



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: September 17, 2019

Location: Clark County Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway Pueblo Room
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Time: 5:30 pm

Board Members Present: Paul Dixon, Chairman John Michael Reese, Vice Chair
Dave Talaga John Hiatt Dan Gilbert Molly DiBlasi

The agenda for this meeting was posted in the following locations;

- Nevada Department of Wildlife, 3373 Pepper Lane, Las Vegas, Nevada 89120
- Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89108;
- City of Henderson, City Hall, 240 Water Street, Henderson, Nevada, 89015;
- Boulder City, City Hall, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, Nevada, 89005;
- Laughlin Town Manager's Office; 101 Civic Way, Laughlin, Nevada, 89028;
- Moapa Valley Community Center, 320 North Moapa Valley Road, Overton, Nevada, 89040;
- Mesquite City Hall, 10 East Mesquite Boulevard, Mesquite, Nevada, 89027.

1. Call to Order – Roll call of Board Members for determination of quorum

- The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Chairman Paul Dixon.
- Roll call of Board Members was performed by the Secretary, Stacy Matthews. A quorum was present. 5 members present. Brian Patterson absent/excused and John Hiatt arrived at 5:41 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

- Chairman Paul Dixon requested all stand and lead the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes of the August 6, 2019 CCABMW Meeting (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

- Chairman Paul Dixon asked the Board and attendees for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of the August 6, 2019 CCABMW Meeting. It was discovered that the recorder was not working. Recorder was then fixed and began recording. Chairman Dixon stated the motion was approved by the board with a vote of 5:0.
- Board Comments: None
- Public comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of August 6, 2019 CCABMW Meeting as written.
- Motion passed 5:0

- 4. Approval of Agenda for September 17, 2019 (*For Possible Action*)** Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda, and two or more items may be combined for consideration. The Board may also remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.
- It was discovered that the recorder was not working. Recorder was then fixed and began recording. Chairman Dixon stated motion approved as presented with a board vote of 5:0
 - Board Comments: None
 - Public comment: None
 - A motion was made and seconded to approve the Agenda for September 17, 2019.
 - Motion passed 5:0
- 5. CCABMW Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence: (*Informational*)** CCABMW members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the CCABMW. Any item requiring CCABMW action will be scheduled on a future CCABMW agenda. CCABMW board members may discuss any correspondence sent or received. (CCABMW board members must provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record).
- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Molly DiBlasi no emergent items
 - Dave Talaga no emergent items
 - Vice Chair Reese made announcement that this Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday the Southern Nevada Sporting Clays State Championship will be held here in Las Vegas. We get people from all over the United States and mid-West and this event will be another huge influx to the economy with more hotels being booked, car rentals and targets shot. Event is open to the public.
 - Dan no emergent items
 - Chairman Paul Dixon added will bring the info to the next meeting for the Kirch Award. Got the call for the Kirch Award nominations. Brett Jefferson will be this year's recipient. He spends a lot of time promoting Wildlife. If anyone knows of someone in the South or of an organization to nominate, Chairman Dixon will assist with pulling together a package. Chairman Dixon also stated he will have copies for the Kirch Award nomination at the next meeting and topic will be included in the next agenda. Will also send Julia electronic copies and get it out to the board members as well.
 - Closed agenda item.
- 6. CCABMW Board Vacancy for a person who represents the interests of the general public: (*Informational*)** Applications are being accepted for an upcoming CCABMW Board vacancy for a person who represents the interests of the general public of Clark County (NRS subsection 501.265(2)).
- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
 - Chairman Dixon advised that Brian Patterson's term is ending October 2019 and Brian has served as the position of the general public for the last three years. Anyone interested in applying to represent the general public should submit an application, or if you would like to talk to your county commissioners about adding someone to that list please do so, as there is a new vacancy available.
 - Stacy Matthews advised will be posting the position of the general public to the county website in the next day or two just waiting for the DA to do the final approval. Interested parties will need to go to the website and submit an application.
 - Chairman Dixon stated he hadn't heard anything yet from Brian Patterson on if he would be re-applying.
 - Stacy Matthews added she was told by Brian Patterson he would be applying for another term.

