

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting
Agenda
DRAFT MINUTES—COMPLETE VIDEO OF THE MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT
WWW.NDOW.ORG

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

Videoconferencing at the following Locations:

College of Southern Nevada
Henderson Campus
700 College Drive, Building C - Room 224
Henderson, NV 89002

Great Basin College
1500 College Parkway, High Tech Center Room 121
Room
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.

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners present for two day meeting:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Chairman Jeremy Drew | Vice Chairman Grant Wallace | Commissioner Chad Bliss |
| Commissioner Kerstan Hubbs | Commissioner David McNinch | Commissioner Pete Mori |
| Commissioner Paul Valentine | * | * |

*Commissioners Bill Young and Brad Johnston had excused absences for both days.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Secretary Tony Wasley | Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward |
| Recording Secretary Suzanne Scourby | Administrative Assistant III Jordan Neubauer |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Deputy Director Jack Robb | Deputy Director Liz O'Brien |
| Operations Administrator Bob Haughian | Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed |
| Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling | Fisheries Division Administrator Jon Sjoberg |
| Wildlife Diversity Administrator Jennifer Newmark | Conservation Education Administrator Teresa Moiola |
| Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne | Management Analyst III Kim Jolly |
| Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson | Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme |

Meeting Attendees Continued:

| | |
|---|---|
| Fred Voltz, recreationist | Bob O'Neill, self |
| Carolyn Stark, self | Tina Marie Wener, self |
| Barbara Gowan, citizen | Cynthia Kimball, self |
| Theresa Grant | Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance |
| Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters Association | Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW |
| Catherine Smith, self and Washoe CABMW | Paul R. Dixon, Clark CABMW |
| Furn Winder, self | Cliff Gardner, self |
| Karen Layne | John Hiatt, Red Rock Audubon |
| Stephanie Myers, Mt. Charleston | Jana Wright |
| Jeff Wooden | Genelle Richards, self |
| Caron Tayloe, Nevada Wildlife Alliance | Allan Souigny, self |
| Jana Hofeditz, self/Project Coyote | Miles Humphreys, self/Washoe CABMW |
| Mel Belding, self | Joel Blakeslee, self |
| Elaine Carrick, self | Steven White, self |
| Bob Brunner, self | Madonna Dunbar, self |
| Cheyenne Neuffer, self | Bill Chamberland |
| Bobbie McCollum | Kim Jardine Reiley |
| Trish Swain, Director, League of Humane Voters-NV | Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW |
| Laurel Hoggan | David Von Seggern, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club |
| Debbie Tayler, self | Karen Jacobs, all animals – wildlife |
| Linda Platshon, self, NV H.S. volunteer | Constance M. Howard |
| Marta Bunuel | Judy D. Brown |
| Roxanne Gould, public | Mike Vocslid |
| Theresa Grant | Kathryn Bricker |
| Dylan Miller | Bob Quilitch |
| Karen Jacobs | Mike Irwin |
| Debbie Tayler | Sandra Kell |
| Bobbie McCollum | Cynthia Kimball |
| J. Stewart White | Bianca Kleintzes, Coyote Defense |
| Janette Dean, Sierra Club | Bob Brunner, self |
| Debra Gilbertson, self | Monty Martin, Systems Consultants |
| Don Sefton, Systems Consultants | Stacy Endres |
| Lynn Soncini | B. Godwin |
| Craig Burnside, Douglas CABMW | Larry Allen, Humboldt CABMW |
| Genelle Richards | Eva Winder, Elko |
| Tina Nappe | Madonna Dunbar |
| Deborah McBride | David VonSeggern |
| Caleb McAdoo, self | |
| Robert R. Boehmer, Carson CABMW/NV Operation Game Thief | |

Friday, Nov. 13, 2015 – 10:00 a.m.

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

Chairman Drew called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. He asked for roll call of the Commissioners. Commissioners present: Chairman Drew, Vice Chairman Wallace, Commissioners Bliss, Hubbs, McNinch, Mori and Valentine. Absent Commissioners: Johnston and Young.

Roll call of CABMW members present: Paul Dixon, Clark; Robert Boehmer, Carson; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Joe Crim, Pershing; Craig Burnside, Douglas; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; Cathy Smith, Washoe; Miles Humphreys, Washoe; Larry Allen, Humboldt; and Furn Winder, Elko.

- 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 VALENTINE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 7-0. COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND YOUNG ABSENT.

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

Secretary Wasley acknowledged that numerous emails were received on the petition, agenda item #6. He said the correspondence has been shared with the Commission and it will be in the exhibit file. He also announced that Monday is the deadline for the Kirch Award.

Chairman Drew said Dream Tag funding opportunities are available through Dec. 1. He said he received several emails and calls on the harvest guidelines and he directed that correspondence to the Department. He received a letter regarding a potential land transfer to the Moapa Band of Paiutes in Southern Nevada. It might be something to add to the agenda at the next meeting in Las Vegas. He received a call from Ken Wellington in Elko County expressing concern over reasonable access for landowner elk tags in Unit 061. Chairman Drew said that the Commission received a fair amount of correspondence on the petition as well.

- 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.

Robert Boehmer, Carson CABMW, said he is the president of the Nevada Operation Game Thief (OGT) Citizens Board which is a 501(c)(3) organization that provides rewards for information to individuals who bring forth information to assist in prosecuting wildlife crime cases. He is present today to make award presentations: Law Enforcement Professional of the Year Award to Nevada Department of Wildlife Lt. Randy Lusetti, and the citizen service award to Douglas County Sheriff Ron Pierini OGT board for over 30 years of service (Sheriff Pierini is not present today). He also recognized Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed and thanked him for his efforts.

Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed echoed Robert Boehmer’s comments.

Chairman Drew personally thanked Lt. Randy Lusetti.

Craig Burnside, Douglas CABMW, said at their recent meeting they had a presentation on “Pelagic Food Web” at Lake Tahoe. Pelagic means open water. He said it was very interesting because it related somewhat to the reintroduction of Lahontan cutthroat trout at Lake Tahoe.

The presentation focused mostly on the mackinaw, the kokanee, and the mice and shrimp that were introduced to the lake. The narrative of the presentation was reflected in their minutes and he will forward the PowerPoint presentation to the Department to share with others.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said at their meetings they have been talking with local government and the Department about the urban pond fishing issues mainly at Sunset Park and the outcome is that Clark County had an idea of requiring the display of fishing licenses at the park and the Department staff sent good documentation that they have the regulating authority for that and it would not solve the problem. They are focusing on signage and waiting for direction from the Department and Clark County to be on the same page. Specific recommendations were requested for their January meeting. Secondly, a CABMW member had a recommendation to change the take and daily fish possession limits as take is limited until consumed. They have requested the Department to look at that and provide a recommendation to their CABMW.

- 5 Approval of Minutes – Chairman Drew – For Possible Action
Commission minutes may be approved from the September 25 and 26, 2015, meeting.

Public Comment – None.

COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO APPROVE THE SEPT. 25 AND 26, 2015 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER BLISS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 7-0. COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND YOUNG ABSENT.

- 6 Petition – Don Molde, Fred Voltz, Leah Sturgis, and Constance Howard – For Possible Action
Don Molde, Fred Voltz, Leah Sturgis, and Constance Howard have submitted a petition to the Commission requesting a regulation(s) which prohibits wildlife killing contests involving mammals. The Commission may accept the petition and initiate regulatory action or deny the petition.

Chairman Drew said the process will begin with opening comments from Constance Howard in Las Vegas and Don Molde will then show a PowerPoint presentation. After the presentations there will be Commission comment and then public comment. He asked everyone to stick to the issues around the petition. It is an emotionally charged issue.

Constance Howard, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, said the petition is requesting an end to indiscriminate wildlife killing contests in Nevada. The petition is for mammals and is not directed at big game mammals that are already managed. It is directed to the mammals that are not protected, specifically the coyote and also the fox, badgers, and raccoons. As to the “slippery slope” argument, it is false. No one wants to end hunting we just want to end indiscriminate wildlife killing contests. She said hunter ethics would support their petition.

Don Molde showed a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file) and commented. He said it is not a mystery why they are here because they were here in March 2014. He said they petitioned the Commission due to their concern about coyote killing contests that have occurred in Nevada. The last one was about a month ago in Austin, Nevada. They are also concerned that if the coyote is removed as a target species the organizers and participants could easily pick another species to impact. He stated there has been misunderstandings about their petition, and since the March meeting, the petition has been revised. He said the petition is nothing more than an idea as there is no existing regulation that addresses coyote or wildlife killing contests.

According to Nevada Administrative Code 501.195, section 1, subsection c, it states that petitions are to address existing regulations or are acceptable to bring new ideas in the form of a description of the issue and subjects involved, which is basically what this petition is. This is a discussion of an issue. It is not a proposed regulation as they do not have that authority to do that, the Commission has that authority. This is nothing more than presenting an idea that they think is worthy of the Commission's concern. Nothing in the petition is cast in concrete, everything is negotiable. While they are most concerned about coyote killing contests they are also worried about the proliferation involving other species. If the only acceptable thing would be to approve the banning of coyote killing contests then they would certainly be happy to start with that. They are hoping to think more broadly.

Mr. Molde said at the March 2014 Commission meeting there was some concern that the petitioners were fuzzy about what they wanted. Since the revised petition has been out, there have been some additional concerns about what they are asking for. He said they are requesting a regulation banning organized wildlife killing contests involving furbearers and non-game species not protected by tags, quotas, or other means. A question arose at the March meeting about whether the status of the coyote needed to be changed. They think that it does not need to be changed. The definition of an unprotected animal under the law is that there is no closed season on the species. They do think that the coyote's status should be looked at by the Commission and the Department at some point because short of the sage-grouse, which might be the most talked about species in the state, the coyote comes in at a close second. There is public support for the ban. The "slippery slope" argument was already talked about. We do not think there is a "slippery slope" to this. The killing contests are very easily identified. They are very focused and easy to see. He described some of the ways a killing contest could be identified.

He said some would claim that the best argument with respect to these killings contests would be the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. He outlined the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. He says it is the best description as to how wildlife management might think about itself. Someone came up with the term "Seven Sisters" to characterize the principles of ideas that stand behind this concept. He reviewed the Seven Sisters. He said there are four that fit into the petition and he listed them. He asked for everyone to look at the sportsmen's ethics online. He said we would be amazed at how little there is. There are generally only four or five things that talk about sportsmen's ethics. He likes what the Boone and Crockett Club have to say. He said that they say that sportsmen should display a personal code of behavior that shows sensibility and does not dishonor the hunter, the hunted, or the environment. He thinks that is a terrific statement.

Don Molde said that some people will argue that a coyote is not a native animal in Nevada. The Department spends about \$500,000 on Projects 14 and 15, the predator control projects that were funded by the Commission 10 years ago. They involve Wildlife Services, the government trappers, randomly killing coyotes in Wildlife Management Areas 22 and 33. This proceeded for five years and it did not benefit mule deer which was the entire purpose of the projects in the first place. Thanks to Cody Schroder and Kevin Lansford who put this analysis together. He explained the graph within the PowerPoint. About 1,200 coyotes were killed. The scientists say that coyotes can respond by increasing their litter size dramatically. The graph shows that the litter size tripled over the five years. The male to female ratio increased. When coyotes are killed randomly in certain manners, not only do you get more coyotes, you get more males too. Juvenile male coyotes are not the kind of coyotes you want to have hanging around your neighborhood. He continued to explain the way in which the coyotes were killed and the outcome. He says the science is on the petitioners' side with this issue. He asked if we really

need to kill more coyotes in Nevada with killing contests, no. The people on the other side seem to forget that every year in this state we kill around 10,000 coyotes. This is an astonishing number. Half of those coyotes are killed by Wildlife Services. Some years the number is up around 6,000 or 7,000. One year they actually killed 10,000 coyotes all by themselves. Another portion of the 10,000 coyotes are killed by private fur trappers. They typically kill 2,500 coyotes per year. Then there are the other random killings by people who just kill the animal whenever, wherever. How is a coyote killing contest, like the one held in Lemmon Valley last year where they killed 10 or 12 coyotes going to help ranchers or mule deer? The small number of coyotes killed in coyote killing contests has no impact in terms of the general disruption of the animals' well being that we do ourselves to the tune of 10,000 coyotes a year. He said they do not think that the killing contests have any benefit. He said they do not think that coyote killing contests benefit livestock producers. Random killing produces the kind of coyotes you do not want. Everybody knows that it is Wildlife Services job to protect the livestock and agriculture industry, the public dumps, the airports, et cetera, it is not the job of weekend coyote killing contests. According to their company policy, they are not supposed to randomly kill animals. They are supposed to target offending animals. He said there are so many pictures of coyote killing contests. He showed photos in his PowerPoint and talked about them. He said he was in Elko a week ago and he attended the town hall meeting put on by the Game Division of the Department. He said it was interesting because a gentleman spoke up about having seen a deer with his head cut off. He described another circumstance where he said another animal was killed and only partly removed from the field. This gentleman said what bothered him about that was that whoever did it appeared to lack respect for the animals that had been killed. As he spoke of this Mr. Molde said he looked around the room and saw a number of people looking at him and a number of heads nodding. He said he assumed they agreed with the gentleman's comments about the respect issue. Afterwards, he thought if that gentleman were here today, if he would extend this concept of respect for life to this issue. He said that he has heard some comments from sportsmen that respect for life taken really only extends to certain animals and not to others. He said he does not understand that point of view; it is not his point of view.

He said the real reason to accept the petition involves the issue of respect for life taken. If there is any kind of a commandment short of hunter opportunity that you ought to live by, it seems to him that it is respect for wildlife, regardless of what animal. He thinks the Commission would be taking a step forward in wildlife management if they adopt the petition. If the petition is adopted the Commission would be saying respect for wildlife is important. He said he thinks that is the way things should be in the state of Nevada. He thinks that is the strongest argument.

Leah Sturgis, petitioner, said they are simply requesting acceptance of their petition by the Commission to initiate the regulation rule-making process. She said they would be happy to assist in drafting regulatory language however, that is not the obligation of the petitioners at this time. Nevada Revised Statute 501.181 recognizes the duty of the Commission to establish policies regarding the management of all wildlife protected and unprotected. With regard to the contest targeting coyotes, they feel the regulation is needed at this time, as there needs to be ethical standards and considerations to reflect the valuable role predators play in maintaining an ecosystems functioning, resilience, health, as well as public values and appreciation and respect for all wildlife and predators. She said they submitted Project Coyote's letter written by an esteemed science advisory board and more than 50 independent scientists who concluded that indiscriminate killing of coyotes and other predators is ineffective and may actually lead to increased risk of livestock predation. They also concluded that contests are not a reliable means of increasing ungulate abundance as some contest supporters contend.

