

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting  
Agenda  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

The public is invited to attend and provide public comment from the following locations:

Meeting Location: Clark County Government Center  
Commission Chambers  
500 S. Grand Central Parkway  
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Teleconference Locations: Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Western Region Office  
1100 Valley Road  
Reno, NV 89512

Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Eastern Region Office  
60 Youth Center Road  
Elko, NV 89801

Public comment will be taken on every action item and regulation workshop item after discussion but before action on each item, and at the end of each day's meeting. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person. The chairman, in his discretion, may allow persons representing groups to speak for six minutes. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers. Persons are invited to submit written comments on items or attend and make comment during the meeting and are asked to complete a speaker card and present it to the Recording Secretary. To ensure the public has notice of all matters the Commission will consider, Commissioners may choose not to respond to public comments in order to avoid the appearance of deliberation on topics not listed for action on the agenda.

Forum restrictions and orderly business: The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech.

Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks that antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.

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

NOTE: Public comment allowed on each action item and regulation workshop items and at the end of the meeting.

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners present for two day meeting:

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

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	Chief Pilot Greg Smith
Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne	Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson
Fisheries Division Administrator Jon Sjoberg	Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger
Conservation Educator 3 Martin Olson	Administrative Assistant 4 Kathleen Teligades
Conservation Educator 4 Doug Nielsen	Administrative Assistant 2 Teresa Brian

Meeting Attendees Primary Las Vegas Location Friday, Jan. 29, 2016:

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW	Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW
Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW	Monty Martin, Systems Consultants
Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW	Alex Corey, Las Vegas Review-Journal
Josh Vittori, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited	Jana Wright, self
Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation	Mike Cassidy, self
John Hiatt, Red Rock Audubon Society	William Stanley, self/Clark CABMW
Cory Lytle Lincoln CABMW	Dana Leong, self
Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW	Karen Layne
Stephanie Myers	Connie Howard
Annoula Wylderich	

Meeting Attendees Reno Location Friday, Jan. 29, 2016:

NDOW Administrative Assistant 3 Laura Feliz

Fred Voltz, recreationist	Bobbie McCollum
Flint Wright, Nevada Department of Agriculture	Elaine Carrick, self
Lloyd Peake, self	Jana Hofeditz, self – public
Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters Association	Allan Souigny
Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance	

Meeting Attendees Primary Las Vegas Location Saturday, Jan. 30, 2016:

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW	Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW
Monty Martin, Systems Consultants	Gil Yanuck, Carson
Ray Sawyer, White Pine CABMW	Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW
Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW	Stephanie Myers
Karen Layne	Caren Tayloe
Stacia Newman, Nevada Political Action for Animals	Connie Howard, Nevada Wildlife Alliance
Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation	Jana Wright, self
Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW	Mike Cassidy, self
Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW	Sara Bullock, self

Meeting Attendees Reno Location Saturday, Jan. 30, 2016:

NDOW Administrative Assistant 3 Laura Feliz

Fred Voltz, recreationist	Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance
Gerald Lent, Nevada Hunters Association	Carol-Anne Weed
Bobbie McCollum	Allan Souigny
Elaine Carrick	Genelle Richards
Jennifer Simeo	Trish Swain, Trail Safe Nevada
Lloyd Peake	Margaret Flint, Nevada Wildlife Alliance

Meeting Attendees Elko Location Friday, Jan. 29, 2016 and Saturday, Jan. 30, 2016

NDOW Administrative Assistant 2 Natalie Pannunzio

*No attendees either day at the Elko location*

Friday, Jan. 29, 2016 – 10 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 10:06 a.m. and conducted roll call of the Commission. Commissioners present: Chairman Drew, Commissioners Wallace, Bliss, Hubbs, Johnston, Mori, McNinch, and Valentine. Commissioner Young not present at roll call, he arrived at 10:09 a.m.

CABMW Roll Call: Joe Crim, Pershing; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Gil Yanuck, Carson; Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas; Larry Allen, Humboldt; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; William Stanley, Clark CABMW; and Sean Shea, Washoe.

- 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.

Chairman Drew announced that due to staff health issues, agenda item 10 A, “Bighorn Sheep Disease Surveillance and Herd Performance from 2012 to 2015” will be tabled to the Commission’s next meeting.

Chairman Drew asked if there is public comment in Reno. Ms. Feliz answered no, and Chairman Drew asked if there was public comment in Elko. Ms. Pannunzio answered no.

Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Ward noted that he will be presenting agenda item 10 K, “Litigation Report,” instead of DAG Newton.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

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

Chairman Drew said he has a series of correspondence received relative to pertinent agenda items and will discuss the correspondence received at that time.

- 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.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said they would like to ask that the Commission consider the introduction of elk in Mineral County.

Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW, said they have updated the brochure relative to the urban deer problem that Carson City is experiencing. The brochure has been widely distributed in the Carson City community, and he provided a copy of the brochure to the Commission (exhibit file).

- 5 Approval of Minutes – Chairman Drew – For Possible Action  
The Commission may approve Commission minutes from the Nov.13 and 14, 2015, meeting.

Chairman Drew asked for CABMW, Commission, and public comment on the minutes?

Administrative Assistant Feliz answered none in Reno and she asked if the Commission could speak up because cannot hear well. Chairman Drew answered that they will try to speak up and that it feels like he is screaming in this room. Ms. Feliz answered okay. Ms. Pannunzio answered Chairman Drew that there is no comment in Elko.

**COMMISSIONER BLISS MOVED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 13 AND 14, 2015, MINUTES. MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WALLACE. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 6 Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Predation Management Plan – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson – For Possible Action  
The draft FY 2017 Predation Management Plan will be presented to the Commission for initial review and input for submission to the State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee.

Chairman Drew said for this agenda item, that the Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Predation Management Plan is being presented to the Commission for initial review and to the State Animal and Rodent Committee (PARC). He said to keep in mind this is a preliminary draft and there will be several iterations of the draft plan in the process with input received from PARC as per Assembly Bill 78.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said the plan is draft and he asked that anyone with questions contact him. He provided a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file) explaining projects recommended for continuation, projects newly proposed, and projects recommended for discontinuation, from the draft FY 2017 Predation Management Plan as submitted in support material.

Chairman Drew asked for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Bliss said his comments are on Project 40, and provided background: the Eureka CABMW put funds together and did habitat work in the Diamonds, and Robert's Creek Mountain area, all the work was on private lands with the target being areas that were transitions from sage-grouse lek areas to nesting areas to summer range. He said he went to one of the sites where trees were removed and there had been brush manipulation done as well, and in the past there were never any birds in that area at that time. After that work was done he counted 85 birds on a lek which was something to see and you can see the hard work pay off when you see something like that. Also, they removed feral horses which benefitted the grasses and seed on the mountain, 100 percent turn around in one year. As the Eureka CABMW put some of this project together for Project 40, they wanted to tie the predator work into the work already done and along with Policy #23, which states that within the policy. One concern was the raven work and no specific project tied to the Diamonds and Robert's Creek for raven removal during the lek and nesting period. He understands that could be done through the statewide deal and Eureka County is in there, but they would like to see a targeted raven removal project to go along with all the other work they have done. He said the money for a specific raven project would be well spent as the nesting area is near a dump where ravens are in the general area of the Diamonds. Also, he said there were typos in the plan with a reference to the Diamond Range being in "Washoe County" and that needs to be changed to "Eureka County." Dates for

the pinyon-juniper work are 2013, 2014 and 2015, and is still ongoing with more projects going forward.

Commissioner Valentine said the Clark CABMW had asked what the actual number of take for ravens that NDOW has in combination with Wildlife Services.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services issues NDOW a yearly permit for 2,500 ravens and his understanding is that Wildlife Services gets their own permit for another 2,500. Legally 5,000 ravens can be removed throughout the state per year. He said an increase in the cap for NDOW is supported and has been discussed.

Commissioner Bliss said in regard to any projects that come forward, that when there is a project area identified, he believes we should go at that project 100 percent to make sure it is fully funded to the maximum, to insure we accomplish what we set out to do. He thinks when we put a little bit of money here and there and spreading the money around makes it where you don't get the result you want. He said the projects need to be targeted and make sure there is enough resource to make sure you accomplish what you want with the numbers to reduce and as you look at these projects, such as the one for \$60,000 because it's on a stream, is a week worth a flying to spend that money really going to accomplish what you set out to do. He wants to make sure we have enough funding to make sure that the results we are reaching for have a chance.

Chairman Drew said as a note to staff, the Commission received correspondence from Don Molde, Laura D'Amore, and as Commissioner Bliss mentioned correspondence from Jake Tibbets, on this agenda item, and he wanted to make sure now that we have this new process that the Wildlife Damage Management Committee members, the PARC members, and Mr. Jackson, receive the correspondence.

Commissioner Hubbs said when the Commission receives the Predator Management Plan it is nice that it comes with a introduction and a summary as to why the area was selected, what the objective is, and what is going to be done, and she asked when does the Commission see the data from the removal and how that removal is impacting the long-term goal. She said she is trying to understand that better as to when it is provided to the Commission and the public.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said NDOW provides the predator report at the final Commission meeting each year and the "raw data" that is the total animals removed and inference on the success and impact of each project is completed.

Commissioner Hubbs said last night they had a question about the data at the Clark CABMW meeting and asked if "raw data" is appended to those reports so the public can see the impact of the strategies used, and what was taken from the areas.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said from his recollection NDOW has never appended raw reports; however, we have summarized raven take by either county or by game management unit, he can't recall at this moment. That information is provided, but would not provide the exact location where a raven was removed, which is in part due to NDOW's relationship with Wildlife Services and their relationship with landowners and the protection of a removal that may be near a private residence as the residents may not want that information out there.

Public Comment from Las Vegas at Clark County Government Center:

Bill Stanley, Clark CABMW, said in a split vote (4-3) the Clark CABMW recommended accepting the plan as written with the exception of the three following items:

- a) Recommend not funding Project 22-16 as results today at garnering no useful data for the money being invested.
- b) For Project 21 and 21-02 the Clark CABMW wants to know if these studies would leads to increased authority from the feds to remove more ravens, and that question was answered earlier.
- c) Finally, the overall plan as written lacks clarity as to measurable and detailed expected results. In addition better background material is needed on each project to clearly define what we are investing predator funds on this project.

Mr. Stanley said the dissenting opinions did not agree with un-funding Project 22-16.

Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW, said at their CABMW meeting this past week they had discussion of Project 32 and they would like to be included in the project area around the Tahoe Basin.

Jana Wright, resident of Clark County, said she understands this is first draft for the 2017 Predator Plan, and would draw the Commission's attention to page 3 where stated, "predator management is a tool to be applied deliberately and strategically. Predator management may use lethal or nonlethal methods, the plan should be applied on a case by case basis with clear goals, based on objective scientific analysis of available data, should be applied with proper intensity and at a focused scale." Page 3 also has a statement that projects should be monitored to determine whether desired results are achieved. She said she finds the plan lacking clear goals or desired results of each project. For instance Project 21 does not state when the poison eggs will be placed. She asked will they be placed 24/7 year round, or time specific. How many ravens were killed last fiscal year on this project? For Project 21-02, has a little more detail, referencing the end of the year report, but what has the Department learned about ravens and their population patterns? On Project 22-01, she thought we had plenty of sheep but has learned at the CABMW meeting that the pathogens are impacting the sheep population which will impact the quota discussion later this year. Once again the fiscal year 2015 end of year report stated six lions were killed, and she asked what are we really learning. Project 22, 074, again there is no mention of "problem lions" it just seems like we are killing lions. Why? Project 38, she personally finds aerial gunning to be a sick practice, and on page 29 what are the sensitive areas during certain times of the year. What are they referencing? Project 40, increase mule deer and sage-grouse populations by removing coyotes. She asked how many coyotes did Wildlife Services remove in the area in 2011 or 2012? The project contractor in 2014 that was mentioned on page 32, was that a trapper? She said she thinks the plan is vague and needs to be more details and she hopes moving forward we have that information.

Dana Leong said she is a private citizen in Las Vegas, and she said she has two questions. How many common ravens are estimated in Nevada and what are all the methods going to be used to remove common ravens.

Lynn Cullens, associate director Mountain Lion Foundation, representing the entire Nevada membership said they are concerned about the conservation of mountain lions in Nevada in general. Ms. Cullens said they are going to get five year focus on this state as they are a nationwide organization dedicated to conservation of mountain lions. Nevada has become one of their most serious concerns. They are concerned with length of season, the quota, the predator management plans, depredation, poison, habitat loss, as more people, pets and livestock come into the state, you will probably see more conflict. Particularly she wanted to address the predator management plans, which are additive to mortality causes for mountain

lions, and they would like to see more effective reporting on the plans and more comprehensive plans. To that effect she would echo Don Molde's letter and Jana Wright's comments on the lack of comprehensive information that is contained in both of the plans and the reports. Ms. Cullens said more transparency in this process, and that this morning she looked for actual reports that had been published and was only able to find 2014's report and 2015's report is on the website but is draft, although they may be hidden, we are not seeing easy availability to the public of the reporting information and that makes it difficult to evaluate upcoming plans. Previously information had been presented over many years in a cumulative fashion, that was more comprehensible to the public, and that practice was stopped two years ago. They don't understand the reason for that. All of this information is difficult for the public to find and follow and we would like to see that reporting but also more transparent reporting and more ease given to the public to be able to comment on this. They prefer to not engage in public records request or FOIA requests.

#### **Interruption from Reno 10:47 a.m.**

"This is Fred Voltz in Reno, Mr. Voltz said, point of order here, we cannot hear anything that is being said and this is an Open Meeting Law violation. If you folks want to continue the meeting we are going to file a complaint with the Attorney General's Office about this."

Chairman Drew said "Thank you Mr. Voltz, we will take a break here in just a minute before we go to audio for Reno, and see if we can't get it straightened out. Please continue Miss."

Ms. Cullens continued saying that the Mountain Lion Foundation is going to call for a moratorium whether that is by petition by this entity or another, of hunting or the very least a reduction of the quota or a truncation of the year long season. The reason for this is a lack of science that has been presented in the reports and in the plans. We understand that your hands are tied with the 80 percent rule, and that doesn't mean that you can't choose to reduce hunting of mountain lions to offset the losses. Until there is better science we can't see a way to move forward with continuing to kill additional mountain lions when there is no evidence that mountain lion numbers are increasing in the state. You have committed to using the most up to date science, there is no mention of Andresen's report in Northern Nevada, no mention of Coates report from Southern Nevada mountain lion research, no mention of "Weilgus" in the current plan, and his information from Eastern Washington on hunting mountain lions has revolutionized our thinking on removal and its impact on both prey and depredation. You have the opportunity to conduct research that would actually look at the efficacy of lethal versus non-lethal measures but instead have simply chosen to remove problem lions, that is not science. You have the opportunity to demonstrate leadership amongst states that have mountain lions; you can't do that without a comprehensive plan. There has not been a comprehensive mountain lion plan in this state since 1995. Of all the states that have mountain lions that is the farthest back that any state goes without looking at this predator species which is a apex predator, the most important species in the state in a comprehensive manner. Science in the last 20 years has turned our outstanding of lions upside down, and this Commission deserves to be informed and to be able to make decisions with the best available science. She urged the Commission to make decisions with the best available science, and urged the Commission over the next couple of months to look a real hard look at what you are doing and see if you can't create a situation where the 80 percent rule becomes an opportunity rather than something which is going to bring greater and greater scrutiny of mountain lion treatment in the great State of Nevada. Thank you for your time.

Karen Layne said she wants to reiterate and echo what has been said by the last two speakers. She said she has been coming to these meetings since 2010, and have been talking about the predation plan and the need for measurable goals and objectives. As a matter of fact, I had to

laugh while at the PARC meeting, I actually had to agree with Gerry Lent when he talked of we need to be more measurable in terms of what it is we are trying to get at by having this predation plan. And we all agree it is not the number of animals that we kill, it is what happens when you kill those animals. Does your lamb recruitment go up, can you actually show that? She thinks the complaint of the sportsmen in the past has been, "Wow, hey look at the number of coyotes we kill, look at the number of mountain lions we kill, it cost us a lot of money...but the mule deer herds haven't increased." We still don't see any change in game animals, and those are the issues she would like to see addressed, we really need to deal with what we get with this money and these animals we are killing.

Chairman Drew asked if there is any additional public comment in Las Vegas? If not, we are going to take a break in the middle of agenda item #6 to see if we can get the audio to Reno fixed. It is 10:46 a.m. by his clock and we will re-adjourn at 11 o'clock.