- Chairman Paul Dixon stated not aware of Brian Patterson re-applying but it is a general public position and last time around did have some controversy, so if people are interested they should apply.
- Closed item

7. Recap of August 9th and 10th, 2019 Commission Meeting Actions (*Informational*) A recap of actions taken by the Wildlife Commission will be compared to Clark CABMW Recommendations will be presented by Vice Chair J. Michael Reese who attended the meeting on behalf of the Clark CABMW

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated was unable to attend the meeting and instead Vice Chair John Michael Reese attended.
- Vice Chair Reese noted the meeting, fortunately for him, was largely informational and did not have many action items. There was however a CAB workshop held. During the workshop he added, that one of the more eye opening topics was how they do their surveys, deer quotas and drawings. Vice Chair Reese was under the impression that it was based off 1-100 million for every category but instead it was 1-100 million for ALL five species. For example; if an individual was lucky enough to draw a number 1 it would be for that species that he applied for, meaning it would only be one number 1 for the entire state. It's like bingo balls, once that ball is pulled out no one else can get that number. Vice Chair Reese went on to discuss the topic of application statistics and the overall application process. For just residents alone there were almost 215,000 applications for only 28,000 tags. When you add in the nonresident applications that went well over 100,000. The significant part of that is with every single app having \$3.00 going to predator fee. It was also clarified in the workshop questions regarding wildlife surveys. NDOW does not fly every single unit in the state every year. Contrary to what others may believe, Alan Jenne got up and advised yes they fly the majority of all of them but the ones they don't, they use the hunter's questionnaire that comes back as how many animals were taken out of that area. As far as flying, they used to fly the same pattern every year but now they do not fly the same pattern every year but instead fly in a polygon effect. It may be another two or three years before they fly the same area again, which was another eye opener for everyone. The other item discussed was the Rut from Mule Deer which biologist dated it as starting between November 10th through November 24th (i.e. between the 45th and 47th weeks of the year) and Vice Chair Reese agrees with this date. At his ranch, mating is done and they are starting to move on by Thanksgiving. Asked Chairman Dixon if he wanted to him to continue with the other topics that also touch on the topics of land owner tags and shed antlers regulations that are already on the Agenda as items to discuss.
- Chairman Dixon advised to bring up when reach those items in the agenda.
- Vice Chair Reese continued to state it was a highly informational meeting and that even he and Wildlife Commissioner Paul Valentine were shaking their heads because they have been here for 30-40 years and they never knew that was how they did the draw.
- Chairman Dixon asked Vice Chair Reese if he attended the Cave Valley Ranch tour
- Vice Chair Reese answered yes he did. Informed the Chairman the tour was done extremely well. It consisted of a half day tour and ended with a dinner at Cave Valley Ranch. BLM and some local biologist toured Cave Lake and discussed some of the problems with the dam that may need to be redone. BLM showed how they did the chaining and revegetation set-up, doing a checkerboard effect which in turn was helping habit. They also showed how the last 5 million dollars of Heritage funds have been spent in that area.
- Chairman Dixon stated for the record that John Hiatt joined the board and going forward will now be a 6 member vote rather than a 5 member vote. Chairman Dixon also thanked Vice Chair Reese for representing the board.
- Closed item

8. Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners September, 19th and 20th, 2019 meeting agenda, as well as additional items brought forth to the CCABMW from the public for discussion. CCABMW agenda & support materials are available upon request to Stacy Matthews (702) 455-2705 or smatthews@co.clark.nv.us. The final Commission agenda & support at http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Agenda/.

A. Commission Regulation 18 – 01, Amendment #3, Fishing Seasons and Regulations for the Two-Year Period March 1, 2018 through February 29, 2020 (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending CR 18-01 to change the ending date of this regulation from February 29, 2020 to December 31, 2019.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic
- Board Comments:
- Chairman Dixon stated only change in the regulation is to change the current end date to December 31, 2019 and so the New Year will start January 1, 2020. This will reset it to be based on calendar year instead of working mid calendar year.
- Vice Chair Reese added this was a good idea but not to confuse with fishing licenses. For example, fishing license do not expire December 31st but instead one year from the day it was purchased. Some could confuse the two.
- Chairman Dixon explained one will not affect the other
- Dan Gilbert expressed that typically a person is going to buy their hunting license and fishing license; bisecting the fishing date from the hunting date
- Chairman Dixon clarified the regulations is only changing the date of fishing regulations from February 29, 2020 to December 31, 2019 and has nothing to with licensees
- John Hiatt added this will have little to no affect
- Vice Chair Reese added this is a cleanup item
- Chairman Dixon agreed with Vice Chair Reese and restated it is a cleanup item based off federal fishery dates they do it off a calendar year and current date was off calendar year.
- Public Comment- none
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of **Commission Regulation 18-01, Amendment #3- Fishing Seasons and Regulations for the Two Year Period March 1, 2018 through February 29, 2020 as written.**
- Motion passed 6:0