She concluded by saying that we live in a time when societal ethics and values are being eroded. She asked what the message killing contests are sending to our youth. She questioned if this teaches our youth to be conscientious and respectful of wildlife and what will happen to our humanity if we allow these contests to continue in the future. She is requesting to end the unlimited killing of wildlife for which there are no bag limits or quotas. The reality is and most hunters believe that killing an animal without adequate reason is unjustified and unsportsmanlike. She strongly believes that most hunters in attendance actually have a deep reverence for life. She does not believe that a true ethical hunter would be interested in continuing the contests. She wants to come together and end the senseless killing today.

Commissioner Valentine said when we heard the petition last March, Commissioner Johnston was explicit when he moved for denial that he was looking for wording for a regulation. He asked was there a reason why they did not come back with a regulation for the Commission to address.

Mr. Molde said the petitioners do not have the authority to create regulations. That is the Commission's and Department staff's job. If a petition is accepted than the Department drafts a regulation to implement the petition. Commissioner Johnston asked them to do something they cannot do. He said there was a portion of his PowerPoint that could be a start/beginning to a regulation.

Commissioner Hubbs asked Chairman Drew to clarify what the Commission is being asked to do. She asked if the Commission is being asked to move the petition forward or to deny the petition.

Chairman Drew said that is correct. If the Commission accepts the petition it would initiate a regulatory process. Chairman Drew asked Mr. Molde the intent of petition, although it states "mammals," is it to be specific to unprotected mammals and furbearers.

Mr. Molde said that would be their preference.

Chairman Drew said it was stated that he wanted to support proper and traditional values practiced by most sportsmen. He asked if their belief is that the only way to achieve that is through a regulation.

Mr. Molde said he supposed people could do the right thing, but these days he is not so sure about that. He said Commissioner Young had a point last time the petition was heard in March, that we cannot regulate social behavior and that is an interesting point of view as he thinks that is what laws do. He gave an example of dog fighting. He suggested the Commission could step up and take an educational role. He said the Commission could take a position and say that these contests are not the way to do business. He said as a Commission value judgement he thinks you should stop this. When a flyer is posted about a contest the Commission could say it is not a good idea and makes hunters look bad in front of the public and it is not a smart thing to do. He said they could work an alternative arrangement of education regarding those who promote and participate in the contests, and he would be happy to help, but he is not sure that it would get the job done.

Chairman Drew asked for clarification on the answer to question #3 on page 10 of the petition. It is about having a social event planned for participants before or after. He said the social aspect of a hunt is probably the most important to him. He asked if the social event was fine if money and prizes are not being exchanged.

Mr. Molde said he thinks the Chairman misunderstood what was written in the petition. He said he used that language to help describe the event they are talking about. The objectionable part of the event is the killing of the animals.

Chairman Drew said that the petition reflects that on page 3. He asked if Mr. Molde truly believes that by setting a regulation that disallows contests they are truly going to reduce the overall number of coyotes that are being killed.

Mr. Molde said he does not think that we will stop coyote killing and he said that it is not the purpose of the petition. The petition says that these events are objectionable on ethical and moral grounds. He said the petition has nothing to do with controlling coyote populations in Nevada. This has to do with whether the public wants this to happen to wildlife. Do we want to train our kids to go out and kill as many animals as they can on the weekend for a banquet or a prize? His answer is no. He said their petition has more to do with the moral and ethical aspects than any issue regarding coyote population dynamics. He said they are pointing out that the science of population dynamics of coyotes is on their side.

Chairman Drew said the future generation issue has no bearing with him because he thinks that is the parent's responsibility.

Mr. Molde said he agrees.

Chairman Drew said it is a difference of opinion. He said talking about fair chase and hunter ethics and Mr. Molde listed the Boone and Crockett Club, is there some reason why someone who is participating in a contest cannot follow the same ethics?

Mr. Molde said if you look at hunter ethics on the Internet, almost none of them speak to contests, including the Boone and Crockett Club. He thinks the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation is much more persuasive. The killing contests have received a lot of publicity. The information was for the Commission's edification.

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward asked the public waiting to speak, that if public comments are being read, to submit the to the Recording secretary for inclusion of the minutes.

Public Comment in Las Vegas and Elko –

Jana Wright said for the record speaking in support of the petition to ban mammal killing contests in Nevada. As the governor appointed the Board of Wildlife Commissioners, you have to make tough decisions that might cause you some grief in your communities. We know being a Commissioner is not always enjoyable or easy and at times might be very difficult but doing the right thing is always noble. The real question before the Commission in her opinion is, does the Commission find nothing wrong with contests that kill animals for fun and prizes. Killing animals for no legitimate purpose is against the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. These animals are not killed because they have caused harm to a rancher, farmer or domestic animal but because someone just wants to kill some coyotes, have a few beers and maybe make a few dollars in the process. Is this the type of behavior that defines a sportsman? Please vote in support of the petition and respect our wildlife by working on a regulation to ban these types of animal killing contests.

Stephanie Myers, said she is speaking in support of the petition, and that she is concerned with the message the coyote killing contests sends to young people and to have these coyote killing contests euphemistically called "coyote calling contests." In schools we teach of senseless eradication of passenger pigeons and the almost eradication of the American bison and those are pointed to as examples of the arrogance of the American people have almost wiped out a species of wildlife. Also, in their great wisdom we have outlawed dog and cock fighting, and how is this really different. This has to do with telling young people about having respect for wildlife and whether or not wildlife has value. She will soon be a grandmother and is concerned with children seeing poster with "wildlife calling contest" on it and being asked to explain that is a group of people who go out and pool their resources and money to go out and kill as many coyotes as they can then they dump them all in a bloody, carcass mass. Ms. Myers said she hopes the Commissioners vote in favor of the petition.

John Hiatt, representing Red Rock Audubon, said there has been huge evolution in attitude toward wildlife over the past century, also strong recognition that predators play essential role in ecosystems. To have contests in which we are killing animals just to kill them, does not make sense to him. As mentioned by others, to have respect for wildlife is key, and that is what sportsmen are all about. Makes no sense how sportsmen respect one species but not another species because they are predators, and is very inconsistent with what we know about wildlife dynamics. He said he would urge the Commission to accept the petition and move forward with thinking of language of how to implement desires of the petitioners, and we would all better serve Nevada if we do away with wildlife killing contests.

Karen Layne, said she would encourage the Commission to accept the petition, recognizing that although you may not agree with everything in the petition, it allows the Commission to look at the issue and do their own work in this area. She said it is very important for the Commission to show a willingness to at least address this issue. She attended the Clark CABMW meeting and had interesting discussion particularly on concept of wanton waste. She remembers that CABMW member Joe Luby said his view was that he was in contest and killed coyote and he had the animal taxidermied, that is not wanton waste, and in her mind that shows difference of values. She would like the Commission to consider how these contests are perceived, and how the idea of respect for wildlife, makes these contests fly in the face of respect for wildlife.

Furn Winder, Elko CABMW, said they had lengthy discussion at their meeting on this matter, and in regard to comment that nothing is done with these animals, they had one person say they took animals to fur trade for use in military coats, and he has a son in the military that benefits.

Cliff Gardner, representing Rural Heritage Preservation Project, said he is against the petition and provided his written statement:

If the Dr. Molde's were to move to a distant land - and I wish they would - I believe we would find that the average IQ within society would increase by at least ten points. For no one is less observant and understanding of our natural world than are animal rightists. In Ruby Valley where my family and I live -you can visit the Ruby Lake Refuge and observe nothing but a desert of dead decadent vegetation, with few wildlife to be seen anywhere - whereas, prior to the government's purchase of the area, there were waterfowl, songbirds, rodents, and muskrats everywhere. Have you ever noticed, a rancher will show up some place - break out a piece of ground - put in alfalfa, or a grass mixture of some kind and before long, squirrels and gophers start showing up; mice and voles become a problem; badgers start digging holes here there and everywhere; insects and songbirds become commonplace; hawks, ravens and seagulls began

patrolling the area - first thing you know the rancher is out there setting out a trap line and placing poison bate in squirrel holes. My wife and I now have five grandchildren that are attending our little country school in Ruby Valley. Three or four years ago, some of the children at school noticed that there were a number of ground squirrels that had taken up residence along under a row of tress that bordered the school playground - so, being country kids, they ask their teacher if they could bring some traps to school and trap squirrels. Well, it wasn't long of course, one of the ladies at Refuge headquarters found out about their little venture, and you know what hit the fan. Meetings were called and it was made known to everyone, "all ranch kids ever do is kill things". As I thought about what this women had said, "All ranch kids ever do is kill things" it reminded me of what I had been witnessing there on the Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge during my lifetime. In 1938, the Gardners put up hay there on the Cave Creek Ranch, just as they had been doing under lease for a number of years. This was just before the Refuge was created. There were sage grouse everywhere - mower men had trouble keeping them away from their sickle bars - enough so that someone was able to harvest a few for the evening meal a time or two. And as for squirrels, the Temokes and Knights who made-up most of the hay crew, who's families were camped near the road, were practically living on "zippie," as squirrels are called in Shoshone. It wasn't long however - after the Refuge had become established, sage grouse and zippie were disappearing - and today, are nearly extinct on the Refuge. Muskrat abundance is also a thing of the past. In the 1960's and 70's, Slim Saxton and Jack Lemback would trap from 6,000 to 7,000 muskrat during any given season there on the Refuge. Now such abundance is gone. A person attempting to trap the Refuge today would find he would have absolutely nothing to do within a day or two. As for sage grouse - where refuge personnel counted an average of 500 sage grouse inhabiting the refuge during the first years following its establishment - today, by all counts, there is only one small group of sage grouse left, which can be seen on the southern end of the Refuge near Narcise Spring from time to time. Yes, it may be true - we ranchers do kill things - coyotes, ravens, chicken-hawks and badgers - but, you know what - we are smart enough to know when we kill things, not only do we protect our own interest, we create a balance. A balance between predators and prey. By keeping predators down, there soon develops an abundance of all manner of animal life, including predators. This is what was wrong in the West prior to the coming of white man. There were too many predators, and not enough prey. When the Bartleson/Bidwell party undertook the task of reaching California via crossing through the Great Basin in 1841, they thought that they could supplement their meager stores by living off the land. Instead they found a desert nearly void of wildlife of every kind. Later, John Bidwell wrote; "we followed down to the Sink of the Humboldt and were obliged to drink its water, which in the fall of the year becomes stagnant and of the color of lye, and not fit to drink or use unless boiled." ... When we killed our last ox, we shot and ate crows or anything we could kill, one man shot a wild-cat." Lewis and Clark while making their way through today's Idaho in 1805 had a similar experience, while traveling through Lolo Pass they were reduced to eating a coyote, a raven, and a mare, including its unborn foal. Peter Skene Ogden, while traveling near present-day McCammon Idaho in 1825 wrote, "with the exception of a few Busards, we have so far not seen birds or fowls of any kind save and except ravens and crows in abundance ..." Without a doubt, there were not as many ravens, coyotes or crows in the old days as there are today, but there were certainly enough to keep sage grouse and other prey at a minimum. Livestock grazing, trapping and trappers are central if you want wildlife abundance. I'll not forget what Todd Weagent told us some time back. Having lived in Humboldt County most of his life, and being aware that trapping had not been allowed on the Sheldon Wildlife Refuge for a good many years, he thought, if he could put out a trap line adjacent to the Refuge boundary, he would catch an abundance of cats and coyotes. It didn't take long however - he came to realize his mistake. Rather than finding an abundance of cats and coyotes, Todd found a drought of wildlife of every kind. Which brings me to my original discussion? For years now, we have been putting up with the nonsense of naturalist, nature

lovers and animal rightist, only to have witnessed the destruction of wildlife abundance at their hands. It is time we push back, and free our people and our wildlife from their lack of common sense and stupidity.

Furn Winder, speaking for himself, said Mr. Molde has made comment that he supports off-road racing in Las Vegas which tears up more land than hunters do, and has heard him state that hunters are killers, killers, killers. He said we kill but we do to provide for our families, and there are not many coyote killing contests in state and no reason to ban them. As he said people go to the contests to take the coyote hides to give to fur trade to use to make clothing and warm weather gear. Mr. Molde says he represents public and he is referring to himself, as every rancher is the public, everybody is the public those are not his (Mr. Winder's) wishes. Mr. Molde said 10,000 coyotes are shot and Mr. Winder said contest does minimal amount of damage. To Ms. Myers, Mr. Winder said his daughter too is having a baby and his family benefits from this, and he hopes his future granddaughter has choice to participate in contest or not.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they did not support petition and recommend that the Commission not support the petition either, because when they went from coyote calling contests to mammal calling contest it spread to ...we have lot of contests out there such as taxidermists give a free mount to largest animal brought to their business and that becomes a contest. By changing from coyote to mammal without clarification that was clear in the support material which some members felt was not well written, they felt that was one reason not to go there. He brought up argument that when you have an unprotected animal such as the coyote, and you are trying to make legislative decisions about oversight or rule-making on it and make new regulations, until you have the Legislature agree to regulate an unprotected animal he does not think you can go forward with the concept. Other states will not allow you to write regulations for an unprotected animal, and you need to have legislative backing and for those reasons Clark CABMW does not support the petition.

Cathy Smith, Washoe CABMW, said did not have much discussion as they had already discussed at the March meeting and they voted to decline the petition by a vote of 2-3.

Craig Burnside, Douglas CABMW, said he can agree with petitioners on ethical issues raised in the petition. Their CABMW discussion centered on slippery slope and historically these types of things can snowball, and where does it stop...as there are fishing derbies and chukar contests. They said public relations wise, these things (contests) could happen in a less objectionable format; they voted to deny the petition.

Rob Boehmer, Carson CABMW, said majority of sportsmen in attendance at their spoke against the petition; two CABMW members received multiple calls from Carson City residents, with a total of 17 calls/emails received and all were in opposition to the petition. Some who objected said petition was poorly written and petition did not take into account demographics of Nevada and what our wildlife and management plans which hold a lot of science from other parts of the United States, and with that, the Carson CABMW voted unanimously to deny the petition.