Meeting re-adjourned at 11:10 a.m. Chairman Drew said: "We will re-adjourn the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' meeting here in Las Vegas with audio feeds to Elko and Reno. A couple of reminders on the audio, if you are speaking at the front podium, and to the Commissioners, please speak as close to the microphone as close as you can and we will try to update the sound in the room so that it doesn't sound like the voice of God booming on you. From Reno if for some reason you can't hear us, please let us know, so we know going forward. At this point we are picking back up with item #6, draft fiscal year 2017 Predation Management Plan, Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson for possible action. Mr. Jackson has gone through the PowerPoint slides that are available in Reno, and the Commission did take CABMW and public comment in Las Vegas, and at this point is asking for public comment in Reno." (11:11 a.m.)

#### Western Region Reno Location Public Comment

"My name is Gerry Lent, Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order as I cannot hear or participate in the meeting as posted on the NDOW agenda as there was no audible sound and I have no idea where you are on the agenda and no idea what was already discussed. Therefore, I could not participate, therefore this meeting should be rescheduled in accordance with the Open Meeting Law, or at least items one through six, should be reconstituted because he could not hear anything until now of one through six on the agenda. So those items and the conversations were not valid from here in Reno as he could not participate and hear, and I think you should start over with agenda item one on the agenda so we can all participate."

Chairman Drew said he will take his comment under advisement, and he asked Mr. Lent if he had any comment on item #6, draft Fiscal Year 2017 Predation Management Plan, and is asking for public comment from Reno.

Elaine Carrick, in Reno said she has public comment on item #6, the Predator Management Plan, and read statement for the record: She said she understands this is the first draft of the predator plan; however she has real concerns with this plan and hopes that the changes will be made to future drafts. She said in your plan summary, it states the Plan should have "clear goals," objective scientific analysis, conduct research and use lethal and non-lethal management methods, increase the knowledge of predators. After reading through this "management plan" several questions came to me. The goals are not clear. Predators are being killed in particular areas for what reason? What is the expected outcome? What does it mean to determine "needs of wildlife populations in the area?" Is it to increase a deer herd to what number? Can the area support the artificially increased number? How many mountain lions or coyotes are expected to be killed? It's all very vague. As a member of the public who owns the wildlife here, I would expect to know the reasons for killing the public's wildlife. The stated projects simply state that predators will be killed but the research and goals or objectives to

justify this killing is not given. The projects simply state that predators will be killed to have some vague effect on other wildlife. Also, there is no mention of what non-lethal methods will be used. Only the lethal methods are stated. With the abundance of scientific journal articles that talk about the important role our predators play in our ecosystem, none of these projects state what research will be done before and after the removal of large numbers of predators in a particular area, to find out the effect on that ecosystem. What is the environmental impact on the area where the predators are removed? We know that wolves were reintroduced into Yellowstone because the ecosystem there was hurting without these important predators. No research is indicated for that to be done. Before \$450,000 is spent on killing the public's wildlife, there needs to be some more in depth research to show these are projects are needed and this money is being spent wisely.

Bobbi McCollum asked if the Commission could hear her. Chairman Drew answered yes. She said regarding various items on #6, the various projects, slated for fiscal year 2017, other than vague comments she read, there are no scientific justifications offered for starting or continuing these projects. Many of these projects list the mule deer as one of the potentially impacted species. She said she went to NDOW's website to see if there was any scientific data posted which supports mass killing of predators as it relates to mule deer populations. She said she found a 76 page publication entitled "Mule Deer Population Dynamics Issues and Influences Biological Bulletin #14." The publication listed various reasons for the decline in mule deer numbers, the first of which was degraded habitat, followed by plant issues: pinyon-juniper, overgrazing of livestock, wildfires and other range factors, cyclic phenomena, human population, climate extremes, disease, and finally predation. Predation was discussed on page 26. The NDOW biologist investigation resulted in two conclusions regarding the effect of predators on mule deer populations. The first conclusion addressed a theory that an increase in mule deer occur during a time of high predator control activities, the NDOW biologist concluded that data does not support that theory. The second theory was that the removal of large numbers of predators such as coyote, bobcats and lions occurred just prior to and during the last mule deer boom, again the NDOW biologist concluded that the data do not support this hypothesis. She said her question is what scientific data are you basing your decisions regarding predators. Also, regarding Project 22 – 16, an unnamed private contractor specializing in coyote denning will use "FLIR" which is "forward looking infrared." She asked who is the coyote denning specialist? What are his or her credentials? Is this person a biologist? How will the diet of the coyote pups be determined? Are you advocating raiding coyote dens and killing pups to remove the contents of their stomachs? If so, what specific science are you using to justify this project?

Jana Hofeditz said she is here without being able to hear as well now because we had to actually get the program set up after we got here and we all got blasted with feedback sounds that pretty much destroyed their hearing. She said she will say what she has to say with her ears hurting right now. She said she had hoped to have a visual meeting today because she brought a "fox light" with her. These are non-lethal tools that need to be in place now. Fox lights work, the USDA is beginning tests now, and there is no justifying in any way, shape or form, killing because of depredation when fox lights and other deterrents can be used. Killing because money has been allotted to kill is a crime, not just against nature but humanity. The only predator population out of control is our own species, and we all know this. We need to take a closer look at where our money is going.

Fred Voltz said in regard to specific projects (written comments provided): These comments concern various projects within the proposed 2017 Predator Management Plan. Regarding the sage grouse in item #21, what have been the specific outcomes, especially upon other species, such as poisons released in the environment and consumed by other wildlife species feeding on dead ravens? Is it the same impact as lead bullets consumed by wildlife or lead in the water for

Flint, Michigan residents? Project #22 Mule Deer—Why do we need more deer when their numbers have been stable and hunters have had no problem finding deer to kill? Project #22-01 - Based on the scientifically flawed \$500,000 study done by Alyson Andresen, partially funded by hunter trade groups, eliminating mountain lions has a negative impact on naturally controlling wild horse populations, which hasn't been addressed. Also, we see nothing about requiring ranchers to provide adequate protection for domestic sheep they raise to kill. The sheep have no shelter from the weather or other perils because ranchers won't spend the money. But ranchers often want reimbursements for any losses without taking reasonable step to protect their sheep and cattle from known perils. Project #22-074—The reduction in mountain lions has as its main objective increasing Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep so human predators have maximized killing success, opportunity and convenience. With mountain lions' numbers diminished, how will this fact disrupt other wildlife species and the intricate, inter-species food chain? Project #37—There is no mountain lion objection for how many to kill in this supposed big game protection project. Project #38—For coyotes, there is no objective for how many will be killed and what the projected, positive outcome would be from this project. Allison Andresen study, negative impact on controlling wild horse populations, and mountain lion populations. 37 – Big game protection no objective of how many killed; 38 – killing coyotes, impact to individual species. None addressed in draft plan.

Allen Souigny said he was looking over PowerPoint slides provided by Mr. Jackson, and with regard to Project 21, Greater Sage-grouse Protection Common Raven Removal, there is a reference to Wildlife Services administering an avicide DCR 1339, and is wondering because the slide on page 2, states 11 eggs gone equals one common raven removal -- and are we to understand 11 poisoned eggs are gone, missing, and that is equated to removing one removed common raven? That brings to question where are the other 10 eggs, and or what other effects are there on wildlife from leaving poisoned eggs sitting out. Eleven poisoned eggs sitting in our environment and one removed common raven, does not sound like a very good equation and that would be his comment on Project 21.

Chairman Drew asked if any additional comment in Reno?

Administrative Assistant III Laura Feliz said they have no more.

Chairman Drew asked if any additional comment in Elko?

Administrative Assistant Natalie Pannunzio said no comment in Elko.

Chairman Drew returned the discussion to Las Vegas, and said to Mr. Jackson there was a question or clarification on the PowerPoint on the raven eggs.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said the numbers were generated from a Coates et al. study in 2007 and that is work that Dr. Pete Coates did for his dissertation and that is the equation that he came up with. DCR 1339 is an avicide, more accurately a corvacid which shuts down the functions of corvids' kidneys, and is not harmful if consumed by other wildlife such as ground squirrels, badgers, and coyotes, as there is not enough volume for a lethal dose.

Chairman Drew asked if the Reno location was able to hear that from the presenter's microphone?

Administrative Assistant Feliz confirmed that they were able to hear Mr. Jackson.

Commissioner Young asked if you feel that this report is light on some of the issues brought up as related to purpose and results in the expenditures, is there more information that we can put

into this report, and this may be a question for Director Wasley as well? Commissioner Young said the report in its draft stages is light in some of these areas as the public mentioned.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson asked Commissioner Young if he wants his response?

Commissioner Young said he would like Mr. Jackson's response first.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson said he believes the plan is accurate and thorough enough, but that doesn't mean more can't be added.

Commissioner Young would add that obviously we work for the public, this is a state funded agency, and he knows that you guys are doing a great job in all in every area but he does think we could be a little bit more descriptive in this report, it needs...the questions that the public raised, as he has heard them over and over the last few years, and he would like to stop hearing their complaints and make the public happy or happier. If that is possible.

Secretary Wasley said thank you Commissioner Young, he would say this program has been in place for somewhere in the neighborhood of a dozen years, maybe just over, and there has been a constant evolution in the appearance and content of this report and plan. He said he doesn't think there is any amount of specificity that will address the emotional divide that exists around it. He asked do I agree that we could be more specific? Absolutely. What comes with that specificity often is expectation and opportunity for continued dialogue. He thinks that because we are a public trust agency, he thinks transparency is imperative and we could certainly be more transparent. He also thinks there are some challenges in administering this program as you know AB 78 requires us to spend 80 percent of this \$3 fee on lethal projects. Sometimes that is challenging to know in advance exactly when and where those projects will occur and so for example the specificity that has been requested here today as far as numbers of animals, target animals, as well as numbers of populations, some of those are nebulous at best. So, do I agree that there could be greater specificity? Yes. Do I think that increased specificity will address the emotional divide? No, I think that will probably go in the opposite direction, but in the spirit of public trust I think we can certainly increase with the specificity in this report or plan."

Commissioner Young said "Director Wasley I do agree with you generally, but I think we should try to make this report as descriptive and as transparent as possible. But you are right the emotional divide is great, AB 78 requires so. Thank you very much for your responses and thank you Pat."

Chairman Drew said, "Additional questions or discussion on item 6? Commissioner Hubbs."

Commissioner Hubbs said she wanted to add a little bit of input that in terms of the specificity that we were discussing is what came to mind, and what she was hearing, is perhaps we could start in small steps and build up to see if it would help, but some of the areas she was hearing that needed to be addressed in a bit more detail were "measurable" and goals, clear goals, and she thinks just basic scientific writing will assist with that, if we were to add a couple of sections to clear up what the hypothesis is, and what we are testing, and the materials and methods behind what the study entails. Those are very easy sections to add, and she thinks it would allow people to get a better understanding, and the long-term objectives to ascertain if goals are being met. (11:30 a.m.)

Commissioner McNinch said this program has been around for a long time, and we have a handful of people that haven't been around who probably don't know the whole story. And the bottom line is this is legislatively driven. He thinks it is pretty fair to say, and will even go out on

a limb and say he is not so sure that the Department is 100 percent in favor of where they are at to deal with predator control with the way they are mandated to with the way they were mandated by the legislature. So anybody that is concerned about the money going into it, that is a legislative issue, go talk to the legislature and get involved there. It is frustrating to hear the implication that the agency's the one...there in a position where they have to spend money to do things and is being prescribed to them on one side, than on the other they are being told to do it biologically sound. He said he sees the Department's efforts to generalize some of these projects so that they can put some scientific...so they are just not proposing junk projects like has been done in the past, as former Commissions were notorious for doing that. The Department is trying to put some science behind it, and put some validity to it and try to make sure the public had a level of trust in the agency but no good deed goes unpunished. So what is happening is the agency wants to make sure through the course of the year that they are able to handle it biologically and not just throwing projects on the ground. In his mind the agency is in a tough spot, and appreciates how they handle it, and there has been more detail in these reports and there is probably room for some improvement in that area and at the same time, he thinks and is hopeful that everyone will take a step back long enough to really process what this system is and how it is working and the challenges the agency has and the Department has to handle that and manage that, with all the interest groups out there and the pressures that they get. Their hands are tied behind their back in a lot of ways, and they don't want to spend money as his guess would be on junk projects so they are put in a position of having to find legitimate projects. The way that the report and plan is laid out provides a little bit of an opportunity for them to have some legitimacy with their biology and that is where he is at and is frustrating, he call tell you and he feels for the agency.

Chairman Drew asked for additional Commission comment or discussion?

Commissioner Johnston said he did receive a letter with respect to this agenda item and it appeared to suggest that this Commission and the Department could avoid the spending of 80 percent of the money on lethal predator management because there is an absence of complete information. He does not believe that is a fair reading of AB 78. He said that reference to complete information is in the context of how you calculate the 80 percent number back to fiscal year. Is directing the Department to look back at the fiscal year for which it has complete financial information to them to determine the 80 percent figure. So he said he does not believe that the petition submitted in the letter that was forwarded to us is accurate in that regard. He said he does not want to repeat something that Director Wasley said, but when he hears a lot of comments is the legislature has mandated lethal control measures of predatory animals, and that is why it is being done. It requires the expenditure of the money, and if someone is philosophically or personally opposed to any lethal control of predators, which he believes some people are, there is no amount of detail that will ever go into a predator management plan that involves lethal control, that is going to satisfy those individuals. It will not address that particular issue. He said he respects the views of other people who are opposed to this and understands that they are coming from a point of view where they oppose lethal control of predators. We respect that but he doesn't know how he can address that as a Commission or how the Department can address that as a Department in any predator management plan that the law requires the fund to be spent on lethal predator control programs, so he understands where we are coming from, but we are where we are, and he thinks that the Department has made progress in moving forward and putting together these plans, trying to make sure that we adopt programs that comply with the legislative mandate, that will have a benefit to wildlife and is confident and does share some belief that there could be more detail, but there could always be more detail. When does it end? There has to be some sort of balance between what a plan is and how much detail is going to be provided and he hopes though that as this continues to progress that when we get to the end of the calendar year we are getting reports back as to what occurred, then we can ask questions...was this worthwhile? Was this money well spent,

and hopefully, we have answers to that and that helps address some of the issues that have been raised by the public.

Commissioner Hubbs said she has one more comment to counter what Commissioner Johnston stated. She said she thinks that as he discussed, a lot of this stems from legislation and counters back that if our strength is in our scientists and our biologists on the ground to report how the study happened or occurred in the predation studies or research or in the management and control measures that were utilized, she thinks that will help if we need to change the legislation to have the science speak and in that regard she thinks it is essential that these projects be put together in a systematic fashion. Very open so everyone understands what the objective was and if the objective is not reached it can help us perhaps make better legislation over time.

Chairman Drew said the only thing he would say from a historic, and does not know how historic perspective it is, as we are a couple days short of Groundhog Day, and when we get to this subject since he has been on the Commission it has always felt like Groundhog Day. Same discussion, same issues, and he would tell everyone that the process now, is much better and much more transparent and much more inclusive then it was when he began his time on the Commission. For that he thanked the Department, and staff, and committee members, because without you trying to improve this program we would not have gotten there. Sometimes it is easy to look at the mountain top and realize you have further to go, but maybe we should pause and look back at how far we have come with this program in light of some really challenging changes that came out of the last legislative session. So going forward can we improve? Absolutely. Have we improved? Yes, and let's keep up the good work. Chairman Drew said this is an action item and does not see any need for action, given our audio problems he would not recommend action at this time, but will open it up if there is any call for action?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson said he apologizes for not reading this earlier but he is going to read Section 4, Subsection 4 (b) from Assembly Bill 78 and this in reference to the 80 percent mandate for lethal control. He said the Department's interpretation is that we need to spend 80 percent on lethal control and also feel that largely ties our hands to monitor the effects of that lethal management.

Chairman Drew asked if there is anything else before he closes agenda item #6. He asked if the Reno location is still with us, and if the microphones are doing well.

AA III Feliz answered yes they are fine.

Chairman Drew said with that we will close agenda item #6, with no action taken and we will move to our Commission General Regulation workshop, which is informational and public comment will be allowed. Persons wishing to provide comment on regulations are requested to complete the regulation speaker card and present it to the recording secretary so that is the green card.

**Commission General Regulation – Workshop/Informational – Public Comment Allowed – Persons Wishing to Provide Comment on Regulations are Requested to Complete a Regulation Speaker’s Card and Present it to the Recording Secretary**

- 7 Commission General Regulation 456, Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel, LCB File No. R031-15 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed
- The Commission will consider permanent adoption of a regulation relating to amending NAC 502.42283 by which the Commission may facilitate decisions by appointing or serving as the arbitration panel should arbitration of elk incentive tag awards become necessary; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. A workshop on the temporary regulation was held on March 20, 2015, and the temporary regulation was adopted on May 15, 2015, at the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission meetings. An additional workshop was held on August 7, 2015, at the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission meeting and no further changes were made. The Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners adopted this regulation as a permanent regulation on September 26, 2015; however, on October 27, 2015 the Legislative Commission deferred the regulation.