B. Commission Regulation 20-01, Fishing Seasons and Regulations for the Two Year Period January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021 (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about fishing seasons, bag and possession limits for the period of January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic:
- Chairman Paul Dixon advised very limited changes. Will highlight the changes for the board as follows: Kirch Wildlife Management Area the proposed regulation increased the number of bullhead to 50 and added wording “15 other warm water game fish”. Fort Churchill Cooling Pond in Lyon County selectively removed out trout from the fish and increased the take by creating separate entity for trout. Truckee River proposed area from East Mustang Road Bridge

(I-80 exit 23) downstream to the Pyramid lake Paiute Reservation Boundary, limit is three game fish, of which 1 may be trout. Main change no longer just catch and release and allowing fish out of that river. Chairman Dixon added the take has been the main change to this regulation which is good for us.

- Board Comment: None
- Public Comment:None
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of **Commission Regulation 20-01- Fishing Seasons and Regulations for the Two Year Period January 1,2020 through December 31, 2021- Fisheries Division, accepted as written.**
- Motion passes 6:0

C. Commission General Regulation 485, Tag Transfer, Deference and Return Program, LCB File No. R022-19 (For Possible Action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about direction for allowing the transfer, deference or return of tags under certain extenuating circumstances after the passage of Assembly Bill 404 of the 80th Legislative Session.

Extenuating circumstances may INCLUDE...

- Life-altering illness
- Life-altering disability
- Destruction or potential destruction of home
- Unanticipated medical incidents

Extenuating Circumstances DO NOT INCLUDE...

- Unfortunate life events
- Loss of job, marriage, vehicle, weapon
- Minor illness
- Planned medical events
- Pregnancy, surgery, regular treatments

Other Considerations:

- The timeframe for an extenuating circumstance to occur in order to return, defer, or transfer a tag is the calendar day before the season.
- If the transferor loses bonus points and is in a waiting period, they will not be able to keep applying for someone else to keep transferring that tag
- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic
- Chairman Dixon requested from the board to focus on the topic of more specific details regarding additional recommendations for extenuating circumstances for the members of the CAB for transferring tags.
- Vice Chair Reese added this is pertaining to immediate family and cannot transfer to someone who is not an immediate family. To keep it civil and not get out of hand it's been left to allow the CAB to dictate what in our terms would be considered extenuating circumstances. Also added, as a CAB will need to discuss time line on when they can transfer that tag, currently is two days prior to season opening to still get money and points back. Vice Chair Reese shared story of personal friend who recently passed who was going through Chemo Therapy, who had finally pulled a sheep tag and would have loved to pass it down to his grandson to have the opportunity to harvest that. In favor of this regulation.
- John Hiatt Page regarding page 2 Section 2a asked if the death happens at the beginning of the season it often take months to present the death certificate and if can only be transferred to the immediate family member, they too may be impacted from the loss of an immediate family member. Doesn't seem to solve the problem based on the way it's written.