Larry Allen, Humboldt CABMW, said they voted unanimously to deny the petition, mainly the language was too broad and was poorly written.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, read their CABMW recommendation as submitted and was the same as how they voted at the March meeting: The Lincoln CAB strongly opposes the petition for the following reasons: The coyote is a "non-game" species. There is no need to regulate coyote hunting in any form beyond current laws and regulations which are in place; the contests

and coyote resource itself provide an additional and exciting form of “non-game” hunting opportunity and recreation, notably for youth. They also promote friendly competition among sportsmen, contribute to local economies, especially in rural areas, and provide income from the value of pelts. The questionable public display of harvested coyotes is certainly not condoned by the large majority of sportsmen who hunt them. These unfortunate portrayals, although small in number, are more often than not, are taken out of context and negatively publicized. These contests are very similar to fishing derbies, big buck contests and other events that are part of the sporting outdoor culture and lifestyle. Cultural differences and “socially acceptable” activities are difficult to regulate. Regulation of this nature is not necessary.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said their meeting was not well attended and consensus was if not broke don't fix it as not that much impact by having these contests.

Linda Platshon read her statement for the record: The coyote and other wildlife unregulated thrill kill contests must be banned. These contests have proven barbaric, inhumane, and insensitive. The unnecessary slaughters send a message to our children that wildlife is of no value. It desensitizes children to animal suffering by turning the coyote and other Nevada wildlife thrill kills into a sport, a sport for profit in many cases. This indiscriminate killing of coyotes and other wildlife is something Nevada should not tolerate and most of us wildlife defenders and the public in general vehemently oppose. Several weeks ago, the shooting and killing of a coyote was broadcast on the local news. It was very disconcerting. The defenseless beautiful animal was hunted down then brutally shot in the head. The coyote stumbled around not knowing what had happened, twitched and jumped for some time as if it was being electrocuted until it finally fell dead. It was horrifying and very painful for the animal not to mention those of us who viewed this travesty or as the thrill killers call it, a sport or contest. This practice of thrill kill fests is certainly not effective or wise wildlife management. Coyotes can be relocated to BLM land once they are spayed and neutered to live without being recklessly and unnecessarily slaughtered. Coyotes are predators that control the rabbit and rodent populations. Their habitat, especially with the construction and expansion of homes and apartments in the Spanish Springs area, in particular, has been destroyed. The animals are only searching for food so they can survive. I urge the Wildlife Commission to ban immediately these cruel thrill kill atrocities for fun and profit. The wildlife in our state should be protected and cherished not destroyed for enjoyment of thrill kill contestants. Coyotes and wildlife matter to so many of us. Thank you.

Karen Jacobs, Tactical Team Member for the Protection of Animals, read her statement (exhibit file). She asked why coyotes are not protected, why Nevada does not care, and she asked that the Commission outlaw those hunts and contests.

Debbie Tayler, said just because we can do something does not mean that is right as should value “life” for whatever that “life” is. To go out and indiscriminately wipe out coyotes just because you can shoot them is a lack of personal integrity, lacks compassion and believes it is plain wrong. She said if you need to manage coyotes issue tags, and there is an impact as she lives out in country and has been overrun with rodents this year.

David von Seggern, Toiyabe Chapter of Sierra Club, read written comments: I am today speaking for our nearly 4,500 Nevada members of the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club. We see coyote-killing contests as an undesirable component of our interaction with wildlife. The chapter believes that the coyote-killing contests are a black mark on sportsmen, the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners, the Department of Wildlife, and the citizens of Nevada. Our club does not support hunting events that promote the killing of any animal in an excessive manner such as when hunters are encouraged to amass the highest number of dead animals

possible for accolades or prizes. Such contests disturb many members of the public as events that wrongly provide opportunities for unethical sportsman behavior. Coyote killing contests may have historically been accepted; we believe that such contests are unacceptable today though. Furthermore, there has been no evidence to date that justifies a coyote-killing contest to protect wildlife or livestock. The Toiyabe Chapter therefore supports a ban on wildlife-killing contests and any similar events that target coyotes or any other animal. The Club understands, however, that some exceptions in formal regulations may be warranted to continue to allow more acceptable public events - fishing derbies, for example. We also recognize that there will be need for predator control at various times and places, but contests and similar events are not the appropriate means. Lethal predator control should be undertaken in an orderly, regulated manner based on current and peer-reviewed science when other reasonable, non-lethal methods have failed. We ask the Wildlife Commission to now examine its statutory powers and determine whether it can ban coyote-killing contests in Nevada. He said to Chairman Drew's question to Dr. Molde whether this could be done by other means or other regulations and to that he would say that the Commission needs to take ownership of the issue as this is a festering sore on the body of Nevada, and come up with proposal to eliminate these contests through education or however, is skeptical but that might be possible.

Laurel Hoggan, representing herself, said just as there is the letter of the law and the spirit of the law, she asks that the Commission accept this petition for its spirit of ethics. Dr. Molde left out the pictures of unnecessary brutality that poignantly clarify the petition's intention. She respects the hunting and take of animal that helps someone survive, but killing of coyotes in contest or any killing of any animal in such a disrespectful manner that is happening in our state. Please support the ethical treatment of all animals and do it any way you want with laws and she said she is also a constituent.

Barbara Goodwin, representing herself, said coyote hunting contests put Nevada in bad light and the people who organize the contest recognize that by calling them "coyote calling contest" instead of "coyote killing contest." Nevada is working hard to attract new business into the state and a lot of people would view the contests unfavorably as contests are barbaric. As mentioned earlier it is cultural thing and is true, but at one time dog and cock fighting were culturally accepted, and they no longer are. She thinks the time has come for coyote killing contest to not be culturally accepted.

Kim Jardine Reiley, representing herself, said she is not against hunting but is against the good old boy network that feels it is their right to take the Nevada wildlife and kill it. Wildlife belongs to all of us and seems like here in 2015 it is a barbaric practice, we need to learn to live with our wildlife. She sees the smirks from the good ole boys and knows you don't want to hear what us women have to say. Wildlife belongs to all of us and wildlife does not need man, we need wildlife. We all have pets and love animals and has had cats killed by coyotes and has taken action to protect her yard. She is angry because takes a lot to get up here and speak against the good old boy network. If minorities were doing these kills, a permit would be required. She said she works for a company that provides clothing for the military and there are strict guidelines. She asked that the Commission support the petition.

Cynthia Kimball, representing herself said she supports hunting and is from a family of hunters. She said they strongly oppose hunting that serves no purpose and is backed by no evidence of benefit to Nevadans, and is demonstrably inhumane. She asked the Commission to initiate regulatory action.

Trish Swain, representing League of Humane Voters of Nevada, said she will not repeat the good points already made. Ms. Swain said difficult to contain discussion as all kinds of considerations come in regarding social issues. She said she firmly believes public education is the means to overcome fear, prejudice, superstition and misunderstanding of the coyote. At Nevada Wildlife Alliance they will offer a program targeting various Nevada neighborhoods where fears crop up about coyotes because somebody saw a coyote or somebody's cat was taken as there are techniques to deal with that situation. She said the Commission is being asked to support them and provide public education and hopes that is the case, but her fear and suspicion is that you want to pick apart this petition and that is the Commission's choice but there is a difference that would be made if better public education, less fear, and less prejudice against the coyote. The very people who complain of being overrun by rodents have killed off the neighboring coyotes. The mission statement is to protect, manage, preserve, and restore wildlife and its habitat for its esthetic, scientific, educational, recreational, and economic benefit to the citizens of Nevada and the U.S. and to promote safety of persons using vessels on waters of the state. Hard to understand why anyone would support unregulated hunting where do you know go through regulations of NDOW or get a tag, and asked the Commission as individuals if they would go out and join one of these unregulated coyote hunts? She has a suspicion that none of the Commissioners would participate, as they pride themselves on being ethical hunters and she thinks Commissioners would distance themselves and that needs to be looked at. Nevada Wildlife Alliance can offer positive solutions at the neighborhood level with public education to end the prejudice against the coyote that has a place in the ecosystem and is serving the role as an apex predator.

Bobbi McCallum said she supports petition, and when March meeting held, the majority of people spoke in favor, but did not get feeling from this Commission that they believed the general public does not want this and that made her wonder why. She said the Commissioners hold the opinion of the county CABMWs with great regard and look to them for information and guidance, after the March meeting she looked online at CABMW minutes to see what discussion occurred. None of the minutes she read contained much discussion other than CABMW members expressing their personal opinions in favor of allowing these killing contests. The CABMW's purpose and duties are in NRS 501.297, the CABMW's duties are to solicit and evaluate local opinion. The statute does not require CABMWs to solicit and evaluate only the opinion of sportsmen or to relay a personal opinion to the Commission. She said she found on page 12 of the CABMW manual that two equal responsibilities are representation and communication, and she read the section as well as the steps for CABMW members to resolve issues. Ms. McCallum said she can't recall a CABMW member soliciting a public opinion on coyote killing contests anywhere in my community. Merely posting a CABMW agenda and waiting to see who shows up is not seeking out places where people in your community meet to share ideas, Why would the average person think their opinion matters when the NDOW website states that sportsman's opinions on issues is gathered, to those who make comparison between these contests and fishing contests, she would ask how many dead coyotes are caught and released or taken home to feed a family. The coyote killing contests are a huge liability to the Commission and how will this be perceived if someone is hurt or problem with money collected or a crime is committed? The Commission will be looked at as the government entity that allowed this activity to continue and did nothing.

Bill Chamberlain, U.S. Wolf Refuge, said he has worked with natural resource agencies for 30 years and he speaks to both sides of many of the wildlife related issues and has heard despicable comments from both sides. He said he has always tried to find common ground and for the Commission to reject this petition closes the door on all future discussions and modifications whatever is necessary to address both sides of the issue. He encouraged the

Commission to accept the petition, as Mr. Molde has overwhelmed him with his presentation – the ethical, the moral, and the cultural issues have all been well addressed. He said in discussions with other states, Nevada is always brunt of jokes nationally and let's make Nevada better by accepting the petition.

Rex Flowers, representing Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, asked that the Commission deny the petition on grounds that it is overreaching. It is very well defined, there is no slippery slope. Also heard presenters state that if the best we can get out of this is acceptance of petition for coyotes only, we are willing to start with that. That is slippery slope in of itself. Given what has gone on in the 9th Circuit Court, getting a lot of liberalism, and once you make a law, it is up to interpretation, and down the road and we don't know where that interpretation is going to go. Also a few years back we had a group come, Trail Safe, they had a proposal for safe places to hike. The trapping community met to establish safe havens and in 2011 we had a Commission that willing gave away everything for those who were against trapping and put ourselves in a bind.

Tina Weiner, Reno resident, said this is her first time addressing Commission. She attended today to get an understanding of the Commission/CABMW process and issues. She said she is personally against killing contests. She said she is interested in due processes and how we manage the state and the state's business. Ms. Weiner said she does not want to encourage any unnecessary law but at the same time does not understand how issues become part of the public dialogue if regulations are not considered. In this particular area may be germane to approve petition and go through process to see if it can stand up on its own. She said she is on record for the Commission to accept the petition to start up the dialogue.

Cheyenne Neuffer, UNR student, said she lives in Palomino Valley and grandfather taught her how to live off the land and co-exist with wildlife. She learned from a real hunter how to respect wildlife. Growing up in the desert she gained knowledge to live with wildlife and not fear wildlife as many do. These wildlife hunts are completely disgraceful to the fundamentals of being a Nevadan. She is embarrassed and outraged that these contests go on as has been proven that they do not work to control populations. She asked why they go on, is it to profit animal companies for prizes? That is wrong as that is not hunting it is psychopathic behavior should not be allowed. If you value the reputation of being a Nevadan, please don't let this continue, there is a whole new generation that will not stop fighting for this.

Madonna Dunbar, resident of Incline Village, said she is speaking on behalf of herself and her husband. Ms. Dunbar said she would ask the Commission to look further at this topic and support the petition. If the language of petition is too broad, the Commission has the ability to amend the language to be more specific to coyotes. The Commission should continue the dialogue because she is a voter, fishes, boater, and is a constituent. This is about the reputation of sportsmen, and she has spoken to the Commission previously about bear management issues. These contests are not for sustenance hunting, do not help promote sportsmen ethic which is so highly regarded by the Commission and Nevada sportsmen. These hunts are bad for Nevada tourism. Asked that the dialogue be continued instead of rejecting petition, science also supports. This is not a good management tool which petitioners presented.

Cathy Smith speaking on behalf of self and husband said coyote killing contests are not about biological science. They represent a bigger question about who we are as humans and where we think society should be heading. Accepts wildlife management at the population level, she also believes there is an intrinsic worth in an individual animal beyond its utilitarian value. Coyotes like many other animals have social networks and there are ramifications beyond the

single animal that is killed. She found it interesting that the Commissioner's comments from the last petition hearing were clear that they themselves would not participate in a coyote killing contest, so clearly there is some degree of disapproval. She asked if the Commission means to condone an activity that has prizes for the youngest, the biggest, the three-legged, and or the pregnant coyote. Social behavior is regulated all the time and the Commission has the authority to regulate non-game animals and can regulate killing contests. Ms. Smith asked the Commission to accept the petition and end the contests.

Bob Brunner said his comments are to the author of petition who assumes that people who are in these contests are sportsmen, assumes furs are not harvested, assumes that if they knew the activity increased populations would have a problem with that. The premise petition is built on is all wrong, and there are rights of minorities and individual. Mr. Brunner said there are rights for the few, and finally he asked that the petition be rejected as it is overreaching as testimony heard today and that they want to go after all contests.

Stewart White, speaking for himself, said he is almost a lifelong resident of Nevada and speaking on behalf of petitioner believes there is misapprehension as to what acceptance of petition means today. Some think that it means no more coyote killing contests, and talk of slippery slope and will bar other contests. That is not the case. If the Commission accepted the petition they then direct staff to draft suitable, appropriate regulation to stop coyote killing contests and is not slippery slope, not end of world as some are saying. Commission has ability to regulate wildlife. He urged the Commission to accept the petition.

Elaine Carrick, speaking for herself, read and provided written comments: We can all agree on one thing, making decisions on controversial issues is never easy. I'm sure you've gotten an earful from your hunting friends on how they want you to vote on this issue. And you'll probably hear from them after this vote if you accept the petition. So that puts you in a tight spot. What you have been hearing and what I've heard from hunters here today is this is overreaching and an "anti-hunting" petition. I'd like to address that. What we, the non-hunters are saying, is that coyote killing contests is not really hunting in the acceptable sense of the sport. Most people can understand the legal hunting of say deer, elk and other animals but we simply cannot accept the indiscriminate killing of coyotes for "fun." To me and others, this killing is not hunting in any acceptable definition of the sport. It is a wasteful slaughter of wildlife. As members of the Wildlife Commission, appointed by our Governor, the public looks to you to make the best decisions for our wildlife. And I think that is what we are all here for today. The public wants all wildlife to be treated with respect. Coyote killing contests fails any test for being an acceptable hunting practice. And that's the simple reason I and some many others are here today. Please vote yes to approve this petition. Your yes vote is the right decision for our wildlife.