Chairman Drew read the agenda item and explained that the Department and Commission are trying to deal with the Legislative Commission’s concern at this point.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said this was first brought from the White Pine CABMW. They pointed out the challenges with trying to make arbitrations decisions with a local panel. They recommended adopting an NAC to provide a broader perspective. This was first a temporary NAC and a process was adopted. The Legislative Commission did not like that it was final and binding and they deferred the regulation back to the Department. He said the Department thought the NACs listed in section 3 dealt with it adequately. It was existing language. He explained what the Department is recommending.

Commissioner Johnston asked why section 3 was problematic.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said the specific concern was whether or not this created a final and binding decision where litigation could not be pursued and it could not be appealed. The Legislative Counsel Bureau reviewed it and the Department thought the other references of state law handled it.

CABMW Comment – None

Las Vegas Public Comment – None

Reno Public Comment –

Fred Voltz said the subject of this regulation, a special incentive elk arbitration panel, does not rise to the level of a regulation and should be dealt with as a Policy under existing Policy #3. The Commission recently decided that killing coyotes in a contest-style format does not merit a regulation. This issue of tag receipt is not as serious or substantive as unconstrained people killing as many coyotes as they can in as short of a period of time as outlined by contest promoters.

Elko Public Comment – None, and Chairman Drew closed the workshop.

- 8 Commission General Regulation 458, Electronic Rifle Triggers, Caliber and Cartridge Length, and Smokeless Powder Restrictions, LCB File No. R144-15 – Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed  
The Commission will hold a workshop to consider a regulation relating to amending Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code. It revises provisions relating to hunting; deleting the prohibition against using smokeless powder in a muzzle-loading firearm while hunting a big game mammal under certain circumstances; making it unlawful to use certain firearms and cartridges while hunting a big game mammal; and proving other matters properly relating thereto.

Chairman Drew read the agenda item. He said it is a three part regulation. Each item was recommended from a different place. He said there will be a video at one point in the PowerPoint and the video will be played at each location.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said the regulation deals with three independent topics: black powder substitutes, electronic triggers/smart rifles, and caliber and cartridge length. He went over the PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file) on black powder substitutes, which explained the reason for the amendment to the regulation.

Commissioner Young asked the difference between smokeless powder and black powder.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said at the time the original regulation was written there were no smokeless powders that could be used in the muzzleloader back then because of the burn rate and pressure. If a muzzleloader was loaded with a common centerfire rifle power it would likely blow up the gun. Blackhorn 209 is a smokeless powder, but they figured out how to slow down the burn rate, add fillers so the measuring amounts are similar to others, and they added stuff to make it smoke for visual effect. It was a new thing on the market and it is a black powder substitute, but chemically it appeared to be a smokeless powder, so it is thought to be illegal.

Commissioner Young asked who did the chemical research.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said Cameron Waithman did a lot of research on their Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS). Blackhorn does not want to tell us what is in their powder, but MSDS are public information. He said they looked at that to find out that it is primarily nitrocellulose based, which is the chemical that makes it a smokeless powder.

Commissioner Young asked if he knew of any other states that allow this product to be used as a substitute for black powder.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said a lot of other western states have wrestled with it including Utah, he said he does not know how they have shaken out the issue.

Commissioner Bliss asked if he was aware of any other smokeless powders other than Blackhorn 209 that can be used in a muzzleloader.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he is not aware of any. He did not research if there were other powders that were nitrocellulose based. He said there are a lot of powders that are advertising how clean they burn. With Blackhorn, people could shoot 10 or 15 rounds without cleaning their barrel, which is unheard of with other older black powder substitutes. There are other brands on the market who advertise shooting numerous rounds without cleaning, so they may have some of the same chemical makeup.

Commissioner Bliss said that is one of his concerns. He wants to know if there are other powders and what does it do to the muzzle velocity. He is afraid that we will move away from traditional muzzleloader hunting. He has heard that there are other companies. He would like more background and information. He does not have a problem with the gun being cleaner, but he does have an issue if it is going to turn the muzzle velocity way up.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said that research has not been done. He does not know what it does to the muzzle velocity. Personally, he wants to keep it primitive. He does not know if it will provide an advantage.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed went over the PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file) on electronic triggers/smart rifles and a video was showed (exhibit file).

Commissioner Valentine asked if there was already something in the Nevada Administrative Code or the Nevada Revised Statutes that restricts laser scopes.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said we have a regulation about projecting a beam forward. A visible beam is prohibited, but not an invisible beam.

Commissioner Young said there needs to be a limit on the use of technology in the field. He said there is no place for this in hunting. He asked if it was possible to draft a regulation that would prohibit all the various types of technology. He is a big 2nd Amendment person. Military weapons should not be in the hands of civilians.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said the applications are mind boggling. Before Tracking Point he never thought he would hear about this. He thinks it does not have a place in the hunting world. This goes to fair chase ethics. He said people say we do not regulate hunting ethics, but we do.

Commissioner Young said the Tracking Point folks mentioned hunting in the video. They just want to sell their product. Technologists are going to be pushing this stuff into the hunting world. He thinks the Commission needs to nip this in the bud soon before people start purchasing them and using them in the field.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said other videos are very much geared towards hunting.

Chairman Drew mentioned the bill that passed last legislative session enabling some disabled citizens to hunt. Are the opportunities provided with or without computer devices?

Commissioner Bliss said there is a mechanical mechanism where they can bite something to pull the trigger. There are other mechanisms where you can suck or blow into a straw that will pull the trigger and the gun will fire. He does not see anything in the regulation that will affect this. Some disabled citizens cannot look into a scope, but there is a camera looking through the scope which is then projected on to a monitor so they can see what they are looking at, but there is no link to the trigger, it is a mechanical mechanism.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he agrees with Commissioner Bliss. This should not affect the disabled citizens in the field. They have bite triggers, hydraulics, and buttons. He read the regulation change. This was the simplest way to go about it.

Commissioner Valentine said he is kind of against regulations. He asked if it is possible to regulate in the field.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he does not know. He thinks it addresses what may happen. He cannot predict the future in technology.

Commissioner Johnston said he never thought those rifles would be available to the general public, but then he goes back to the scopes we have today and 15-20 years ago they might have thought they violate fair chase. He does not know where we stop the regulation. He does not know where to draw the line with technology in the hunting world. Laser range finders are relatively new. Some might not think it is fair chase if you can use a range finder. Technology can help avoid wounding animals and result in better shooting. He does not know what the policy decision is. Technology is frightening. No one knows what technology will be like in 10 years. He does not know what the right decision is. When he sees the video he thinks the technology should not be used for hunting.

Chairman Drew said he has a strong believe in process. This body exists to deal with issues like this. The Commission has to identify and address issues on a case by case basis. He has an issue with it.

Commissioner Johnston said when he heard the Tracking Point representative talking about the computer generated ballistics solution and the gun will not fire until the ballistic solution is solved and they are talking about the distance, it gets to him. It is beyond fair chase and beyond a fair manner of take. The individual is not actually solving the ballistics solution; it is the computer that is doing it for them.

Commissioner Young said he thinks that this Commission is here for a reason. One reason is to strike a balance. A lot of people do not like hunting. These guns are eliminating skill. There will be no missing shots. He said the Commission should look at all technology. The focal point is on fair chase. Hunting is a sport. People practice and sometimes they miss, but that is part of hunting.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed went over the PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file) on cartridge length and caliber.

Chairman Drew said the 16 pound weight was a roundabout way to attack this, which is what Idaho did. Can change cartridge length to 4 or 4 ½. The combination was good.

Commissioner Hubbs said she is very pleased with the comments today. She respects the work that has been done to keep up with the technology and it will be harder overtime. She commends hearing how one envisions hunting and the responsibility a hunter has. Also, the sensitivity to the public and how they may perceive technology that is too advanced for our current environment.

Commissioner Bliss said he hand loads quite a bit. There is some truth to the overall length being longer than 3.8 inches. He asked if it would it be cleaner and easier if you went off of the length of the case and not the loaded length. It would be extreme to have to shorten a case. The rifles are chambered for certain measurements. It would be good to have a minimum and maximum case length and not tie it to the overall length.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said it would be a great way to go about this.

Commissioner Johnston said he does not know what they need to look at but has not doubt no one should be hunting with these. He gave an example of a hunt he was on. He asked if there was any evidence of anyone hunting in Nevada with theses.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he heard about people hunting with these. They are killing elk with them. Northern Washoe or Pershing County someone killed a doe at a short range with one and the outcome was ugly. He said he wrestled with how to write this regulation effectively without an unintended consequence. He said they are not looking to restrict the antique rifles. He read the proposed regulation change. Using the term center fire rifle does not affect muzzleloaders.

Commissioner Bliss asked about the new muzzleloader by Remington. He said the ignition system is the primer.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he did not think about those. He asked if the ignition system looks like the base of a center fire cartridge.

Commissioner Bliss described the ignition system. It is a cleaner ignition system.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said this is new technology once again. He said he wanted to get an attorney's opinion on it. He said he thought it would still be considered a muzzleloader and not a center fire rifle, but he had not considered that.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the 3.8 inches on the loaded length.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he did the research online. He looked for the common overall loaded length for the biggest cartridges. He said a lot of the big ones are around 3.6 inches. He said if they stick with the overall loaded length maybe 4 inches is more appropriate. Or maybe the case length is a better way to go.

CABMW Comment –

Bill Stanley, Clark CABMW, said the Clark CABMW is unanimously in opposition to all proposed regulation changes except the smart trigger. They do not know what is driving changes on cartridge length and want black powder to remain primitive. Soon there will be no difference. There was discussion about the definition of a primitive hunt.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said the CABMW voted 4 to 0 to deny the entire regulation. The regulation was grouped into three different things and it was confusing. Until more information on cartridge length and caliber are address the Commission should wait. He said you can shoot a 9 millimeter rifle and not a 9 millimeter pistol. Someone could make a pistol to shoot a .500 caliber over 4 inches. The regulation is too confusing.

Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW, they had no recommendation at this time. They did not have enough information. Concern was expressed that electronic rifles or smart triggers would not be considered fair chase or ethical. Caliber and cartridge length was considered a potential safety issue. One member was concerned about the entrance and exit wound that a .50 caliber round could make. He mentioned a movie in 1973. There were smart triggers in the movie. Somebody's mind has been working on this technology for 40 years. A lot more thought needs to go into this before it is authorized.

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, said they voted against the entire regulation change. The black powder aspect got away from the traditional side; they want to stay with the smoke powder not the smokeless. The electronic triggers are an unfair advantage to the hunter. The bullet length gave the hand loaders an unfair disadvantage.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said they supported this regulation. The overall cartridge length may need to be revised. Personally, he appreciates that Law Enforcement is getting ahead of this. They voted for an allowance for .22 mags for mountain lion hunting only.

Larry Allen, Humboldt CABMW, the only issue was with the caliber length.

Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW, said they supported electronic trigger and smokeless powder. He said they wanted to wait on the maximum caliber and cartridge length because they need more information.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said they concur with the Department's recommendation and they feel we need to be proactive and not reactive.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said with regard to the big game mammal he wants it to be any game mammal.

Chairman Drew asked if it was in regard to this regulation.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said yes.

Las Vegas Public Comment –

Jana Wright said she is in support of banning smart triggers for hunting. She read from an article "Drones, electronic guns on Wildlife Board agenda" from the Las Vegas Review Journal (exhibit file). She thinks some sportsmen actually use hunting as a sport.

John Hiatt said he is appalled that we can kill without seeing the animals with our own eyes. Need some concept of fair chase and skill. He would strongly urge this Commission to enact these regulations. People are smarter than animals; let's have some idea of fair chase and skill.

Reno Public Comment –

Fred Voltz said the proposed regulation does not go far enough. Allowing any type of technological weapon or advantage in any form is the equivalent to the government giving automatic weapons to drug cartels. No electronic devices should be used in killing wildlife ever. Wildlife has no defense against the technology. All technology advantages should be banned.

Elko Public Comment – None.

Chairman Drew said they can provide suggested changes because this is a workshop.

Commissioner Johnston said a comment he heard that he thinks should be included is changing where it says "it is unlawful to hunt a big game mammal with" and removing "big game mammal" so it reads "it is unlawful to hunt with." It will make it broader. He does not know how this technology works. Will someone develop an electronic device on a shotgun to make duck hunting easier? He does not know where technology ends. He has a concern and maybe it is a lack of information, on the regulation on the cartridge length. He looked up some information online and would like more information. He is in support of a black powder regulation.

Commissioner Valentine said he is happy with holding this regulation and processing it through the CABMW process for a more solid regulation.

Commissioner McNinch asked about the time sensitivity.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said there is not a huge time issue. It is nice to have them passed by June so they are in the hunt book. We would want them in effect by the fall hunting season. If something is changed and it is minor would be fine without LCB reviewing it again.

Commissioner Hubbs is interested in what the CABMW members said today. Many were in agreement to the electronic trigger, but some wanted more thought in general. There might be some consensus to the electronic trigger portion at this point.

Chairman Drew said there were eight CABMWs that addressed this issue. Maybe the Commission can do another workshop and have another discussion.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said the CABMWs were confused about having three regulation changes in one. The reason for that is that they all fall under NAC 503.142.

Chairman Drew said to advance this to another workshop and request a recommendation from the Department to change "big game" to "any game" and also on an alternate overall loaded length or an overall case length for more information. He will work Chief Game Warden Turnipseed to put together some supplemental information and a description for the CABMWs and the public to look at all three aspects of this proposed regulation change. Hold another workshop in March.

Commissioner Young said Commissioner Johnston had a good point on "any hunting". There was a consensus on the electronic trigger change.

Chairman Drew said the rifle might be restricted to big game. A second workshop is good.

9 Commission General Regulation 459, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (Drones), LCB File No. R145-15 – Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

The Commission will hold a workshop to consider a regulation relating to amending Chapters 501 and 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code. It revises provisions governing the use of aircraft, hot air balloons, unmanned aerial vehicles, satellites or certain other devices to locate or observe, for the purpose of hunting, a big game mammal; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Chairman Drew gave some background. The current regulation does cover drones, but it is not explicit. This explicitly adds drones and changes the timeline for scouting from an aerial device to a year round prohibition.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said there are two parts. It adds the explicit language calling out drones specifically. He read the regulation language. This change specifically adds drones and defines them. The first 14 pages of the regulation is the license demerits schedule. The second part expands to a year round prohibition for aerial scouting. He read the regulation language. The mountain lion season is not considered a big game season for this regulation.

Commissioner Valentine asked about flying a drone and when it is illegal.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said it depends. There is a key phrase, “for the purpose of hunting.” It is a fairly difficult burden of proof on the Department.

Commissioner Mori asked if private land was considered.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said it does not set out private or public land. They are considered the same.

Commissioner Mori said landowners do inventory of wildlife on their private land. Is there enough protection for landowners with this language?

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he thinks so. They are not hunting, they are doing inventory.

Commissioner Young said the officer has to show the person was intentionally trying to commit a crime.

CABMW Comment –

John Hiatt, Clark CABMW, said they opposed the regulation. They think we need a regulation, but this is written poorly. As written it has unintended consequences and seems unenforceable. This is a complex issue and evolving.

Chairman Drew asked if there was discussion on how to clarify the regulation.

John Hiatt, Clark CABMW, said that they do not understand the technology. It is rapidly evolving. A lot of drones are now registered with the FAA. How do you know the intent of the person flying the drone? How do you show what is happening? It is a can of worms.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, they were split on the regulation. The 48 hour change was too much and they felt it was slipped into the regulation. Not just big game animals, but all animals including cattle.

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW, said there was a guide who told him a story about hunting in Clark County. The entire hunt was filmed with a drone. This regulation is needed. Need to get word to the guides.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said they accepted the regulation with any game mammal. He thinks the Commission is staying with the curve on this. The intent of the law is discussed. People are using drones all the time, especially in his area. They hope that it would get policed.

Las Vegas Public Comment – None

Reno Public Comment –

Allen Souigny said it would be useful to have a universal ban on drones like other states have. Do not just say it is for big game mammals. It would be easy to get off of any allegation.

Don Molde would like someone to explain the mountain lion season exclusion.

Elko Public Comment – None

Chairman Drew asked about the mountain lion exclusion language.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed read the regulation language dealing with mountain lions. He explained the reason for the exclusion. It is not an exemption for mountain lions for aerial scouting.

Chairman Drew asked about the regulation already prohibiting drones, we are just clarifying.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said yes, they were already covered. This clarifies the language so there is not any confusion.

Chairman Drew asked if there are any successful cases.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said no. They have heard reports of people using drones while hunting. There are not any cases yet though.