- Vice Chair Reese added for example; if he is the person deceased he doesn't get to decide who gets the tag so it's a moot point
- John Hiatt clarified and pointed out if the deceased passed it down to his wife who is the immediate family member, based on the how the death can impact the wife it doesn't really solve the problem if she doesn't use the tag either.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added it would be State Dependent
- Vice Chair Reese said it was regulated by NDOW and can choose what types of verification is needed from the hospital in reference to any possible delay in getting death certificate.
- Chairman Dixon added if you are the transferee of a tag for example, (i.e. a father transferred his bull tag to his son, and does he lose his bonus points? And does the son in receipt of the tag lose their bonus points and go into waiting period? Why is the person who gets the tag not under the same waiting period? Point is that the person who is transferring should also be losing points and waiting time reset
- Vice Chair Reese added anytime you acquire a tag you lose your bonus points
- Chairman Dixon asked are they handling this like a landowner tag.
- Vice Chair stated they might consider making that part of their motion
- John Hiatt added that the guy who gets to go hunting should be the one who loses the points
- Vice Chair Reese responded to John Hiatt, that the guy has option to hand it back to NDOW and retain his points and refund back on tag.
- John Talaga asked should the recipient of a transferred tag lose any bonus points.
- Dan Gilbert agreed with John Talaga and added that he saw an issue with the donor retaining the bonus points because it could allow the donor to continue to build up bonus points and give it anyone in the family they wanted to.
- John Talaga concurred with Dan Gilbert that to avoid any scheming both the transferor and transferee should lose their bonus points
- Vice Chair Reese stated agreed as well, if you wanted to keep your bonus points turn your tag in to NDOW and let them give it to someone else
- John Hiatt also added someone would need to provide documentation of the illness so should prevent scheming
- Chairman Dixon added it may not be so simple, in urban areas not as easy to falsify but in more rural areas where the physician has more interactions with the hunter they might be more inclined to falsify information.
- Chairman Dixon asked the board if they had any contributions to the Unfortunate events section. What should this entail?
- Vice Chairman added these specifics should be part of their motion and added these items for example, inability to access the home as it pertains to inability to access the guns or license to hunt.
- Chairman Dixon added really need to breakdown all examples of extenuating circumstances to deter people's creativity with transferring tags
- Public Comment:
- Jana Wright referenced Assembly Bill 404 which states the commission may adopt the regulations establishing etc. etc. The commission doesn't have to do anything and when she reviewed the video from the August meeting, Director Wasley said they had a black and white system now about addressing tags and yet they still get sued. Topic will always have so much grey area. Process is a gamble and topic was originally brought up to legislature due to bonus points.
- Mark Transue made comment that this topic has a lot of discussion and leaving too many ends open. Asked why is this being brought up, is this to appease someone? Based on the reputation of NDOW they may have just added this in to appease someone.
- Halverson- Curious regarding first bottom page of the agenda regarding life altering illness then on page 3 of the agenda under Extenuating Circumstances do not include, unfortunate life

events is listed. The two seem to contradict themselves. Lots of grey areas and not sure how you address that with different interpretations.

- Chairman Dixon agreed with Jana Wright regarding the wording of “may” be used in AB404 and if this is more work in the regulations. How often would this occur to transfer to immediate family member?
- Vice Chair Reese added NDOW cannot make the law but when the legislature passed AB404 it allowed NDOW the legal ability to draft a regulation if they wanted to. These are just general categories or ideas if we had the ability to write the regulations what we would want included?
- Chairman Dixon added for example, knee surgery or other planned medical treatments
- Vice Chair Reese responded to Chairman stating knee surgery is a scheduled medical event and someone who is issued a tag would have advance notice
- John Talaga asked do we want to do transferred tag in the immediate family. If so, need to define what it means to transfer the tags. If cast the net too wide can cause too much grey.
- Chairman Dixon added will need to pass something to see how it works and then can come back to amend based on how it works. It’s the will of the people for about a year. Won’t know until something is passed
- John Talaga added if that is so, suggested to start slow and go from there
- Vice Chair Reese added would need up to 3 years to collect data in order to be able to create a regulation
- Dan Gilbert added if double penalties are engrained at the start then people will be deterred from abusing the system
- Chairman Dixon asked the board, what is the general consensus of wanting to transfer the tags, does the board want to proceed with this regulation?
- John Hiatt asked what the actual feedback from the public wanting to transfer tag.
- John Talaga asked are the 6 people present on the board for or against it?
- Dan Gilbert stated he is for it and references how Utah is currently transferring their tags. It helps the next generations of hunters. Bonus points would need to be taken away.
- John Hiatt added NDOW needs to clean up the extenuating circumstances section
- Vice Chair Reese added CAB has the ability to change that list or add to it
- John Hiatt suggested to change the wording from Life Altering illness to Incapacitated for the duration of the season.
- Vice Chair Reese agreed with changing wording to Incapacitated for the duration of the season
- Molly DiBlasi also agreed with the wording provided by John Hiatt
- Chairman Dixon read the following from his notes regarding the motion as follows, we agree with the regulation as written but would like to see that that the transferee and transferor both lose their bonus points and the waiting period times are reset for both regarding tag transfer. Of the extenuating circumstances, incapacitated for the duration of the season, life altering disability, inability to access ones home for the duration of the hunting season and unanticipated medical events; feel for all of these, the timing in which you have to announce these extenuating circumstances must be 1 day prior to the start of the season.
- John Hiatt pointed out that 1 and four of the extenuating are the same thing recommend to combine
- Vice Chairman Reese added if your incapacitated for the season it doesn’t matter what it’s for
- Chairman Dixon added that life altering for example is being blinded, and therefore would be incapacitated for the season or for life
- Vice Chair Reese advised the state will be able to look at what all other CABS will put in and not surprised if it comes back to them again
- Chairman Dixon asked the secretary of the board to read back what he had stated prior for the motion