Joel Blakeslee, speaking for himself, said a lot has been said and he will not repeat much of it. We have banquets, raffles and auctions held that come close to what we are talking about today involved in our culture. He said this is about cultural intolerance, it is about one culture that has no use for another culture. If you peruse the Facebook sites, you will see agriculture in there, trophy hunting, among other things. The quota and tag thing brought up about furbearer management is a way to re-open the trapping thing through this petition, which brings up his final point which is his most important, is that most of the Commission members remember the Trapping Committee which went on for a year and had 12 meetings and he estimated cost of trapping meetings was somewhere between \$100,000 to \$150,000 and knows what it cost the Trappers' Association to attend and sees that happening again if petition accepted. He said this is pretty easy thing to deny and get on with other business.

Carolyn Stark, Incline Village, asked the Commission support the petition. She has attended these meetings and has heard Commissioners say they base everything on science first. Based on science alone you must support this position as has been shown that coyote killing contests create worse problems. She is sure the regulation could be drafted so slippery slope that sportsmen are concerned about can be eliminated. This is not about fishing derbies or other ones, this is about coyote killing contests. She said a lot is put into the CABMW testimony and we all know that 99 percent of CABMWs are sportsmen who have hunting licenses, and they are not representative of the state of Nevada, as less than 3 percent of Nevadans hunt. She said she would imagine the majority of hunters subscribe to ethical and fair chase practices while hunting, coyote killing contests are not fair chase and not ethical. She would imagine that less than one-half percent of hunters participate in these killing contests, and she asked that the Commission move forward with the petition to represent the majority of the people in Nevada and the majority of sportsmen that are ethical and subscribe to fair chase.

Mel Belding, Washoe County, said he attended a meeting at the Humane Society and he asked one of the petitioners what it would take to make them happy and was boldly told by that person that he wanted his traps, his guns, his four-wheel drive, to shove them up his posterior. He believes that is what this whole thing is about, and what he said is the truth. He said we need to deny the petition as very overreaching, and not needed.

Miles Humphreys, Washoe CABMW, said as a CABMW member he would correct Ms. Smith's statement as the vote was 2-1 not 2-3 as she stated. Mr. Humphreys said in regard to Project Coyote there is statement about "the community" and he asked if the anti's with the petition represent the "community" as that is very vague and broad. Another statement "killing animals without reason is unjustified and not sportsman like" and who can say it is "unjustified" as they may be doing their duty to de-populate or take care of predators in surrounding community so there can be a "justification." He said he has trouble with the definitions as they are not consistent, and in regard to fair chase Boone and Crockett focuses on big animals and a coyote is not a big game mammal. He strongly suggested that with the CABMW vote that the petition be denied.

Jana Hofeditz, represents herself and Project Coyote, said she is in favor of the petition being accepted, and she spoke at the March meeting and said the Commission is supposed to represent the community and have a closer look at this before denial. She said this needs time to be thought about and since a decision is to be made today, understand that more time is needed to look at this. She asked that the Commission please as representatives take more time to look at issue before taking action.

Alan Solini, supports petition as these contest kills are not hunting, and are blood baths for entertainment. She said it would take courage to support a ban on these killing contests, people you know have told you about Second Amendment Rights and hunting rights, but they are wrong, this has to do with recognizing responsibility to treat all wildlife with respect. Whether you hunt or not the idea of going out into our beautiful Nevada landscape and killing as many of a given species as possible for social fun, prizes and bragging rights is repulsive. If you have a God would he create any species for this purpose. Killing contests have no place in modern wildlife management, real sportsmen have higher values. Killing contests are ethically, morally, and scientifically indefensible.

Marcus Arellano strongly requested rejection of the petition. He said he grew up in small Nevada rural community and if you could see damage from coyotes to livestock such as a cow calving as coyotes will eat a calf as it is being birthed. Please reject petition.

Bryce Yearman said he is native Nevadan and asked petition be denied. They say sportsmen do not respect animals they are taking and that a matter of opinion, as he was taught to respect every animal you take and has participated in coyote hunting events and coyote hunts.

Caren Tayloe, represents Nevada Wildlife Alliance, said to Commission they are probably thinking of all the criticism they would receive if accepted the petition, and people who oppose the petition have offered fear coupled with innuendo and now have information that people are selling fur from these events. She said hopefully they have a license. She suggested the Commission look to the two CABMW members who did vote in favor of the petition who bravely faced derision and personal attacks for doing what is right for wildlife due to science and ethical considerations brought forward. Cannot keep denying the rights of Nevadans who want to treat and manage wildlife according to Best Practices and according to the science; can't keep denying their rights because of anger and fear of other people. She said they demand that wildlife killing contests be banned according to science and ethics presented.

Janelle Richards, representing herself, said she is asking Commission to support petition, and will not repeat what has already been said. She said she has come to many of these meetings since becoming involved with animal activism and bewilders her when she comes to meeting as she is kind of angry as she would bet her house on what Commission vote will be. We know that most Nevadans do not hunt. Less than 3 percent of Nevadans hunt, and government is supposed to represent people and why are you constantly supporting the hunter. Why is it that NDOW supports hunters, and she is angry as every time they come before the Commission with wildlife oriented issues, the animals lose. Wildlife should be protected. If most of Nevada does not hunt and if opportunity to survey most of Nevada, she would bet that you would find out that most of Nevada would not want coyote killing. If you are hunters or not should not have anything to do with it as you should represent what people want in this state, and they want wildlife protected treated humanely. This is barbaric, useless, and horrible, people will not and do not want this. Do the right thing and support the petition and let the animals win.

Jeff Wooten, resident of Washoe County, said he is opposed to the ban on hunting. He was born and raised on a ranch. He said until you see the reality of what coyotes do, they would be opposed, and he personally has a real hard time with coyotes.

Kathryn Bricker said she is representing herself and personally supports the petition. She said the continued dialogue can be beneficial to the polarized groups. She herself lives in rural Nevada, and is in the woods daily and sees coyotes. Ms. Bricker said she has experience with coyotes, and to assume that people who want the petition accepted don't have experience with coyotes, is an incorrect assumption. They have had domestic pets taken, and she said there are times where she lives when children not allowed outside due to coyotes. The problems are cyclical and they manage. We do need continued dialogue and she is concerned about recruitment into hunting industry as certain products in any industry have a shelf life and would ask those who care about the future of hunting industry and recruitment into it if a killing contest is helping recruitment or the industry. She would suggest to sportsmen that they may eliminate themselves as you are not responding to changing societal norms by allowing unnecessary and rampant killing as that is revolting and that is not coming from someone not experienced with coyotes as she is.

Eva Winder, speaking for herself, said Mr. Molde said he is speaking on behalf of all public and she herself is part of the public and she has never given him permission to speak on her behalf for this petition. She said she finds it asinine that Mr. Molde is trying to get rid of a past time that

hunters use to spend time with family members. People use calls to call the coyote in and if the coyotes don't like the calls they don't come in, and does not understand and why Mr. Molde is speaking for the public when there are other people in the public that he can't represent. She asked that the petition be denied.

Public comment concluded.

Commissioner Valentine said last March the Commission heard testimony and today testimony was heard, and he has done studying, research and contemplating, and has had tough time with coming to grips with differences between rural and urban coyote issues. The perception from urban citizens is different than rural, and finds it difficult to regulate coyote calling contest from the point of view as this state regulates cell phone use on highway yet see it every day. He does not know how you regulate what petitioner is asking for and does not know if he can support the petition.

Commissioner Hubbs said this is such a contentious issue. She would mention that this past month she did receive a lot of communication as the Commissioner for General Public of which the majority was in support of the petition with very few opposing the petition, which may have been different from the rest of Commission. As Commissioner for General Public her biggest issue is that the breadth of petition is very broad, and would like to talk more of that. As Commission protecting the public trust, she said we have a duty to be very prudent to insure the best decisions are being made, and would err on side of caution and she supports the petition moving forward to have public dialogue. She said as the regulatory body, the Commission may be able to come up with something functional over time.

Commissioner Bliss said he took time to reach out to individual who puts on the calling contest and he asked who, what, and where type of questions. He asked him what makes you decide the where, and the answer received was that with all the recent sage-grouse issues, mule deer fawn recruitment issues, that they focused their contest on sage-grouse leks and mule deer fawning areas. Commissioner Bliss said he also asked him about money generated from competition and what they did with money. The answer was they took money generated to rebuild three big game guzzlers, added tanks, spring development and piping with volunteer labor. Commissioner Bliss said he would agree that the contest is beneficial in right place at right time and would not agree with contest otherwise. He also could not find anything called "coyote killing contest" and honestly his opinion has not varied off where it was in March and does not think he can support the petition going forward.

Commissioner McNinch said as you read the support material, you develop an opinion and he made notes for himself, and all variables can be difficult to process all at one time. Commissioner McNinch said he has been on Commission long enough to have seen really poor petitions accepted by the Commission, and this petition in his opinion is very well put together and appreciates the effort that went into the petition. He said we can talk about the biology and believes the science that coyotes respond to repopulate themselves if pressure put on them although that does not make him a fan of the contests. He said Commissioner Valentine made the comment about the urbanization versus rural and human dimension studies tell us that State of Nevada is one of the most urban states in the U.S. and with urbanization of state that increases attitude of distrust for wildlife agencies increases so we are swimming upstream when talking of developing broad base of support for this agency. He believes that potential detriment of public perception of these contests...and is not completely sure if public opposed with removal of coyotes as may be more how removal is done. This just compounds and exacerbates that issue that we are already dealing with as a Commission, and he does believe

the Commission needs to take ownership of the issue and by accepting the petition does not lock the Commission in and the Commission has not been told whether they have legal authority or not by the DAG or LCB. He said Wildlife Services in place to deal with agricultural issues and over many years they have justified their actions by being very specific, and their reports denote removal of offending animals, so the Commission needs to play an active role regardless where we end up, and he will vote to support the petition.

Commissioner Mori said this is pretty typical for him as he hears all these comments and hears what members of public are saying. We have two opposing sides, and he does not like feeling that he is ignoring one side or the other, tries to stay open. His perception of petition as he listened is that he agrees that these contests do not benefit ranchers. He also is not really clear what petitioner is asking for as consistency is not there. As heard first at beginning of presentation it was "unprotected mammals" not governed by some type of tag system or quota, then as we went on, the reasoning was that we need the petition that broad to prevent these contests and coyotes from progressing into something else, and then as we went further, the petitioner finally said we are not talking about rabbits, and not sure if we were still specifically talking about coyotes or other mammals, so that makes confusion in his mind about slippery slope deal. Also brought up we need more time to make a decision, and brought up that educational avenues could be pursued. In his view the way to go may not be as stringent as regulatory action that could be taken by accepting petition and at this time will go with denying petition.

Commissioner Wallace said opinion has not changed since the last time the petition was heard, and he will stick with CABMWs as they bring this to the public. In his mind, two more populated urban areas of state, Clark and Washoe, do not support the petition. He said this is a cultural issue with many people not agreeing and a lot of people with no problem. Roughly 26 people spoke in support of petition as represented with representing public of Nevada and only 26 of public in Nevada does not state that people are overwhelmingly in support. Commissioner Wallace will not be in support of the petition.

Commissioner McNinch said accepting petition does not lock the Commission in a direction; rather allows opportunity to discuss, at least 25 percent or one-third of CABMWs did not have a meeting for whatever reason, and some CABMWs present said votes based on what was contained in packet, and clarification heard today as to intent of petition. He said we had three times the testimony heard today than most CABMW meetings lasted. The petition warrants more time and Commission has responsibility to give it a fair shake.

Commissioner Hubbs said she would reiterate what Commission McNinch said as Commission has duty to take a look at it and does not set the Commission under any course of action. Action leaves the Commission open to modify, amend or just take a look at unprotected mammal species at this time. The Commission has a duty to protect and manage wildlife; and sees no harm in taking a look at it.

Chairman Drew said in his opinion the contests are not sanctioned or endorsed by the Commission or the Department. He appreciates all who came today as discussions were productive for him, and he appreciates the petitioners taking time to clarify their petition and putting together a much better package. He struggles with putting together a regulatory process simply because with all the time the petitioners had to put together the petition there are still a lot of questions as to what we are trying to regulate. He sees a problem with that as we are trying to use a regulation to bridge a social divide. He thinks launching into a regulatory process could make it more difficult going forward, and if he believed denying the petition would

completely discontinue all dialogue and discussion, he would support accepting it. At this time he does not think a regulatory course of action at this time makes sense due to all the variables. Chairman Drew said there are activities that go on within the hunting, fishing or the community in general that he does not support, and is not sure if regulation is answer he is not finding regulatory common ground right now.

Commissioner McNinch asked for him what is alternate process to keep dialogue open as valuable for agency. Bottom line is agency has to adapt to new attitudes on wildlife. In his opinion Commission does not always do that.

Chairman Drew said regulatory process will be cumbersome and has not been that efficient from past experiences. In his opinion a Commission Policy discussion would be more fruitful as polarized as this issue is.

Commissioner McNinch said he will vote in favor of the petition and does recognize that regulatory history with Legislative Commission has not gone very far or well in the past even with all of the Commission on board.

Commissioner Hubbs said she believes petition met all of the procedural requirements although may have been broad for some present, thinks petition is worthwhile to look at it and if the Commission shies away from petitions as perception is they are too much work and if the Commission does not take action, the petitioners will take effort somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE PETITION AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION. COMMISSIONERS IN FAVOR: HUBBS AND MCNINCH. COMMISSIONERS OPPOSED: MORI, VALENTINE, WALLACE, BLISS, AND CHAIRMAN DREW. MOTION FAILED 2-5.

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward advised to clarify that two Commissioners are absent.

COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND YOUNG ABSENT.

Commissioner Valentine said compared to where we were at March, much has been in the media about contests and word is out with coyote calling contests as not a positive issue, and will have to move forward with denial.

COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO DENY THE PETITION FROM MOLDE, VOLTZ, STURGIS AND HOWARD DATED OCT. 9, 2015. COMMISSIONER MORI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Mori said the Commission has started down regulatory path before and we ended up where we did not want to, and he does not want to run scared, but he feels that is where we could end up. That furthers his support for denial of the petition.

COMMISSIONERS IN FAVOR: CHAIRMAN DREW, COMMISSIONERS MORI, VALENTINE, WALLACE, AND BLISS. COMMISSIONERS OPPOSED: HUBBS AND MCNINCH. MOTION CARRIED 5-2. COMMISSIONERS JOHNSTON AND YOUNG ABSENT.

