by blanket prohibition adopted by the California Legislature. He said that makes it clear that the California Commission clarified what the legislature had already prohibited. So these comments to follow the lead of the California Fish and Game Commission are not quite entirely accurate, and wants to make distinction between what the Nevada Commission is being asked to do, which is to create a new prohibition that is not found in Nevada statute and what the California Fish and Game Commission did in clarifying an existing legislative ban on wildlife contests. He wanted that clear before public comment and before considering the petition.

Commissioner Layne said in response to Commissioner Johnston's statement that if the Commission decided to move forward in an attempt to look at this issue, that discussion of the legislative issues would be part of that review and any further discussion that the Commission would have. She said she would hope the Commission would not come out and say that just because the legislature has not set up something similar in Nevada that the Commission could not do anything. She said she appreciates what you have discussed this morning but hopes that does not limit the Commission looking at this issue and addressing the legal ramifications if we were to take this on.

Commissioner Johnston said he is not suggesting the distinction between what occurred in California and what we are asking here is definitive from precluding the Commission from taking any action, he just wanted to put the discussion in the proper context because there were so many emails of which many referenced California. The petition even referenced California.

CABMW Comment –

Bert Gurr, Elko CABMW, said event organizers attended their meeting, and described what happens at coyote contest and how proceeds are donated to charity. He said the contests result in economic benefit to rural communities, and is aware that New Mexico did not pass the legislation. Mr. Gurr noted recent lockdown of Las Vegas elementary school due to coyote sighting, and suggested taking predator control money and placing a bounty to assist with protection of sage-grouse. He said they met with the Elko County Commission and who are in total opposition to petition; Mr. Gurr said letter sent from Elko County Commission to the Commission stating their opposition.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said they had two contests in their county and had total of 32 coyotes taken, and as soon as photos taken the coyotes processed with proceeds put into fund for crippled children.

Rob Jacobson, Lyon CABMW, said the Lyon CABMW voted unanimously to not support petition.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they did voted 4 – 1 to not support petition. He said everybody that comes into the contest should be licensed as a lot of revenue being lost from out-of-staters not having a hunting license.

Brad Block, White Pine CABMW, said they voted unanimously to reject the petition. He said there was no public in attendance at their meeting, and after listening today, they did not get the entire argument and personally may have swayed him.

Doug Martin, Carson CABMW, said they voted unanimously against supporting the petition. He said comments were made that this sets bad precedent for other hunting contests; animal that is not protected; and a member of public talked about servicing a ranch and had direct result of less lambing loss. Part of what is being asked is to regulate social behavior and that is not purview of Commission.

Bert Gurr, Elko CABMW, said they also discussed the license issue and supported having a requirement to have a hunting license.

Public Comment –

Jana Wright, said she supports petition to ban coyote killing contests. She was disgusted to learn a New Mexico Commissioner participated in a contest in Elko. She does not support aerial gunning of coyotes, the contest does not meet criteria of North American model. She said it is a total lack of respect for wildlife, and voting to accept the petition merely directs staff to work on regulation to reach goal of a ban on coyote killing contests not the killing of coyotes.

Stephanie Myers, Lee Canyon, said she is testifying in support of petition. She said participants say they are doing a public service, and yes coyotes do kill urban wildlife, and responsible owners should take care of their pets and same for livestock. The USDA killed 73,000 coyotes in 2013 with cyanide and aerial shooting, the public paid for that. Wildlife biologist's state coyotes adjust their birth rate in response and balance their own population, and there is no reason economically or ethically, and wildlife killing contests should not be allowed on public lands.

Carmen Rhoda urged Commission to accept ban and has had no problems, but had numerous problem with hunters spotlighting and shooting in direction of her house that should be banned. Egregious activity and is a shame as native Nevadan.

Ray Benjamin said he supports petition, coyote contest sad reflection on all, and look at language submitted in petition, and coyotes prevent recurrence of plague and rabbits are chief competitor to livestock and coyotes control them.

John Carpenter said in ranching career that people don't understand damage coyotes do to our livestock, and coyotes binge kill, killing cows and lambs, and when he was in cattle business coyotes do a lot of damage, and people think it is wanton slaughter and cannot survive livestock

business without predator control. He said he is absolutely opposed to petition, and knows what good these contests do.

Walt Gardner, said as rancher coyotes detrimental to his business, coyote contests not designed to degrade the animal and assists ranchers. He asked the Commission to deny the petition.

Dave Gowan said he has put on a number of coyote contests and sees it as an event that is a community event, and eliminating contest will have minimal impact.

Catherine Smith, Washoe CABMW, said speaking for herself that she supports acceptance of the petition. Ms. Smith provided her comments for the record: There is no significant role for coyote killing contests in wildlife management. NDOW maintains a philosophy that predator management is a tool to be applied deliberately and strategically -- coyote killing contests are neither of these. They further state that predator management should be applied on a case by case basis, with clear goals, and based on an objective scientific analysis of available data. Removing less than 75 percent of a coyote population may actually increase the population through increases in reproduction." So, there is no scientific basis for a coyote killing contest. There is no evidence to suggest that humans or pets are safer because of coyote killing contests. Are coyote killing contests ethical? Is it okay to kill for fun? It depends on who you ask. Most would say no. Boone and Crockett says no. If hunters are concerned about their reputations this is the type of event they should want to stop. Continuing events similar to this make no sense while simultaneously trying to ramp up a PR campaign to improve the public perception of hunters. In a recent local news interview a gentleman summed up the reason for coyote killing contests well, shooting them is fun. Maybe I am wrong, but I don't think that coyote killing contests are part of most hunters' culture. I think most hunters are more ethical. How long are you going to let the more unethical sportsmen continue to define who you are? I request that you please accept the petition. This should be done at the Commission level. We should try to avoid legislating how our wildlife is treated.

Leah Sturgis speaking for herself supports acceptance of the petition, and she provided her written comment for the exhibit file.

Janette Dean, representing Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter, state their full supports of the petition to ban coyote killing contests in Nevada for five reasons as stated in their written testimony provided for the exhibit file. Coyote plays important role in ecosystem, mass slaughter of coyotes does not control population, no authorized coyote management plan by Nevada Department of Wildlife, coyote killing contests that occur appear to be largely for participant entertainment and monetary prizes, and to follow lead of California which has enacted a ban on coyote killing contests. She said they represent over 4,000 members and respectfully requested acceptance of the petition.

Elaine Carrick speaking for herself said she supports the petition. She said in response to some of the comments made today that stopping coyote killing contests would regulate social behavior. She said we have all kinds of laws regulating unacceptable social behavior, and if public feels that killing contests are unacceptable that is not regulating public behavior. Secondly, regarding California stopping killing coyote contests, we are Nevada and is sure we could come up with wording that would suit this situation and people who commented on that were simply saying it has been done there. The "coyote killing contests" which is what they are, are killing the public's wildlife for entertainment and fun. Proponents of these contests say they are managing coyotes. Since when does indiscriminate killing of any wildlife constitute

management of a species? Killing every coyote one sees, and often other animals that happen to move in the bushes, is not management. Biologists and ecologists have done many studies on coyotes across the country and they have found that indiscriminate killing actually causes them to breed more often and the coyote population gets larger. NDOW oversees the management of our state's wildlife and their website has a great article on Nevada's coyotes, the headline is Coyotes – Part of the Eco System. Nowhere does it state that people should go out and simply kill as many coyotes as they can to solve a conflict. These contests do not solve conflicts & are used as an excuse to have a fun killing day with usually a party or barbecue at the end to award prizes. You, as our state's Wildlife Commissioners, make many decisions about our wildlife. Most of you are hunters that practice ethical hunting. These coyotes are not killed for food, a trophy or for any reason but simply for the fun of killing. These contests have nothing to do with ethical hunting and killing animals for fun gives all hunters a bad name. These killing contests have been under the public's radar for years. But the cat is out of the bag (so to speak) and the public is outraged and it's not going away. As our Wildlife Commissioners, you have the authority to ban these killing contests or let them continue. As Nevadans, we can all do better than creating this kind of image for our state. These contests should be banned in Nevada.

James Schmidt retired USDA Wildlife Services coyote specialist/bio technician, said this is anti-hunting movement and they are starting with coyotes. General public has not said they are opposed, and sportsman support coyote control. He said this has been defeated in New Mexico and Arizona and other states do not support this and Utah has a bounty. He urged the Commission to not accept the petition

Fauna Tomlinson, Project Coyote, read statement: Good morning Commissioners, I've lived at Lake Tahoe for 25 years, I am here representing Project Coyote and our Nevada members and supporters. I play a vital role in implementing PC successful non-lethal program, saving livestock and predators while saving ranchers and taxpayers. Project Coyote is a coalition of educators, scientists, predator friendly ranchers and citizen leaders promoting coexistence between people and wildlife through education, science and advocacy. This past year we successfully petitioned the California Fish & Game Commission and in December California became the first state in the nation to officially ban wildlife killing contests. As the public becomes more aware of the horrors of killing contests they are asking for bans, we hope that Nevada will follow California's lead in banning this cruel and unnecessary practice. Our ecosystems need predators. Playing an invaluable role in nature, coyotes eat at least 1,800 rodents a year. That's a lot of free rodent control. In California the commissioners recognized that there was no wildlife management purpose to justify this practice. Project Coyote's Science advisory board was asked to respond to the two claims made by killing contest supporters - that such contests effectively reduce coyote populations and boost ungulate populations. I share with you today the scientific letter drafted by Project Coyotes scientific advisory board that countered these claims and showed there is no basis for either in peer-reviewed science.

There is no ethical justification for wildlife killing contests; in fact killing contests counter the ethic of fair chase and sportsmanship. The few that engage in killing contests give ethical hunters a bad name. Let me explain. Here is a letter I received from Boone and Crockett headquarters that shares their position statement, Boone and Crockett does not support programs, contests or competitions that award cash or prizes for the taking of wildlife. Even the official Hunters Pledge states "Take only what you need, even if it is under the legal limit. Don't flaunt your kill. Remember the future of hunting depends on being considerate, leaving a positive image of hunters. On Valentine's day last year, a California warden was hit in the neck by a bullet, while sitting in his car, monitoring a night time coyote killing contests. Killing coyotes

and other wild animals for fun and prizes is not only dangerous to public safety but also sends a chilling message to children that life is cheap and violence in the form of mass slaughter is acceptable. We hope you will recognize today that killing contests have no place in modern conservation and predator management and are a threat to public safety. We urge you to support the petition and move to ban killing contests statewide.

Julius Fortuna, said he is a longtime Nevadan and hunter, is a member of numerous sportsman groups and he discussed concerns with petition with Nevada Woods and Water and has the organization's full support against the petition. He said he felt so strongly about opposing the petition that he along with Mr. Schmidt traveled to Reno to address the Commission, and after reading emails, said they want Nevada to be similar to California although other states have not followed, such as New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona.

Susan Kauffmann said she supports the petition and heard contradictory statements from same individual about contests being a management tool and she knows someone who uses guardian dogs to protect livestock. Ms. Kauffmann said not against hunting in general, and said concerns about coyotes are overblown to justify sporting activity. She provided her written statement for the exhibit file.

Dona Fong supports acceptance of petition as coyotes are important part of eco system and are necessary predators of small rodents, and those in favor of this slaughter are not doing a public service as it is a reason to fulfill their blood lust. Ms. Fong provided her written comments for the exhibit file.

Trish Swain, director of TrailSafe Nevada, said she is here to support petition as presented, and stated that she and her organization do not have a secret agenda regarding hunting or fishing. She is present to support of the petition as presented and as mentioned have to look at the Intent of the California action which was to stop coyote hunts as manslaughter, and she presented her arguments as to why the coyote has become today's scapegoat. Her written comments were provided for the exhibit file.

Carolyn Weed, supports petition to ban coyote slaughter, and said pet owners need to be responsible protecting their pets as livestock owners have. She provided her written comments for the exhibit file.

Peter Hussmann, business owner from Lake Tahoe, supports petition and said coyotes are part of living in the mountains. He said the perceived benefits of the killing contests such as controlling the population, keep people and pets safe, reduce livestock losses, do not stand-up under close examination. He said coyotes have survived and killing them in large numbers has the opposite effect. He provided his written comments for the exhibit file.

Terry Sullivan, representing himself, said he is not in support of the petition. He said the coyote thing is about sensibilities and he knows it helps, particularly sheep man. He said the California rule prohibits killing coyotes in a contest for fun but you can still shoot them. Mr. Sullivan said coyotes are a serious problem where he lives in Washoe Valley, and he provided his written comments for the exhibit file.