- Stacy Matthews reiterated what she had written down as follows, inability to access home for hunting season, life altering disability serious incapacity and transferor and transferee lose bonus points and both the waiting period would reset.
- Vice Chair added the duration coincided with giving the tag back to NDOW
- John Talaga asked Stacy to re- read the life altering portion
- Stacy Matthews re- read the following as, life altering disability and seriously incapacitated for the duration of the season
- John Talaga advised that we could combine the two as a serious medical event
- Vice chair added good point could be out for only a week but still can hunt the rest of the season should be for the duration of the season.
- Chairman Dixon added the following will be added in the motion;
- **A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Commission General Regulation 485, Tag Transfer, Deference and Return, Program, LCB File No. R022-19, the changes that the cab were presented to the CAB concurs with the following recommendations to those changes 1. Transferor and transferee lose bonus point and waiting time is reset for both should an event occur 2. Should there be a medical event that incapacitates the hunter for the duration of the seasons 3) should the hunter not have the ability to access the home for the duration of the season. All of these extenuating circumstances just listed, the notification tied to NDOW would coincide with existing regulations.**
- Motion passes 6:0

D. Commission General Regulation 486, Veteran and Active Military Waterfowl Season, LCB File No. 4027-19 (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider a regulation relating to amending Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). Federal statute was adopted in 2019 enabling a veterans and active military waterfowl hunting season. Federal frameworks would allow for veterans and active military to exclusively hunt waterfowl for a period of two days within the existing season. If adopted, this regulation would allow the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to establish such a season.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- John Hiatt asked, with no disrespect, why a veteran would be included in this versus any other citizen
- Chairman Dixon advised there is currently federal statute that states active military and veterans get a designated waterfowl zone in the country, we can follow federal regulations and enable one in the state, using the definition provided, the question is do we want to do that
- Vice Chairman Reese added no disrespect they can still hunt during the regular season and would actually like to see them partnered with the youth hunt and establish good mentorship with the youth and active military. Not sure or don't know if we have currently, if it picked up with the youth with NDOW Ducks and donuts approx. 40 some people showed up at the last event. Would be beneficial and big event with combining the two.
- Dan Gilbert added that some of the desire is to make it not a big event but make it more exclusive and perhaps make it on a weekend; we cannot do enough for our vets or active military
- Vice Chairman confirmed that the season is set at 108 days in the season. Could do south part of the state if so chose to give them their own special day would be the weekend after the season closes. Prime time for down south for north might be different