- 7 Predation Management Fiscal Year 2015 Report – Staff Specialist Pat Jackson or Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Informational
The Game Division will present the status of the 2015 Predation Management Report. Per Commission Policy 23, the Department shall prepare an annual Predation Management Status Report (Status Report) detailing results of the previous fiscal year's projects. This status report shall be presented at the last Commission meeting of each calendar year.

Staff Specialist Pat Jackson presented a PowerPoint (exhibit file). He gave a brief overview of the progress of the 11 projects in the plan.

Commissioner Bliss asked if Pat Jackson had been to any of the kill sites to see if there is competition over mountain lion killed or black bear killed. Have you documented any of that through your GPS collar data?

Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said they have documented that data, but he does not know the portion of kill sites that competition was observed. It is a fairly large sample size.

Chairman Drew asked if the slide on the PowerPoint that is showing the collar data where one animal is essentially avoiding the other animal would be an example of this.

Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said yes. One of the initial pictures was of the black bear consuming a deer that had been initially killed by a mountain lion.

Chairman Drew asked to be reminded of when the summary of the events are due or when the results are going to be presented.

Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said it is a multi-year study and it still has a few more years to run its course. He did not recall what fiscal year it will end.

Commissioner Bliss asked about the additional testing on the Sierra Nevada Red Fox.

Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said those data will be collected this summer.

Game Biologist Russell Woolstenhulme said the samples were collected over the course of this summer and they are in the process of analyzing those right now. The additional sample areas are all in high elevations. Most of the trapping samples that came in were low elevation. They are trying to increase the high elevation sample size.

Commissioner Bliss asked when they will stop collecting samples.

Game Biologist Russell Woolstenhulme said at this point in time he is waiting to see what he gets out of it this year and he will evaluate the data.

Commissioner Bliss said he is asking because he thought the committee decided to approve the final portion of this project last year.

Game Biologist Russell Woolstenhulme said hopefully next time the predator plan is presented there may be some analysis that is finalized that can be incorporated.

Chairman Drew asked what the preliminary findings were.

Game Biologist Russell Woolstenhulme said the low elevation areas are all hybridized with European Red Fox. The high elevation areas look like they are native type foxes. The native type foxes are closely tied to the Rocky Mountain population of Red Fox. California is doing a lot of work like this. There is no current data that shows any indicators that the Sierra Nevada Red Fox has ever come over the top of the Sierra's. That was one of the big questions. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service made findings on the Sierra Nevada Red Fox and chose not to list it at this time. They are under review. They can come forward again in the future, but at this point in time there is not any data that shows they are on our side.

Chairman Drew asked what he meant by native.

Game Biologist Russell Woolstenhulme said native is the Rocky Mountain Red Fox.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the intent of the management and if they are trying to reintroduce the black bear in its historic range.

Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said they are not reintroducing black bears. They have been recolonizing from California so they are trying to understand the recolonization, how mountain lions interact with black bears and speed up the recolonization, and when the recolonization takes place are mountain lions more inclined to partake in human wildlife conflicts. An example would be a mountain lion spending time to acquire a deer but it does not get to eat much because a black bear came in and took over. The mountain lion did not get to eat much so is it more inclined to go eat someone's cattle? There is a standalone project of collaring mule deer, but the funding does not come from the \$3predator fee.

8 Public Comment Period

Rob Boehmer, representing Carson CABMW, said he should have provided his testimony during the CABMW section. An urban mule deer education program was implemented in Carson City. It is an ongoing effort and they have recognized that urban mule deer are an issue in Carson City. They have developed a special committee that has developed educational flyers and implemented outreach to the community through cooperative efforts. The Carson City School District has helped us get the outreach back to households. They have also been working with local governments. The Department has given us some council on how we should go about developing a long term plan for this. He said they do not see it going away. The community is coming forward to ask what the city is going to do about urban mule deer in Carson City. They want people to understand that it is illegal to feed any wildlife and kids should not be trying to pet the deer. They are excited to hear that the Department has created a position to assist community dealing with nuisance wildlife. He hopes that this will help them with coming up with a long term management plan with the urban mule deer population. He said Carson City CABMW had a good meeting. He said they recognize the need to have more input at CABMW meetings. They want to drum up interest and have people from the community come and express their opinions. Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling did attend their meeting to discuss the Departments guidelines for harvest management. He expressed the importance for sportsmen and the public providing input. They will add this to their annual plan.

Paul Dixon, speaking on behalf of himself said Shadow Ridge High School has the first ever clay shooting sport event. There are 10 other schools in the valley that are interested in seeing how this program evolves. Any other school in the valley can send their children to this after

school activity. If they get more than 5 children they can start their own team. Mike Reese will be the instructor who is starting the shooting sports program.

Cathy Smith, Reno said that one of the problems with the CABMW process is you are not going to get the public input when outcome is foregone conclusion. CABMW representation is similar to Commission representation. They have a majority of sportsmen representatives and you can almost guarantee the outcome of the votes. Until that changes I do not know if you can go with a nice, diverse public body being represented by the CABMW, maybe in the rural areas, but especially not in Washoe County and Clark County. It is not a realistic expectation.

Don Molde, Reno speaking on behalf of himself said that with respect to CABMWs he thinks that no one knows about them and it is unfortunate. He think that if the CABMWs offered a minority reports some people, including him, would be interested. So it would be mentioned that some people had a different opinion. From his point of view it is a waste of time. He thanked the Commission for support and comments on the petition. He likes the idea of a policy. He has had trouble getting his stuff on the agenda. He said they have no avenue at these meetings other than the petition and public comment. He commented that he and former Commissioner Layne mentioned coyote killing contests for a year or more. He does not like doing business that way. He would like a way other than suing or petitioning and would like opportunity to discuss things. He said he is happy with the vote. He said Commissioner McNinch has way of seeing the future that coincides with how he sees things. The public is going the way Commissioner McNinch talks about as seen on social media. It is going to get more interesting.

Fred Voltz suggested when there is a petition or any other contentious issue to report precise number of emails that were received. Some of the comments made today indicated that you felt the public is from a different perspective than what he has been seeing on some of these issues. It is an important number to put out on the table before discussion.

Cory Lytle, speaking for himself on behalf of CABMWs, he said the CABMW process is a great process and it works. They do not always agree and they appreciate the process. On behalf of CABMWs this is their voice to the Commission and the Department. He received many calls and many topics are discussed among sportsmen that do not necessarily end up in the meeting minutes, but things are recognized. They are recognized a lot more than what is stated in a survey that was conducted two years ago. The CABMW process is sound.

Gerald Lent, representing Nevada Hunters Association, said he would like his comments to be included in the distributed minutes of the meeting. He does not believe Nevada laws are being followed in accordance with the predator plan. The predator plan shows that there are three types of projects: implementation, experimental management, and experimentation. If you look at the final draft of the predator plan there are two projects, subproject 21-02 raven removal and greater sage grouse nest success, which is included in the lethal part and another one is subproject 22-074 mountain lion removal and diet analysis for the protection of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, those are not lethal projects. The Department says the projects contain limited lethal, but I do not know what that is. Limited lethal are not eligible for federal funds. The PR funds are nonacceptable. They do not apply those because they consider them lethal. They are not lethal, they are a mixed study and a mixed lethal. You have to delineate how much is lethal and how much is study. Diet analysis of lions is not lethal. If you take those two projects out of the lethal, you are doing 60 percent of the projects with the money for lethal and 20 percent is, what he calls, a combo. A lot of NDOW employees and Commissioners were at the meeting, the big meeting at the Legislature, and the law does not say limited lethal and the law does not say studies. It says 80 percent is to kill predators of the money collected for the current year. We

have \$556,000 times 80 percent is \$445,000 to be lethal control and you are not spending that money here. Chairman Drew, at the June meeting in Eureka did go over the bills effecting wildlife and he talked about Assembly Bill 78. The signed version requires 80 percent of the \$3 predator fee to be lethal control. He acknowledged the bill here. If you remember the meeting we had with the senator down there, the Department and there were some Commissioners there who pleaded with the senator when they were going to take this out of the Department of Wildlife to keep the program and the Department promised they would implement it. That is exactly what came out of the meeting. They kept it in the Department because they said they would do the 80 percent. I am not going to go into Assembly Bill 78, it is a law that says you are not to approve any projects that do not provide for the expenditure of less than 80 percent. It is the law. Commissioner Johnston, so astutely in the May 2015 meeting, said the ending balance was \$480,000 and we have a plan with \$550,000 and so we have about \$1 million in there and the carryover of \$456,000, no one knows where it is at. We have almost \$1 million in there and we are not spending it. If you look at what is being expended right now, I do not know where the rest of the money is. He is saying that you have to read the law and it says that you must spend 80 percent on lethal control, it is really simple because you know how much money we have and it became effective May 27, 2015, regardless of when you current predator plan was started. For example, if the speed limit from Tonopah to Las Vegas was 70 miles per hour and a law was passed effective May 27, 2015, you would have to change the speed limit on May 27, 2015 down to 55 miles per hour because that is when the law took effect. The law took effect 80 percent and I do not care if the predator plan was approved a year ago, it has got to do the 80 percent and it is not being done now. I think the Commissioners should look at where the dollars are and make sure there is 80 percent for lethal, not limited lethal because what can happen is you can take a predator plan for \$100,000 and have 1 percent of it for lethal and 99 percent of study and call it mixed lethal and then put it in and call it lethal because that is what they did and so they are saying there is 86 percent lethal and it is only 60 percent lethal if you take those out. I do not think it is following the law and I think the Commissioners should really take a good look at the percentages of these plans. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Saturday, Nov. 14, 2015 - 8:30 a. m.

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

Chairman Drew called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. He asked for roll call of the Commissioners. Commissioners present: Chairman Drew, Vice Chairman Wallace, Commissioners Bliss, Hubbs, McNinch, Mori and Valentine. Absent Commissioners: Johnston and Young.

Roll call of CABMW members present: Paul Dixon, Clark; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Joe Crim, Pershing; Craig Burnside, Douglas; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; and Cathy Smith, Washoe.

- 10 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.

Public Comment – None

COMMISSIONER BLISS MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. MOTION CARRIED 7-0. COMMISSIONERS YOUNG AND JOHNSTON ABSENT.

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

None

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

None

- 13 Consideration of Possible Changes to Waterfowl Hunt Zones for 2016 - 2020 – Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme – For Possible Action
The Commission will hear alternatives and may choose to provide direction to the Department on possible changes to waterfowl hunting zones. The Pacific Flyway entertains changes to waterfowl hunting zones every five years, and potential changes must be noticed by Dec. 1, 2015 to receive consideration. Any changes accepted by the Pacific Flyway will not take effect until autumn 2016 and would remain in effect until autumn 2020, at which time the Department may again suggest changes.

Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme said every five years the Pacific Flyway states have the opportunity to adjust waterfowl hunt zones. No change is needed, but he wanted to allow consideration in case changes are desired. Alternatives were provided (support material/exhibit file) and there is the option to leave the seasons as they are.

Chairman Drew asked if the Department had a preference.

Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme said the Department is neutral.

Chairman Drew said that he did not see very much comment from the CABMWs. A lot of the CABMWs that would be affected by switching to Alternative 1 or 2 seem to have addressed the issue. He asked for input from CABMWs.

CABMW Public Comment –

Cathy Smith, Washoe CABMW, said they briefly discussed this and did not hear a compelling reason to change it. They voted on the no action alternative.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they had short discussion about this. The big thing for Southern Nevada is they wanted to make sure that anything that was done did not impact the Southern Zone. They did not feel qualified to discuss other parts of state as less than 1 to 2 percent of their hunters hunt that area. They want the Southern Zone to stay the same and so they chose the no action alternative.

Craig Burnside, Douglas CABMW, said their discussion centered on the support material and assumed that Eureka and Lander Counties wanted to be able to have earlier hunt, therefore they voted to recommend Alternative 1, adding Eureka and Lander Counties to the Northeast Zone.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said they voted to stay with the current or go with Alternative 1.

Public Comment –

Rex Flowers, speaking for himself said he attended the Washoe CABMW meeting and before the meeting he contacted Lander CABMW and they took no action as they have few waterfowl hunters. Eureka CABMW and Nye CABMW did not take action as they did not hold meetings. He suggested to Washoe CABMW to leave as is, as there was no input from the affected counties.

Chairman Drew said with no comments from the affected counties he supports the no action alternative.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO LEAVE THE WATERFOWL HUNT ZONES AS IS AND VOTE TO APPROVE THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 7-0. COMMISSIONERS YOUNG AND JOHNSTON ABSENT.

- 14 Nevada Department of Wildlife Project Updates – Secretary Wasley – Informational
The Commission has requested that the Department provide regular project updates for ongoing projects and programs as appropriate based on geography and timing of meetings. These updates are intended to provide additional detail in addition to the summaries provided as part of the regular Department Report and are intended to educate the Commission and public as to the Department's ongoing duties and responsibilities.

Secretary Wasley said today's presentation is on the Departments water development program, and Western Region Water Development Program Supervisor Clint Garrett from Winnemucca will make a PowerPoint presentation explaining the program.

Division Administrator Alan Jenne said Clint Garrett has been in the Water Development Program for nearly 20 years. He has developed this program into a program that is self-sustaining and the pride of the Department. He said the Water Development Program has had immense success and impact on wildlife populations across the state for both game and non-game species.

Western Region Water Development Supervisor Clint Garrett provided a program overview using PowerPoint (exhibit file). He answered follow-up questions from the Commission.

- 15 Wildlife Commission Policies Agency Initial Review with Suggested Actions – Management Analyst (MA) 3 Kim Jolly and Division Administrators – For Possible Action
The Department shall provide the Commission with a report of an initial Commission Policy review. The initial Commission Policy review included an evaluation of relevancy, need, and redundancy of the Commission’s current policies. The Department’s broad recommendations for potential Commission Policy edits and updates will be provided to the Commission. The Commission may choose to provide direction as to the process for updating existing policies or developing new policies that may be warranted. Any Commission Policy changes, or new policy adoption, would require at least two public meetings prior to adoption.

Chairman Drew said this item is on the agenda at his request, as during the Humboldt County Elk Planning process he discovered that a former Commission Policy went away and seems to be missing. It was clear in his mind that a comprehensive review of policies is needed. His intention is to discuss with the Commission what the best way to proceed with the policy review is, as there is a fair amount of policies that need revision, a number of policies that need to be kept, and the most logical start would be to begin with the Commission’s policy committee and he will adjust the committee memberships later today.