Fredrick Jameo said he is here to speak for the animal and supports the petition, and spoke to finding humanity. Mr. Jameo said with great power comes great responsibility, and he provided his written comments for the exhibit file.

Man whose name is not clear spoke in support of the petition.

Jana Hofeditz, said speaking for self, said she lives near Pyramid Lake, and that we have no right to kill coyotes as they have rights. The absolute disrespect shown by these wildlife killing contests is a crime against nature. She supports acceptance of the petition, and provided written comments for the exhibit file.

Carolyn Van Stralen said she is a member of the NRA and has been a long-time hunter. She said while living in Idaho a massive coyote extermination effort was done and after the coyotes were all gone, the rodents ate their crops. Subsequently farmers changed management practices. Coyote killing contests not sportsman like and she supports acceptance of the petition by the Commission. She provided written comment for the exhibit file.

Amanda White supports acceptance of petition, and said coyotes have been ingrained in Nevada culture like icon. She said if we continue on this path future children will not know coyotes, and massive killing of any species is not supported by many. This is a form of animal cruelty, and is unjustified for the reasons provided.

Leroy Dougherty, said he is a hunter who said he participates in coyote contest hunts as well as fishing derbies. He said the comments comparing hunters to holocaust are unfounded as they are just hunters, and he and his family enjoy hunting and this is a lead in to take away the right to hunt.

Jeff Turnipseed, NBU, said he would assume that the ACLU is present, that the petition is seeking to limit the right of sportsmen to gather, enjoy those gatherings, and advertise those gatherings. He said the Commission has done good job of recognizing murky waters when they see them, and agreed with Commissioner Johnston to be careful in decisions.

Jessica Gardner, said she support acceptance of petition. Science needs to be used and hunters get emotional when they say this is to remove hunting. She said some people move in rural areas to enjoy wildlife.

Anita Tipton said she is representing coyotes who she calls "song dogs." Coyotes are native to Nevada and closely related to domestic dogs, yet some call them vermin. She supports acceptance of the petition. Contests are unethical, cruel, and show a total disrespect to the species.

Colleen McCrea said she supports the petition and is opposed to coyote killing contests. She said the people have spoken very clearly and hopes their request does not fall on deaf ears. She asked that the petition be accepted.

Jim Woods, said he supports the petition and asked the Commission to approve the petition after hearing the comments today. He said he is a hunter himself, and to see what Nevada says as he does not care how California or any state does it as he lives here.

Mark Holt, from Caliente, said for the record he is not in favor of petition. Heard lots about California today, and certainly hopes we don't follow them. He said we also heard a lot about science today such as when you kill coyote they have more babies. Coyote hunting is a renewable resource, and he knows the Department uses science to do their studies and set seasons. He said he is a hunting guide and a coyote hunter, and is opposed to the petition.

Nancy Cooper said she supports petition, and heard gentleman speak who was against the petition and would say there are regulations and rules for many parts of hunting, but for coyote killing like this there are no rules. She asked how anyone could stand by and witness these mass and indiscriminate reckless killings.

Carolyn Stark said she supports the petition and that she attends these meetings and has heard Commission state science comes first and evidence has shown that these contests do nothing to reduce the population and populations actually rebound. The science also shows coyotes are important to the eco system. Science does not support coyote killing contests. Ms. Stark said the Commission has said they represent all Nevadans, but less than 2 percent of Nevadans hunt and even less Nevadans would participate in these killing contests, the majority of people who spoke, are against these contests. She asked the Commission to represent the majority of Nevadans and support the petition.

Bobbie McCollum, said she supports petition, and said this is an unregulated mess. She asked for NRS 463, definition of contests, does that come into play in regulation as prize with specified amount of money? She also asked about NRS 462 and lotteries, and the liability issue in case there is a problem or someone injured or a crime is committed as the Commission would be looked at as the government entity that looked at this and did not do anything about it. She urged that the contest be banned.

Mel Belding, Washoe County, said although he does not partake in coyote calling contests he does not deny the right to a fellow sportsmen to do so. He does not support the petition.

Connie Howard, speaking for herself, said she has a small ranch and all the key points have been made and mentioned two items: Please do not be cowed into slippery slope argument as reasonable people in the room who are not anti-hunting but anti-egregious activity such as a killing contest; and thinks there is issue of respect for science and understanding that our ideas are changing. She supports acceptance of petition.

Sylvia Helton, said she supports the petition and is concerned about loss of habitat and wholesale slaughter with these types of contests, and would not want Nevada to join the other states.

Leslie Mix said she strongly urges the Commission to support petition, Commission is first part of process to get to legislature to analyze these types of issues. She supports the petition.

Nate Phillips, representing himself, said he is in favor of regulations as written and is opposed to petition. He said he respects those who have spoken and their opinions and their right to enjoy coyotes as they want, and would ask the Commission to allow those who enjoy coyote hunting to continue. He said the issue is fundamental rights and he shared verses from Genesis, and encouraged the Commission to deny the petition.

Cory Lytle, representing Lincoln CABMW, said they are opposed to petition due to coyote being a nongame species and no need to further regulate, coyote contests contribute to local economy, contests provide another opportunity, and the value of pelts, and contest is similar to other events such as a fishing derby. He said unfortunate the photos of contest are published as they are often out of context, and they asked that the Commission deny the petition.

Mitch Buzzetti, Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association, said a letter submitted opposing petition (exhibit file). He said he takes high offense at some of the comments about sportsmen made today as he has taught his family to be good sportsmen and coyote contests allow him to teach them about hunting. He said the proceeds of the contest are usually donated to charities, and does not know how these events are termed a "slaughter" as it is just people going out into the woods for good time, and no different than fishing derby. The antis are not going to just stop with the contests, and urged the Commission to oppose the petition.

Mike Reese, Southern Nevada Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, said Clark CABMW did not agendaize the item and did not discuss it. He would echo two previous speakers' comments and does not support the petition. Mr. Reese said if passed it could tie our hands from adding a bounty in the future, and does not agree with that. If petition accepted, would new information would come from the CABMWs that has not been heard today; disagreed that indiscriminate killing as pest control really does indiscriminate killing.

Catherine Chelsucil, said she supports the petition and since she is last all of her points have been covered by previous speakers, and would ask the Commission to pay attention to people who spoke in support of petition to stop killing. She does not think it is slippery slope, and coyote has specific place in eco system and has right to be left alone.

Joel Blakeslee, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, said they voted to deny the petition. He said this is cultural thing not biological, and is it okay for like-minded people to get together to socialize and he thinks it is and won't apologize for enjoying himself when he hunts, fishes, and traps. Mr. Blakeslee said he is disturbed by things said today such as calling this a hate crime, and hunting leads to domestic abuse and all those comments beyond the pale. Dr. Molde commented that he knows something when he sees it, and he will echo that. This is doing away with the culture and is a systematic assault on a culture and has heard lots of these people state in public that they don't oppose hunting and yet they get up and talk about this and they mentioned genocide. He said this is cultural genocide.

Rebecca Harvey said to please accept the petition and give coyotes a voice.

Chairman Drew concluded the Public Comment and Commission Comment (12:22 p.m.)

Commissioner Johnston said he had an outline of points, and wants all to know that he duly took into account what everyone said and included it in his analysis as he takes his appointment to the Commission very seriously. Commissioner Johnston said he has to look at the issue from what the petition asks and what the Commission is empowered to do. NRS 501.385 (d) provides that any violation of a regulation that this Commission adopts is a misdemeanor. He asked if the Commission prepared to make a crime, something that is lawful, if it is considered a contest, tournament or derby, which the petitioners do not define. He said we know it is currently lawful to hunt coyotes at any time. The petition does not seek reclassification of the coyote. He asked petitioner if they wanted reclassification and they did not answer directly. He said he would ask why the petition does not seek reclassification of the coyote as a game mammal or furbearing mammal under law when asking for regulation. He can only conclude they are not requesting reclassification because that would be supporting a hunting season if the coyote were reclassified as a game mammal. Commissioner Johnston said second question is does the Commission partially regulate the unregulated. He looked to see if Commission has authority to do that without reclassification of coyotes. He read NRS 501.105 and believes the petitioners did not make any showing that this proposed regulation is necessary. He said he thinks the

petition is in itself fatally flawed and illogical; he looked at NRS 501.181 (4) empowering Commission to establish seasons and take of wildlife and unprotected mammals are not mentioned. He is not convinced the Commission has authority to adopt a partial regulation of unprotected species. The petition cites NRS 503.050, that statute is irrelevant due to not seeking reclassification. He said the ban will not address that it is lawful to hunt coyotes when they want without any limitations. He said if we regulate coyote hunting we would have to go through series of regulatory processes such as reclassification, season setting, bag limits, licensing requirements and so forth. Important that he brought up what California did earlier on and not suggesting to follow them, but his point is California had specific legislative decision at legislative level to ban all wildlife contests with exceptions. Nevada legislature has taken no such action, and to the contrary our legislature has adopted policy in which sportsman pay \$3 predator management fee when they apply for big game tags, and that fee is to go to lethal control of predators. Also, found that petitioner not really concerned about coyote contests but coyote hunting in general and potentially the results of coyote contests, that is inconsistent and illogical along with the number above five gathering.

Commissioner Young said he is torn on this as he represents sportsman on the Commission but he personally would not himself participate in contest due to his sportsman ethic of eating what he kills. From his work experience in Clark County as sheriff and an experience with trying to ban rap music from being played, he knows you can't regulate social behavior as that backfires, and is a waste of time. He wishes petitioners had started with reclassification of coyotes as a huntable species and instead heard insult about our intellect. He said he could support regulation of coyote hunting with the reclassification of the species.

Commissioner Layne said she will not address legal portion of petition as to whether Commission can do this, because she recognizes that Commissioner Johnston has done that, and she would like additional work by NDOW staff. What bothers her about this, and as Commissioner Johnston referred to the \$3 predator fee, we talked about this yesterday during the committee meeting and Mr. Lent complained that many of the projects were not targeted enough to deal with issues, that we know predator control works when targeted to a specific animal in a specific area. Her problem is with these contests is that they are wholesale slaughter and no effort to try to identify problem in a particular area and or a particular number of animals causing an issue and to deal with that particular issue. They are just going out and killing whatever comes in front of that group of people. Sees problem with petition and what they are asking and if not targeting what are we accomplishing. Talk of cultural thing and hears at her other job, with other animal issues cockfighting and dog fighting and heard from those participating that those cultural events have been declared illegal, they are felonies. Commissioner Layne said she asked for this to be addressed by Commission and hard for her to say that this is a good hunting practice and thinks if we say this is okay, we create our own situation for hunters.

Commissioner Bliss said as a sportsman he does not condone any indiscriminate killing of wildlife. He said in his opinion a lot of these contests are held at the right time of year, during spring when mule deer fawning and calving, and other times are winter, when wildlife on winter ranges. In his mind it is a tool which benefits wildlife and addresses predation. He said he understands some contests are held away from ranches to allow coyotes to benefit the ranch, and believes it is a tool in tool box by allowing sportsmen to participate in this issue. He understands and appreciates comments made today but if contests held in right place at the right time there is a benefit to Nevada's wildlife.

Commissioner Mori said for him after listening to discussion; that because a majority of the people do not like an activity such as the contest does not make it right. He cannot support the appeal.

Commissioner Valentine said he appreciates the comments but took offense to some comments and he cannot support petition as coyote is unprotected. He said there have been three contests in the state. If the petition were accepted he doubts the Department could enforce it, and based on that he is opposed to accepting the petition.

Commissioner Wallace agreed with Commissioner Mori and said this is a highly emotional issue. He received hundreds of emails, and sees cut and paste emails with the wrong information with little thought as to who the writer was addressing. He himself does not participate in those types of contests, does not plan to, and does not have a problem with it. The CABMWs did not support the petition and he will not be supporting the petition.

Secretary Wasley said the Department sees its statutory responsibilities managing the wildlife for the citizens of Nevada. That is 892 species that we are responsible for managing, and a very small percentage of species generate our funding, and with that creates expectation of advocacy. He said there is probably some philosophical discussion that can occur around the definition of the Department's statutory responsibility for managing the wildlife. When we talk about wildlife, it has been the Department's interpretation that withstood the test time that we manage for healthy stable thriving wildlife populations. It seems with these socially charged issues, that it is more of the scale of focus and when individuals focus on the population level, it elicits different response than when we focus on individual animals. The Department must be consistent and when we look at this activity biologically there is no risk of the population being decimated, and will some animals succumb to this practice – absolutely, but we feel this should be discussed in the social arena. Brings up being committed to the process, and that is the Commission process to engage and hear from everybody and to take that input and go forth to maintain healthy wildlife populations.