- John Hiatt added waterfowl is every other day so would this also need to be then non consecutive
- Chairman Dixon confirmed yes has to be non-consecutive
- John Hiatt then confirmed it could not then be on a weekend
- Dan Gilbert added that the non-consecutive day only applies to certain areas for example
- Vice Chairman Reese added if you do it the last two days of the season for example in January
- Chairman Dixon stated it is based per waterfowl zones and we currently have 3.
- Public Comment:
- Wayne Bliss stated regarding the definition he encourages to be very specific and cite definition of those terms with what is an active military for example coast guard might not be considered active military. If you just say uniformed services it could include TSA for example.
- Chairman Dixon read the NRS 417-005 defines a veteran and active member of the military, asked if we should define this by adding during wartime
- Vice Chair added its already defined in NRS 417-005
- Chairman Dixon would recommend for approval and need to define
- John Hiatt interjected if we word it with during wartime it could include branches that might not be in the definition
- Vice Chair Reese read the NRS 417-005
- Dan gilbert added we wouldn't be the CAB to change the NRS that defines what an active military person is
- Chairman Dixon stated well no, but we can be more inclusive with the definition
- Molly interjected believed the coast guard should be included with the definition
- Dan Gilbert clarified what is the motion, is to approve with the recommendation that it is more inclusive of all attached to the homeland security dept?
- Vice Chairman Reese advised yes if that's the motion
- Dan Gilbert read the following for the motion as; Commission General Regulation 486, Veteran and Active Military Waterfowl Season, LCB File No. R027-19 with the addition that it include all active or former member of homeland security
- Vice Chairman Reese asked for amendment to the motion because the file is not ro27-19 should be 4027-19
- Stacy Matthews added for the record should be LCB File 4027-19
- John Hiatt interjected that homeland security should be removed from the motion
- Stacy Matthews asked if want to withdraw or amend the motion at this time and will amend the typo of R027-19 and change to 4027-19
- Dan Gilbert requested to withdraw the motion
- Vice Chairman Reese restated the motion as follows: A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Commission General Regulation 486, Veteran and Active Military Waterfowl Season, LCB File No. 4027-19 to include all definitions of veterans or active military service
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of **Commission General Regulation 486, Veteran and Active Military Waterfowl Season, LCB File No. 4027-19 to include all definitions of veterans or active military service**
- Motion passes 6:0

Commission General Regulation 487, Use of Live Bait Fish and Tackle Restrictions, LCB File No. R060-19 (For Possible Action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider and recommend amendments to Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). This regulation is intended

to update and simplify the use of bait and other fishing tackle in NDOW's Western Region and Southern Region.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item
- Chairman Dixon advised this is a regulation clean up and board is looking at removing outdated, unclear unnecessary complex or repetitious language. Asked the board if any concerns with changes?
- Dave Talaga added good job with cleaning up the regulation
- Public Comment:
- None
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of **Commission General Regulation 487, Use of Live Bait Fish and Tackle Restrictions, LCB File No. R060-19 as presented**
- Motion passes 6:0

E. Commission General Regulation 488, Landowner Compensation Tags, LCB File No. XXX (For Possible Action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider a regulation relating to amending Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). This regulation would provide direction for allocating landowner deer and antelope compensation tags if owner applicants cumulatively qualify for compensation tags in excess of the statutory limit.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item
- Chairman Paul Dixon asked if there was an LCB file and response was no
- Vice Chair Reese stated he made it known at the state that 1) ranchers did not cause this problem 2) solution is to grow more deer. With that said – the 2 proposals were 1- take all of the 1st 50 deer or antelope and the proposal is to give everyone their one tag for the first 50. After that they will raise to 50 ½ and so on until no tags left. If population grows too low for the actual 50 it will start at 50 ½. Option 1 gives you 1 tag but option 2 is set at 51 deer to obtain the tag.
- Chairman Dixon asked how to you calculate ½ a deer
- Vice Chair Reese added would need 51 deer to get that tag
- John Hiatt stated process is overly complicated.
- Stacy Matthews advised do not see the 50 ½ in the back up paperwork
- Vice Chair Reese added this was a discussion using a PowerPoint created by Mike Scott. Vice Chair Reese also added that at the meeting regarding people who own multiple properties and how they wanted to be able to combine them together to achieve the 50 or more to get more tags.
- Chairman Dixon read from NAC 502.426, no reference with 50 ½. Only dealing in whole numbers
- Vice Chair Reese advised was referencing excel spreadsheet during power point presentation at meeting done by Mike Scott and Cory Schroeder. The purpose of the excel formula and using the ½ would assist with getting rid of more tags so NDOW wouldn't end up with leftover tags at the end of the season
- John Hiatt added it could complicate matters if add properties together
- Chairman Dixon advised not in the regulation and advised although discussed it was not put in the regulation to add properties
- Dave Talaga asked about paragraph 3 sub paragraph b of the NAC 502.426, a whole number derived , asked what the qualifying number was

- Chairman Dixon answered with 50
- John Talaga also touched on why would they want to try and combine properties
- Chairman Dixon stated there are some who felt they should be able to combine their properties
- Public Comment:
- Mark Transue asked what's wrong with the current process and using formulas and 1/2s seems like they are trying to appease a certain person or group
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend to approve **Commission General Regulation 488, Landowner Compensation Tags, LCB File No. XXX as written**
- Motion passes 6:0

F. Commission General Regulation 489, Shed Antler Regulation, Regulation Changes: NAC 503.172- Shed Antler Season, NAC 501.200 Demerits (*For Possible Action*). The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about how quota recommendations are developed based on a targeted management objective, like a post-season mule deer buck to doe ratio, using data on harvest success and hunter demand (often referred to as the demand-success formula).