Chairman Drew asked about regular traditional aircraft cases.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said yes. He explained the case. The 48 hour rule confused the hunters. This regulation was initially passed in 2002 because of powered parachutes.

Chairman Drew said the 48 hour prohibition is muddy because of the different seasons. He asked about changing it to any game mammal instead of just big game mammals.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said he thinks it can be done.

Chairman Drew asked about section two and satellite devices with real time images.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed said it has not been considered in the past. Google Earth showed a group of sheep on a mountaintop at one point. He does not know how often they are updated.

Chairman Drew said some changes may need to be sent back to LCB for review. He would support changing "big game mammal" to "any game mammal." Also, he would like to look at adding real time images under section 2.

Commissioner Young gave a suggestion to incorporate language under section 2. He has a hard time understanding Clark CABMW. He thinks this is clear. Drones can fly very high. He thinks this is very simple and recommends approval.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed asked to clarify the change to section 2.

Commissioner Young clarified.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed gave information on current technology with drones. First person view hooked up to drones to see real time.

Commissioner Hubbs said she agrees with Commissioner Young. She does not see a problem with the regulation even as written now.

Commissioner Johnston said he is in support. This just clarifies for the public.

Commissioner Bliss said he agrees and supports the regulation.

Chairman Drew said he thinks everyone agrees and supports it. He wants to make the two changes he mentioned earlier and move forward for approval or to LCB for a redraft. He closed the agenda item.

10 Reports – Informational

- A Bighorn Sheep Disease Surveillance and Herd Performance from 2012to2015 – Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox and Wildlife Veterinarian Dr. Peri Wolff– Informational  
The Department will provide a presentation depicting our bighorn sheep herd responses (lamb recruitment as primary metric) over time in relation to disease exposure, environmental factors, and other variables. This presentation will cover information developed from data collected over the last three years.

Chairman Drew said as mentioned previously this item tabled due to staff unavailability and will be placed on the March agenda.

- B Status of the Helicopters Owned and Operated by the Nevada Department of Wildlife, Game Division – Deputy Director Jack Robb, Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling, and Chief Pilot Greg Smith – Informational  
The Department will provide a presentation primarily on the helicopters owned by the Department, but reference the fixed-wing aircraft, and provide an overview of the status and utility of the Bell Jet Rangers. The Department will discuss air fleet modernization and possible mechanisms to improve performance.

Division Administrator Brian Wakeling presented this item with a PowerPoint presentation (exhibit file). He said the intent and ultimate goal is to replace a current helicopter with a newer model. He said Air Ops provides support to other Divisions. Division Administrator Wakeling introduced NDOW's new Chief Pilot Greg Smith, and he answered questions from the Commission such as selection of model of helicopter "Bell" versus "McDonald Douglas;" and will the new helicopter be safer? Chief Pilot Greg Smith answered that there is no comparison between the new ship and the old one. Commissioner Hubbs asked Division Administrator Wakeling about matching and federal funds and she asked how much the match is? He answered with the price being \$2.4 million would have to come up with \$1.8 million and \$600,000 through non-federal match, such as license and tag fees, and can be direct donations from sportsman groups too. The new helicopter will cost \$2 to \$3 million. Commissioner Bliss asked if the helicopter will have capacity for water drops to water developments. Administrator Wakeling answered yes.

Secretary Wasley said the new ship will provide increased utility with revegetation work and increase safety. The intent is donation dollars and to use restricted reserve and not use sportsman revenue.

Deputy Director Robb said NDOW's Cessna and other helicopter will be sold at auction, and he sees funding sources such as Heritage, Dream tag, NGOs being used.

- C Mid-Winter Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Conference Report – Secretary Wasley and Commissioners McNinch and Wallace – Informational  
A report will be provided on the recent mid-winter conference held in San Diego, Calif.

Commissioner McNinch provided a brief overview on how WAFWA is set-up and provided highlights from the conference on the biology level: The BLM did receive full funding request for sage-grouse for this next year in the amount of \$45 million more than previous year; there is

also a model coming out as a guideline for interaction for domestic and wild sheep, based on risk contact helping to alleviate ranching concerns to manage risks. He said presentations at Commissioners' Committee discussed "how agencies will transform but under what terms," and has to do with multiple constituencies, finding balance and other issues. Numbers discussed with hunter recruitment, and the interesting dynamic occurring with traditional funding source. Per capita the number of sportsman is going down. The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies has convened the Blue Ribbon Panel for study of agency funding mechanisms, and funding is designed for others beside sportsmen, and the panel has started to look into existing royalties from large oil companies, as there is several trillion dollars in unappropriated royalties. They would like to tap into 10 percent with money going back into Pittman-Robertson. Several million would go to Nevada, and theory is Congressional Sportsman's Foundation is supportive and ready to take next step.

Commissioner Hubbs asked for explanation of untapped royalties from oil companies.

Commissioner McNinch answered that royalties from oil and gas have went into big pocket of money that is unallocated and intent is to have about 10 percent appropriated to a consistent cause such as Pittman-Robertson. Challenge to Nevada is finding the match.

Commissioner Wallace said Commissioner McNinch covered the meetings and he will report on his WAFWA experience as it was the first time he attended: Great meeting other commissioners from other states, 11 western states represented with Commissioners and one state had their full Commission with some states more than two representatives. He said he understands why Commissioner McNinch goes to these as you build relationships with other Commissioners, really enjoyed the review of each state and discussion. He took notes and said South Dakota was excited to have 300 bighorn sheep and issued three tags; New Mexico using DNA from hair caught in fences to estimate their bear populations, and wanting to increase bear and lion tags. Many commonalties and many differences too. Montana had big news with possible delisting of grizzly bear, and he attended the Loren Chase presentation and suggested that Mr. Chase make a presentation in Nevada.

Secretary Wasley said to Commissioner Wallace that Chase and Chase is currently under contract with NDOW to study fee simplification. Focus groups are being formed and the plan is to have Mr. Chase provide a presentation to the Commission on Nevada's data. He said WAFWA has been in existence since 1922 with two meetings per year, is a great opportunity for professional development and interaction with federal government partners as they too attend and attendees share science and information. Commissioners McNinch and Wallace covered the meetings they attended and he provided overview of the topics of meetings he attended: State hatchery coordination meeting discussed technology, challenges with quagga mussels to state hatchery systems; Colorado River Fish and Wildlife Coordination meeting attended discussed Colorado River system; ad hoc sage-grouse meeting, Sage-grouse Executive Oversight Committee, Archery Trade Association (ATA) made aware of changes coming to Pittman-Robertson so some of federal funds can be spent on education and outreach; developing new and alternative funding for wildlife as Commissioner McNinch mentioned the AFWA Blue Ribbon Panel, would be very similar to Pittman-Robertson and actual amount of match is undetermined hypothetically calculations are now less than \$1 million to \$20 million annually. As stated the challenge would be generating match. Dave Chanda the director from New Jersey current president of AFWA mentioned current policy issues facing AFWA and WAFWA which deal with the Endangered Species Act and formalizing state roles and improve coordination with states, and try to take away frivolous aspects of listing petitions. One challenge all western states face is work forces in transitions, and Director Scott Talbott led discussion and future challenges all states face is with retirements and new workers in the workforce. Lastly last September at the AFWA meeting he talked to Alexa Sandoval director

from New Mexico with challenges in managing bears nuisance bears in particular. New Mexico has had five bear contacts and discussed value to use WAFWA to develop consistent protocols for states and whether that would include lions and coyotes as they have a Wildlife Conflict Committee and are developing scope of work to develop consistent protocols for management of nuisance wildlife.

- D Humboldt County Elk Management Sub-Plan Update – Chairman Drew and Commissioner Mori and Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – Informational  
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 he attended the recent meeting Tuesday and some members are hopeful that was the last meeting. He said the draft plan is close to being done and may be ready for the Commission's March meeting. He told them to take as long as needed to insure Humboldt County is comfortable and the committee has population objectives set for game management units within the county. If you talk to sportsmen in the county they will say the objectives are too low and if you talk to ranching or agriculture representatives they will say objectives too high, and is controversial. A COT team will be formed to stay in place within the county to address elk issues going forward to handle localized issues. Chairman Drew said he is pleased with progress to date and his intent is that when draft plan returns to the Commission, the Commission will have the opportunity to review and provide input for the committee to take back and then the draft plan will be back to the Commission for final adoption.

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

Secretary Wasley said this will be easier if he takes questions, as there have been four news articles and a press release from the governor's office during the last 24 hours, addressing the governor's mineral segregation proposal. He said an argument made in the USFWS decision for the not warranted finding in September was contingent on mineral withdraw of significant area in northern Nevada. Governor Sandoval asked Division of Minerals, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and Department of Wildlife to determine alternative solution for area proposed for mineral withdrawal. NDOW worked with agencies to develop alternative maps specific to segregation as segregation as proposed recommends mineral withdraw of 3.2 million acres of sage-grouse habitat. The September not warranted finding heavily contingent on mineral withdraw, and mineral withdraw is called segregation and over two-year period they will evaluate economic value of lands recommended for withdrawal and value of habitat. Currently alternative plan put forth by governor's staff as alternative to the plan Secretary has recommended for withdrawal.

- F Department Activity Report – Secretary Wasley – Informational  
Secretary Wasley will provide a report on recent Department activities.

Secretary Wasley provided the following Department activity update: Annually, NDOW examines the wings submitted by sage-grouse hunters to determine from characteristics of those wings what annual recruitment may be expected. This year's efforts yielded a statewide average sage-grouse chick recruitment of 1.52 chicks per hen. There was some regional variation noted. The western region had a value of 2.23 while the Eastern Region was at 1.18. The statewide nest success value was 39.6 percent. This data indicates that sage-grouse populations seem relatively stable this year.

One hundred mountain quail were released on the Massacre Rim in north Washoe County in early December.

Fifty-three turkeys from Utah were released in Battle Mountain on Jan. 19, 2016.

Captures to assess effects of State Route 160 on ungulates in the Spring Mountain Range were conducted during Nov. 8 through Nov.11, 2015, in the Spring Mountains of Clark County. Twelve bighorn sheep, 14 mule deer, and six elk were captured and fitted with GPS radio collars.

Bighorn sheep from Lone Mountain near Tonopah are intended to be captured on Jan. 31, 2016. About 15 of these bighorn sheep will be fitted with transmitters that identify when they give birth and released in the Garfield Hills near Hawthorne.

About 25 mule deer were radio marked with GPS transmitters as part of the ongoing movement monitoring studies associated with Bald Mountain and the Pequop crossings on Interstate 80.

A major fish kill in Rye Patch Reservoir beginning the first week of October may have resulted in the loss of the majority of the fish remaining in the reservoir. The likely cause of the die-off was a toxic bloom of golden algae.

NDOW staff also completed a project to introduce hybrid Tiger muskie to Chimney Reservoir in Humboldt County. Approximately 1,100 - 10 to 12 inch tiger muskie were released in late November.

Water quality conditions at Comins Lake in White Pine County prevented restocking of the reservoir with trout or bass prior to ice-up, due to low oxygen and high pH after the reservoir was lowered last summer to remove northern pike.

Sparks Marina pond also experienced another winter fish kill in December although this wasn't as severe as the incidents that happened in 2013 and 2014.

The annual mid-winter dives to estimate Devils Hole pupfish numbers were conducted in January. The average count was 135 which is a significant improvement over past years.

The NDOW Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) program has received an additional \$50,000 from the National Park Service to help support decontamination and inspection activities within Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

The Habitat Division continues to coordinate with Clark County Regional Flood Control District to evaluate flood planning modifications for the Overton Wildlife Management Area.

The record of decision for the Mason Valley Walker River channel modification has been received and this cooperative project with the USFWS, Great Basin Bird Observatory and Otis Bay Ecological Consultants is expected to take place during the summer of 2017.

Wildfire restoration efforts are underway with Western Region Habitat Division personnel collaborating with Carson City BLM District to reseed approximately 4,000 acres associated with the Cold Springs Fire in the Desatoya Mountains. Additionally, Eastern Region personnel are waiting for a break in weather systems to begin reseeding efforts across 12,000 acres in Eureka and Elko Counties.

The Eastern Region has hired contractors for the Overland and Spruce habitat improvement projects. The Spruce Mountain project will treat 1,500 acres of pinyon and juniper with mechanical mastication while the Overland Pass will implement hand-thinning across 6,700 acres of conifer encroachment. Collectively, these two treatments will eventually treat 38,000 acres of pinyon and juniper to improve mule deer and sage-grouse habitat conditions.

The Habitat Division recently held stakeholder meetings in Reno, Las Vegas, and Elko to receive initial comment on the proposed Industrial Artificial Pond Permit regulation change.

Clint Garret the biologist from the northern water development crew was recently awarded the Ted C. Frantz Employee of the Year Award. Clint was recognized for his efforts in bringing the agencies 1,700 – plus guzzlers into compliance with legislation requiring hotline contact signage at every guzzler within the state. In typical Clint fashion he was quick to point out that this was definitely a team effort and without the hard work and support from crew members Eddy Willis and Cole Husted it would have never been accomplished.

Tomorrow Chief Game Warden Turnipseed will provide a detailed presentation on law enforcement cases and he highlighted the following cases not included in that presentation: Investigation near completion for doe antelope harvested near Ely before antelope season opened: two Southern Nevada men plead guilty on Dec. 1 to charges related to flying a plane in Washoe County to scout for an upcoming bighorn sheep hunt.

The new conservation aids for urban wildlife began work in both the Southern and Western Regions, they will serve as a single point of contact for urban wildlife issues in those regions.

Conservation Education staff participated in the Wild Sheep Foundation Youth Outdoor Experience introducing over 1,000 kids to wildlife conservation.

The 2016 Nevada National Archery in the Schools Program state tournament just concluded at the South Point Hotel. The tournament was the largest to date for Nevada and as a result was moved from the ballrooms to the hotel's practice arena.

The Outdoor Education program held a series of hunter and angler education volunteer instructor recognition events. Eight recognition events were held around the state in January 2016 including Reno, Winnemucca, Las Vegas, Tonopah, Caliente, Pahrump, Elko and Eureka.

A full-scale recruitment effort is underway in the Southern Region to recruit a new corps of volunteers to support of myriad of agency programs, much of it targeted at non-traditional, general public audiences. The Southern Region Volunteer and Wildlife Education coordinators attended a volunteer symposium hosted by the Outside Las Vegas Foundation. The symposium presentations addressed recruitment, retention and use of volunteers in an outdoor setting.

Preparations have begun for the Clark County Fair to be held April 7-10. We will once again have a catch and release fish tank, an archery range, the Operation Game Thief (OGT) trailer, the boating education trailer and an exhibit hall.

The Southern Region Conservation Education and Law Enforcement supervisors attended a coordination meeting hosted by the Clark County Parks and Recreation Dept. Sunset Park was again the focus. Parks & Recreation is moving forward with a volunteer program designed to improve park stewardship across all user groups. NDOW will remain involved as it goes forward.

The Wildlife Diversity Division recently completed an intense week-long mine claim marker pull on the Montezuma Bench and the Malapais Mesa near Tonopah. Over 2,000 illegal mine claim markers were pulled over the course of four days by eight staff on 4-wheeler quad bikes and on foot. Illegal hollow mine claim markers are a significant source of mortality for cavity-nesting birds, mammals, reptiles and insects. Of the more than 2,000 posts pulled, 60 percent of the posts on the Montezuma Bench and 40 percent of the posts pulled on Malapais Mesa had dead wildlife trapped inside. This program has treated over 17,000 mine claim markers in total over the past several years.

Statewide, Diversity biologists are monitoring winter hibernacula for evidence of White Nose Syndrome, a disease that is killing millions of bats in the eastern U.S. As part of a federal grant, biologists have deployed several temperature and humidity data loggers in mines and caves throughout the state. Each winter, data from these instruments are downloaded and analyzed to better understand which areas may provide conditions suitable for the fungus that causes White Nose Syndrome. In addition, at several monitoring sites around the state, individual hibernating bats are sampled for evidence of fungal spores. To date, this devastating disease has not been detected in Nevada, but early surveillance and proactive research will help lessen the effects of this disease should it spread to the state.

Winter is an excellent time to survey for pygmy rabbits, a focal species on recent surveys in Elko County as part of Diversity's multi-year study in partnership with UNR. Five locations across Elko County were inspected for recent rabbit activity. Newly fallen snow made the effort very easy. All five sites have some level of rabbit use.

In late November approximately 50 headquarters staff at our Valley Road office, and 30 headquarters staff at our Kietzke Lane office moved from those locations to our new headquarters facility. This move was the culmination of 13 months of planning to co-locate headquarters staff under one roof in a leased facility in south Reno.