Chairman Drew said although he does not partake in coyote contests, he does not appreciate anyone stereotyping those hunters that do. He said he will not be able to accept the petition as written today due to the technical issues delineated by Commissioner Johnston. He said that does not mean this Commission is not open to still discussing the means and ways of looking at this in the future.

Commissioner Young said idea is worth pursuing and will require a lot of hard work from a lot of people, he understands that, but he does get where people are coming from on both sides of issue.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO DENY THE PETITION OF DONALD A. MOLDE AND FRED VOLTZ DATED JAN. 29, 2015, AS PETITION FAILS TO REQUEST APPROPRIATE ACTION ON PART OF COMMISSION TO REGULATE COYOTE HUNTING GENERALLY OR COYOTE CONTESTS IN PARTICULAR AND FAILS TO SHOW PROPOSED REGULATION IS NECESSARY AS REQUIRED UNDER NRS 501.105. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Layne said she will vote against the motion and understands where Commissioner Johnston is coming from, and the Commission needs to keep working on this.

MOTION CARRIED 7 – 1. COMMISSIONER LAYNE OPPOSED, COMMISSIONER MCNINCH ABSENT.

8 2015 Nevada State Legislative Session

- A Nevada Department of Wildlife Legislative Report – Management Analyst 3/
Legislative Liaison Kim Jolly
The Department will provide a report on the 2015 Legislative Session and activities.

MA 3 Jolly reviewed the Department's list of legislation of wildlife tracked by the Department, as contained in support material.

Commissioner Layne said she is concerned about feral cat position by the Department and asked that the Department look at it.

CBMW and Public Comment -

Bert Gurr, Elko CABMW, asked what the role of the CABMWs' are in the legislative process.

Chairman Drew explained how CABs can comment and expressed the difficulty with how quickly the legislative process moves.

- B Legislative Committee Update – Chairman Drew – Informational
Chairman Drew will report on the Commission's Legislative Committee recommendations and actions.

Chairman Drew reviewed the report, and advised that the next Committee meeting is April 1, with the Legislative Commission meeting scheduled for April 15. Review of bills:

COMMISSIONER LAYNE MOVED TO SUPPORT AB 35, AB 78 AB 82 AND SB 41 AS PRESENTED THROUGH THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION.

CABMW and Public Comment - None

MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

Assembly Bill 136

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO OPPOSE TO AB 136 AS ORIGINALLY INTRODUCED. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Layne left the meeting – 3:11 p.m. and will be absent for remainder of today and tomorrow.

Discussion on AB 136 -

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said issue of assistance with disabled person on hunt to allow follow up of wounded animal, and has not yet figured out the language yet as have to be careful how NRS is modified.

Chairman Bliss said believes it incumbent on the Commission to find proper vehicle to allow that assistance to a mobility impaired person.

MOTION CARRIED 7 – 0. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

Commissioner Valentine asked if premature to vote on amendment to AB 136.

Chairman Drew said not premature as amendment has been presented to bill sponsor.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION SUPPORT AB 136 WITH AMENDMENT FROM NDOW TO BILL SPONSOR. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 7 – 0. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

Assembly Bill 142

Chairman Drew said the committee's position was opposed to AB 142 as effect if passed would be removal of Commission and Department's ability to suspend or revoke a license, and renders demerit system as inconsequential, transferring that authority to a judge.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said that the Department is opposed.

Public Comment –

Jana Wright supports Commission's opposition to AB 142.

Stephanie Myers said AB 142 needs to be vetoed.

Bert Gurr, Elko CABMW, said they are opposed to AB 142 and were clueless as to the bill, and after listening he knows now the vote would be 5 – 0 opposing.

COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED TO OPPOSE AB 142 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONER MORI ABSENT FROM ROOM, COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

Senate Bill 4

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said she has concerns over Subsection B as Department has scientific collection permittees in the field, and the exception leaves them with possibly having to mark all of their traps.

Discussion – and question from Commissioner Bliss 3:29 p.m.

Fisheries Division Administrator Sjoberg said discussing traps such as hundreds of small mammal traps and would be a burden for researchers, and a method to address that may be an exception, the studies are large scale and focused on non-game and small mammals.

CABMW and Public Comment – None

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trappers Association, said they request support of the bill and that they have exemption, as a righteous bill for fur trappers.

Chairman Drew said this bill has additional language than when reviewed by the committee, and one option would be to defer back to committee or move forward.

COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED FOR SB 4 TO BE RETURNED TO COMMISSION'S LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 7 – 0. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

Senate Bill 130

Chairman Drew said the bill would convert NDOW to a division under DCNR, there has been hearing and amendment to the bill to consolidate CABMWs into regional boards, and that 85 percent of \$3 predator fee be transferred to Department of Agriculture.

CABMW and Public Comment –

Bert Gurr, Elko CABMW, said they were opposed and have been told bill has been pulled and bill is dead, especially amendment for Super CABMW.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said they discussed this and do not support the bill, and if they do redo the advisory boards he would have to retire.

Doug Martin, Carson CABMW, said they did not discuss at their CABMW meeting and speaking for himself creation of three Super CABMWs would dilute their input and the rural input would not be represented as it would be north/south.

Chairman Drew said bill has not been pulled, the \$3 fee moving to Department of Agriculture and changes to CABMW are still on table, and understands it will go next to workshop.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO OPPOSE SB 130 CONSISTENT WITH LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE AND THE AMENDMENTS TO DEVELOP COMMISSION PLATFORM OPPOSING TO CONSOLIDATE THE CABMWS AND THE \$3 FEE TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WALLACE. MOTION PASSED 7 – 0.

Senate Bill 163

Carson and Clark CABMW members relayed that both CABMWs voted to support the bill.

Joel Blakeslee, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, said the concept they like is SJR 1 and SB 163 should dovetail with SJR 1 which will be vote by the people.

Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW, said they fully support this.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said this was supported in a 4 – 1 vote.

Fred Voltz, said this is a private function no need for new tax, the council has no counterbalance given the structure.

Jana Wright said she is in opposition to SB 163. NDOW currently has a division to educate the public, and is just an end route to promote SJR 11.

Stephanie Myers, Lee Canyon, said in regard to SB 163 that Colorado already banned trapping, and is offended by idea of hugging a trapper and hunter. This is a PR campaign - a propaganda campaign, and if you left off trapping she is not opposed.

Chairman Drew said his recommendation would be to adopt the committee's recommendation and knows things are changing with fees.

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO SUPPORT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON SB 163. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 7 – O. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

Assembly Joint Resolution 2

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO SUPPORT AJR 2. MOTION SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 7 – O. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Commissioner Johnston commented that there is a Commission Policy in place and opposition is not recognition of issues with federal management of public lands, issues are with transfers.

CABMW and Public Comment

Jeannette Dean, representing Sierra Club, said they are opposed to SJR 1, as this involves more acreage than noted. Believes state would be under immediate pressure to sell the land, and would urge the Commission to testify.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO OPPOSE SJR 1 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE SPECIFIC CONFLICTS WITH COMMISSION POLICY #64. MOTION CARRIED 7 – O. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

Senate Joint Resolution 5

COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO SUPPORT SJR 5 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- C Commission Position and Platforms on Bills – Chairman Drew – For Possible Action
The Commission will review bills of interest, consider legislative committee recommendations and may take official positions on those bills. The Commission may also choose to develop platforms on bills by supporting or opposing general concepts contained within bills rather than specific language.

Chairman Drew said for this item he would like to identify bills for the committee to review and on his list, he has SB 4, trapping and private property exemption, SJR 11 constitutional amendment, bills relating to ivory, feral cats, and OHVs. Chairman Drew said he will take public comment on any other bills that the public would like the committee to review at the NBWC's Legislative Committee April 1 meeting reserving the right to add more as needed.

Public Comment -

Mike Reese, Clark CABMW, said they addressed SJR 11 and had one dissenting view as different avenue to protect rights. He personally supports this bill and 12 other states have this type of similar legislation being introduced.

Mitch Buzzetti, Elko CABMW, said the CABMW voted on SJR 11 and voted to support it.

Darrin Elmore said he is a sportsman representative on Nevada OHV Commission, and in regard to AB 217 that at the Commission level they are opposed to AB 217 as written and hoping the sponsors are open to amendments. Speaking for himself, he said OHV Commission has had process issues and noted that \$200,000 is available for law enforcement. The program has not opportunity to pass or fail on its merits, and if bill kills registration sportsmen lose and he hopes the bill sponsors will look at friendly amendments and asked that the Commission and NDOW oppose this bill as written.

Karen Boeger, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, agreed with OHV Commissioner Elmore. She said years ago the legislation was passed finally and the result was a commission with representatives from each stakeholder group. She said frustrated that the OHV Commission is not working, and has talked to bill sponsors that the intent is not to throw the program out. Lastly as Coalition member voted to oppose the bill and try to get more two years, and assess the program at that time.

9 Commission Regulation and Commission General Regulation – Adoption – For Possible Action – Public Comment Allowed

A Commission Regulation 15 - 09 – Amendment #1 – Emergency Depredation – Big Game Seasons – Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox – For Possible Action
The Commission will consider amendment of 2015 – 2016 and 2016 – 2017 hunting seasons and dates for elk emergency depredation hunt structure and quotas.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox presented information on season dates for elk emergency depredations hunt structures and quotas.

The Commission took CABMW comment with Clark, Douglas, Elko and Washoe CABMWs all voting in support.

COMMISSIONER BLISS MOVED TO APPROVE CR 15 – 09 AMENDMENT #1 – EMERGENCY DEPREDATION – BIG GAME SEASONS. MOTION SECONDED MOTION CARRIED 7 – 0. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

B Commission General Regulation 453 – LCB File No. R113-14 – First Come First Serve Bonus Point Program Amendment – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action
The Commission will consider a regulation relating to wildlife; regarding making an exception in the bonus point program and not have the loss of bonus points occur in the bonus point

categories if the applicant is successful in the “first come, first serve” draw for a tag; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The regulation was heard in workshop on Feb. 6, 2015, and was moved forward to take action at the March 2015 Commission meeting. Tags in the “first-come, first-serve” draw are unissued tags which are remaining tags after the big game tag draw (i.e., the Main Draw) and the subsequent remaining tag draw. Currently, bonus points are reverted to zero for those species categories when an applicant draws a tag for any of these draws. This regulation amendment would exclude an applicant from having their bonus points revert to zero on species categories if they draw a remaining tag in the “first-come, first-serve” draw.

MA 3 Hullinger said there are no changes to CGR 453 since the November meeting, and she provided the statistics on leftover tags.

Commissioner Mori commented that he couldn't reconcile receiving and tag and not losing bonus points.

CABMW and Public Comment –

Clark, Carson, Douglas and Washoe CABMW members present said that their CABMWs were unanimous in support.

Mitch Buzzetti, Elko CABMW, said they were opposed because those hunters applying for leftover tags may not have ability for what they are buying over the counter.

Commissioner Mori said he is with Elko CABMW and understands tags lost if not allocated, and if you don't lose bonus points good way to allocate. He said he has trouble with getting a tag and not losing your bonus points, and he will not be able to support the regulation.

Commissioner Johnston said after hearing from Elko CABMW is torn, and have heard from other CABMWs in support. He said the TAAHC put a lot of time and thought into this with the idea of getting tags to be used, and one way was if bonus points are not given up, then rifle hunters would take up archery hunt and have opportunity to get in the field. He supported it in committee and is hearing exactly what Elko is saying but also wants to give sportsmen opportunity and thinks this will be the really avid hunters who go out and buy a bow.

Chairman Drew said he is not completely wild about it with similar thought to Commissioner Mori, and will support the motion due to wide ranging support from the CABMWs at the last meeting and this one.

COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO APPROVE CGR 453 – LCB FILE NO. R113-14 AMENDING THE BONUS POINT PROGRAM AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 - 1. COMMISSIONER MORI OPPOSED. COMMISSIONERS LAYNE AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

10 Commission General Regulations – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

A Commission General Regulation 457 T-15 (Temporary LCB File) – Awards, Issuance, and Use of Tags – Proposed Changes to NAC 502.42279 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

The Commission will hear a temporary regulation amending license issuance and use clarification for elk incentive tags. Elk incentive tags were designed to be issued in association with “bull” hunts and seasons. Subsequent to initial NRS and NAC adoption, “spike” hunts have been developed, and “antlered” tags do not clearly denote the appropriate quota or season for which the incentive tags are intended. The Department will propose language that clarifies the original intent of the legislation and rule promulgation to clearly articulate the association between the incentive tags and “bull” seasons, excluding any “spike,” “antlered,” or “antlerless” seasons.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said the proposed regulation is an amendment to an existing regulation to keep the issuance of elk incentive tags consistent with the original intent. The Nevada Department of Wildlife determined that, although NRS 502.142 establishes the program for issuance of special incentive license tags, it does not provide a specific definition for “bull” elk. At the time of initial adoption (1997), the only permits issued for male elk by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners were for “bull” elk. “Bull” was defined in NAC, and a definition for “spike” was added in 2002, but a subsequent amendment to NAC Chapter 502 added and amended definitions for several game species in 2010, of which an amendment of “bull” to “antlered” was included. Consequently, there is no current definition of “bull” in NRS or NAC. When NRS 502.142 was adopted, the intent was to provide a venue by which the efforts of private landowners could be rewarded with permits for mature male elk, which they could subsequently offer for sale and benefit from their husbandry of the habitat on private lands. The 2010 promulgation of rules has inadvertently reduced clarity of designation for animals that may be lawfully taken and eligible seasons. Although this unintended oversight has yet to cause any application of the statute or administrative code inconsistent with original intent, addressing the inconsistency seems prudent. The enactment of this NAC will not alter any current practice or result in an additional cost to landowners that participate in this program or any additional cost to the agency other than the processing of this administrative code amendment.

Commissioner Mori asked with the language added will it influence the number of tags issued through the incentive program because the total number in the formula is influence by the total number of antlered elk tags. In short, will this language affect the total number of incentive tags available to landowners.

Administrator Wakeling said this will not change the current implementation. The way it has been interpreted is to deal with bull elk segment. With the issuance of spike tags in addition to bull elk tags, a dramatic increase the number of potential incentive tags is possible. Because the spike component was never considered as part of the eligibility, and someone could argue the case, a challenge may be possible in the future. This is intended to keep everything exactly as it has been.

Chairman Drew said in Section 1 the formula is shown, and NT is total number of elk tags, excluding spike, and asked if we are technically not changing the calculation due to never having had a spike elk hunt. He said it is not necessarily number of spikes on the ground, rather the number of tags in the formula.

Administrator Wakeling said that is correct.

Commissioner Johnston said that if you have area with antlered bull elk tags, and issuing spike tags as a management tool, the formula should consider both, to arrive at number of incentive

tags. If you are issuing more tags in the area, because you now have antlered and spike tags, the number of incentive tags should increase as well.

Commissioner Mori said he is in agreement with Commissioner Johnston's comment.

Chairman Drew asked if there was a reason to not include spike tags as part of the calculation.

Administrator Wakeling said Department's primary concern was is some of spike seasons occur in the rut, a different timeframe. If we include those seasons within the eligible period for which an incentive tag holder might participate, it is going to dramatically increase the value of incentive tags and potentially affect the availability of older age class bulls for regular draw hunters.

Commissioner Johnston said he was not suggesting the season be changed in that manner, rather the formula and calculation of number of incentive tags. He said in a given area if you are issuing more tags for elk, be they antlered or spike tags, that should be considered in the formula without necessarily changing when the incentive elk tag can be used.

Chairman Drew suggested striking "excluding spike" from the two areas in the first page, it is number of tags issued and the calculation, but nothing with seasons. He asked if that is logical step, or does it not make sense for some reason.

Eastern Region Biologist Ken Gray said the reason for concern is that success rate for a bull is 56 percent and success rate is 14 percent for spikes. He said for example if they killed the same number of bulls with 100 tags, and if we killed same number of spikes, we would issue 400 tags. It would increase tags more than might be expected due to the difference in success. For instance in Unit 076 if we killed 10 spike in that area that would add 100 tags and subsequently add 15 incentive tags in that area. It would go from 51 tags to 66, and he understands Commissioner Mori's concerns, however there would be a major increase.

Commissioner Bliss said explored another concept. He suggested that if you changed legal animal from spike only to anything without a point, as Utah offered a tag that was aimed at age class of elk that they wanted to harvest. To locate a spike that is not two points can be challenging and may limit hunt success. If the legal animals' was broadened to anything without a brow point so you could shoot a branched antlered bull then success may go up and you won't have to issue as many tags. Better define the range and age class that you want to harvest.

Administrator Wakeling said he suspects if we included broader definition of spike the success rate would increase as availability of other animals is greater, but the definition is probably outside of the purview of this NAC.

Commissioner Valentine said in his mind if take spikes out of formula that reduces number of incentive tags and puts additional tags in sportsman and hunters pocket and that is a good thing in his mind.

Commissioner Mori said he understands what the Department is trying to do and since this is workshop he is trying for appropriate changes so that he does not hear from constituents that there are more tags allocated, but proportionately the incentive tags are not going to be increased. That is his concern.

Chairman Drew said along those lines, he would suggest, if on page one where it states NT equals the total number of the antlered excluding spike elk tags that were issued during the previous year and the new language would say plus spike elk harvested during the previous year, and in unit or units within management area in which the private land is located so it no longer calculates in success. He said we are actually calculating the actual harvest from the previous year so we don't have these wild spikes.

CABMW and Public Comment -

Clark CABMW and Washoe CABMW, members said their boards supported the regulation unanimously.

Chairman Drew said he would like to move from workshop and for Section 1 he would like the definition of NT as part of calculation to read similar as follows: The total number of antlered elk excluding spike, elk tags that were issued during previous year, plus spike harvest during the previous year in the units, or units within the management area in which the private land was located, with authority by the Department to adjust wording to meet that intent so that the regulation can go back out to the public and CABMWs. Chairman Drew closed the workshop.

B Commission General Regulation 456 T-15 (Temporary LCB File) – Elk Arbitration Process – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

The Commission will hear proposed processes describing the newly amended arbitration NAC 502.42283 by which the Commission may facilitate decisions should arbitration of elk incentive tag awards become necessary.

Division Administrator Wakeling said the purpose for this regulation is to amend existing administrative code to provide the ability for the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to appoint a panel or serve as the panel by which arbitration of disputes of the Nevada Department of Wildlife's (NDOW) determination of appropriate allocation of special incentive elk tags. Currently, the arbitration process has been handled using a panel that serves from the local area from which the individual that files the arbitration resides. This panel currently comprises a member represent the local business community, one representing the agricultural community, and one representing the sportsmen or County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife. In practice, this has proven problematic as local community members have demonstrated discomfort and unwillingness to serve on a panel that sits in judgment on a fellow community member. This difficulty was pointed out and an amendment to the existing process was requested by the White Pine County board chairman on August 11, 2014. Subsequent to this letter, the Commission has heard and discussed the existing process and NAC on three separate times: at the Churchill County Chambers, 155 Taylor Street, Fallon, NV on Friday, August 15, 2014; at the Clark County Government Chambers, 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV on Saturday, September 13, 2014; and at Truckee Meadows Community College, 7000 Dandini Blvd., Sierra Building, Room 108, Reno, NV. At this latter meeting, video and audio was also teleconferenced into Elko and Las Vegas, NV from which the public could comment. Arbitration is an infrequent occurrence with this process, with relatively few challenges to NDOW determinations. However, during the instances in which arbitration is requested, the likelihood that the arbitration will occur in a location proximal to the individual that submits the request is less likely. While an arbitration request does not require the physical presence of the individual that submits the request and arguments may be at times submitted in writing or via teleconference, such an individual may believe that presentations and discussion

made in person may be more persuasive. Consequently, an individual that submits and arbitration request may want to travel to a location where the arbitration request is being heard. The Commission will have an increased workload associated with any Commission meeting at which they choose to hear an arbitration request. This may result in longer meetings, although it is unlikely that additional days or expenses will be accrued in association with these meetings. In the event that the Commission simply appointed a panel to serve the arbitration process, no added expense would be expected beyond that currently in place with the local panel.

CABMW and Public Comment -

Mitch Buzzetti, Elko CABMW, said they discussed and had consensus to support the recommendation.

Clark and Washoe CABMWs, both said supported unanimously

Commissioner Johnston said he understands panel hears it decision is final and does not come back to the Commission, and would like that confirmed today.

Chairman Drew said that is correct, and if no changes will have the regulation brought back to the next meeting. The suggested amendment provides for an efficient method to address any arbitration request, but does not place fellow community members in a position by which they must sit in judgment of another.

11 Public Comment Period – none

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Saturday, March 21, 2015 – 8:30 a.m.

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

Commissioners present for roll call: Chairman Drew, Commissioners Wallace, Johnston, Mori, Valentine and Young. Commissioners Bliss, Layne and McNinch excused absences.

CABMW Roll Call: Mike Reese, Clark; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Wes Young, Douglas; Sean Shea, Washoe; Brad Block, White Pine; Gil Yanuck, Carson; and Bert Gurr, Elko.

13 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. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

14 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 will also be discussed.

No items

- 15 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.

Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW, thanked the Department for providing outstanding support at the recent legislative luncheon. He said CABMW budget forms will be developed upon approval of the calendar and possibly have a Finance Committee meeting.

- 16 Wildlife Damage Committee Report and Fiscal Year 2016 Draft Predation Management Plan (Second Draft) – Commissioner Bliss, Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling, and Wildlife Staff Biologist Pat Jackson – For Possible Action
The Commission will hear a report from the Wildlife Damage Management Committee chair and the second draft of the proposed Fiscal Year 2016 Predator Management Plan will be presented and the Commission may take action to provide recommendations for modification of the second draft for the May Commission meeting.

Commissioner Johnston said the committee met Thursday, and recurring theme during the committees' review of projects from members of the public and committee members was that both want to see additional detail in the programs. They want to know who is responsible, goals of programs, and how the program fits with Commission policy and predator management program. He said if program is research based they wanted to know the questions seeking to be answered and based on those answers they want to know what would be follow-up implementation to have better understanding of the budget and funds coming in on the \$3 fee. He said the committee agreed in a motion to eliminate: Project 36, the study of what happens to mountain lions when incidentally trapped; and to eliminate Project 39, the education component on urban bear issues. He said the committee did not believe either project fit within the statutory confines of NRS 502.253. The motion passed was to direct the Department to review the Predator Management Plan by eliminating Project 36 and redistributing the funds assigned to that project to other on the ground predator control projects that have been proposed, to eliminate the urban bear educational piece of Project 39, and then to revise the Predator Management Plan based in respect to all the remaining projects to provide the additional detail with respect to the individual who will be responsible for the specific goals and how project fits within the Commission policy. He said if it is a research project to identify the questions to be answered in the implementation that would follow most of those questions, and to include not only the summary budget that is provided at the end of the plan that shows each of the projects and their costs in matching funds, but to show the rolling budgetary process of the \$3 management fee and where they stand on projects being funded, remainder to be funded, so that the people who are paying the \$3 predator fee can look at the management plan and understand where their money is going, how much is coming in, and make that as transparent as possible. He said it was not necessarily approval of all the projects that were not eliminated at this time, and was more when the plan comes back to the committee with the additional detail, they can take an additional look at the projects for further recommendations.

Division Administrator Wakeling said the education component was added following comment by Commissioners at the February Commission meeting.

Commissioner Johnston said that the committee realized that both Mr. Wakeling and Mr. Jackson are new and they have been very receptive in working with the Commission and intent was not to be critical of them as individuals.

Chairman Drew said we also have a new Commission Policy in place and this is the first cycle through it this year.

Public Comment –

Gerald Lent said he represents Nevada Hunters' Organization, he said they are not opposed to predator control and helped sponsor AB 291 after survey of what sportsmen wanted and NDOW would not do anything about predator problem in state. He said the proposed predator plan has no goals, and read article authored by biologist. He said there needs to be a trigger in the plan tied to reproductive goals, and predator populations are something we can control opposed to weather. Mr. Lent said the plan violates the Commission's Policy #23 which states to have clear goals and geographic locations at the outset, and he quoted statements from Policy #23. The plan should not go forward without more guidance from the Commission.

Jana Wright said she had specific questions and would like direction as to who to send questions to? She said she heard from Commissioner Johnston's comments that committee wants more detail, and also heard committee recommendation to delete of Projects 36 and 39 and does not understand explanations as those are timely and relevant projects to move forward with.

Stephanie Myers said she too questioned Projects 36 and 39 and wondered why they are not being pursued.

John Carpenter thanked the Commission for denying the petition yesterday and said the predator plan includes too many studies. During testimony on the bill the people wanted this to be for on the ground predator control. He wants the \$3 fee spent for on the ground control.