Secretary Wasley said at Chairman Drew’s direction the Department has prepared and provided a document with an overview of the existing Commission Policies (exhibit file). There are three buckets for policies: keep, needs revision, and delete. Management Analyst 3 Jolly met with each Division Administrator and she is present today if there are any questions.

Management Analyst Jolly said the policy numbers were repeated over the years and the numbering system could be revised to eliminate missing policy numbers.

Chairman Drew asked if there were new policies that were identified.

Management Analyst 3 Jolly noted that the only new policy would be a policy to describe the Commission’s elk arbitration process.

Commissioner McNinch asked about the requirement for review.

Management Analyst 3 Jolly said there is a requirement that Boards and Commissions, and Executive agencies, review their Rules of Practice every three-years. We have them in both Nevada Administrative Code and Commission Policy. Rules of Practice are due for review. Every 10 years agencies are required to review their regulations, we reviewed our recently.

Chairman Drew said Policy 23 and 25 will be high priority for review and for those policies, the review should be under the Wildlife Damage Management Committee. They will get the policies updated with changes from the 2015 legislative session. That should occur sooner rather than later. He said he wants to make sure a place holder is put in for the elk policy (at one time it was Policy 26), which he believes was replaced or overlapped with the Transparency Policy. Based on yesterday’s discussion he would also like a placeholder put in for wildlife contests and that will go through the Administrative Procedures, Regulations, and Policy Committee (APRC). He asked to add a priority and assignment column to the Departments’ table. His hope is that an APRC meeting can be held before or associated with the January meeting so that priorities could be assigned and move forward on the policies that need review. He would like to have this on the January meeting agenda to decide priority and review.

Commissioner Wallace said that he believes there may be a Heritage item that comes up at the February meeting.

CAMBW Comment – None

Public Comment –

Rex Flowers, Washoe County resident, said all this information became public after the Washoe CABMW meeting so residents had no input. He is glad to see that most of it will be sent over to the APRC meeting, and he would hope that no policies are repealed or suspended. If suspended or repealed he would ask that the policy just be suspended and keep the number out of the system. As stated earlier Policy 26 has been lost from during the Scott Raine chair position, and that was actually the pioneering elk policy, and now it is on the list for repeal as it is now the Transparency Policy. He would like to see the numbers stay so they are not duplicated. Policy 26 is actually part of the Nevada State Elk Management Plan, and it is a terrible loss to suffer.

Jana Wright thanked Chairman Drew for the placeholder for a policy relative to wildlife killing contests. She was going to speak to that. Kudos for bringing it up, great minds think alike.

16 Reports – Informational

- A Update on the Guidelines for Harvest Management in Nevada: Progress and Timeline – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Informational
The Game Division will provide the Commission with an informational report on the progress toward compiling the existing Guidelines for Harvest Management in Nevada, summary of public input, and propose a revised timeline for completion.

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling provided a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file) with the update on activities that were undertaken relative to the process for guidelines for harvest management in Nevada and review of the input to date, concluding with next steps and a revised timeline.

Secretary Wasley said he did not anticipate the push back or fall out that has resulted from the town hall meetings. He does not know if the Commissioners have received much correspondence about it. He wants to speak to the process generally. Initially he would like to say that the comments have been surprising from all the factions that exist. They have all identified portions of this process that offended them or that they are distrustful of, and he said one of the points articulated in the presentation is that the Department wanted to hear from the public. There was 10 hours of public input and he received phone calls, emails, and comments, and would reiterate that at this point there is nothing new, the only new aspect is that we have not gone out and said “what do you think.” A concern that was expressed is that we already have a CABMW process, and he pointed out that the Commission approved a survey recently of mule deer hunters and the result of the survey was that only 6 of 100 mule deer hunters were aware that CABMWs existed or had attended a CABMW meeting in the past three years. He said there is great value in inviting the public to share their views within the town hall concept, and he values the CABMW process as an incredibly robust opportunity to provide comment to the Commission, but partly due to that data and what we see in terms of attendance at CABMW meetings speaks to a need for us to look for more ways to engage more people Town hall meetings are a great opportunity to obtain input. He definitely wanted to speak to the perception of loss by those persons.

As far as the hunting season angle and timeline that Mr. Wakeling provided is that there is ample opportunity to solicit input while the hunting experience is fresh on their minds and later, as opposed to another time of year. He was surprised at the internal input and with his comments he wanted to address concerns that he believes the Commission may have heard as well as himself and have a public endorsement of these efforts to consolidate the guidelines. Secretary Wasley said Mr. Wakeling did not refer or advocate any one thing. This is simply an assessment of where we are and thinks this consolidation is long overdue for how we currently manage wildlife. In terms of the objectives, we had a request from field staff for direction, for example, when do they initiate an antlerless hunt. Having some guideline will help achieve consistency statewide and will assist with compiling guidelines that have already approved by the Commission and taking those various plans that exist in those places and consolidating it into a single clear coherent table will make it easier for all. This is not in the Nevada Administrative Code or Nevada Revised Statute and the Commission can act beyond those things. His initial reaction was do we really need to do this, so he understands others having that same reaction, but in actuality he does think it is beyond the time to do it. It will provide value, not only to the Commission, but consistent direction to the Department field staff. It will make a more transparent and efficient process as they bring forward those recommendations.

Chairman Drew said the guidelines will not replace and species management plan that has been approved or elk sub plan at this time, correct? The guidelines may reference those documents but it will not serve as a replacement.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said he has no intent to replace those plans, however, as he pointed out with the pronghorn management, they are managing for a much higher buck to doe ratio than what is identified for in the plan. This may identify places where we need to amend and update the existing plans.

Chairman Drew said he does not disagree with that he just wants to make it clear about what we are not doing. We are not trying to replace a locally derived management plan or sub plan.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said that is correct.

Chairman Drew said that he thinks that there is a very high possibility that the guidelines could indicate where some of our management plans are well out of date. Part of the misperception with the CABMW and Commission processes was that he does not know that they did a good job of describing where the guidelines fit in the grader scheme of things. From the Commission standpoint, his hope with the guidelines is that when the Department comes to the Commission with a recommendation on a season date or quota, the Commission, CABMWs, and public can better understand how the dates and quotas were derived. The document talked very little on survey protocols and arrays. He would like to know what to do in terms of the survey protocol and what to do in terms of the array protocol as it relates to Policy 24. He says he would find it very valuable and he thinks the CABMWs and public would too. Once the recommendations get to the Commission, the Commission and CABMW processes will not change.

Commissioner Bliss said that he received calls with concerns. People were saying that the system is not broke and asking what the Department doing. Our residents are happy with the hunting quality we have in Nevada. They are afraid that we were going to shortening seasons or lower buck ratios. As far as CABMW participation, he said it is bad that some CABMWs did not meet. It is their responsibility to make sure that opportunity is provided to the public. He thinks if things are going smooth and people are happy they do not show up, but when something

changes that is when they show up. The Department is doing a good job and everyone is happy.

Game Division Administrator Brian Wakeling said there were two comments overall that have suggested that we might want to reduce buck to doe ratios to put more people in the field. He is in no way advocating for reducing buck to doe rations. They talked about managing for a range rather than a point because in looking at the data they have been good at that. They want to try to keep a method by which they can standardize and stabilize things over time. Some of the feedback he received is that not everyone is happy with their hunting experience. He is speaking to antlerless elk hunts. There is a big perception that hunter crowding is an issue and that hunt success is an issue. A lot of comments are about the overlap of weapon types and different seasons. That is not something the Department is suggesting. He said those are the kinds of things they need to try to narrow down. He asked how they achieve the objectives that are established within the sub plans without trying to increase the harvest. There were varying suggestions as to season length and resolution of overcrowding. He is not advocating for change but with some aspects the public is telling the Department they have concerns.

Commissioner Mori attended a town hall meeting and Mr. Wakeling described the sentiment of some of the comments very well. He said there seemed to be an interest in having the town hall meetings in conjunction with the CABMW meetings. He said he thought Mr. Wakeling said that it would be hard as most of the CABMW meetings are scheduled around the Commission meetings. There seemed to be a sentiment that the CABMWs could schedule another meeting not in close proximity to Commission meeting. He asked that Mr. Wakeling explain that the harvest guidelines may not change anything, but may contribute to revisions in sub plans and asked what he foresees.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said gave an example using the pronghorn plan. He said the plan says it will manage for 10 to 20. Currently we are approaching 40, so we have clearly been managing for 30 to 40. What that indicates is that there may be a need based on the outcome of the guidelines there may be a need to amend the pronghorn plan. The elk sub-plans can identify a series of population of objectives. Routinely the population objectives are a number. There are strengths and challenges associated with using the number, but it could be forage use that elk accumulate or use in a particular area. Regardless of what that objective is, the Department would incorporate that, the elk sub plans would inform the guidelines. The Department would be managing towards what an elk sub plan is identified for in objective, whether a number or forage use, they would still use the tools to try to achieve the sub plan objective. He does not see this effort adjusting the number or forage use that is allocated.

Chairman Drew said that it is a hard document to understand especially when you go from big game, to fur-bearer, to upland game. He is not as worried about the timelines as he is making sure the document right. He has no problem taking extra time. He would like to know what is existing and make sure the references are clear. If there are new guidelines being proposed highlight it so the CABMWs and the public can identify that. He said he is pretty comfortable with a lot of it, but there are things that he does not know.

Commissioner McNinch said he fully endorses the process. He thinks it is an audit of what the Commission has committed to in the plans. He wants to make sure the Commission is prepared for legislative hearings and he thinks this will help. He said if we are not adhering to the plans, we can modify or justify or identify why we are not. It is providing awareness. It does not change the biology, biology is that it is. He is not sure what the push back is. Maybe it is a function of the urbanization in the state of Nevada. There is general distrust and there is no reason to

distrust the process. We are seeing it amongst sportsmen. It is driven by fear of change. He thinks the Department is headed down the right path and he is appreciative.

Secretary Wasley thanked the Commission for their constructive comments. He said there is an element of distrust and perhaps it is because this is a new process with the town hall meetings. He said maybe we need to ask people what they are thinking. If people are happy they should tell us. It is good to know. He said each faction has identified a different perception of loss and none of them are consistent. Biologists are concerned that it may give too much authority or control to the Commission. The Commission may be concerned that it will give too much autonomy to the Department. There are different losses and he does not see any validity in any of them, but they all underscore the inherent distrust that exists. He encouraged the Commission and CABMWs to ask people to express their feelings regardless because it is all valuable input. He said it is really important to compile all the directions they are operating under. There are three aspects to this: compilation of what the Department is currently doing and having that in a single place to be able to clearly and concisely share it with everyone, assessing discrepancies between an existing plan and what we are doing, and lastly refining that to elevate the inconsistencies where they may exist. He hopes this has been helpful.

Chairman Drew said the Department may want to consider adding the recommendations moving forward. He wants people to understand that the guidelines are not necessarily going to change those things but there are things that have been identified through this process and the next step may be to address them. It might help us show that we are trying to develop a document that shows existing practices, but that has exposed some updates that need to occur. He said he was unsure as to what was new and what the Department was actually doing.

Secretary Wasley said there are not any new recommendations or proposals. This is simply compiling what is currently occurring. The Department does not maintain the ability to move forward or in any direction without the open, transparent participation of the CABMWs and the Commission.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said from this point forward is they will clearly identify that as new from what has been compiled so far. He said he tried to share that with this document he may not have captured every aspect of what the Department currently does. A lot of the comments that were received do not have any bearing on the harvest guidelines. There were 13 pages of written comments. There are people who have ideas on how the Department can do things better. He did not try to correct people if they had a misconception, he just captured their comments. This provides an opportunity to review what they are doing now and they will continue to brief the Commission and CABMWs about this topic. The CABMWs are challenged sometimes too because they get information about what is going to be on the agenda for a Commission meeting, but they do not necessarily know exactly what the topic discussion will be about. There were 10 hours of public meetings and 10 hours of agency meetings in 5 days. It is impossible to do that for each of the CABMWs unless they had their meetings two weeks before the Commission meeting. They are trying to capture as much information as they can about anything the Department or the Commission has the authority to deal with. He does not expect to address every aspect of it through the guidelines process.

B Application Hunt 2015 Draw Report – Don Sefton, Systems Consultants
Systems Consultants will present an interim annual report of the 2015 Big Game Draw. Information is presented in tables and charts and includes interim application, license and tag fees and counts as well as bonus point and client statistics for the draws already completed this year.

Don Sefton and Monty Martin, Systems Consultants reviewed a PowerPoint presentation on the 2015 Big Game Draw as submitted in support material for this meeting.

- C Humboldt County Elk Management Sub-Plan Update – Commissioners Drew and Mori and Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling
The Humboldt County Elk Management Sub-Plan Steering Committee met recently and a brief summary of the meetings will be provided as well as a report on the committee's progress.

Chairman Drew said the group has a good product started and they are struggling with some of the more difficult decisions. They had initially identified some working numbers and population ranges that they wanted to work with and they received a lot of feedback from agricultural interests at the meeting prior. This meeting there was a lot of input from sportsmen's interests. They discussed a lot of different options and alternatives. He provided some input from a personal basis. He reiterated to the group that he was not worried about getting a draft plan at the six month deadline, but he wants them to have a plan that they are comfortable with. They set their next meeting for December 15, 2015 in Winnemucca. They are still trying to identify what their heard objectives might look like. He said he is comfortable with the progress they are making. It is not an easy plan or process, but they are doing a good job and they have come to grips with getting down to some of the difficult decision they are going to have to make as the committee.

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

Secretary Wasley said sage-grouse have received quite a bit of attention lately, and as reported at the last Commission meeting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) decision was that the sage-grouse was not warranted for listing under Endangered Species Act. The reason why they arrived at that decision had to do with meeting the bar for regulatory mechanisms. In 2010 USFWS deemed the species warranted but precluded through multidistrict litigation. The USFWS was required to arrive at a listing decision by Sept. 30, 2015 and the USFWS came to the 11 western states that sage-grouse occupy and encouraged the states to meet the bar for regulatory mechanisms. The primary regulatory mechanism that the USFWS referenced in arriving at the not warranted decision was the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Land Use Plan. The BLM's Land Use Plan carries with it certain restrictions and those restrictions are now the subject of subsequent lawsuits and controversy. What is contained in the BLM's Land Use Plan is the main thing you are seeing in the news right now. Some of the specific concerns are the disturbance caps based on biologically significant areas for sage-grouse, land use restrictions that speak to mineral withdraw in certain areas, limitations for development by industry (geothermal, wind, etc.), and habitat management guidelines related to grazing practices. Some individuals are concerned that cure is worse than the disease, and much discussion is if the restrictions in the Land Use Plan are necessary and if they are better or worse than a listing. At this point the discussion continues and there will be a hearing next week on injunction that was filed by Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and others. Another part of the Land Use Plan that has received some attention in the media has to do with the mapping that is in the Land Use Plan and what it contains in a Habitat Management Category map that was developed by USGS. They were contracted to develop the map through the State of Nevada, through the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council. The map is not a species distribution map. It was never intended to be the final decider, but it was intended to be where discussions were initiated. Subsequent to the initial dialogue the project level analysis would need to occur in

order to determine if a project should occur or what certain mitigation or provisions should be conducted in order to compensate for the impact. The USGS is refining that map. They believe a lot of the core inaccuracies will be addressed in the second draft and will be presented to the state in early December. No map is ever perfectly accurate. Once the dialogue occurs and we look at project specific scales they believe they have built flexibility into the system that allows them to operate on the landscape and have the discussion. The lawsuit will be heard next week and the governor is aware and engaged with the Department of the Interior. A lot of the finer details are being discussed. The governor will have a meeting with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior in early December, and monitoring will continue.