With the recent assignment of a larger office facility by the Division of State Lands to NDOW at our Winnemucca complex, our engineering, maintenance and information technology employees are in the final planning stages for the renovation of the office. Previously occupied by JOIN, Inc., this larger office is located on our Winnemucca property, and will provide for expanded office space for our employees who have outgrown the existing office. This new office will also be shared with NDOT staff, for a combined total of approximately 30 state employees. This new office will be ready for occupancy in the spring 2016.

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

Deputy Director Liz O'Brien said there is a one page report in your material titled "Heritage Trust Account Interest and Funding Summary by Year." We have \$688,231.51 available for distribution to projects this year down from \$708,029.61 in the prior year but that is still the second highest amount for distribution in the report. That is a decrease of \$19,798.10 in funds available to spend this year from last year. This decrease is due to a small decrease in the Heritage sales particularly the elk tag. This year there was not one tag sold for over \$100,000 when compared to last year. However, the funding is still up when compared to any other year on the list as the PIW and Silver State tag sales were up again as was discussed at the last Commission meeting with the Systems Consultant report.

- H Administrative Procedures, Regulations, and Policy Committee Report – Commissioner and Committee Johnston McNinch – Informational  
The Committee chair will provide an update on recent committee activities and plans.

Commissioner McNinch reported that they met Jan. 13, 2016, and started with Rules of Practice as there is a state requirement for review every three years. Policy #1, #3 and #4, the latter two relating to petitions and appeals were reviewed. Minor edits suggested to the Department and after changes the policies will be submitted back to Commission. The committee had discussion of the Commission's petition and appeals policy and problems with the current processes. The committee reaffirmed delegation of Policy #23 to Wildlife Damage Management Committee and took action to delegate certain policies to different committees. There was discussion about the policy numbering system and NDOW staff suggested using names for policies instead of numbers. Suggestions taken for new policies and one possible new policy is a "Fair Chase Policy;" and he said at the March meeting Policy #1, #3 and or #4, will be up for review and or modification.

- I Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee Report – Commissioner and Committee Chairman Johnston – Informational  
A report will be provided on the committee's recent meeting.

Commissioner Johnston reported that the committee met this morning, prior input received to add topics to "topic list" which is weighted from one to three. One having merit and three doubtful. Agreed to remove all but four of the "threes" from the list. The committee's next step is to start bringing items to the Commission that need to be moved forward, and expects to do that at next Commission meeting. Topics are the waiting period for bull elk to move waiting period from 10 to five years for successful and unsuccessful hunters, and the PIW sequence, transfer of adult tags to youth, and remove antelope waiting period. The committee plans to address topics that are weighted "one" and they are working on whittling the topic list from 20 or so pages to nine.

Director Wasley received correspondence from Nevada Outfitters and Guides for TAAHC to consider and would like the committee to consider hunters who put in for nonresident guided tags to be eligible for PIW and the second chance draw.

Commissioner Johnston said the committee did receive that correspondence for consideration.

- J Wildlife Damage Management Committee – Commissioner and Committee Chairman Bliss – Informational  
The Committee chair will provide an update on recent committee activities and plans.

Commissioner Bliss said purpose of last night's meeting was to address Policy #23 and bring the policy up to date with changes from Assembly Bill 78. Second part of review of Policy #23 was considering that this was actually the first complete year of complying with the entire policy since enacted to see what worked and what may need to be changed. He said the committee did a really good job and are ready for input from the Commission. One part that needs clarification is the raw data given to the Department by the contractor because there is a desire from the public to see raw data, and committee was not sure what information to include as raw data has trap sites and other information that may be sensitive so they are seeking advice. As far as policy flows, the policy provides needed guidelines and deadlines. One proposed change is removal of the September committee meeting as that meeting was to look at preliminary raw data and with the data not being complete and the data not fully compiled could cause confusion as data is not complete. The committee felt the meeting was not necessary.

Chairman Drew announced that former Commissioner Layne is no longer on the WDMC and has appointed Commissioner Hubbs.

K Litigation Report – Senior Deputy Attorney General David Newton – Informational

DAG Ward provided a brief update to TCID case that started in 2003 and was an appeal of judgement against TCID for excess diversion of water and NDOW appealed to protect its water rights. DAG Ward read the judgement: An appeal of a judgment against the TCID for excess diversions of water. NDOW appealed to protect its water rights and interests. Oral argument held before the Ninth Circuit on June 12, 2013. July 22, 2013, decision from 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit. This appeal deals with what is essentially a footnote to the long-running litigation over how much water from the Truckee and Carson Rivers should be diverted to irrigation and how much should flow to Pyramid Lake. The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit held: “We have before us appeals by Churchill County and the State of Nevada from the district court’s judgment on remand. This judgment, however, did not alter the obligations of either the County or the State pursuant to the 2005 judgment. They were not injured or affected in any way by the judgment on remand from Bell, and thus do not have standing on appeal.” The panel dismissed appeals from Churchill County and the State of Nevada, withdrew the mandate in U.S. v. Bell, 602 F.3d 1074 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010), and amended the opinion, and vacated the judgment of the district court on remand in an action concerning diversion of water from the Truckee and Carson River to either irrigation use or for the benefit of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Indian Tribe. DAG Ward said he will provide the written order in the next litigation report.

11 Public Comment Period

Chairman Drew asked for public comment in Las Vegas – None

Chairman Drew asked for public comment from Reno –

Bobbi McCollum said she attended a CABMW meeting this week, and asked two questions relative to population numbers on two of the regulations on tomorrow’s agenda. The chairman of the CABMW could not provide an explanation and explained to her they are an advisory board. She said a reasonable person would assume that knowing population numbers would be key when recommending opening a season, and she was not offered guidance or advice from CABMW members as to who to contact for information. She read excerpt from the Department’s CABMW manual and she left the meeting with the question of how a person could get answers after attending two meetings, and how could recommending body make recommendation on a season when population numbers are not known.

Fred Voltz had four points: When will the Commission fix the videoconferencing as it has been three years of and the Commission has heard about if for a long time; Commissioners who give legal opinions or interpretations need to be advised not to -- specifically in regard to AB 78 no need to spend money if no worthwhile lethal projects added to plan, as the funding situation is not a use it or lose it; there is a problem with Commissioners who miss multiple meetings and put personal recreation ahead of attending Commission or committee meetings should be asked to resign; and lastly when poorly documented lethal projects have no specific objectives or measurement of intended or unintended consequences, these are not emotional objections or criticisms but legitimate holes in analytical research and such holes lead to bad science and policy.

Chairman Drew thanked staff for manning the phones and fixing the technical glitches.

Meeting adjourned 5:03 p.m.

Saturday, Jan. 30, 2016 – 9 a. m.

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

Chairman Drew called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. and all nine Commissioners present at roll call.

CABMW Roll Call: Paul Dixon, Clark; Larry Allen, Humboldt; Sean Shea, Washoe; Gil Yanuck, Carson; Glenn Bunch, Mineral; Ray Sawyer, White Pine; Joe Crim; Cory Lytle, Lincoln; and Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas.

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

**COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 14 Hunter Education Instructor Southern Region Award Presentation – Conservation Educator 3 Martin Olson  
Southern Region Hunter Education Instructor Floyd Coons will be recognized for 30 years of dedicated service as a certified volunteer hunter education instructor.

Southern Region Hunter Education Instructor Floyd Coons was recognized by the Department and the Wildlife Commission for 30 years of dedicated service:

Mr. Floyd Coons began as a hunter education volunteer instructor in Nevada 1985, prior to moving to Nevada he taught hunter education in Washington state for six years; has instructed a total of 78 classes totaling around 1,400 students in Nevada, been a shooting sports volunteer instructor since 2011 when the program opened at the Clark County Shooting Complex. Provided instruction in the beginning rifle course, the intro to shotgun course (trap and skeet), introduction to muzzle-loading totaling around 150 students. For all his years of volunteer service Northern Nevada Safari Club International donated a .50 caliber engraved in-line muzzleloader for Floyd's 30 year anniversary.

Chairman Drew thanked Mr. Coons' for his service to the state as a hunter education instructor.

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

Chairman Drew said he would like to address one comment made yesterday and will not belabor the point but there was a comment during agenda item #11, "Public Comment" questioning the commitment of some of the members of this Commission. He said he will tell everyone in the audience that you can question a lot of things that the Commission does and be unfavorable to the decisions that we make and what ends up on the agenda but the one thing that you cannot question about the members on this board is their commitment to this state, its people, and its wildlife.

- 16 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

- 17 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.

Chief Game Warden Turnipseed provided information in a PowerPoint presentation on law enforcement cases statewide from 2015. PowerPoint presentation in exhibit files and is available at ndow.org in video.

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

- 18 Commission Regulation 15-09 – Amendment #2 – Big Game Seasons – Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider amendment #2 of the 2016 – 2017 hunting seasons and dates for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, and mountain goat, including limits, hunting hours, special hunt eligibility, animal sex, physical characteristics and legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and emergency depredation hunt structure and state wide quotas.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling showed a PowerPoint Presentation. The seasons were set last year for a two year period; this is an amendment to the seasons. He outlined the proposed changes and the rationale for the changes. There are only four proposed changes. Three of the changes deal with bighorn sheep and one with antlerless elk. He said they are trying to hold things steady and not make many changes. The Department does not want to add Unit 195 to the resident Nelson bighorn sheep as proposed. It was predicated on an agreement with the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center (TRIC); however, at this point in time there is not a signed agreement in place. The Department cannot adequately inform a hunter at this time, therefore they cannot go forward with this change. He said it was considered in the first place because it is an established population approaching 100 animals. He continued reviewing the PowerPoint on the three other proposed changes.

Commissioner Valentine asked how much the non-resident ewe tag costs.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said \$1,200.

Commissioner Johnston asked if an agreement will be complete for a future season with TRIC.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said he understands that this is not a season that has been in place for very long. The biologists recommended this season to be closed because it has not been effective. Other seasons are in place to address the same issue. This is a depredation problem. It has not been a time when the elk have demonstrated susceptibility.

Commissioner Johnston said he was focused on Unit 195 and the agreement with TRIC.

Deputy Director Robb said they are working with someone in Virginia City. They are working on an agreement. The Department had an agreement, but they wanted additional language put in and it is problematic. The Department needs more time to work out the agreement. There are not stop gaps in place for Silver State tag and Heritage tag and we have limited resource out there. We need to address those first. It is in process and TRIC is working with us in good faith. We need an agreement that protects them and gives opportunity to sportsmen.

Commissioner Bliss asked if there are any parts of the unit that have sheep that do no encounter parts of the private property. Maybe there is a mountain range where the Department can exclude the private property.

Deputy Director Robb said Storey County has the most private land out of all the counties in the State of Nevada. We know a good number of the sheep that have been transplanted are mostly on private property, mostly TRIC's property.

Chairman Drew said White Pine CABMW and Lincoln CABMW both wanted season changes, but we are only looking at amendments today. He encouraged them to engage with the Department. Now is the time to start thinking about changes for 2017. He asked if we are looking at opening a ewe hunt in each of the units and if the Department is comfortable putting a non-resident tag in each unit.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes.

Chairman Drew said on these sorts of hunts we have really tried to gauge the interest, the interest cannot be gauged without having a hunt. As long as the Department is comfortable with including one non-resident tag in each unit he does not have a problem with it, but he does not know what kind of non-resident pool we are going to have. There might be a second draw for one of these tags potentially. He has provided direction to the Department that if this Commission cannot put on paper what the restrictions are going to be for the hunter when they go in the field on the private property, then it would not be good to advertise a hunt in Unit 195 without having those in black and white. He said the Commission is willing to help. He thinks the Department is making the right move by pulling the recommendation.

CABMW Comment –

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they looked at the entire Commission Regulation, but now they realize that changes can only be made to the amendment. They support the amendments as written.

Las Vegas Public Comment – None

Reno Public Comment –

Bobbie McCollum asked about the double asterisk on the bottom of page one. She asked what the populations of elk are in those areas. She said it is an odd comment.

Chairman Drew asked for the question to be addressed.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling explained the reason for the double asterisk. The Department is trying to achieve a management objective. Sometimes the objective is to completely eliminate the elk in the area because of the relationships that have been developed with the land management agency through the management plan. When there are elk populations at very low levels it is virtually impossible to estimate the actual numbers in the area. The Department wants to inform hunters before they apply what kind of experience they might expect.

Commissioner Mori said there are private land issues. The private land owner would be eligible for the antlerless tag program, right?

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes, that is accurate.

Commissioner Valentine said Clark CABMW suggested making a change to the antlerless elk hunts. He thinks they need to be pushed back a bit. There was a suggestion on the sheep hunts that the rifle hunt in all the areas to the end of December.

Chairman Drew said the Commission received that correspondence. The Department should have received it too and it should be part of the harvest guidelines.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said to look towards the harvest guidelines. There may be some unintended consequences with an extended season.

Commissioner Bliss agrees with Commissioner Valentine, there are a lot of good comments from Clark CABMW. In the future, he would like to make additional amendments to the amendments proposed. Some suggestions are legitimate. The way this is presented ties their hands in the ability to do any adjustments.

Chairman Drew said he wants to work with Game Division Administrator Wakeling on the changes in the future. It is a disservice to the Department not to have the changes discussed through the local area biologists.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the low probability of encountering an elk in some areas. Is it the Departments position to lower the numbers?

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes. The Department does not want to exceed population objectives. There are portions of the state where the elk population exceeds the population objectives that are established. The Department has been innovative to come up with way to keep those populations from exceeding the objectives. That plays a role in the season lengths, season frequency, hunter crowding, etc. He explained how the Department is managing elk populations. When a hunter applies for that type of a hunt we are trying to disclose the type of hunt they are applying for.

Commissioner Hubbs said she understands now. It sounds odd the way it reads, but if we know we do not want them there she understands the disclosure.

Chairman Drew said it is a depredation hunt. It addresses a problem of conflict or a commitment through the elk planning process.

Commissioner Hubbs said it is a good point.

Commissioner Bliss asked to rewrite the description.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said it can be fixed. He thinks the short message delivers the intent. Some people do not understand what the Departments objectives are.

**COMMISSIONER HUBBS MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 15-09 AMENDMENT #2 HUNT 4107 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

Game Division Administrator Wakeling made a comment about footnote b. Intent is to eliminate that footnote and renumber the other footnotes.

Chairman Drew said the comment will do.

Chairman Drew said the Commission will not make a motion on CR 15-09 Amendment #2 Hunt 3151.

**COMMISSIONER WALLACE MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 15-09 AMENDMENT #2 HUNT 3281 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 15-09 AMENDMENT #2 HUNT 9151 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER BLISS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

- 19 Commission Regulation 16 – 09, Big Game Mountain Lion Harvest Limits for 2016–2017 – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of 2016 – 2017 mountain lion hunting season open units, harvest limits by unit group, hunting hours, and special regulations.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson said there are not any changes; this is the same as last year. The Department recommends no changes.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they voted in favor of the recommendation with an exception to open Unit 033 with a harvest of zero so the state can be in communication with the federal officials especially after the removal of horses.

Gil Yanuck, Carson CABMW, said he has almost the exact same comments as Washoe CABMW regarding Unit 033.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they had one dissenting opinion and they wanted to see Unit 033 open. The rest of the members felt with the wild horses removed and with the mountain lions main dietary source being wild horses they want to see if the mountain lions would disseminate off of the Shelton area because of the food source. They just want to wait a year or two.

Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW, said he wants to mirror the other CABMWs. They went with the Departments recommendation and they would like to see Unit 033 open.

Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW, he would like to mirror the suggestions of other CABMWs to open Unit 033 with an open dialogue as far as the proper assessment to be made by the federal government and the state. They would like a zero harvest limit.

Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW, said there are a few people who want to go back to the area specific management as opposed to the unit groupings.

Larry Allen, Humboldt CABMW, said they are in support of the regulation and echo the other comments on Unit 033.

Las Vegas Public Comment –

Lynn Cullens, Mountain Lion Foundation, said she is opposed to the regulation. The lethal predator program is mandated by Assembly Bill 78. It is based on a desire to focus Nevada's lethal predator management efforts on localities where prey is in decline and on specific predators that prey upon deer and bighorn sheep that might otherwise be available to hunters. She said she is not sure why the legislators decided to accomplish this using researchers and contractor given that management has traditionally been done by hunters, but in doing so the legislature prioritized the hunting of deer and bighorns over the hunting of mountain lions for sport and trophy. Although the state has not updated its mountain lion plan since 1995 and although we do not have the benefit of a mountain lion status report the number of lions killed for sport each year has remained relatively steady. The Department has said that Nevada's mountain lion management has been based on science for those years and focused on conservation of the species as well as recreational opportunities then it follows that directing lions to be killed outside of that hunt by contractors other than hunters requires the number of mountain lions killed during the annual hunt be reduced to compensate. If not, then we need a really good scientific reason why we are suddenly increasing the number of mountain lions that are being killed in Nevada. For this reason, the Mountain Lion Foundation asks the Commission to reduce the length of the mountain lion season and to reduce the harvest limits and quotas and other factors with the goal of reducing the number of lions killed through the hunt in order to compensate for the lions that are killed through the prescribed management by contractors and researchers.