Chairman Drew said persons with questions can send them to him and he will forward the questions to appropriate persons. He said to the committee members in regard to public comment that the committee recommendation was to obtain more detail and definitions in terms of goals, objectives and actions.

Commissioner Johnston said that was the main focus of the committee recommendation, that we were not approving the plan as presented, need more detail, and need it to be consistent with Policy 23 and wanted the specific goals outlined. There was a question as to why the committee proposed to eliminate Projects 36 and 39, and it was simply in reviewing those projects and reviewing statute NRS 502.253 of which sets forth the items the predator fee money can be used for. Those two projects did not fit within statute. In response to additional public comment for on the ground projects, he believes the revised plan should place 80 percent or more of predator fee money for on the ground projects. Some of the studies such as black bear and mountain lion/coyote density studies, we received additional information from NDOW staff as to what those studies would produce and how the implementation will follow and that information will be included in revision of plan.

Chairman Drew said one additional question, is the Commission did receive correspondence from Eureka County Commission, not the CABMW, specific to Project 40. He said it is Eureka's

desire to help facilitate and may even provide matching funds for the project and he asked if that was addressed in committee.

Commissioner Mori said that was discussed and he believes during discussion of elimination of Projects 36 and one aspect of Project 39 it was expressed that Eureka County Commission was seeking funding. He said that some of the money that comes available is to be shifted to that account. He said Administrator Wakeling at the beginning of the meeting outlined a funding goal of 75/25 split and ended up 69 to 70 percent before removal of Project 36.

Chairman Drew said he appreciates committee's work and would like to see motion to support recommendations of the committee as that addresses questions brought up during public comment.

COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION OF WILDLIFE DAMAGE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WITH UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE IS STILL A LOT OF WORK LEFT TO DO. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE, AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

- 17 Humboldt County Elk Species Management Planning Process – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action
The Commission will begin the elk sub-planning process in accordance with the Nevada Elk Species Management plan for Humboldt County, and the Commission may begin to form and solicit nominations for a Steering Committee.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling reviewed the Elk Species Management Planning process: As the Commission was apprised on Feb. 7, 2015 during the Director's Department activity report, the Department has initiated planning for elk populations. The process for developing a sub-plan, under the statewide elk species management plan, was adopted by the Commission on Feb. 11, 2006. That process was included in the support materials for today's meeting. The process includes 8 steps, A through H. Briefly:

- A. Director notifies Commission of need for plan.
- B. Commission appoints sub-planning committee chairman within three months. Invites participation from list of groups identified.
- C. Commission appoints steering committee from list of volunteers and assigned agency personnel submitted.
- D. Planning meetings initiated in community closest to new elk sub-plan area.
- E. Steering Committee appoints a Technical Review Team (TRT). TRT is comprised of natural resources professionals.
- F. Within six months of first meeting, committee will distribute first draft for review:
 - a. The Commission.
 - b. The Director posting on the NDOW website.
 - c. At scheduled public meetings in Reno and Las Vegas for public comments for TRT consideration.
- G. Monitor progress of planning groups and planning team to ensure facilitation of process.
- H. Submit for approval in accordance with the Elk Species Management Plan.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said local Game Division biologists already have a substantial head start on a draft that will be used to initiate the development of the plan,

including the collection of historical data and initial analyses. The Commission had already authorized a season for this population at the February Commission meeting. However, in terms of the planning process, we are today ready to initiate step B, which is the naming of a sub-planning committee chairman for the Humboldt County elk population and to extend an invitation to the various groups that may wish to have a voice at the planning table.

Chairman Drew said he asked Humboldt CABMW Chairman Tom Cassinelli if he was interested in chairing the steering committee process. Mr. Cassinelli declined due to personal time commitments; however, he provided names for the Commission to reach out to in Humboldt County, and one name was for Eddie Booth. Mr. Booth served as the administrator of Humboldt County School District and has experience running public meetings, and when contacted, Mr. Booth was excited for the opportunity and available to provide the time to the effort and all involved from Humboldt County seemed comfortable with Mr. Booth. Chairman Drew said his recommendation going forward is for the Commission to consider Eddie Booth for appointment as chairman of the Steering Committee and also recommend the Commission provide direction to solicit volunteer nominations for the Steering Committee in coordination with himself and the committee chairman. Chairman Drew said he read in the minutes from White Pine CABMW that asked if Humboldt County effort would have any impact on White Pine County, and said there would not be as specific to Humboldt County and hoped that message gets back to White Pine County.

CABMW and Public Comment -

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they supported the item. He said they would like a Western Elk Plan started to get ahead of the game.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPOINT EDDIE BOOTH TO SERVE AS CHAIRMAN OF STEERING COMMITTEE FOR HUMBOLDT COUNTY ELK SPECIES MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE, AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

CHAIRMAN DREW MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT TO SOLICIT VOLUNTEERS FOR THE STEERING COMMITTEE PER THIS GUIDANCE. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE, AND MCNINCH WERE ABSENT.

18 Elk Depredation Damage Claim – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling –For Possible Action

In accordance with NAC 504.431, the Department has the authorization to compensate landowners for a damage claim when submitted in compliance with this rule. A claim has been submitted and investigated by the Department, but this same NAC limits the Department for approving any claims for greater than \$10,000. John Grady has submitted an elk depredation claim for \$13,720. The Commission will consider authorizing this claim.

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling said elk depredation and damage claims are administered in accordance with NRS 504.165 and NAC 504.421, among others. Pursuant to these regulations, the Department has the authority to settle financial damage claims for amounts of less than \$10,000, but cannot exceed that amount unless authorized by the Commission. On Jan. 15, 2015, the Department received a claim that was mutually negotiated

and agreed to by John Grady and the Eastern Region of the Department. This property is located in Hunt Unit 121. This agreement was executed by John Grady and regional staff on January 28, 2015. Because the agreed upon amount is \$13,720, it is the Commission that must authorize the claim. Mr. Grady has worked with the Department on elk damage in the past. He has provided prior reports of damage caused by elk in 2007, 2012, and 2013. In response, the Department facilitated an emergency depredation hunt in 2012, implemented two antlerless depredation hunts in 2013, and increased that number yet again to four antlerless depredation hunts in 2014. In 2013, the Department authorized \$5,810 for alfalfa damage on Mr. Grady's property. The recent damage was caused by about 60 elk, and involved damage to a standing crop of 1,830 acres. The Commission has authorized four antlerless depredation hunts next year as well. There are sufficient financial resources in the elk damage mitigation account to provide for funding this damage claim. To date, just over \$44,000 have been spent from this account, and we have the authority to spend up to \$200,000 during the current fiscal year.

Eastern Region Biologist Ken Gray said this was a unique situation as the prior claim was for damage to alfalfa, and this year the damage is specific to 6,000 trees for aesthetic and wind prevention. Claimant has agreed not to re-plant the same type of trees again and will enroll in the Landowner Antlerless Elk Hunt.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said his board supported payment and suggested that a different check-off be provided on the form for this situation, as it reads "standing crop" when the actual damage was to trees.

COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE DAMAGE CLAIM TO JOHN GRADY. COMMISSONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE, AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

- 19 Draft Process for use by the Commission in Arbitration as Described in NAC 502.42283 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action
The Commission will review a proposed process for arbitration as described in proposed amendment to NAC 502.42283 arbitration panel that will outline the responsibilities of the Department and landowner applicant when contesting issues associated with awards of special incentive elk tags, the establishment of a subcommittee to hear the contest, timelines associated with contest and decision, and recommendations to the Commission as decision-making arbitration panel. The Commission may provide the Department with direction on further revisions or approve the draft process pending adoption of temporary regulation CGR 456 re: NAC 502.42283.

Division Administrator Wakeling said yesterday, the Commission heard in workshop a temporary NAC proposed under agenda item 10B, CGR 456 T-15. This temporary NAC is designed to address the regulation regarding the arbitration process associated with the awarding of elk incentive tags and any disputes associated with them. Because this temporary NAC is the result of discussions through three previous Commission meetings before the current one (August, September, and November meetings), the Commission asked that the Department draft a process for the Commission's consideration should this temporary NAC be adopted. During yesterday's workshop on the temporary NAC, Commissioner Johnston noted that the temporary NAC provided for a binding decision by any Committee appointed by the Commission. The binding nature of a Committee decision was inconsistent with the original draft that the Department prepared for Commission consideration. Administrator Wakeling took draft alternate language for the draft arbitration process, which is provided at this time for Commission consideration. This draft has tracked changes in color identified and double-spaced. A copy of

the original draft without changes, also double-spaced that may ease editing efforts of the Commission was provided. Copies of both are available for others to review. Briefly, this process identifies the timeline and responsibilities for any request for arbitration. The Commission or a designated Committee may serve as the arbitration panel. The timeline ensures that the decision will be rendered by end of June during any year. It also identifies that the arbitration process will be identified on all Elk Cooperative Agreements beginning in the next fiscal year. In practice, due to the time frame in which we develop the cooperative agreements, this will begin following this calendar year.

Chairman Drew said he is aware of a pending case and hopes to have the NRS done and he asked if NAC and updated arbitration process could be on the May agenda.

Division Administrator Wakeling said that would be adequate to address that claim. He said it may be difficult to convene a committee and the Commission may have to serve as the panel.

Chairman Drew said that is understood.

Commissioner Mori asked if it would be the full Commission, and Chairman Drew asked if flexibility should be included to add a CABMW member.

Commissioner Johnston cautioned on making sure that it is not a committee with an even number of members. He said he has comments on the revised proposal and would strike sentence in Section 5 (a) to comply with keeping meetings public in accordance with Open Meeting Law (OML) and he will provide his mark-up if Commission agrees with his suggestion.

Chairman Drew said he would agree with that as part of bringing it back to the Commission is making sure it is part of OML process. He said he would ask the Commission to consider that at the end of sub (a) where it spells out three members of the panel and where it states "representatives from the Commission or local CABMW" which gives the option if we want to incorporate some local folks down the road we can, providing more flexibility.

Secretary Wasley said historically what the process has been used in the past was to determine whether the Department followed the NAC and asked with the language if you are intending to provide to the committee the authority to determine the number of tags or to determine if the Department followed the process.

Commissioner Johnston said he thought it was to entertain the arbitration demand from the landowner and once the hearing is concluded, that committee and this Commission would determine the number of tags to be issued.

Secretary Wasley said he is not sure if the committee wants or should have the authority to determine the number of tags. He said historically arbitration was utilized to determine if the process was followed and if the number of tags determined through that process, is warranted, or the process was not followed. He said this may warrant further discussion.

Commissioner Johnston said whether it is the current arbitration panel, the Commission or some other committee, if they were to make a determination that the Department did not follow the appropriate process in determining the number of tags and that number was there in error, it seems only to have that number adjusted at that point in time, as part of arbitration decision.

Secretary Wasley said correct, and he brings this up, as we have had arbitration panel in the past, make determination of number of tags absent of being able to specify how or why the Department determination was incorrect. There are two processes, and one is determination whether the process was followed; and secondly does that warrant or result in additional tags. As far as blanket statement that committee shall determine number of tags, could be more responsibility or more authority than the committee would wish to have going forward.

Chairman Drew said it would make sense to make that clear under (a) and (b).

Commissioner Johnston said he has comments to Section (b) which could be incorporated so that the Commission follows the same process as the committee.

CABMW and Public Comment –

Jana Wright said no Commission committee should include members of the CABMWs.

Chairman Drew said the motion should provide direction to Department to work with Commissioners on development of further language to go out to CABMWs and then back to the Commission at May meeting for discussion/approval.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSTON MOVED FOR THE COMMISSION TO DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT TO WORK WITH COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND DREW TO REVISE THE ARBITRATION PROCESS TO SATISFY ELK INCENTIVE TAG AWARDS, TO ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING, IN SECTION 5 IF CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSION DESIGNATES A COMMITTEE TO HEAR THE ARBITRATION THAT THE COMMITTEE WOULD BE OPEN NOT ONLY TO COMMISSIONERS BUT ALSO MEMBERS OF LOCAL CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD, THAT IN BOTH SECTIONS A AND B, THE PROCESS WILL BE AT A PUBLIC MEETING ONLY. WHETHER COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION ENTERTAINING ARBITRATION WILL REVIEW INFORMATION PROVIDED AND FIRST DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE DEPARTMENT'S AWARD ABOUT TAGS WAS IN ERROR AND IF THAT CONCLUSION REACHED THEN THEY WILL DETERMINE NUMBER OF TAGS TO BE ISSUED. CERTAINLY AT ANY HEARING CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPOSAL BOTH THE DEPARTMENT AND APPLICANT WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT DETAILS AND EVIDENCE OF THEIR POSITION AND THAT INFORMATION WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION OR THE COMMITTEE SITTING TO HEAR THE ARBITRATION AND IF THE COMMITTEE HEARS IT THAT IS FINAL AND BINDING, SAME FOR DECISION BY THE COMMISSION, THAT IF ANY REVISED TAG AWARD IS MADE, SECTION 6 WILL PROVIDE THAT THE DEPARTMENT WILL ISSUE THAT NUMBER OF TAGS. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Drew said for clarification that draft language will be put out in support material and on the agenda for the May meeting.

MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

20 Reports – Informational

A Curtailment of Supplemental Ground Water Pumping in Smith and Mason Valley Hydrographic Basins – Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne

A report will be provided on the proposed State Water Engineer order to curtail supplemental groundwater pumping and the implications to the Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area.

Habitat Division Administrator presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Curtailment of Supplemental Ground Water Pumping in Smith and Mason Valley Hydrographic Basins exhibit file, Mason Valley WMA and Carson Lake Wetlands this year due to reduced irrigation deliveries and curtailment of supplemental groundwater pumping from ongoing drought conditions. Truckee Carson Irrigation District (TCID) Board of Directors has set water allocations at 20 percent this year for the Carson Lake Wetlands. NDOW is exploring options for the best use of its TCID water allocation and is considering leaving it in Lahontan Reservoir to benefit the fishery and public recreation. Mason Valley WMA is expected to receive less than 10 percent of its water deliveries through the Walker River Irrigation District this season. In addition, Division of Water Resources is curtailing the pumping of supplemental groundwater rights by 50 percent in Smith Valley and Mason Valley. The reduction in water received from those sources will result in less acreage of agricultural fields in production this season at the Mason Valley WMA.

Commissioner Johnston said as an update last week a group of farmers did file a lawsuit in Yerington to challenge the State Engineers' curtailment order, if the full relief as requested is granted, depending upon what the court does, part of the allegation is that the State Engineer could not curtail supplemental ground water without curtailing primary groundwater rights, and if that occurs that may further affect the management area, depending upon how the State Engineer looked at the primary groundwater and its beneficial use at the management area. There is a lot of uncertainty in Mason and Smith Valley, as to what may come of a court decision or remand to State Engineer.

Chairman Drew asked if pumping of Joggles well affects primary groundwater, and the implications to projects requested with Duck Stamp funds.

Division Administrator Jenne said the Joggles well are primary rights, and the only two wells that will be affected are the north and south Bolster and primary ground water rights unless the lawsuit grabs traction, no know problems are perceived. However, given what Commissioner Johnston reported, the Department will watch the situation and appreciates the update as he had not heard that.

- B Bald Mountain Mine Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) – Habitat Division
Administrator Alan Jenne
A report will be provided on the status of the Bald Mountain Mine DEIS.

Division Administrator Jenne said last report provided to the Commission was spring 2013 and a request to provide a refresher was made and the report was provided in a PowerPoint presentation, see Exhibit File. The Habitat Division considers recent direction in avoidance and mitigation discussions on the Bald Mountain mine operated by Barrick to be a significant step in the right direction. The BLM decided to incorporate an adaptive management plan into the EIS based on likely impacts to the Ruby Deer Herd, and Barrick has since proposed adjustments to their Plan of Operation that will be helpful in designing adaptive management strategies that may reduce overall project impacts to the migratory deer herd.

- C Draft Treatment Plan for Comins and Bassett Lakes – Supervising Fisheries Biologist John Elliott
The Fisheries Division will present the draft treatment plan to eradicate invasive northern pike from Comins and Bassett Lakes, White Pine County, to the Commission. The document is available for public review and comment through April 3, 2015.

Eastern Region Biologist John Elliott said this testimony will provide historical information on the Comins and Bassett Lakes fisheries and NDOW's proposal to restore those fisheries. Comins Lake is located seven miles south of Ely and was built in 1953 as a storage reservoir for the 3-C Ranch. The reservoir is fed by Steptoe Creek and is 410 surface acres at capacity. The maximum depth is 14 feet, with an average depth of 4-6 feet. Northern Pike were introduced from 1970-1973 to control a nuisance population of Utah chub. After exhausting all food resources (chub, trout, bass), the pike population crashed in the mid-1980s. The reservoir was chemically treated in 1989 and then almost completely dried up in 1990. Trout were then restocked in the fall of 1995. The 3-C Ranch was purchased by NDOW in 1999 and became the Steptoe Valley Wildlife Management Area. From the late 1990's through mid-2000s, Comins Lake was nationally known for its trophy trout and largemouth bass fishery. In 2004, Comins was the fourth most visited fishery in the state (~35,000 angler use days). Northern pike were illegally introduced in 1999. They successfully spawned in 2001 and have done so every year since. Heavy predation upon trout and bass has been documented every year since 2002 and trout stocking was discontinued in 2007. Past creel surveys have shown that the percent composition of fish harvested has gone from 100 percent trout and no pike in 2004, to 90 percent pike and no trout by 2010. Intensive creel surveys were discontinued in 2011 as angler use had dropped to very low levels. Angler use, which peaked in 2004 at nearly 35,000 angler use days, had dropped to less than 1,300 angler use days as of 2013. Current status of the fishery shows that trout were effectively eliminated by the fall of 2008 and largemouth bass reproduction was effectively eliminated by the fall of 2009. After exhausting all available food sources, the pike population has turned to invertebrates and cannibalism. Recent data shows the pike population has crashed once again. A one hour electroshocking survey in October 2014 only produced six small pike. There will be several gory photos of northern pike with young-of-year largemouth bass, adult largemouth bass and adult pike in their stomachs. The loss of this fishery has not only had a great impact on anglers, but also the economy of Ely and White Pine County. Using USFWS statistics on what an angler expends for one day of fishing, there was approximately \$2 million expended on Comins lake angling in 2004, and around \$73,000 in 2013. The \$2 million in 2004 is most likely on the low side as a majority of the anglers (73 percent) were not from White Pine County. They were from other counties, other states, and other countries. Bassett Lake is located five miles northwest of McGill and was constructed as a siltation basin in 1942 by Kennecott Copper Company. At maximum capacity, it covers 77 surface acres, has a maximum depth of 9 feet and an average depth of 4 feet. Bassett Lake currently contains northern pike, carp and largemouth bass. Once a popular warm water fishery, it now represents a pike population after a crash. Bassett Lake most likely represents the source of pike for the illegal introduction into Comins Lake. Eradication of the pike in Bassett Lake is crucial to prevent future illegal introductions elsewhere. This lake also has excellent warm water fishery potential, including the possible introduction of sterile tiger muskellunge, which will hopefully pacify those who liked to fish for the northern pike.

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

Secretary Wasley said as previously reported the primary focus of the state's sage-grouse planning efforts have been centered into the BLM's resource management plans (RMP) and land use plan amendment. With Nevada having 85 percent of its state land being managed by the federal government, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will rely heavily on what is contained in the BLM land use plan amendment. Presently there is a preferred alternative, and the final EIS for the land use plan amendment is expected out later this spring. The USFWS will evaluate the plans content to determine by September 2016 whether or not the species is warranted or not warranted for listing. There has been ongoing discussions with the state, and

the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council (SEC), the SEC Technical Team, and as far as developing the state plan which was adopted, his understanding is it is being incorporated into the BLM EIS as part of the preferred alternative. He said in areas that the BLM deems the State plan to be deficient or inadequate, then the BLM may choose to go above and beyond, but we won't know until the BLM's final EIS is released as he indicated earlier, which may be late April/ May. Presently still meeting as SEC and still trying to get the state's mitigation system, the Conservation Credit System, off the ground with credit/debit projects.

E Department Activity Report – Secretary Wasley - Director Wasley will provide a report on recent Department activities.

Director Wasley presented the activity report to the Commission:

Operations

Planning for new leased department headquarters continues. With the focus of co-locating into one facility headquarters staff at Valley Road and Kietzke Lane, efforts have been underway to find such a facility. With the assistance of the Division of Buildings and Grounds, we are evaluating a facility in South Reno that appears will meet our needs. Floor plan designs, costing estimates and other related planning steps are underway.

The big game tag application period begins Monday, March 23, and closes on Monday, April 20.

Effective July 1 management responsibilities of the Department's air operations program will move from the Operations Division to the Game Division. Operations Division Administrator Bob Haughian and Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling have been coordinating this transition closely to ensure a smooth change over.

Game Division

Capture and Monitoring

East Humboldt Range

Fourteen Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, originally relocated from Alberta, Canada in February 2013, were recaptured in late January 2015 and marked with radio collars. These bighorn sheep were sampled and did not test positive for any pneumonia pathogens, although a ewe that died during capture did have botfly larvae in her sinus cavities.

During the same capture event, 11 Rocky Mountain goats (5 billies and 11 nannies) were marked with VHF radio collars to document interactions with sympatric bighorn sheep. In combination with the other mountain goats captured in the East Humboldt's since 2012, there are currently 34 marked mountain goats.

- Preliminary tests indicate that 2 of the 11 goats tested positive for mycoplasma ovipneumoniae.
- Currently, the East Humboldt goat population is estimated at 100-110 individuals.

Ruby Mountains

In January 2015, seven Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep (five ewes, one lamb, and one yearling ram) were captured in the Ruby Mountains. The lamb and yearling ram were new

captures. The recaptures were outfitted with a combination of satellite and VHF collars that will be used for future sampling and monitoring of lamb production and recruitment. Four Rocky Mountain goats were also captured, marked, and sampled in the Ruby Mountains, primarily for continued disease surveillance.

Other Captures in January

Twenty-five mule deer does were captured for marking and disease surveillance from the Ruby Mountains and Pequop Mountains on January 23.

Fourteen elk were captured for radio collaring and disease sampling on the Nevada-Idaho border as part of a collaborative study.

Canvasback trapping and banding has been ongoing since February 2 in the Swan Lake area of Lemmon Valley, north of Reno. Project goals are to attach geolocators (tracks bird movement) to Canvasback ducks. An additional 100 birds will receive metal USFWS bands only and will be used as a control group for the project. This project is being funded through the Department's duck stamp program and is a joint effort between the Department and the Nevada Waterfowl Association.

Big Game

Final 2014 Big Game Hunt Results were compiled with hunt returns through February 2 for all big game species and provided to webmaster for posting on website for use in deciding where to apply for big game tags in 2015.

Bull and antlerless elk harvest increased from 2013 by 80 bulls and 540 antlerless elk.

Overall cow elk management hunts were effective to increase harvest and not increase hunter congestion.

A record number of 256 desert bighorn sheep rams were harvested in 2014 with age equal to long-term average and a slight decline in horn score, with the lowest average hunt days ever recorded.

There were 62 desert bighorn ewes and 10 California bighorn ewes harvested from 4 separate herds.

The 2014 pronghorn harvest increased by over 100 for a total of over 2,300 pronghorn bucks and does compared to 2013.

The 2014 statewide mule deer harvest of almost 9,000 animals was a drop of almost 400 compared to 2013 with slight declines in hunter success rates for all weapon classes in 2014 compared to 2013.

Scientific Presentations

The Game Division will be presenting four papers at the upcoming Deer and Elk Workshop in Canmore, AB, one of which is a cooperative project with University of Nevada, Reno.

Similarly, the Game Division will be presenting three papers at the Desert Bighorn Council meetings in Borrego Springs, Calif.

Predation Management

The second draft of the predation management plan for fiscal year 2016, on which the Commission was briefed earlier, has been shared with Wildlife Services and the Sportsmen's Coalition, as well as with the Wildlife Damage Management Committee as well.

Mule Deer

Professional Outreach

Game Division staff participated in the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Mule Deer Working Group

Topics ranged from new publications on mule deer barriers and migration corridors to antlerless harvest strategies (Nevada is leading this project).

Public outreach

Three representatives from Nevada's Game Division provided an information booth at the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo in Salt Lake City, UT sponsored by the Mule Deer Foundation and Sportsman for Wildlife

Nevada's Heritage mule deer tag (statewide auction tag) sold for a record high \$100,000.

Winter Conditions and Wildlife Response

The months December-February were the warmest on record in Elko which was indicative of the entire region. In addition, precipitation and snow loads are hovering at 50 percent or less in the majority of the region. Sage-grouse lek activity and big game migration is occurring more than a month earlier than on normal years.