Commissioner Valentine asked what the impacts to sportsmen would be if sage-grouse were listed.

Secretary Wasley explained that the effects on sportsmen would be less severe than the effects on private landowners. He cannot think of any species that has been as far ranging as the sage-grouse are that encompass seasonal changes. They truly are a landscape scale species. This is one of the challenges. When people say they would rather have a listing than the Land Use Plans he does not think they have a realistic view of what a listing would bring. For private landowners who have habitat that could be designated as critical habitat it would require a consultation. Anything that could cause a taking of sage-grouse, incidental killing of sage-grouse, would require a consultation with USFWS. It is important to recognize the restrictions. Some of the challenges are that Nevada has so much federally administered land. We are looking at what regulatory mechanism is better. If the regulatory mechanism goes away and we look at a listing than the question is: are we better off having regulatory mechanism on the 85 percent of the land that is federally administered or subsequent listing and how that would affect private lands? He gave an example of Lahontan cutthroat trout. He thinks the restrictions on private lands and private land owners as a result of a listing would be far greater than impacts on sportsmen or women.

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

Secretary Wasley stated that it is unfortunate that we do not have more people in attendance today. We had an issue yesterday that put a lot of people in this room, but there may be five people present now that are not Department employees, CABMW members, or members of the Commission. Part of the value in the Department activity report is to share with the broader public of who we are what we do. The number of people in the room yesterday relative to the number of people in the room today is frustrating. As an agency we have a statutory responsibility to manage 892 species and we have a lot of people who are worried about one species on one day, but yet we as a Department do a lot for more species and habitats and it is unfortunate that we do not have a greater desire for participation to share what is contained in this report. This is a high level update. It is a minority and by no means a majority of what each of these divisions are doing. It may represent 25 percent of what we are doing as a Department. These are activities that each Division Administrator has put together that they think is worthy of sharing.

Game Division

USDA Wildlife Services was contracted to remove coyotes from a park within Carson City because of repeated attacks on pet dogs in the area. Six dogs had been bitten and injured, whereas another three had been killed by coyotes or had to be euthanized after seeking veterinary attention. None of the dogs that were bitten had been on a leash, although two dogs

were within a fenced back yard abutting the park. City personnel have provided warnings around the park notifying residents of the risks and advising them of methods by which to increase safety. Nevertheless, because public safety of issue, three coyotes were removed that exhibited bold and aggressive behavior.

Biologists continue to deal with bears in nuisance situations. A cub involved in one of these incidents climbed to the top of a tree before succumbing to the effect of the tranquilizer. With the help of the Reno Fire Department staff brought the cub down to applause from the large crowd that had gathered, as well as news crews which covered the event. The cub was placed very close to his mother and sibling that had been released on site where the original trap had been set. Unfortunately, in other situations involving public safety in which bears have entered homes or put humans at safety risk, the Department has had to euthanize seven bears thus far this year.

Nuisance wildlife calls don't just involve coyotes and bears. Game Division biologists responded to a call from Nevada State Parks, Echo Canyon, concerning an aggressive tom turkey. This turkey was accused of damaging vehicles and attacking campers. It was identified that the turkey had become habituated to humans due to food provided by campers, but had only recently become aggressive. The turkey was located and trapped using the "Munson Snare" technique, an innovative foot noose used when the turkey was lured close by. Cowboys may recognize this technique under another name known as "heeling." It was then fitted with a leg band for future identification and released about 15 miles south in another turkey occupied area.

The Game Division has contacted the Idaho Department of Fish and Game concerning the availability of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse to continue the translocation efforts into Nevada. The translocation effort from Idaho began in 2013 and has produced promising early results, but additional translocations are being pursued to ensure that the population has the best possible chance at establishment. These interstate translocations illustrate the importance of collaboration fostered through interagency working relationships developed through the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and similar affiliations.

The Eastern Region has been working to get contractors working on the Overland and Spruce habitat improvement projects; one for mechanical mastication of 1,500 acres of pinyon and juniper on Spruce Mountain (primarily for mule deer winter range rehabilitation) and one for 6,700 acres of hand-thinning of pinyon and juniper (primarily for sage-grouse) in the Overland Pass area. Two separate contractors were awarded bids for each of these projects in mid-September for \$380/acre and \$78/acre, respectively. Work is expected to commence in early fall-winter 2015 and the duration of the contract is approved through December 2016. These two treatments are contributing towards an overall target of treating 38,000 acres of pinyon and juniper between the two areas which has been approved in two separate Environmental Assessments.

The Southern Region participated in a meeting with Nevada Department of Forestry honor crew, Lincoln County Conservation District, and Natural Resources Conservation Service on a tree removal project in Unit 231. This project is removing encroaching trees from about 40 acres of private property that has 3 flowing springs that are used by elk, deer, and sage-grouse. Options for future projects and fencing opportunities were discussed as well.

In response to a landowner's concerns over elk use on private land in northern Butte Valley, an email blast was sent to antlerless elk tag holders for Units 104, 108, 121. The intent of the emailing is to encourage hunters to take advantage of the elk herd in the north end of the

Cherry Creek Range while helping to alleviate some of the ongoing private land depredation at the same time.

Game staff attended the first Wild Sheep Working Group's oversight committee meeting of the WAFWA Director's approved Adaptive West-wide Wild Sheep Disease Management Venture (DMV). The meeting was held in Salt Lake City, October 28–30, 2015. The DMV is a collaborative effort of all the western states and provinces to "Provide management tools for improving wild sheep population performance in relation to respiratory disease." Through brainstorming efforts during the meeting, 5 experimental research projects were identified with the framework for conducting intensive monitoring of herds with and without mycoplasma, a leading source of respiratory infection in bighorn sheep.

October 20–24, 2015, the Game Division conducted desert bighorn disease surveillance efforts in Clark and Lincoln Counties in the third year of continued effort to sample and test all herds in Nevada to identify their pathogen profiles, parasite exposure, and physical abnormalities and to compare these to herd performance trend data. Fourteen desert bighorn sheep herds totaling 95 animals were sampled over 5 days with the help of a small NDOW crew and volunteers from Las Vegas and Alamo, including members of the Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn. The helicopter net gun crew conducted the captures with the majority of the animals being brought back to a basecamp to have consistent sampling methods performed on the animals. Herds that were sampled include: McCulloughs, Rivers, Muddys, Arrow Canyons, Gold Buttes, Virgins, Mormons, Meadow Valleys, Delamars, South Hikos, South Pahrocs, North Hikos, East Pahranaagats, Pahranaagats, and Mt Irish. An attempt was made to locate and capture the few remaining bighorn in the Egan Range, but no sheep were detected after 1.5 hours of survey by the capture crew. Variable forage conditions and body conditions were encountered, with a few herds having animals with visible nasal discharge. An ultrasound was used to determine pregnancy status on a number of ewes in most herds. Results from this testing should be available in late November.

Fifteen ewes and their lambs were captured in Gabbs Valley Range, Saturday, November 7, 2015. All yearlings and adults were radio collared. About 20 volunteers from the general public and sportsmen participated in the capture. Animals were translocated to the Garfield Hills. This is considered an experiment where bighorn sheep from a herd with positive herd performance with active mycoplasma in the herd were used as source stock to initiate a new herd in an area surrounded by herds with same strain type of mycoplasma with similarly favorable lamb recruitment.

During November 14–17, 2015, there is a planned disease surveillance effort of pioneering bighorn herds on the Nellis Test and Training Range (NTTR) and Nevada National Security Site (NNSS). This is the first cooperative effort on the Department of Defense controlled lands. Herds adjacent to the NTTR (Bare Mountains and Specter Range) were sampled recently to identify the distribution of pathogens and possible disease transmission of herds.

Fisheries Division

Although the eradication project to remove northern pike from Bassett and Comins lakes in White Pine County was very successful, water quality issues in Comins Lake post-treatment have delayed plans to stock the reservoir with trout and largemouth bass. The low lake level for the treatment and lack of inflow because of the drought has created low dissolved oxygen and high pH that prevents fish stocking. Without more inflow stocking may be delayed until next spring.

Bassett Lake water quality has been good after the treatment and it has been stocked initially with around 2,400 largemouth bass. This was a mixture of sub-adult fish and some adults that will spawn in 2016.

Eastern Region staff also successfully treated JD Reservoir in Eureka County to remove northern pike at the end of September. This reservoir is on a private ranch and the owners gave permission for the treatment. Fourteen staff completed the eradication in one day of field effort.

Beginning the first week of October we responded to reports of a fish kill in Rye Patch Reservoir. This was primarily around the dam area and included most species including carp, blackfish, walleye, wipers and catfish. This wasn't unexpected because of the lack of inflow and we've just been lucky up to this point. The fish kill wasn't complete but it was substantial. There is actually a nonpoint source of chloride in the water and the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection is trying to locate the source and the kill is most likely a result of the contamination rather than dissolved oxygen levels.

The agreement to develop the Winnemucca urban fishing pond is being finalized and we should be able to stock the new fishery in spring 2016. Humboldt County is leasing the property for \$1/year and we will assist with management and provide stocked trout.

Tiger muskie for stocking into Chimney Reservoir in Humboldt County has been ordered. Delivery of 1,000 10 to 12 inch tiger muskie should occur this fall.

A major series of storms that created a 1,000 year flood event in Death Valley also impacted Ash Meadows NWR and Devils Hole in Nye County. Roads were washed out making the refuge essentially inaccessible. A major debris flow occurred on the shelf in Devils Hole but the pupfish seem to have weathered the disturbance quite well.

Staff has been working with the US FWS and Newmont USA to address concerns over relict dace in Goshute Valley. Newmont has hired a consultant to update information on the dace and develop a management plan with NDOW and FWS participation. This population of relict dace was petitioned for listing under the ESA in 2014 because of alleged threats from the Long Canyon Mine project.

Staff met last week with several other states and Federal agencies to continue development of a rangewide conservation strategy for Interior Redband Trout (native rainbow). Redband occur in Nevada in several northeastern Nevada systems including the Bruneau, Salmon Falls and Owyhee river systems.

Flow from the main source spring at Gallagher Hatchery in Ruby Valley has recently, and unexpectedly, dropped probably due to drought conditions. This is manageable but will cause some delays in development of our brood stock program because brood fish had to be moved to other internal raceways until the problems can be addressed.

Through the end of October the Department's AIS program had performed over 450 full watercraft decontaminations at Lakes Mead and Mohave, including 90 boats at two major bass tournaments. The inspection stations will continue to operate through the winter season with decontaminations available seven days a week by appointment. Based on experience this year, we will increase emphasis on "clean, drain and dry" and making sure all drain plugs are pulled even for boats that don't require full decontamination.

In northern Nevada over 1,500 watercraft inspections were performed at several waters and a full time inspection and decontamination station was operated at South Fork Reservoir for the first time for a full season. In 2016 NDOW will operate stations at Lahontan and Rye Patch previously run by the Division of State Parks and will move the Wildhorse Reservoir inspection station to the Mountain City Highway outside of Elko to better contact vessels that might be moving from Nevada to the Columbia River basin.

Habitat Division

Due to persistent drought conditions, the Greenhead Hunting Club (GHC) has elected to not issue hunting permits at the Carson Lake Wetlands for the 2015/16 waterfowl season. Additionally, NDOW and GHC decided it would be best to limit access into the property to protect the area resources and infrastructure.

On October 19, 2015 Overton WMA received some flooding from the Muddy River due to heavy rains. There was some damage to the dikes on the moist soil units in multiple places but none of the ponds received any major damage. However, the flood waters deposited some silt on the A-6 field and damaged some of the surrounding roads.

Despite a very light wildfire season, we are currently coordinating with the federal land management agencies on 2015 wildfire restoration projects and will be cooperating on projects in both the Eastern and Western Regions.

NDOW provided comment to the Bald Mountain Mine DEIS which closed on October 13th.

We are expecting a record of decision for the Mason Valley Walker River channel modification in the very near future and will begin working to implement this cooperative project with the USFWS, Great Basin Bird Observatory and Otis Bay Ecological Consultants. The project will restore river sinuosity on two miles of the Walker River through parts of the Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area (WMA).

Law Enforcement

October 2nd saw a hunting related shooting fatality in the Oneil Basin area of Elko County. This was the first such fatality in Nevada since 1998. The incident involved a Carson City man who was unloading a .30-06 rifle in the back seat of a four door pickup when it discharged and struck the driver of the vehicle who was standing at the driver's side door.

Hunting seasons are in full swing and many big game investigations are under way. Several of these involve multiple elk killed on one tag, or wrong sex elk, and are keeping wardens busy. A cow moose was accidentally harvested on a cow elk tag.

Eastern region game wardens witnessed the illegal killing of a trophy bull elk at the Bedke Ranch in unit 081 with a Utah tag on the evening of October 16th. The investigation is ongoing and felony charges will be pending.

Eastern region wardens assisted Elko County Sheriff's Office with service of a search warrant in Lamoille for a report of a man hunting deer that was a felon with a firearm. Several firearms were seized in the search warrant. Felony charges are pending.

We've had at least two "waste of game" cases in recent weeks. An Ely game warden issued a needless waste citation for an elk hunter that left a majority of the elk meat on the mountain. Southern region game wardens also issued a needless waste citation for a mountain goat

hunter that killed a mountain goat near Elko and left a majority of the goat meat on the mountain. A conviction for needless waste of a big game animal is assessed 12 demerits and will result in a revocation of license privileges for three years.