Karen Layne said she thinks hunt Unit 033 should remain closed.

Stephanie Myers said there is no reason for a mountain lion season, especially not a season that lasts all year. There is more than enough big game for the hunters in Nevada without having to kill any mountain lions at all. There are more mule deer and the populations remained stable. We have more elk than we know what to do with. The number of bighorn sheep is so high that we have to export some. There is more game than hunters need, except for the mountain lion, there is no reason for any mountain lions to be killed by hunters and she wishes we would like nature take its course.

Stacia Newman, Nevada Political Action for Animals, said they oppose the regulation. They support the recommendations proposed by the Mountain Lion Foundation.

Jana Wright said she agrees with everything against the hunt.

Connie Howard, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, said she agrees with Lynn Cullens and others. The aggressive predation management plan that has unfortunately been mandated through

Assembly Bill 78 call in question the continued hunting at the same level, particularly the mountain lion. Alyson Andreasen is a mountain lion researcher in Nevada and she said her research is the first research done on mountain lions in Nevada since the 1970s. Her findings were very interesting. In particular many of our mountain lions are actually largely eating wild horses. This indicates that they are not impacting the bighorn sheep or the mule deer. Big game species are doing very well. There is no argument that mountain lion populations need to be killed for the sake of protecting the big game. She said she opposes the regulation and hopes that the Commission considers the impact of the predation management plans on the populations before we continue hunting them at the same levels.

Sean Shea said Alyson Andreasen said mountain lions kill more horse in one unit because that private land owner let the horses be transported to the unit, which almost has no deer. It is not across the state that mountain lions eat more horses. He wants communication on the Shelton Range with the federal government and the Department. They want the quota to be zero.

#### Reno Public Comment –

Don Molde, Nevada Wildlife Alliance, said it seems that it is time to think about looking at a mountain lion management plan based on science. There have been a lot of interesting developments in the science of the animal over the last decade, none of which is reflected in the current system of setting quotas. The quota system is concealed from the public. He has had an interest in this area for 40 years he has no idea how the numbers of the quota are derived. It should be a public process. He said he has seen quota numbers as high as 500. It is very clear from research over the last decade that mountain lions cannot sustain an annual reduction of population of more than 14 percent without the population declining. The current system was put into effect about 20 years ago not for a biological reason but because the people that had the votes at that time hated the animal and regarded it as a competitor for killing deer. There is no biological reason to have a year round hunting season. It makes no sense. The animal has no opportunity to raise their young without the possibility of being harassed by humans and dogs. He thinks this area needs to be revisited. He appreciates that the Department still examines the carcasses because it provides various information for keeping track of the animal and what goes on with it.

Fred Voltz said he echoes other comments about the mountain lion hunting process being ended as soon as possible.

Elaine Carrick said she would like to see more research done with hunting lions. She would like to support Lynn Cullens in Las Vegas regarding taking a closer look at predators.

Allen Souigny said someone spoke about Alyson Andreasen's mountain lion study. He recently attended a presentation on her study and only in one mountain range did mule deer constitute more of a diet for the mountain lions than did wild horses. There is some misinformation on the diet of mountain lions. It is primarily, in all of the mountain ranges studied, wild horses, not mule deer.

#### Elko Public Comment – None

Commissioner Bliss asked about opening Unit 033 for hunting. He thought the Commission could not create an open season with a zero quota. He agrees with starting the dialogue.

Secretary Wasley said that applies to the big game populations, but he does not know if it carries over to mountain lions as well.

Chairman Drew said the same issue came up with the elk planning in Humboldt County. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said to open or implement any hunt in the Shelton they would have to do an environmental assessment and also compatibility analysis in terms of the charter of the refuge. The suggestions of opening the unit shows the states interest in opening a hunt. He does not know if that will get the dialogue we need. It might not clarify the process for opening a season. He said he will draft a letter instead of opening a unit with a zero quota. He does not want to confuse hunters. He is not supportive of opening Unit 033 with a zero harvest limit.

Commissioner Hubbs asked why a season is not established.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson said Nevada has had the year long season. It is probably set in part due to an animal that is removed from the \$3 predator fee to increase other big game populations. From harvest reports a few animals are turned in every year, but it is a very small amount.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said there are several states that have lengthy seasons. In most instances they try to look at the characteristics of the animals that are harvested and are able to infer the level of exploitation. Typically if you are in a situation where you are overharvesting what you see is a larger component of adult females in the harvest. In Nevada the harvest has been well below the threshold. Based on the level of harvest within Nevada currently, the Department is not seeing anything that indicates exploiting numbers.

Chairman Drew asked about the 14 percent cap on the population.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said there are a number of different ways to look at it the level of exploitation. Research indicates if you are taking a portion of the population that is another indicator that if you are exceeding that you would also be able to detect a population in decline. That type of information requires extensive work or some other way to actually develop population abundance estimates. In many cases, and it is one of the cautions he often provides, we can generate population estimates for a number of things, but rarely is it overestimated. They are almost routinely underestimated. The Department feels confidence because they are able to generate an estimate, but even for common species like mule deer and elk, estimates are just estimates, they are not absolute numbers. There is no indication that we are overharvesting mountain lions in Nevada.

Chairman Drew asked if, from a biological standpoint, he was comfortable with the proposed harvest limits.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes.

Commissioner Mori asked what the actual harvest is in relation to the harvest limits.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson said those numbers vary from year to year. He said since the region wide quotas have been set in place they have never been reached.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about Assembly Bill 78 and hunting. Will they be reported together so it will make sense for the public and they would be able to see how many mountain lions were taken for predator management and how many were taken for hunting?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson said they are reported separately.

Commissioner McNinch recalled when the seasons went to year round; he said he voted against it. He believes that there are few lions that are taken at a certain time of year. The public perception is that there is a year round onslaught on mountain lions. The perception is not beneficial to the agency. There are bigger issues that need to be considered and thoughtful of. There are always exclusions because of the mountain lion hunt. He believes we need to be more considerate of the mountain lions removed. If these were deer, antelope, or sheep in a particular area that were being removed they would certainly be accounted for in the quotas. It adds credibility. He thinks that opening unit 033 was started as a tit for tat sort of thing a year or so ago. The dialogue needs to occur in a different form and he agrees with Chairman Drew. He wants to talk about the area specific hunting with Cory Lytle from Lincoln CABMW.

Chairman Drew said we are discussing only what is on the Commission Regulation 16-09. He does not think that year round season is in play.

Commissioner McNinch said he didn't expect these conversations today. It is too late for this year, but he does agree that it needs to be a part of the conversation for future seasons.

Chairman Drew said he thought the seasons and quotas for mountain lions are set for a three year or five year basis. It would be good to clean up and make consistent when they have this discussion and what information they have. Some discussions are coming up and a lot of the answers are not going to be provided today. It would be good to have a reasonable expectation of when to expect this and on what intervals and information.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the breeding season.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson said they do have a birth pulse, but they can breed year round. It is illegal to shoot a female with her young.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the hunters and people who are concerned about monitoring the numbers in certain regions. She wants to make sure we are not doing anything that is too overreaching on the population numbers.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Wakeling said the information is being developed in Nevada. The Department wants to look at what makes sense. Sometimes people are encouraged to try to establish a unit by unit quota. Mountain lions have huge home ranges. They cross the administrative boundaries. He said they want to look at movements and genetic information can sometimes tell movements too. They want to create a structure that makes biological sense.

Commissioner Johnston said not to open unit 033. The Commission can provide direction to the Department to start the dialogue that has been requested. He made a point about season length and harvest limits for mountain lion hunting in Nevada. He is comfortable with the Department's representation. He supports the regulation as presented.

Commissioner McNinch said he does not disagree with relying on the Department. He is concerned about the people who do not have an opinion. He does not see the need to hunt mountain lions year round. He is more worried about how the agency will transform in the future.

Commissioner Hubbs believes that it looks odd to have one of the big game animals to not have a season. She does not want it to send the wrong signal. She wants the same level of care is provided to this species as is the other big game species.

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-09 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner McNinch said he is a firm believer in using sportsmen hunting as a viable wildlife management tool. He supports the need to manage wildlife including big game. He will support the motion today, but there is a broader discussion that needs to be had.

Commissioner Hubbs said she echoes Commissioner McNinch. She wants to know when and how to have a discussion.

Chairman Drew said it is a discussion that is outside the context of this agenda item and he will talk with her about it at a different time.

Commissioner Hubbs said she will support the motion today in hopes that she can have a discussion at a later date.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

20 Commission Regulation 16 – 10, 2016 Black Bear Seasons – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson – For Possible Action

The Commission will consider the adoption of 2016 hunting season dates, open management units, hunting hours, special regulations, animal sex, legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and dates and times for indoctrination courses for black bear. The Department will provide the annual hunt and population status report following the 2015 bear season.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson presented a PowerPoint (exhibit file) on the bear status report for 2015.

**CABMW Comment –**

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they voted in favor of the regulation. They would like to change the start date to September 1. Giving 15 more days would provide more opportunity.

Bob Rittenhouse, Douglas CABMW, said they agreed with the general concept of the Commission Regulation. They would like to remove the restrictions in unit 192 and unit 194, add unit 203, make a shotgun legal, and increase tags to 51 to generate a Governor's tag to dedicate money to bear research.

**Las Vegas Public Comment –**

Caron Tayloe read a statement from NoBearHuntNV:

NoBearHuntNV.org opposes the NV bear hunt in totality.

Recognizing the likelihood a 2016 hunt will be conducted, and in light of new information generated from the 2015 hunt, we request reconsideration of three motions voted on by the NDOW Bear Committee when conducting the 3-year hunt review recommended by the 2013 NV legislature.

These motions are:

1. exclude female bears from hunting;
2. disallow the use of dogs as a hunting method;
3. shorten the season to end December 1.

**Excluding female bears from being hunted:**

The motion to exclude female bears from being hunted failed to advance from the Bear Committee by a tie vote of 2-2. Proponents of this exclusion argued that the intent of current NAC to protect mother bears and cubs, in light of current research in bear behavior, fails to do so.

Current NAC does not allow the killing of a female bear who is accompanied by a cub(s). However, current scientific studies clearly demonstrate mother bears routinely leave their cubs in a safe place while they independently forage for food, etc. without them. NoBearHuntNV has long argued that a deficiency of the current bear management system is its failure to recognize and protect the dynamics of the developmental history of mother and cubs. At the time of the hunt, while approximately 50% of the cubs might be weaned, and thus their mother be labeled “dry” in a mortality report, the importance of that mother to her cubs still exists. As stated by three different researchers (Rogers, 1987, Lee & Vaughan, 2004, Mazur, 2010) and many more, “Mother bears provision for and protect their cubs until they are 16-17 months.”

We find it also distressing that in 2015 bear hunt, a hunter who killed a lactating female has not been cited under current NAC, but simply taken at his word that he did not observe cubs present. It is the hunter’s responsibility to assess the status of the animal before harvesting to be sure it is a legal kill. If the word of the hunter is all that is required when enforcing current NAC, we can expect this regulation to be additionally ineffective at protecting mother bears and cubs.

Female bears of reproductive age are either pregnant or raising cubs at the time of the hunt. They are the cornerstone of Nevada’s small bear population. Until and unless “no harm” can be proven, or how hunting female bears is helping to protect and conserve NV bears can be shown, we ask the Commission to exclude female bears from being hunted.

**Disallow the use of hounds as a hunting method:**

This motion also failed to advance from the Bear Committee in a tie vote of 2-2.

Proponents for banning dogs presented arguments that have led to bear hunting with dogs being banned in half of the states conducting bear hunts. In the Western United States these include CO, MT, OR, WA and CA. Those favoring the use of dogs argue it is the most efficient method for “sexing” a bear, thus improving hunter selectivity when harvesting individuals. As has been statistically shown already in other states, evidence from the NV 2015 bear hunt continues to disprove this claim.

Of the 14 bears killed in the 2015 hunt, 10 were taken using hounds. All 10 were harvested in one hunt unit-unit 291, as were 11 of the 14 total. Five were female and five were male. Given that Nevada’s bear population has a 2:1 male/female bias, or differently stated, one has 2x the chance of encountering a male vs. female, this becomes even more significant. The females killed using hounds ranged in age from 3-9 years old. Four of the five weighed 150 lbs. and one weighed 175 lbs.

Of particular interest is that on the mortality report of the 150 lb. female killed on Dec. 1, the agent listed her condition as “three” or “good-average for the time of year.” However on the

bear data report comments, the same agent stated “dry, not in good shape, ribs poking out, stomach sucked up into body cavity, not fat-not good especially for this late in the season.” This bear weighed the same amount as three of the other four females killed in the hunt using hounds.

None of this suggests to us that the use of hounds as a hunting method is helping to protect and conserve bears or aid hunter selectivity when harvesting an individual. Rather the reasoning of states banning this practice as being cruel, unnecessary and unsporting prevails.

We ask the Commission to join other Western States that have already evolved their concepts of what constitutes ethical hunting by disallowing the use of dogs as a method for bear hunting in Nevada.

**Shorten the season to end December 1:**

When introduced in Bear Committee, this motion passed 3-2, but one of those voting in favor switched his vote to “nay” when the item came before the Commission.

Proponents of shortening the season argued that in light of there being very little hunting in December to begin with, shortening the season could reduce stress to bears at a particularly vulnerable time when most are preparing to or have entered hibernation. Rather than disallow hunting bears in dens, shortening the season seemed the more reasonable approach.

The 2015 hunt continued this trend, with only one bear taken in December, that being on the first day of the month.

In consideration of fair chase ethics and the unique physiology of bears, we ask the Commission to shorten the bear hunting season to end December 1.

Thank you for considering our comments, as well as for serving Nevadans in setting policy for the public trust of wildlife. – Kathryn Bricker, Executive Director, NoBearHuntNV.org

Jana Wright said she is opposed to the bear hunt in Nevada. It has not been shown to be anything other than a trophy hunt. It is not a management tool for the Department. She suggests the Commission not allow hounds with GPS collars as this is a violation of Senate Bill 417. She read from Senate Bill 417. The use of hounds equipped with GPS collars are used to determine the location of the game mammal and are against the law as Senate Bill 417 is written.

Stephanie Myers said she supports shortening the bear season to end December 1. She said she supports stopping the use of hounds to hunt. It is not only cruel, but it bring into question fair chase ethics. She particularly supports excluding female bears from the hunt. She compared bears and bear cubs to humans and their children. Female bears should not be separated from their cubs.

Karen Layne said she agrees with many comments already made. She is not a fan of the bear hunt. Commissioner McNinch said it goes back to people’s perceptions and she agrees. Many people’s perceptions of the Department is based on what happens in the bear hunt and when bears are killed there is a big discussion on social media. She keeps asking if it is worth it. At some point you have to look beyond the money that is generated. Her suggestion is to look at last bear hunt seasons. In 2015 the last bear was killed December 1. Very few bears are killed in December. Almost all the bears were killed in unit 192. She had the coordinates plotted for

that unit and it is striking in terms of how those bears are killed. She does agree with the conditions placed on unit 192.

Connie Howard said she is opposed to the bear hunt. She supports the recommendations of NoBearHuntNV. She hopes that the Commission does not do a tit for tat sort of thing. She cares about the conservation of the species. She thinks it is wrong to be hunting bears. She has two questions. Are trouble bears being transported into the hunt units and killed? This year there was a high percentage of research bears that died, is that true and if so what happened?

Stacia Newman, President, Nevada Political Action for Animals, said some of the Commissioners started in 2010 and she appeared before them with concern of the black bear trophy hunt. It is now six years later and this is still lingering on. The public outcry has not changed. She gets calls every day asking when the trophy hunt is going to be opposed. They oppose the trophy hunt. If it continues they are in agreement with the other speakers that brought up the proposal to exclude female bears, eliminating hounds, and shortening the season to December 1. Please take that into consideration.

Sean Shea said killing a female bear with cubs is illegal. Having a GPS collar on a dog locates the dog not another animal. The only way he can find the dog is by the collar. A lot of people make it sound like the state is out to kill everything. That is not true, it is a management tool. If it was not the right thing to do the Department would not do it.