Urban Deer Issues

Minden-Tahoe Airport Deer Depredation Problem – Some 40-50 deer have been present on the runway and have been nearly hit by an airplane on at least one occasion. NDOW investigated and contacted Wildlife Services. NDOW specified that these deer were not to be lethally removed until all other efforts were exhausted. The airport needs to fence the runway, but they are exploring the funding to complete.

Carson City Urban Deer Complaint – A meeting was scheduled for February 18 to discuss deer issues in Carson City. The number of deer in town appears to be growing and there are a substantial number of deer that probably never leave town. With current drought conditions, as well as seasonal movement, there are other deer in town that are adding to the problem.

NDOW had a representative at the meeting, but alterations to the schedule prevented adequate notice for regional representation. Another meeting is being planned.

- Several methods of management and research were provided to the public on how to manage urban deer and different options for a solution

Wildlife Health

Walker Lake Waterfowl Die-off Event

Local volunteers from the area report that no new carcasses are being identified and beach walks are only turning up severely decomposed remains. Preliminary results from a number of the fresher carcasses submitted to USGS National Wildlife Health Center (NWHC) indicated that avian cholera continued to be the cause of the outbreak. In total, approximately 3,000 waterfowl probably succumbed this year.

Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza – NOT

One dead red-tailed hawk was turned in from the Minden area and sent for testing. This sub-adult bird was emaciated with indicators of chronic stress. The bird was AI negative.

To date, only a single waterfowl from Clark County has tested positive for this disease.

Disease Sampling

- Seventy hunter-harvested bighorn sheep heads were collected from taxidermists and sampled for *Mycoplasma ovipneumoniae*. Muscle samples were also taken for genetic analysis. Hunters also turned in approximately 140 requested tissues samples that will be similarly tested.

Professional Position Statement

- Wildlife Health Staff contributed to a joint issue statement released by the American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians and The Wildlife Society on Wild Sheep Domestic Sheep Disease Transmission Risk. Link to the document on the TWS website is:

<http://wildlife.org/tws-issues-statement-on-wild-sheep-disease-transmission-risk/>

Personnel Updates

- Cooper Munson was selected as the new Game Biologist in the Panaca-Pioche area (position previously held by Mike Scott).
- Shane Talley was selected as the new Deer and Antelope Compensation biologist (position previously held by Kody Menghini).
- Heather Reich was selected to fill the Conservation Aide position (position previously held by Cooper Munson). Heather comes with qualifications that include grizzly and black bear handling, bear trapping experience, use of Karelian Bear Dogs, bear sample and data collection, and telemetry.

Fisheries Division

Planning is ongoing for treatment of Comins and Bassett lakes in White Pine County to remove northern pike. A draft project plan for the treatment was released for public comment on March 5. The project is planned for late summer (probably late August) and will be relatively complex because of the size of the two waters and the extensive springs and wetlands around Bassett. Project planning is still ongoing but costs are likely to be in the range of \$190,000 exclusive of personnel costs, driven by recent price increases for rotenone.

- Related to this, Division biologists have found northern pike in a small reservoir in Pine Valley. This site is on private land, does not have public access, and the landowner is cooperating. Planning is ongoing for a treatment.

Staff are working closely with Winnemucca BLM and the FWS to follow through on some severe resource damage issues on the Crowley Creek and Riser Creek drainages in Humboldt County. Unauthorized range improvements, the lack of grazing management, and other issues aggravated by drought conditions have severely impacted Lahontan cutthroat trout populations. Some of these problems have existed for 10 or more years but significant progress has happened this spring to move towards solutions.

Development of an urban fishing pond in Winnemucca is moving forward. Staff have been working with Humboldt County on a project design and cooperative agreement and the county is currently working with a private landowner on an agreement for the pond site.

The reconstruction of Jiggs Reservoir has been completed. Unfortunately it's unclear with drought conditions if enough storage can be captured this year to re-establish the sport fishery.

Severe drought conditions are expected to impact sport fisheries in Northern Nevada again this summer and fall. Beyond a likely fourth year of ongoing severe drought, Division of Water Resources has indicated that the past 15 years have been the driest period ever recorded in Nevada. Major reservoir storage is already very low although several waters (South Fork, Wilson Sink) are doing okay and may get through the year with relatively minimal impacts.

To address expected conditions the Division again initiated trout stocking in major waters beginning in February to allow maximum fishing opportunities before conditions deteriorate. Truckee River flows are expected to be similar to 2014 with an early reduction in stream flows and extremely poor conditions below Glendale by mid- to late-summer.

We continue to have concerns about the fishery at Ruby Marsh. The new manager at Ruby Lake NWR has indicated a desire to continue to maintain the dike units in a way that will severely limit the bass fishery. Discussions with the Refuge and FWS to resolve our concerns are ongoing.

The program to develop fish habitat structure in Lake Mohave is ongoing with a number of new sites and new structures already installed this spring. Biologists are experimenting with several new habitat structure designs because the National Park Service will no longer allow the use of some materials such as Christmas trees and wooden pallets.

Staff are continuing to work with the FWS, Idaho and others on a new recovery plan for the threatened bull trout which includes the Jarbidge River basin in Nevada. The hope is this could lead to delisting of the Upper Snake River recovery unit which includes Nevada bull trout populations.

The Hatchery Program has filled several important staff vacancies in the past month including a new manager at Gallagher Hatchery and a technician position for Mason Valley Hatchery.

We have been working with State Lands and National Park Service to resolve issues NPS brought up regarding the cooperative agreement for the Lake Mead Hatchery property, which dates to 1971. After an investment of considerable staff time it appears a solution has been found to resolve this in the near future.

The AIS Program is gearing up for the 2015 boating season and will continue to have inspection and decontamination stations at Lahontan, Rye Patch and Wildhorse reservoirs in cooperation with State Parks. Given the expected low storage conditions, these will likely shut down early again this year when boat ramp access is lost. An inspection station will be continued at South Fork Reservoir to address the zebra mussel DNA detection there last summer. Lake Mead National Recreation Area inspections and decontaminations will continue at Callville Bay, Hemenway and Cottonwood Cove.

Under the Native Aquatic Species Program, two new staff positions are being hired using a grant from FWS for nonnative species removal on the Muddy River in Clark County. That project is showing considerable success with the highest number of endangered Moapa dace counted this spring since 1994 (1,918).

Discussion is also ongoing with FWS on the possible down-listing or delisting of the endangered Clover Valley speckled dace in Elko County. This may still take several years but NDOW survey data has shown overall stable or increasing numbers over the past several years.

The renewed Conservation Agreement and Strategy for the Columbia Spotted Frog in Nevada was released on March 13, for a 10-year term. Signatories include NDOW, FWS, BLM, Forest Service, Nye County and others. This is particularly important as the frog is a candidate species and the FWS is expected to make a listing decision within the next two years.

We are also working with the State of Utah on a new Conservation Agreement and Strategy for springsnail species in the Great Basin. Almost 90 different species occur in springs across Nevada and Utah and 34 of them are currently under review by FWS for possible listing under the ESA.

A recent LE action against individuals illegally fishing with gill nets in Lake Mead found they had captured, along with numerous carp and shad, a two-foot long endangered razorback sucker. This fish had a sonic tag and was part of a long-term research project being conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation and NDOW.

Habitat

United States District Judge Miranda Du on March 12, 2015 issued an order to dismiss NACO's lawsuit seeking an order to require the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management to comply with the requirements of the Wild Free-Roaming Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971 as Amended. NACO along with the Nevada Farm Bureau Federation filed the

lawsuit in December 2013 aimed to protect Nevada's range lands, the state's limited natural resources and the horse and burro populations.

We are preparing comment for Carson City BLM District's RMP with comments due by April 27.

Issac Metcalf was recently selected as the new WMA Supervisor for Mason Valley. Issac has been a supervisor at Kirch WMA south of Ely.

We are still cleaning up from the late summer floods at Overton WMA. Additionally, we are working with adjacent landowners to make some design and operational changes to minimize impacts from future events.

The Northern Guzzler crew just completed their first volunteer project of the year in cooperation with NBU. The Eastside guzzler south of Hawthorne was constructed on March 14th with 43 volunteers in attendance.

The WMA's are evaluating alternatives to deal another drought year with:

- Mason Valley having less than 10 percent of river decree and a 50 percent curtailment in supplemental groundwater pumping.
- Carson Lake will receive 20 percent allocation with the irrigation season ending by late June.
- Scripps will again likely be dry by early summer.

Law Enforcement

Western and Southern Region patrol activities are slow due to the nature of the calendar. March is traditionally our slowest month for people in the field, so wardens are getting caught up on reports, maintenance, and mandatory training. Springtime weather will start getting the public back out in the field after a brief respite.

Eastern Region wardens are busy investigating a poached deer case in which a doe mule deer was killed out of season and without a tag in Spring Creek. A press release seeking information revealed some suspects and they are currently being followed up.

Numerous other big game cases have also been filed with district attorney's offices in the Eastern Region as wardens complete investigations from the fall hunting seasons. This includes an antelope killed out of season and without a tag, a large trophy deer killed in Great Basin National Park, and a doe antelope killed with a buck antelope tag and never reported.

We have eight new hires in law enforcement academies and anticipate having to fill five more vacant positions by early summer. This will be due to four people who left us for another agency and one retirement. By midsummer, we will have had 19 - 20 game wardens quit in their first few years of employment to go to work for another agency during the last six years of state employee pay problems. Out of 31 field positions, this vacancy rate makes it extremely difficult to accomplish our mission and we find ourselves in a perpetual hiring and training process.

Conservation Education

The 2015 Big Game Seasons and Application Regulation publication is now available. NDOW has made several changes in an effort to make it more user-friendly including content, layout and design. All hunts are now split into species instead of resident/nonresident sections.

Regulations and policies language has been simplified. A digital edition is also available with expanded content.

The Western Region is promoting fish stocking in the Sparks Marina and other Reno/Sparks area fisheries. The public outreach messaging encourages anglers to “fish early and fish often” as continued drought is expected to impact the regions fishable waters.

The Southern Region Conservation Education supervisor met with the producers of the PBS production Outdoor Nevada. NDOW is participating as the station prepares to renew production on the show. Their planned schedule will include wildlife and habitat subject matter from the entire state.

Demand for Hunter Education is climbing in anticipation of the tag application period. Classes are filling up quickly. Conservation Education staff and Hunter Education volunteers are making classes available to graduate students before the tag application deadline.

The Trout in the Classroom program is in full swing and Conservation Education staff are making classroom visits dissecting fish and answering questions. Releases are scheduled for late March.

Wildlife Diversity

The Diversity Division recently met in Las Vegas for our annual coordination meeting. Staff discussed upcoming goals, both programmatic as well as species-specific strategies. On the programmatic side, Diversity Division goals, employee roles and responsibilities, team building and coordination, and reporting were just a few of the topics discussed.

Priority species for surveys were discussed for the upcoming field season. Focal species for the upcoming year include Northern Goshawks, Golden Eagles, shorebirds, secretive marsh birds, bats, reptiles, shrews, pikas, Columbia spotted frogs, and other on-going annual species monitoring such as nightjars, burrowing owl, Yellow-billed Cuckoos and Southwestern Willow Flycatchers.

Diversity biologists presented survey results from the prior year that covered a variety of species, including:

- bats (abandoned mine work and White-nose Syndrome)
- Lahontan Valley Shorebird surveys
- pika training and survey work
- statewide winter raptor survey results
- Gila monster transmitter study results
- mine claim markers and their continuing toll on native birds, reptiles and invertebrates and progress in removing these markers
- GIS data development and data requests
- development of long-term datasets for a variety of species including winter raptors and Columbia spotted frogs
- Continued coordination with California on Golden Eagles and Bald Eagles
- Pacific Flyway Nongame Technical Committee Coordination On-going work with the Nevada CHAT tool

Jennifer Newmark hired as new Wildlife Diversity Division Administrator, she previously worked at Natural Heritage.

Commissioner Young asked about law enforcement recruitment and Secretary Wasley answered that retention has been ongoing challenge, and concern that higher compensation is not the sole answer as discussion on challenge of retention of game wardens.

Discussion on retention – Commissioner Young noted Wyoming has 33 wardens and difference with that state and Nevada is that they are able to retain their force. (11:04 a.m.)

F Litigation Report – Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward

DAG Harry Ward said the report has been submitted in support material and he had nothing further to add.

21 Appeal – Mr. Fred Anderson – For Possible Action

Mr. Fred Anderson is requesting reinstatement of bonus points from a desert bighorn sheep hunt.

Chairman Drew requested DAG Ward to instruct the Commission on its' authority and the procedure to proceed with the hearing.