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item
- Chairman Dixon advised is in reference to shed antler season and demerits for violating.
- John Hiatt advised he was unsure of the reason for date change.
- Chairman Dixon stated it reads February 1st through April 30th
- John Hiatt asked what percent do they shed their antlers before February 1st
- Chairman Dixon answered few.
- John Hiatt discussed research showing 95% reduction and was investigated and during the calving season if disturbed by people cows will leave the calves. Causing calf survival to diminish. If there are 10 disturbance events calf live goes to 0%. Shortening the period is a mistake
- Chairman Dixon agreed could impact if change the date.
- John Hiatt added folks using ATV, Motorcycles and SUV causing damage. Agrees with increasing demerits when violations are made regarding shed antlers.
- Chairman Dixon went over the demerits and online courses
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval for **Commission General Regulation 489, Shed Antler Regulation, Regulation Changes: NAC 503.172- Shed Antler Season, NAC 501.200 Demerits as written and recommend required online course for shed possession and demerits as presented and keep dates February 1st though April 30th.**
- Motion passes 6:0

G. Waterfowl Zone and Split Designations (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about several options for potentially changing the waterfowl's zones and season splits in Nevada.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item
- Chairman Dixon read based on federal register rulemaking protocols and Flyway regulatory meeting schedules, the deadline for states to submit any proposed changes is May 1, 2020. A state's zone and split choices at that time would be effective from 2021 through 2025. Asked if any issues with changes to water fowl zones? Northeast areas like Elko and White Pine are different due to freezing.

- Vice Chair Reese hasn't heard from any disgruntled waterfowlers regarding the zones and split designations, added the split with Overton etc. and with good enough control in the south
- Chairman Dixon added is limitation in certain zones for different reasons otherwise; no need to change or add to southern zone. Adding Eureka and others no real gain to change. Fine with current zones but wants board opinion. Board states no issues. Will revisit and as for now Clark CAB recommends water zone stays as is for next 5 years.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of **Waterfowl Zone and Split Designations as presented stays as is for next five years**
- Motion passes 6:0

H. North American Non-lead Partnership (*For Possible Action*). The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the creation of the North American Non-lead Partnership and innovative ways to protect our hunting and wildlife conservation heritage by addressing unintended impacts on wildlife lead exposure through hunting ammunition. Useful links: (<http://nonleadpartnership.org/>; <https://www.peregrinefund.org/non-lead-ammo>)

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item
- Chairman Paul Dixon discussed the topic to ban use of lead bullets and commission will meet. First step in formally informing public going to non-lead bullets. North American Non-lead Partnership is led by hunters who use copper bullets and other non-lead bullets such as tungsten. Other options are available to avoid using lead when performance is not affected. Wants to discuss and have for the record where Clark County stands on the issue of non-lead bullets.
- Vice Chair Reese stated uses lead and has always used lead but not opposed to non- lead and wants to see the presentation. Would want to see presentation and shoot with copper to see what difference is. Possible contamination with using lead. Could cause issues with hunters if need to change from lead to non-lead. If decide to ban lead could be pricing hunters out of the sport
- Chairman Dixon stated trains with lead and if then switches to copper during the hunt ballistics could affect the shot
- John Hiatt stated main issue with lead is the health issues with lead
- Dave Talaga asked what are medical concerns with using lead bullets,
- John Hiatt advised lead is a Neurotoxin, and it causes developmental problems with children
- Dave Talaga stated never has been a documented case of child having neuro issues because someone went hunting with lead bullets, scratch that
- John Hiatt stated we don't do test on humans to have them ingest lead to see what difference it makes
- John Talaga asked what do we do experiments on then? The Condor for example; lead poisoning. Overall research from Ravens only some lead was discovered. Lead may be an issue but need valid research.
- John Hiatt said they tested the condors for lead
- John Talaga asked how many captured, answered with 147 and that extended that to common ravens where there were 27 captured. Added that they tried to access the damage of lead on these animals during hunting seasons and in the study published in 2017 all they could do was speculate on the extent of the damage and once research was conducted what was found that the data was too robust. So for example the 27 ravens – 1 had some amount of lead. His point is that when these people come in and say lead is bad and point to studies to prove that, when the studies are flawed but we wouldn't now that. It gives off an impression that lead is