Reno Public Comment –

Elaine Carrick said the fifth Nevada Black Bear hunting season has just ended. The hunt is not to "manage" the bears in any way. This small population of 400+ bears does not need management. There is no "best available science" that supports killing up to 20 bears a year. The hunt is simply a trophy hunt for a tiny percentage of hunters. Surveys across the country have shown that the public is against trophy hunting. During the past five bear hunting seasons, the public has expressed its outrage over this hunt through emails, letters and signing petitions. If public outrage is not enough, other issues are: no science or management reasons for the hunt, harassment by packs of dogs with GPS collars create a lack of fair chase and this year a lactating female bear was "accidentally" killed with a cub that will probably starve to death. Killing should never be "accidental." Set the hunt season at one day and the harvest at zero. The bear hunt was approved by the Commissioners who were on the board five years ago, and it continues to be a black eye for the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners today. This is a new Commission and for the past five years, you have heard the strong public arguments against killing Nevada's bears. You can end the unnecessary killing of this iconic animal.

Jennifer Simeo said she would like to convey her strong opposition to the bear hunt and her desire to see our black bears protected once again. Please set the bear hunt quota and the number of days of the hunt for 2016 to zero. Four years of drought; vehicular deaths; increased euthanasia; accidental deaths; and poaching have all stressed our bear population. This coupled with the cruel practice of using hounds and being able to hunt female bears with possible cubs makes this hunt even less acceptable. Your current stated bear population is also of concern. It is estimated that Nevada is home to between 400-700 bears, which includes a huge range and does not hold a solid scientific backing to support that this hunt is sustainable. Also, from what I understand, this hunt provides no additional funding for your agency, actually costing you money. The black bear is an iconic and intelligent animal that serves as an important player in our ecosystem. The public appetite for hunting them is just not there. As well, the Nevada hunt was highly opposed from the start, from private citizens, Native

Americans, Animal Rights organizations, Conservation groups, and local agencies, all coming together in shared opposition. In a State of 2.8 million people, continuing an unwanted bear hunt to satisfy the interests of 45 trophy hunters, out of only 2209 that applied for a tag in 2015, to kill up to 20 bears a year, is undemocratic, unjust, and must end.

Carol-Anne Weed said she is against the bear hunt. She sees that eight bears were killed for public safety. She wants to know what number of the eight bears that were killed was due to the human mismanagement of garbage. She wants to know how many humans are accountable for the bear deaths. She does not see anything indicating illegally killed bears. She heard about a person in the pine nut mountain range who had a dead adult bear and a dead bear cub. The bear population is being decimated further by killing female bears that might have bear cubs in a den.

Don Molde said he supports ending the bear hunt on Dec. 1. He would like to propose a regulation that when dog owners find their dogs with GPS collars they should leave their guns in their trucks. The bear hunt continues to be embarrassing for Nevada. Hunter opportunity trumps any consideration for the animal. December should be for bears to prepare for hibernation. Instead of calling it the Nevada Department of Wildlife it should be the Nevada Department of Hunter Opportunity. It is a trophy hunt, the public does not like it and we continue the black eye for condoning it.

Trish Swain, Trail Safe Nevada, said she agrees with everything that has been said in opposition to the bear hunt. Over and over again people ask about the bear hunt. Public opinion goes strongly against the hunt. She said she is strongly against it too. Shortening the season would be a great idea.

Allen Souigny said he understands a bear killed by the Department by drowning in a pond while being chased in Lyon County. This is related to the regulation at hand because he is wondering when these disaster occur if quotas are lowered to compensate and if not, why not. He does not appreciate the repeated characterization of persons representing this body that folks who have questioned methods, seasons, or aspects of something reflected in your proposed regulations should not be listened to because they are all one person or group. It is quite the contrary. There is a wide variety of persons at the meeting in Reno with different view on hunting and et cetera. You should listen to them and the comments and ideas should be reflected in your decisions.

Fred Voltz said because we can we should? This flawed mantra has propelled premeditated and unwarranted bear deaths. As with mountain lion, no science exists that slaughtering these animals accomplishes any constructive end. It is not a thoughtful management tool. The public has expressed strong opposition to the hunt, but the Commission has ignored the public it is supposed to represent, favoring hunter convenience, opportunity and success. The killing of females is particularly egregious given the uncertain population numbers and inability to discern strong vs. weak members of the species for death, not harvest. Will the slaughter continue, or will the public and wildlife the Commission is to represent be respected?

Bobbie McCollum asked what the actual population of bears is in Nevada. This question needs to be answered before a quota can be set.

Genelle Richards said it is depressing to testify on the bear hunt because she already knows what the outcome is going to be. Why does Nevada have to be so barbaric by letting dogs chase animals that are not meant to run? They chase them for 10 plus hours until they are so exhausted that they climb into a tree. The public constantly says that they do not want the bear

hunt and the Commission Nevada listens to the majority. The Commission favors the minority that wants the chance to kill. Are we going to start killing anything that walks on four legs? She wonders when the Commission is finally going to listen to the public. The Commission is supposed to represent the entire state, not just the hunters. The bear hunt has got to end.

Elko Public Comment – None

Commissioner Hubbs said she will not support the bear hunt today because of the general public's outcry against the hunt. She does not think there is any serious or negative consequences to the bear populations at this point she just believes that she has to listen to the public in her capacity as a Commissioner. She hopes that some Commissioner will consider amending the current season to shorten it. She thinks it may help some of the agitation.

Chairman Drew asked about the use of shotguns and hounds on the hunt. Neither one of those items can be changed today. They are handled under separate NAC.

Commissioner Young asked what can be changed today.

Chairman Drew said anything that is on the Commission Regulation 16-10, which is the hunt, the unit groups, the seasons, and the special regulations.

Commissioner Johnston said he heard a lot of comments that the Commission does not listen to the public. He received a lot of emails, maybe 100 of more and he read every single one of them. He read one of the emails into the record. He said he received emails in support of the hunt. He appreciates the public's input. He does not think the majority of the public is opposed to the bear hunt. Many emails did not even come from Nevada residents. A lot of states have bear hunts. He recognizes the emotional issue. He is not certain that the Commission is ignoring the will of the majority if the bear hunt continues. He takes time to listen and read the emails and letters. He waives various factors when making a decision. He felt compelled to outline the comments received. He said people can engage in the personal attacks, they have a right to do that, but he thinks it detracts from the discussion that needs to be had. He wanted to make clear that he does listen to the public's input and read the correspondence and take it into consideration when making decisions.

Commissioner Young said this has been a constant thorn in his side for over two years. Bear hunting is new to Northern Nevada. It takes place in a very residential area. People live and work around the bears. It takes up a lot of valuable time of the Commission and the Department. He read the correspondence too and people make some good points. He does not like wasting time. He is not afraid to shorten the season and eliminate the month of December. He would never hunt bears and he does not like the way they are hunted. He is not sold on the bear hunt.

Commissioner McNinch appreciates Commissioner Johnston's comments. He said sometimes they disagree but they all listen to the public. The bottom line is the Commission has heard over and over and over from so many people. Some people who have spoken out against the hunt today need to understand that some of them refer to them as terrorists and wish families ill. The name calling gets personal. He is not in support of the long season. He does not think it is asking too much to shorten the season and remove December. There was one bear removed early in December in 2015. He is not in favor of extending the season one way or another.

Commissioner Johnston said he does not align the public today with the people who sent the emails making outrageous comments. Most of the emails were opposition to all hunting in general. That view is not consistent with the majority of the public.

Commissioner Bliss agrees with a lot of the comments said today from all sides. He has been in on this process for more than three years and there have been some good valid points made on both sides. There are parts that he agrees with such as Sean Shea's statements about the collars and the dogs. He also agrees with shortening the season. He thinks it might be a good thing to do.

Commissioner Valentine said he has no problem shortening the season. He asked if there is a certain number or percentage of female bears that can be taken.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said no, the sex does not matter. He talked about the bear management plan. They are trying to balance the removal and they look at it over time.

Commissioner Valentine asked if we have been having the bear hunt for five years.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes.

Commissioner Valentine asked if females have always been below 30 percent.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes.

Commissioner Valentine said maybe the Commission should look at making 30 percent the cutoff.

Chairman Drew said that is a discussion for May. There was a comment in a bear report that the Department wanted to maintain a hunt in a manner that maintained or allowed the population to increase. He asked if the population is stable or increasing.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said there is no indication that things have changed. He said the last population estimate as he recalls was 445 +/- 14. There is not an estimate for this year. If you look at the sustained level of harvest in this population over time there is no reason to believe it has changed, it is stable, possibly slightly increasing. He talked about Commissioner Valentine's comments about addressing a cutoff and said this will be something that will be addressed through the hunt guidelines process. The bear plan indicated there is room for an increase in tag quota. The recommendations from the bear committee were to keep things the same for a period of time to evaluate it. For that reason, the Department has brought forward no changes in the recommendation this year. If the bear plan was followed there would be room for increase in harvest.

Chairman Drew wanted to make a point on the season end date. In terms of the season end date and what bears are still out and about, not hibernating, and it seems to him that it is weather dependent and the further you go into the season the more likely you are to have only or primarily male bears out or those who have come habituated to human food sources.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said that is correct. Research has showed that the first bears to hibernate are pregnant females, then the adult females and the adult males are usually the last to hibernate. There may be a female out, but on average opening seasons later and keeping them open later will target the male bears. He said keeping the season open later protects the females.

Chairman Drew said they have spent a lot of time of this issue. He thinks they are at a middle ground. There will always be controversy if there is a hunt. He thinks they have come a long way in four years. He is comfortable with what is presented today.

Commissioner Hubbs asked about the bears being out late in the season. If they do not have enough fatty reserve will they still be out trying to feed? Her point might be that the bears that are out late might be weak.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said yes, they may be out longer if they are malnourished.

Commissioner Hubbs said perhaps they need to be left alone during that time.

Commissioner McNinch said he is concerned about the females. Maybe the conversation shifts to the beginning of the season. Starting the season later might actually resolve a couple of issues with regard to the females.

Commissioner Young asked about the demographic about who is putting in for the tags geographically. He said there are not any bears in Clark County of which he represents. He said 75 percent of the population of the state lives in Clark County. He is not trying to insult bear hunters. Fishing has gone bad in southern Nevada. The Department has a set amount of money and resources.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said they do not have the information now but they could get it.

Commissioner Young said yes, it is important. He would like to know who is putting in for tags. He does not know a single person in Clark County that puts in for a bear tag.

Commissioner Bliss asked about problem bears and if they have been released into the hunt area.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said if there is a bear in a nuisance situation the Department is limited in where they can release the bears and they want to release them into occupied habitat. In some instances, if the bear has crossed the line it will be euthanized because they are a public safety risk. If the Department can we will try to release them. He provided an example of what they do in the state of Arizona. The Department tries to move them as far away as possible. If the Department has handled the bear it will have drugs in it and we ask the hunters to contact us if they harvest a bear with an ear tag so we can tell if it is safe to consume. The Department is not trying to put an animal in a situation where the hunter will not be able to consume the meat they harvested. There have been instances where ear tagged bears who were relocated have been harvested. On average it happens rarely.

Deputy Director Robb said the information is posted on the Department's website. In the past 12 months two bears were harvested that had ear tags. One was a research bear and the other was a problem bear. He explained what happened to them.

Commissioner Young asked about the history of the migration of the bears and how long they have been in Nevada. He thinks they came from Nevada. He asked what year they migrated.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said bears have occupied the Tahoe Basin/Sierra Range for quite a number of years. Based on research that has been conducted when any wildlife is associated with plentiful food sources they thrive because they have access to food. Bears get larger, their home ranges are smaller, they population is more abundant and all of those factors play a role. One research project looked at gene flow and most of the movement probably comes from the California/Oregon front.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson does not know about the research project, it is a Heritage project.

Commissioner Mori asked about last year's harvest numbers for December and if it is typical. He asked what happened in the last few years in the month of December.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson does not know off the top of his head, but he could get the information.

Chairman Drew asked if Commissioner Mori would like the data to be retrieved.

Commissioner Mori said yes.

Chairman Drew asked Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson to get the information.

Commissioner Hubbs said she was informed by the Department about the resources that are allocated for the tags to hunt the bears. She said she believes that might be some match for the funds for the tags. The resources are used for other purposes such as nongame species for the management of habitat. Even though there may be an outcry against this type of hunt the resources are used for wildlife in general and for wonderful things in terms of nongame species as well.

Chairman Drew took a break at 12:57pm to allow Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson time to get the information Commissioner Mori asked for and reconvened at 1:05pm.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Jackson provided the information Commissioner Mori asked for.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling gave information on the applicants of the bear hunt by county.

Commissioner Young said they should be weighted for population. He said Clark County is minuscule compared to other areas.

**COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-10 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT EXCEPT CHANGE THE SEASON END DATE TO DEC. 1. COMMISSIONER BLISS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Mori said he can agree and disagree with the comments equally. He supports the bear hunt. He does not think ending the season on Dec. 1 will affect the opportunity. He said he is confident that if the Department says it is fine to hunt until Dec. 31 it is biologically sound. He said he will support the motion because there are not many bears hunted in December.

Commissioner Johnston said he is torn on the motion. There were a limited number of bears harvested in December. The Department said generally the bears that den sooner are

females. He said he would rather make the season Oct. 1 to Dec. 31. This is a tough decision for him to make. He will not support the motion.

Commissioner McNinch said he is in the same boat. He feels like the beginning of the season would be the more appropriate way to manage it to take pressure off. He is in a weird spot. He wants to support the conversation, but he is struggling. He would prefer the beginning of the season.

Commissioner Wallace said he has the same feeling. He asked if there was flavor to amend the motion.

Commissioner Young asked about setting a specific number of females killed to end the season.

Chairman Drew asked if this would be the quota setting meeting in May.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said that is correct.

Chairman Drew does not support the change. It is going to be reviewed annually and to look for significant changes on the front and back end he would like to ask the Department to consider that before next year's season setting and run it through the CABMW process. He would not support cutting the season back to Dec. 1. He asked if there was an appetite for an amendment or vote on the motion.

Commissioner Hubbs asked if Chairman Drew could clarify what he is asking for, an amendment now or not.

Chairman Drew said he is comfortable with what the Department has requested. He said he would rather make changes in one year. He will not support any changes at this point.

Commissioner Bliss said he supports shortening the season because in the past there was discussion on the diet change in the bears in December prior to denning. That to him is why he supports the change.

Chairman Drew said the peak denning dates are prior to Dec. 1.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said that is correct. He does not have the current dates, but typically they start denning late October.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 5-4. COMMISSIONERS VALENTINE, MCNINCH, MORI, YOUNG, AND BLISS VOTED IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION AND CHAIRMAN DREW AND COMMISSIONERS HUBBS, JOHNSTON, AND WALLACE VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION.**

- 21 Commission Regulation, 16 – 03, 2017 Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2017 Heritage Tag hunt species, seasons and quotas.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said this regulation is to establish the Heritage Auction tags for 2017. Pursuant to Commission Policy #10 the Department must mail the vendor proposal packets out to the vendors by March 1. The Heritage Committee will review vendor proposals during their May committee meeting and provide recommendations to the

Commission for the June commission meeting. The species, season, and quota recommendations are the same as the approved 2016 Heritage tags. For California bighorn sheep the Department is continuing to recommend the closure of Unit 041. The recommendation for closure is due to a limited number of mature rams in this new unit. The special regulation requirements on page 2 are also the same as the 2016 Heritage tag packet.

Chairman Drew mentioned adding in unit 195.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they gave a recommendation for a date change to the wild turkey tag.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, said they accepted all of the tag recommendations. There was a recommendation from the public for a year round season, which is consistent with other states. It creates a greater tag sale amount.

Las Vegas Public Comment –

Mike Cassidy, Northern Nevada SCI Chapter, said he agrees with Sean Shea on the turkey heritage tag. He wants the season changed.

Reno and Elko Public Comment – None

Chairman Drew asked about the turkey tag being sold for the following year.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said they can look at it through the Heritage Committee.

Chairman Drew asked Commissioner Wallace about the Heritage Committee.

Commissioner Wallace said he does not know the best way about going at it. It needs to be discussed further.

Chairman Drew wants to hear the fix. He does not think it can be done today.

Commissioner Valentine asked about year round tags.

Chairman Drew said turkey only has spring seasons. There would still need to be a start and end date.

Commissioner Bliss said there is merit to year round seasons for these tags. He would support a year round season. In the future put out some options for the CABMWs to discuss.

**COMMISSIONER HUBBS MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-03 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chairman Drew asked to add unit 195 to the unit groups closed for Nelson Bighorn Sheep.

Commissioner Hubbs added unit 195 in an amended motion. McNinch seconded the amended motion.

**MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

- 22 Commission Regulation, 16 – 04, Dream Tag 2016 Seasons – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2016 Dream Tag seasons.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said Nevada Revised Statutes stipulates the species and quota, therefore those items cannot be changed. The season recommendations are the same as last year. In regard to California bighorn sheep the Department continues to recommend the closure of unit 041 and will be consistent with the 2016 Heritage closure language. The recommendation for closure is due to a limited number of mature rams in this new unit.

Chairman Drew made a comment on the desert bighorn sheep.