DAG Harry Ward said the appeal has been set for a hearing per his instruction, and he instructed the Commission to listen to the argument for Mr. Anderson. Mr. Anderson submitted a request for hearing on a "Request for Hearing" form to the Department. DAG Ward advised the Commission that the Commission does not have jurisdiction or authority. DAG Ward read the for "Request for Hearing" document: Mr. Anderson drew a desert bighorn sheep tag and he was not aware he drew the tag due to not seeing the confirmation email that was sent to him. Mr. Anderson said the email went to his spam account, and he did not open his email because of being busy at his drilling business. DAG Ward said he does not want to be caught in position like last year (on a case that he did not prosecute) where the hearing was not scheduled at the Commission's next meeting per NAC 501.150. Therefore, he requested that the Department place the matter on the agenda; now that the matter is on the agenda, he would state that the Commission has no jurisdiction. DAG Ward said NAC 501.14 Applicability covers, jurisdiction and practice and procedure of the Commission. This request for a hearing is not for a tag or license that has been suspended or revoked. His request is for reinstatement of desert bighorn sheep bonus point or at least be able to re-apply next year, this is not a license suspension. DAG Ward said again he instructed the Department to agendize the matter due to Mr. Anderson's use of a form; had Mr. Anderson written a letter requesting these points he would not have instructed the Department to place the matter on the agenda. This gives Mr. Anderson the ability to appeal to district court and that is not a concern as he will deal with that, and he read section concerning "Hearing De Novo," procedural error, and as a prosecutor his concern is with dismissal of "Request for Hearing" due to procedural error and does not want to lose a case due to procedural error. Procedurally would ask Mr. Anderson to address the Commission if present, why he thinks the Commission had authority or jurisdiction to award him his relief on the tag.

Chairman Drew asked DAG Ward about NAC 501.150 which is a section discussing aggrieved person by Department decision and submitting within 30 days in writing of notice. He asked DAG Ward if such notice was issued.

DAG Ward said no notice was issued on decision of reinstatement of points or license being revoked or suspended. None of that applies.

Chairman Drew invited Mr. Anderson to address the Commission but to keep in mind the Commission has no authority.

Mr. Fred Anderson said he feels entitled to receiving his points is he is 57 years old and will have to wait 10 years to re-apply. He said once he found out he had a tag it was already a month late, which was a culmination of circumstances that brought it to his attention. He realized he had a tag after a month passed and saw it after a deer hunt with sons when filling out the return questionnaire saw a desert bighorn sheep tag which was an alternate tag, and he explained further his situation and receipt of the tag. Also, noting he is applying through the Department to be a Master Guide and this does not help that effort.

Chairman Drew said he sympathizes with Mr. Anderson's situation; however, his problem today is his request for hearing does not meet intent of NAC 501.150 as statute completely silent on bonus points. There is nothing the Commission can do at this point to alleviate the situation as delineated in a hearing. He said he is not aware of any other recourse and believes the Commission does not have authority to do what he is asking.

Mr. Anderson said he would rebut that as two days after the guide tag questionnaires are supposed to be filled out, he thought he would have gotten a phone call. He has plenty of friends that drew alternate tag who got phone calls and after questionnaire deadline he started receiving phone calls and finally reached Julie of NDOW who wanted his \$50. He said if NDOW would have made one phone call that would have made a difference because NDOW put burden on him. Another problem with Master Guide license application he sent it with secretary to be sent through certified mail and NDOW never got that, and cannot find certification. By same token, he got tag, but did not see it. He knows the precedent if relief provided to him on sympathy.

Chairman Drew said the Commission cannot provide relief as Commission cannot make up rules, and not electing to not do something, just cannot.

Mr. Anderson said that is the answer he was afraid of hearing, and accepts his responsibility in his situation and he thanked the Commission.

DAG Ward said procedurally he would suggest the Commission take an action so in the event Mr. Anderson desires to appeal the decision and include whether or not there is jurisdiction. He said the Commission could take no action as well, and he could still appeal.

Chairman Drew said he would like to hear other Commission comments, and he prefers no action.

Commissioner Johnston said others have petitioned Tag Allocation Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) where folks asked for reinstatement of tag although they did not turn them in on the Sheldon because of government closure, those requests were rejected by TAAHC as no jurisdiction under 501.140 of Nevada Administrative Code to have a hearing on this and even if there was, the request would be denied because when you start reinstating bonus points because tag not turned on where does it lead. He said he really sympathizes with Mr. Anderson but once confirmed when actual tag arrived it was incumbent on him, and realizes this is a

severe penalty for a mistake but does not see how we can say you got it in the mail but you did not realize what you got, so we will reinstate the bonus points.

Public Comment - None

Chairman Drew said he is comfortable with no motion for action

Commissioner Johnston said he does not think that is the right way as Mr. Anderson deserves an answer, the form he used may not apply, but he asked for relief and taking no action is insufficient

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED THAT REQUEST FOR HEARING BE DENIED ON THE GROUNDS THAT THIS COMMISSION DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN A REQUEST FOR REINSTATEMENT OF BONUS POINTS OR TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE MAIN DRAW WHETHER THE PERSON DID IN FACT RECEIVE THEIR TAG AND THAT EVEN IF WE DID HAVE THE JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN SUCH A REQUEST THAT ON THE FACTS PRESENTED, THE RELIEF BEING REQUESTED IS NOT WARRANTED. MOTION SECONDED . MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. COMMISSIONERS BLISS, LAYNE, AND MCNINCH ABSENT.

22 2016 and 2017 Commission Meeting Schedules – Secretary Wasley – For Possible Action

The Commission may take action to approve a schedule of meetings and locations for calendar years 2016 and 2017.

Secretary Wasley said due to the Pacific Flyway Council regulatory change in waterfowl season framework setting to April he would ask the Commission consider moving August meeting's subject (waterfowl season setting) from August to March in 2016 and 2017. The new framework will be a biennial process; however there may be fine tuning that may need to occur.

Chairman Drew said in the 2016 schedule there is a "Commission/CABMW retreat" and his recommendation would be to use terminology such as "Commission/CABMW Workshop" because we are coming out of legislative session and year, there is oftentimes work to be done on regulations, and other items. He said it would be helpful to have discussion of priorities for the next year and would request that the discussion be more collaborative discussion on priorities so everyone has a clear understanding, and this helps with better description of meeting dates as Clark CABMW requested.

Commissioner Young requested that Reno meetings start at 10 a.m. on Friday to allow Las Vegas travelers one more night at home.

CABMW and Public Comment –

Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW, clarified that changes made are for the subject of the March meetings to set waterfowl seasons, and said the location of the meeting should be changed because waterfowl meeting historically takes place in Fallon. He said that may make it difficult to get to Fallon to start the meeting at 10 a.m., and what will the subject of the August meeting be. He said his concern is meeting locations for the spreadsheet he will set-up for the CABMW budgets, and that the subject matter for each meeting is up to the chairman of the board.

Chairman Drew said thanked Mr. Yanuck for his concerns, which will be considered during Commission discussion.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said if legislation pending does not change make-up of CABMWs, he would appreciate if the May meeting would be moved back to the second weekend in May, so that Mineral CABMW members can participate in Armed Forces Day in Hawthorne during the third weekend of May. Mineral CABMW cannot attend Commission meetings in May if the meeting is on the third weekend.

Chairman Drew said to Director Wasley that the main item to move to March was set and revise waterfowl seasons.

Secretary Wasley said that is correct, and the March meeting has been during non-legislative years for the CABMW workshop and the August meeting was designated to set waterfowl seasons. For a non-legislative year switching those two makes sense but may leave question in legislative year what we do at the August meeting.

Chairman Drew said at the August meeting there will be things to do and would say that the Commission/CABMW workshop be something we look at annually and August makes sense.

Secretary Wasley said he would agree with the annual workshop and making change to accommodate season setting framework for waterfowl.

Chairman Drew said with the switch of waterfowl season setting to March, should the Commission consider switching out some of the locations.

Commissioner Johnston suggested flip-flopping March meeting locations so that 2016 March meeting would be in Yerington, the August meeting with the CABMW workshop Las Vegas.

Commissioner Young said to fairly represent persons in S. Nevada that 75 percent of the state population lives in Clark County yet the majority of meetings are in Northern Nevada. He said he understands the costs, and persons may disagree with him, but he would suggest having meetings in Caliente, Ely or somewhere else more southern parts of the state, as this seems unbalanced.

Chairman Drew suggested for 2016: March meeting in Yerington, and Aug. 12 and 13 meeting Reno or Southern Nevada, and for 2017 could set the March location as Southern Nevada. He said he would love to have a meeting in Minden but does not have to be a specific date, and perhaps the June meeting could be in Las Vegas.

Secretary Wasley said we try to reach out to folks around the state and has been a while since we have been to Elko, and the March 2017 meeting in Las Vegas may make it difficult for committees to meet on Thursday.

Chairman Drew suggested Las Vegas for June 2017 and Minden for August 2017, and the committee that may have an issue would be the Wildlife Damage Management Committee (Predator Committee).

CHAIRMAN DREW MOVED TO ADOPT PROPOSED 2016 MEETING SCHEDULE WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES: MARCH 2016 MEETING BE HELD IN YERINGTON THE AGENDA WOULD INCLUDE SET/REVISE WATERFOWL SEASONS AND LIMITS; THE AUGUST

MEETING WOULD BE CHANGED FROM YERINGTON TO RENO AND THE CONTENT WOULD BE COMMISSION/CABMW WORKSHOP. HE SAID FOR 2017 THE MARCH 2017 WOULD BE LISTED AS SOUTHERN NEVADA AND INCLUDE LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AS WELL AS SET/REVISE WATERFOWL SEASONS AND LIMITS; THE JUNE 23 AND 24 MEETING WOULD BE LAS VEGAS; THE AUGUST 2017 WOULD BE MINDEN AND WOULD BE COMMISSION/CABMW WORKSHOP, AND ALL OTHER DATES AND TIMES WOULD BE AS PROPOSED. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 6 – 0. (BLISS, LAYNE, MCNINCH ABSENT).

23 Future Commission Meeting and Commission Committee Assignments – Secretary Tony Wasley – For Possible Action

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for May 15 and 16, 2015, in Reno, and the Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change the time and meeting location at this time. The chairman may designate and adjust committee assignments as necessary at this meeting.

Director Wasley said in April there will be a Commission Legislative Committee meeting on April 1 and then a telephonic Commission meeting on April 15, 2015, to discuss legislative matters, and his list for the May 15 and 16, 2015, Commission meeting are CGR 456 elk arbitration process; CGR 457 incentive tag formula; predator plan presentation; Humboldt County elk planning process, and the primary agenda item will be quota recommendation and big game status reports from the Department for determination of quotas by the Commission.

Chairman Drew said under the elk arbitration there is both the NAC up for approval which was heard in workshop at this meeting, and approval of the process. The time has not been set for the April 15 telephonic meeting and his understanding is the Reno, Elko and Las Vegas Office will be open for Commissioners and the public to attend as well as County Advisory Board members to attend. He said he has no committee adjustments at this time, and has nothing further.

CABMW and Public Comment - None

24 Public Comment Period -

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trapper's Association, said Larry Johnson asked him to relay that he has been in communication with Barrick Mines on the Bald Mountain mine deer corridors, and they have changed staff and are amenable to solving problems with the migratory herd and the Coalition will be involved in that.

Stephanie Myers said the Commission often asks for reporting from CABMW and that is their function as to what is happening at CABMW meetings, and is disturbed that we often don't get what is CABMW vote and what is personal view of person who is reporting. She said it is often muddled and confusing as whether we are actually getting what the CABMW view is or the organizations view or their personal view. She wondered if in the reporting if there could be a clearer division between what the CABMW vote and what the personal opinion is of the person doing the reporting.

Louise Klarr, of Elko, introduced herself, and said she is a Wildlife Commissioner from Michigan Division of Natural Resources. Ms. Klar gave an overview of the Commission she is on and said her family owns the Maggie Creek Ranch outside of Elko and presented each Commissioner with a book on the history of the Ruby Valley, the ranch and the wildlife. She invited the

Commission to stay at her home. The Maggie Creek Ranch was nominated and is a finalist for the 2015 National Cattleman's Association Environmental Stewardship award, and the Nevada Ranch is one of five nominated and thanked those involved in the nomination.

Chairman Drew thanked Ms. Klarr and invited her to speak with the Commissioners after the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.

Note: The meeting has been videotaped and is available for viewing at ndow.org and the minutes are a summary of the meeting. At the Department of Wildlife Headquarters in Reno is a complete record of the meeting.