A western region game warden is wrapping up an investigation in which an illegal immigrant obtained multiple licenses and tags using false information. He will be facing charges for the fraudulent information, being an illegal immigrant in possession of a firearm, and a felony charge for poaching an antelope in Humboldt County. The warden caught this poaching in progress.

Now that boating season has been over for a few months, we're handling several requests for accident reports. Toxicology results recently came in for a fatal accident on the Colorado River at Laughlin in which a female operator collided with a river taxi. These results showed the presence of narcotics, tranquilizers, and a blood alcohol level of 2.3 (nearly 3 times the legal limit). While the actual mechanism of death was ruled as drowning, alcohol and drugs were clearly factor.

Conservation Education

The judging for the 2016-2017 Nevada Duck Stamp Art Contest took place on November 6 at the Reno Headquarters office. The winning artwork featuring the Bufflehead was submitted by Mark A. Thone from Shakopee, Minnesota. This year's contest drew 17 entries from 12 different states.

In cooperation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, NDOW was able to send out a press release on a recent bull elk poaching in Lincoln County to all of the major media outlets in both states. The joint effort resulted in a large amount of coverage including a piece on KUTV Chanel 2 in Salt Lake City and an article in the Salt Lake City Tribune. Some of the evidence suggests that the suspected poachers might be from Cedar City or St. George.

The new Conservation Aids for urban wildlife began work in both the Southern and Western Regions. The Southern Region Conservation Aid is researching past urban wildlife protocols and organizing the information in order to update those protocols.

Humboldt County Shooting Park has been awarded a sub-grant from the Department's Hunter Education/Shooting Range Program. The project will improve accessibility for the mobility-impaired and general public by installing concrete parking areas, ramps and pads in current facility areas. The installations will follow the specifications of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Humboldt County Shooting Park Project was highlighted by the USFWS in the International Hunter Education Journal in their fall issue. The article highlighted the range's grassroots efforts, volunteer support and overall range development.

Carson City Shooting Range has been awarded a sub-grant from the Department's Hunter Education/Shooting Range Program. The purpose of this award is to install one solar power security gate on Rifle Range Road and use metal swing bar gates to close off the multiple two track roads that give random access to the range from multiple directions. The automatic security gate will be located on the main access road to control the majority of traffic into the range. The location of the five metal swing bar gates and boulders to close the two track roads will be done with input from the City Public Works (Landfill and Utilities Operations) and off Road vehicle advocates. The improvements will add additional safety to the shooting range.

Wildlife Diversity Division

Diversity staff has spent the last several months wrapping up the 2015 field season, analyzing data, and writing reports for federal grants. Additionally, staff has been working with several key partners on various working groups, to include the Western Working Group of Partners in Flight, the Pacific Flyway Nongame Technical Committee, and the CA/NV Golden Eagle Working group. Topics of conversation have included:

- Farm Bill prioritization of pollinators and their indirect effects on birds
- Conversion of agricultural lands from flood irrigation to center pivots and the effects on waterfowl and other waterbirds
- Coordinating rangewide surveys for night jays, Short-eared Owls, and Yellow-billed Cuckoos
- Surveying for and protecting wintering sites for Long-billed Curlews
- Critical habitat designations for Yellow-billed Cuckoos as required by the Endangered Species Act and pursuing a multi-state competitive SWG federal grant to support survey work and implementation of key conservation actions.
- Coordinating with key partners in California on management of Golden Eagles.

Field work focused on reptile night driving surveys in the Mojave Desert, continuation of radio-tracking Gila monsters, and a division wide effort to survey Pikas in the northwestern part of the state. Diversity staff also assisted with Game flight surveys and checking in harvested animals.

The Diversity Division, in partnership with Conservation Education, promoted bats during International Bat Week. Bats were the focus of the Department's weekly podcast, a press release with bat information was released, staff participated in interviews, provided elementary educational talks and issued a bat fact of the day. This was very well received by the public and promoted a group of species that are often misunderstood and feared.

Staff attended the Clark County business meeting expressing concerns with external display of fishing licenses and followed with emails to each Clark County Commissioner expressing concerns with revisions to specific articles of the animal ordinance for Clark County. As we heard earlier that ordinance had been dropped and it is no longer a concern.

Every 10 years, states are required to update their Wildlife Action Plans. Nevada is on the hook for review some of the other states plans. We are in the process of doing that right now.

Operations Division

After 13 months of planning, the relocation of Valley Road and Kietzke Lane headquarters staff to the new headquarters office in south Reno is underway. Kietzke Lane staff are moving this week, and the Valley Road HQ staff will move next week. This move will relocate 80 NDOW employees under one roof, bringing together staff from two different Reno locations who have been separated for 14 years.

Regarding facility improvements, once the transition to the new headquarters office in Reno is complete, the Operations Division will turn its attention to renovations and other improvements of the new Winnemucca office which was recently assigned to the department by the Division of State Lands. Located on our existing property and previously occupied by employees of JOIN, Inc., northern Nevada's workforce development agency, our Winnemucca staff will share this much larger facility with Department of Transportation employees.

Since the new federal electronic duck stamp sales process began on Sept. 4, the Department has sold over 2,300 stamps. Nine percent have been sold by our regional customer service counter staff, 13 percent have been sold through our NWDS consumer website, and 78 percent have been sold by our license agents.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the status of the mycoplasma outbreak affecting bighorn sheep and what is being done to combat it.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said mycoplasma is an incredibly troubling infection that bighorn sheep have a hard time dealing with. They have no natural immunity to the bacteria. It is very common in domestic sheep and domestic goats. There is a lot of evidence that the original contraction is by wild sheep coming into close exposure (nose to nose) with the infected. Once it becomes endemic in a population it is incredibly difficult to eliminate. Depending upon the population of sheep you are dealing with they can exhibit a wide array of responses. Some have shown all age die offs which typically deals with multiple bacteria at the same time. Sometimes it may only be the younger animals that die off. There is a lot of ongoing research in regard to the disease. We provided some animals a year ago to South Dakota State University to be part of a larger study. Some of the research is trying to figure out why old world sheep and new world sheep have such a different response. Not every population responds the same. One of the concerns right now is something known as a super shutter theory which is where a sheep will come down with it and it will be persistently infected but it will not demonstrate any repertory disease, but it will continue to expose other sheep. It creates huge challenges for the agency when they are looking at translocations or looking at the distribution of sheep across the landscape. They have intermountain movements at times, sometimes as much as 20 miles or more. Virtually every single one of the populations are within 20 miles of another population so the risk of exposure is really prevalent. This also plays a role in the determination of developing water in an area. It is not a simple solution. He said they have not found any inoculum that they could give the sheep so they would be resistant. Even if they could, trying to distribute that in a wild population comes with huge challenges. It has been an ongoing issue for decades. Trying to find a solution has not proven easy.

F Litigation Report – Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward

Deputy Attorney General Harry Ward said he submitted the Litigation Report (exhibit file). The information in the litigation report is non-privileged information, in other words, the Commission is his client and everything in the report comes from the public record of court filings. At the last meeting Commissioner Johnston requested a meeting to update you all on litigation and after this meeting we will have an attorney client meeting. It is exempt from the Open Meeting Law. It is a non-meeting, meeting.

G Regulation Update – Chairman Drew

Chairman Drew will provide a report on outstanding, pending and future regulations that may require Commission consideration over the next year.

Chairman Drew said at the last meeting, the Commission passed a series of four regulations that had been temporary. Three of them were approved by the Legislative Commission in October. The Special Incentive Elk Tag Arbitration regulation was deferred.

Deputy Director Jack Robb said Senator Ford questioned him on the portion of the regulation that said the decision of the arbitration panel is final and binding and that there is not language for an appeal. That language was not new language. This regulation will need to be brought

back to the Commission with a language change adding another avenue to take it to the next step if they want. It will not pass the Legislative Commission without that change. Once Senator Ford brought it up others piled on.

Chairman Drew said there was a series of regulations that the Legislative Commission deferred back to the agency. The shed antler regulation set a season on shed antlers. The trap registration regulation defined how registration would be marked on traps, and the language was changed during the legislative session from "must" register traps to "may" register traps, therefore the regulation that was in place that was deferred back is no longer valid with NRS. Trap visitation, which looked at decreasing trap visitation times around urban areas in Washoe and Clark Counties, which were deferred back. The agency has sought instruction on how to proceed with deferred regulations. He does not believe that anything happened during the last legislative session that would have changed those regulations or made them inconsistent with other state laws. The same is true for the demerit regulation which was passed quite some time ago. He said he will ask the Department to resubmit them after January 1, 2016.

He said other regulations that are pending are the trail camera regulation, which a draft was never provided by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). He said he would like to move it forward next year. There were three regulations proposed by the Black Bear Committee one regarding tagging the black bear, one on the Commission's authority to dictate where you can hunt with dogs, and the last is whether or not you can use a shotgun while hunting black bears. He plans to move these three regulations forward for consideration.

He said there were a couple regulations that were discussed earlier. We would like to add drones into the flying regulation sometimes next year. Law Enforcement had a regulation on smart rifle triggers that was brought forward to them from a conservation group and the black powder substitutes that was acted on previously needs some clean-up.

He said licensing had a bonus point transfer for big game applications between resident and non-resident clean-up that needs to be addressed. Law Enforcement also has clean-up on hull identification numbers, and one other in regard to assisting with disabled hunters that he would like to have complete early next year.

He said those are the regulations that will be addressed within the next year. It is not a complete or comprehensive list but it gives a sense of where we are with regulations.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the deferral and if the LCB provides a reason for deferring it.

Chairman Drew said on the shed antler regulation they asked to look at placing a private property exemption on it. The other two simply said that they were deferred until after the 2015 legislative session. I do not believe there are any other specifics.

Secretary Wasley said that neither side liked it, which was one reason for deferral. It was not remedied during the session.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if he thought resubmitting it in the same form might shed more light onto why it was deferred.

Chairman Drew said that is his hope.

Secretary Wasley said the challenge is there are statutory responsibilities associated with the Commission considering it and making that recommendation. We are acting in accordance with statutory direction to do so. We want to make sure we are complying with the direction that the NRS is providing us as a board.

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

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for Jan. 29 and 30, 2016, in Las Vegas and the Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change the time and meeting location at this time. The chairman may designate and adjust committee assignments and add or dissolve committees, as necessary at this time. Any anticipated committee meetings that may occur prior to the next Commission meeting may be discussed.

Secretary Wasley said primary order of business for the Department has traditionally been the season setting process. It is a process that sets season dates for two years. This is the interim year; however, it does not preclude the Commission from making adjustments or modifications to any of those seasons. Commission policies or regulations could also be potential agenda items. A commission calendar was provided (exhibit file). This calendar formalizes the business at each meeting.

Chairman Drew said he will work with staff to determine what regulations might be ready to go at the next meeting. He asked if there would be a Wildlife Heritage Committee meeting soon.

Commissioner Wallace said the Heritage vendor Commission regulation will be at the next meeting, they do not need to have a committee meeting for that. They will need to hold a meeting if the Heritage policies need to be reviewed by the committee.

Chairman Drew said he does not think there is a need for a policy update that soon. He asked if the Wildlife Damage Management Committee needed to meet.

Commissioner Bliss said no. The Department will introduce this coming years plan to the full Commission. After that they will take input from groups at the following meeting. He will have an update at the March meeting.

Chairman Drew said he believes the Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee may meet and he would like the Administrative Procedures, Regulation, and Policy Committee to move forward with the policy review. He said maybe it could be scheduled for Friday morning.

Chairman Drew went through the committee assignments:

Administrative Procedures, Regulations, and Policy Committee: Chair McNinch, Commissioners Wallace and Valentine.

Bear Committee: Dissolved.

Duck Stamp Judging Committee: Commissioners McNinch and Wallace.

Elk Damage and Incentive Committee: Chairman Wallace, Commissioners Valentine and Mori and Lincoln CABMW Member Cory Lytle.

Finance Committee: Chairman Gil Yanuck, Commissioner Johnston, and Clark CABMW Member Paul Dixon

Trap Regulation Committee: Dissolved.

Legislative Committee: Chairman Drew, Commissioners Johnston, Young and McNinch.

There will be no changes to the Public Lands Committee, State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee, Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee, Wayne E. Kirch Wildlife Committee, Wildlife Damage Management Committee, Wildlife Heritage Committee, and Wildlife Scholarship Recipient Committee.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

Commissioner Valentine requested that the March Commission meeting be moved because it falls during the week of spring break and it is on the weekend of Easter.

Chairman Drew said the way the agenda item is written it does not allow for changing the meeting date at this time, but is probably something that Department staff can look at. He said this is the first time we are doing the waterfowl regulation in March, and he does not know if there is ability to move the March meeting date forward or back. A formal action could be taken at the January meeting.

Commissioner McNinch asked if it would be moved closer to April.

Chairman Drew said yes, the first week in April.

The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies meeting is in January 2016 and he will work with staff to insure the Commission representatives are selected.

18 Public Comment Period

Paul Dixon, speaking for himself said the Commission often has informational items with no public comment allowed. The CABMWs put those items on their agenda, discuss them, and put them on their action report. He wishes there was some way for CABMWs to give input on the informational items.

Cathy Smith, speaking for herself thanked the Department for arranging the Town Hall meetings. Mr. Wakeling did an excellent job in answering questions from many diverse opinions, and unfortunately many of the non-consumptive members of the public do not distinguish between the Commission and the Department and she is hopeful there will be more dialogue on the killing contests, she does not see a solution for public distrust and public frustration until we truly have a participatory process. Participatory process is a component of government transparency, and it requires decision-makers to be persuadable, which we do not have here. The majority of Commission is not persuadable, that results in public frustration. Unfortunately, the frustration is often displaced to the Department, and she hopes that is considered when the Commission makes their decisions.

Stephanie Myers thanked the Department for the Town Hall meetings. The Commission is still not addressing 97 percent of the majority of Nevadans who think that the black bear hunt and coyote killing contests are unethical, they think the coyote should not be unprotected and considered a varmint. Her special interest is that there needs to be better restrictions on leg-hold trapping. There should be quotas on fur-bearers along with shorter trap visitation times. The trap registration should be enforced and mandatory along with exploration of non-lethal methods of dealing with predators. Secretary Wasley wonders why more of the public is not present at these meetings, and she said they are here when we are passionate, and some of

them are here anyways. She said they are tired of constantly attending and testifying at the Commission meetings and at the CABMW meetings. Any opinion which is not in line with the sportsmen is either mocked or totally ignored, most always ignored. We are tired of never being heard or not having her concerns addressed. She said if you went somewhere and your issues were always ignored you would probably stop attending as well. Thank you very much for the videoconferencing.

Meeting adjourned 2:36 p.m.

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