Commissioner Wallace asked if this was the place to work on the turkey tag issue. There wouldn't be any tags for the 2017 season, but they have a hard time distributing the tags anyway.

Chairman Drew said we are talking about the Dream Tag not the Heritage Tag. He said either way he does not think it could have been changed.

Commissioner Bliss is concerned with setting the quotas right now. He said there is heard of sheep that are sick in the Montana's.

Chairman Drew said the quotas are not being set at this meeting. He asked if we anticipate dropping below 50 California bighorn sheep tags.

Commissioner Bliss does not want other units making up the difference of tag numbers to make sure we fulfill a commitment to this.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said they are based on the previous year.

Chairman Drew asked if we are on a one year lag.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said yes.

Commissioner Bliss said as long as it lags back it solves the problem.

CABMW and Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-04 AS PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

- 23 Commission Regulation, 16 – 05, Partnership in Wildlife (PIW) 2016 Season and Quotas – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2016 PIW hunt species, seasons and quotas.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said NAC stipulates that the quotas cannot exceed the following:

- o Mule Deer – resident 22, nonresident 3
- o Antelope resident only – 5

- o Elk resident only – 3
- o Mountain Goat resident only – 1
- o Bighorn Sheep tags resident only – 4

The species, quota, and season recommendations are the same as last year, with the maximum allowed by NAC for mule deer, antelope and elk. Only 2 sheep tags are recommended, 1 for desert bighorn and 1 for California bighorn. No mountain goat tags are recommended at this time. In regard to California bighorn sheep the Department continues to recommend the closure of Unit 041. This is to be consistent with the 2016 Heritage closure language. The recommendation for closure is due to a limited number of mature rams in this new unit.

Commissioner Young asked if the Department gets funds from the PIW tags.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said this is a process through the draw. \$10 goes to the Heritage funds.

CABMW and Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-05 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Mori asked about the letter from Elko.

Commissioner Johnston said they will handle it in Committee.

**THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

- 24 Commission Regulation, 16 – 06, Silver State Tag 2016 Season and Quotas –  
Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider the adoption of the 2016 Silver State Tag hunt species, seasons and quotas.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said as noted earlier, authority for Silver State tags and Heritage Tag quotas are pursuant to NRS and cannot exceed 14 big game tags and 5 wild turkey tags. The 2016 Heritage tags were approved last year, of which there were 9 big game tags (2 deer, 2 elk, 2 antelope, 2 desert bighorn sheep and 1 California bighorn sheep). The species, quota, and unit recommendations are the same as last year. The season recommendation has been updated to match the season for the 2016 Heritage tags approved last year.

CABMW Comment –

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, asked if Unit 041 is excluded.

Chairman Drew said there is not a California bighorn sheep hunt proposed in this regulation.

Public Comment – None

Commissioner Bliss asked about Unit 195.

Chairman Drew said this is for 2016, so we are still good.

Commissioner Valentine said there is room for one more tag and he was wondering if the Commission would be acceptable to adding an elk tag.

Commissioner Bliss said he would not oppose it, but with the hunt packages are already put together.

Chairman Drew asked if that information was already published. It could be a good consolation prize.

Deputy Director Robb said they are making changes to the website and he would not recommend it.

Chairman Drew said to change the advertisement to say the first one drawn will get the prize package and the second one will only get the silver state tag.

Deputy Director Robb said we could put a footnote.

Commissioner Bliss said he likes the idea, but the confusion makes him nervous.

Chairman Drew asked if it is feasible to know the order of the draw.

Monty Martin, Systems Consultants, said he always knows who is drawn first and last but the sportsmen never know.

**COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-06 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MORI. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

25 Commission Regulation 16 – 07, 2016 Big Game Application Deadline Information – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider adopting language regarding the 2016 big game tag application deadline information.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger said there are no recommended changes to the application deadline format. We continue to offer the option to apply through the mail.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER YOUNG MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-07 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

- 26 Commission Regulation 16 – 08, 2016 Big Game Tag Application Eligibility – Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider adopting language regarding the 2016 big game tag application eligibility.

Management Analyst 3 Maureen Hullinger reviewed the application eligibility draw applications.

- Silver State Tag application eligibility is stipulated in NAC. There are no changes regarding the application eligibility for Silver State Tags.
- Antelope – No change to the antelope eligibility. Applicants will have to choose one category of antelope hunt (buck or doe hunt) and can only obtain one tag through the draw.
- Elk – Again this year the elk application eligibility is as follows:
  - Management hunts and seasons are being recommended by the Department again this year. (See season tables regarding recommendations on antlerless elk management Hunts 4481, 4476, 4411. For deer tags with an antlerless elk management hunt option and bull tags with an antlerless elk management hunt options.)
  - Applicants will be allowed to apply for more than one antlerless elk tag, but can only obtain one antlerless elk tag.
  - Spike elk hunts are being recommended again this year. Applicants in a waiting period for antlered elk (bull) will be eligible for spike elk.
  - Applicants will be allowed to apply for antlerless elk and spike elk.
  - Applicants will not be able to apply for both antlered elk and spike elk.
  - Applicants will only be able to obtain one antlered elk and one antlerless elk.
- Bighorn Sheep – Again this year the bighorn sheep eligibility is as follows:
  - Sheep hunt application eligibility for applying for ram/ewe hunts is “**OR.**” In other words an applicant will have to choose between applying for a ram hunt or apply for a ewe hunt for a species.
  - The applicants will be able to apply for each subspecies of ewe if the hunt recommendations are approved at the Commission meeting.
- Mountain Goat – No change to the mountain goat application eligibility from last year.
- Black Bear – No change to black bear application eligibility from last year.
- Mule Deer – No change to mule deer application eligibility from last year. Applicants can only apply for one category of mule deer (buck or doe) and can only obtain one mule deer tag through a draw. There is an exception to this for the Antlerless Depredation Hunt 1101. A resident applicant may obtain an Antlerless Depredation hunt 1101 tag in addition to a 1331, 1341, 1371, 1181 or 1107 tag only if the applicant applies for them in separate drawings.
- Other tags – Heritage tags, antelope and deer landowner damage compensation, elk incentive tags, and antlerless elk landowner tags are tags that a person can obtain in addition to the draw tags.

CABMW Comment –

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, they want to shorten the antlerless elk season in January. They would like the Commission to allow a tag holder to have two antlerless tags. When harvesting an animal there is the option to harvest another animal. This might increase the harvest success rather than extending the season.

Sean Shea, Washoe CABMW, said they had received some correspondence on this. They want to make sure that the remaining tags sold on a first come first serve basis will not lose their bonus points.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said yes, they can include it in the application book.

Las Vegas Public Comment –

Sean Shea asked about the eligibility for the bear tag. He wants a wait time for the bear tag whether harvest or not to give opportunity to other people.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said the wait time is three years.

Chairman Drew asked if that was for a successful applicant.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said she believes it is for successful or unsuccessful.

Chairman Drew asked it is was a separate regulation.

Management Analyst 3 Hullinger said it is permanent regulation.

Reno Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION REGULATION 16-08 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

27 Commission General Regulation 456, Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel, LCB File No. R031-15 – Game Division Administrator Brian F. Wakeling – For Possible Action  
The Commission will consider permanent adoption of a regulation relating to amending NAC 502.42283 by which the Commission may facilitate decisions by appointing or serving as the arbitration panel should arbitration of elk incentive tag awards become necessary; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. A workshop on the temporary regulation was held on March 20, 2015, and the temporary regulation was adopted on May 15, 2015, at the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission meetings. An additional workshop was held on August 7, 2015, at the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission meeting and no further changes were made. The Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners adopted this regulation as a permanent regulation on September 26, 2015; however, on October 27, 2015 the Legislative Commission deferred the regulation. A workshop was held yesterday, January 29, 2015, and subsection 3 on page 3 was suggested for removal by the Department.

Chairman Drew said this was advanced out of workshop yesterday with no changes.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said this proposal is to remove subsection 3.

Commissioner Hubbs asked what the appeals process is. She asked what the decision will mean if one is made.

Game Division Administrator Wakeling said the rule contained the language saying it was binding. It could be the Commission or a panel appointed by the Commission. Existing language contained statutes and applicable laws of the state of Nevada and the Department felt if someone chose not to use this they could still go to litigation. The Legislative Commission asked about the language and felt that it would not avail the arbitrator of that process.

CABMW Comment – None

Public Comment – None

**COMMISSIONER BLISS MOVED TO APPROVE COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 456 AS PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

- 28 Potential Congressional Land Transfer to the Moapa Band of Paiutes in Southern Nevada – Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne – For Possible Action  
The Department will present a brief overview of a potential congressional land transfer and discuss possible issues with wildlife management and public access in and around lands being considered for transfer. The Commission may choose to develop correspondence and provide input to the Congressional delegation as part of their consideration of the Bill.

Division Administrator Alan Jenne said he is here to discuss S. 1986 proposed by Senator Reid to expand Moapa Reservation lands by approximately 26,000 acres. He showed the area on the map (exhibit file/video) and said the land does go into Unit 268 the northern portion of the Muddy Mountains, specifically the California Ranch area. He said wildlife concerns not that great for the desert bighorn in the Arrow Creeks and as he stated this is an expansion of about 26,000 acres in its entirety. The bill is succinct and no provisions for access and other than the description of the transfer and lands.

Chairman Drew said he placed this on the agenda at this Southern Nevada location to receive input and agreed that the bill is short and had opportunity to spend time in the north Muddy Mountains this past fall and in regard to access and does not know the status of roads or if there is existing right of ways and potentially could be issues with access. He said not sure from a habitat standpoint if they are as big of an issue, but comments from CABMW where the same as maintaining access in future to adjoining public lands. Chairman Drew said the Commission has the possibility of sending correspondence, and he checked with Senator Reid's staff as to status of bill and was told it has not moved nor been marked up. He said with this being an election year the bill unclear what could happen but it could happen at the end as part of a compromise bill at the end. Chairman Drew said Reid's staff advised that the Commission could go on record expressing concern.

Commissioner Valentine said he attended the Clark CABMW meeting and there was substantial discussion. The Fraternity of Desert Bighorn representative was in attendance and were against the whole concept, and he said it would behoove the Commission to send letter to Senator Reid and Senator Heller expressing the Commission's concerns.

Commissioner Hubbs and Commissioner Young both agreed with Commissioner Valentine's suggestion to send correspondence to Nevada Congressional delegation.

Public Comment – None from Las Vegas, Reno, or Elko locations.

**COMMISSIONER VALENTINE MOVED THAT THE BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS' PREPARE A LETTER TO BE SENT TO WASHINGTON DC DELEGATION TO ADDRESS THE MOAPA TRANSFER OF PROPERTIES. COMMISSIONER VALENTINE AND DREW TO WORK TOGETHER ON THE LETTER. COMMISSIONER HUBBS SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Chairman Drew said the motion is to draft a letter in regards to Senate Bill 1986 for the potential congressional transfer to Moapa Band of Paiutes in Southern Nevada, and he asked for questions or discussion on the motion? He said he would point out from the CABMW feedback

that was received and from today's discussion to focus primarily on access of adjoining public lands.

**VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

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

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for March 25 and 26, 2016, in Yerington and the Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change the date 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.

Chairman Drew said there was a previous request to move the March meeting date due to Easter Holiday and there were family conflicts and he discussed with NDOW staff and changing the date a week back or forward was not feasible due to different scheduling conflicts. Moving the date further poses problems for noticing workshops and regulations, in essence the date is stuck.

Secretary Wasley agreed with Chairman Drew and said moving the date does make problems with noticing regulations.

Chairman Drew said his recommendation is to keep the meeting dates the same and there may be some potential family conflicts with some of the Commissioners which is unfortunate but at this point we are boxed in.

Commissioner Young asked if it would be possible to meet part of the day on Thursday and all day Friday.

Secretary Wasley said that would depend on availability at the venue and also look at potential other conflicts on that Thursday.

Chairman Drew said he would suggest while the Commission is in Mason Valley to visit the Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area as well as the Mason Valley Fish Hatchery, and his hope is that we could build those activities into a partial tour day either Friday, Saturday, or even Thursday. He said for a formal action to do this we could add March 24 for the meeting dates for flexibility in that three day window.

Secretary Wasley provided the following agenda items for the March Commission meeting: Set/revise waterfowl seasons and limits; draft 2017 Predator Management Plan for action; CGR 458, smart triggers, smokeless powder, cartridge length and caliber restrictions for workshop; CGR 459 the unmanned aerial vehicle/drone regulation; the bighorn sheep disease surveillance and herd performance presentation; industrial artificial pond permit regulation; and two committee meetings APRPC and WDMC meeting.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO ADD MARCH 24 AS POSSIBLE MEETING DATE TO ALLOW FLEXIBILITY. COMMISSIONER WALLACE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

## 30 Public Comment Period

### Public Comment Las Vegas -

Stephanie Myers said you usually do not hear her speak except concerning trapping, and the only hunt areas she cares about are the mountain lions and black bears. She said for many Nevadans the ultimate goal in hunting area is to see an end to hunting bears and mountain lions. Ms. Myers said she is not anti-hunting except those two species; however shares additional goal of stewarding healthy populations of bears and mountain lions, that is our goal in attending these meetings. Therefore she respectfully submits that you not dismiss the factual information or the moral positions of any presenter, simply because their position does not contribute to continuation of trapping and hunting in Nevada. Respectful controversy is healthy, dissent can improve understanding. There are extremists on both sides and heard Commissioners have received disrespectful emails, we have also had disrespectful insults but mostly at the CABMWS level, so it has been both sides. We are all Nevadans and our fellow creatures deserve the consideration of all Nevadans. Ending discussion is not our goal and thanked the Commission for slowly opening the door for discussion.

### Public Comment Reno –

Allen Soluigny comments made earlier in Las Vegas today that people testifying in Reno on agenda items #19 and #20, mountain lion and bear hunts, were just anti-hunting and perhaps held extremist views. If that were true don't you think at least one of the people sitting in this room would have also commented on the other agenda items? You are wrong about extremist views, we are people in the mainstream and you should get to know us.

Fred Voltz said for the record, yesterday's report about Loren Chase and his alleged human dimensions work may be feel good therapy for wildlife killers, but it is predestined to perpetuate the wildlife killing mindset, and discern how to message and market it. Chase has nothing to ascertain what the vast majority of Nevadans want for wildlife stewardship. The actual foundation of objective human dimensions studies relative to wildlife management, therefore consideration should be given to inserting the word "killing" between "Wildlife" and "Commission" as this is the Commission's consistent objective and would more accurately represent what the Commission actually does which is maximizing death of the public's wildlife for entertainment, bragging rights and profit. Lastly, it has been claimed today that all the public is listened to, of course "claims of listening to the public" is not the same as determining and representing what the general public wants in policy-making, then the obligation is to implement those preferences not just the desires of NDOW licensees intent upon killing.

Elaine Carrick said she would like to thank Chief Turnipseed and the wardens for all the work they do finding people who commit wildlife crimes, and is really important work that is appreciated.

Don Molde said he is speaking for Nevada Wildlife Alliance: Commissioner Johnston read some emails received that were not respectful and he hopes not reflective of most of them, and would add that if he had kept collection of those comments directed at him for the past 40 years that he would have several binders full of comments. Mr. Molde said he wanted to mention that Commissioners Wallace and Johnston have mentioned at meetings, that when we are here presenting our views that we sometimes speak as though we represent "the public" who are not here and we think share our views. Periodically we receive a challenge from the Commission as to whether or not we represent the public or don't, and is usually said in a way to diminish our opinions or our point of view. He said he would say he personally does not believe that the Commission represents sportsmen and the argument is fairly easy to make. In this state we

have resident hunting and trapping licenses that total about 50,000 and if you add 85,000 fishermen or so, and 30,000 out of state sportsmen that apply for licenses and tags. That is 180,000 sportsmen that you claim to apparently represent, he has never even seen 180,000 sportsmen at your meetings, nor have I seen 18,000 --10 percent of that number, nor has he seen 1 percent, 1,800. He said he has seen 18 people at meetings and 40 at the town hall meetings. Mr. Molde said from an mule deer study learned that most knew nothing of CABMWs and did not want to know. He said we are both in same boat and does not see how they can claim to represent sportsmen anymore that you claim we don't represent the public. We have wound up with is the same core of noisy faces on both sides of the aisle that have enough interest to show up and debate these issues. We should go forward with that perspective in the future. We are here let's do business, let's work with science and numbers, and try to reach agreement beneficial to both sides as was done today. He thanked the Commission for its work on bears as thinks it is a step well taken, and hopes in future we talk of mountain lion and trapping reform. But, lets dispense once and for all whether we talk for the public or you talk for sportsmen, neither side can make that claim. He thinks the Department should survey both sides of the equation.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

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