- far off worse than it is. Brought up Commissioner Justin Jones who had found that a study regarding shooting complexes per the EPA what is an environmental issue- only pertains to residential which the shooting complex is not, making this issue about lead based on studies that are questionable themselves. Is leery they are pushing an agenda that has no proven data or research. If not careful could be start of no longer being able to hunt with lead, no more led recreational shooting then ban lead completely. Need to keep it cost effective
- Vice Chair Reese discussed two studies was involved in as a professional not related to lead bullets. Referenced study on corn in 1974 looking at lead levels in corn from lead levels from the highways. Can get lead poisoning from eating corn. Two PhD's in Ireland largest lead zinc occur in Ireland as close at 2-3 feet from the ground. Point is the lead is in the grass, then the animals eat the grass, then the products we purchase as consumers are ingested, there are levels of lead. Added many caveats will need to be added to a possible regulation before would consider changing from lead
 - John Hiatt added that we have been banning lead in paint in other situations for a reason. The idea that there is no harm from lead from the environment seems irresponsible
 - John Talaga clarified the data is skewed based on the online data he read. Gave example regarding Reno and Las Vegas water supplies- radioisotopes. If you ingest too much not going to be good for you that's understood but what is the threshold that will cause you harm. If you sound the alarm on lead when it doesn't need to be sounded then you may take many hunters out of system that can no longer enjoy something they have enjoyed for so many years.
 - Dan Gilbert expressed his understanding the discussion was meant to determine as a board if there was interest in the creation of the North American Non-Lead Partnership
 - Chairman Dixon agreed, that this was for Clark County to discuss and determined where they stood on this issue
 - Dan Gilbert asked if could create motion to deny this request
 - Vice Chairman advised there has not been any action yet
 - Chairman Dixon reiterated at this point it's only at the discussion level but guarantees that next time around it will hit the legislation level. It's pretty clear this will be a topic and the question is does the CAB need to take or want to take a position
 - Stacy Matthews asked if wanted to make the Motion to table it until more information provided
 - Chairman Paul Dixon added there are a few issues that need to be met to change from lead
 - Vice Chair Reese advised North American Non-lead Partnership will be at the shooting complex this Friday from 4:30pm-8:30pm to go over ballistics of lead versus non lead.
 - Dan Gilbert recommended to make motion to not make decision based on unexclusive data to prove if lead has medical issues.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon asked what the board's position on this issue is. Need to figure out how to minimize the impact with the discussed issues today with changing to non-lead bullets. Need to talk to legislatures regarding banning versus limiting lead use in certain circumstances
 - Public Comment:
 - Mark Tensue recommended to table it
 - Wayne Bliss agrees with Chairman Dixon that we need to prepare to face what's coming and take into consideration that children could ingest lead poisoning. Shooting with lead bullets- he has personally shot with copper bullets and when comparing there is no difference when it comes to ballistics but economically lead is best. Also agrees with Chairman Dixon to keep open mind and handle issues one at a time.
 - Chairman Dixon stated should approach in a measured way

- Dave Talaga added that the non-lead population more likely to cause uproar, could be situations where a non-lead bullet could be less cost effective, but wants to table to ensure stay on top of it.
- Vice Chair Reese proposed that Nevada always keep an option for sportsman that can choose what ammunition they want to use.
- Dan Gilbert echoed what Vice Chair Reese said and added needs to stay affordable.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added does not want to windshield wiper the issue; more data needed to know what the species that are sensitive to lead are.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend: table for next meeting until further data can be obtained.
- Motion passes 5:1 to table taking any action (Note: John Hiatt voted Nay)

9. Public Comment -Members of the public may provide public comment (*Informational*)

Comments will be limited to three minutes. Any item requiring Board action not on the agenda may be scheduled on a future agenda.

- Public Comment:
- None
- Closed public comment.

10. Authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its September 19th and 20th, 2019 meeting in Las Vegas, NV. (*For Possible Action*)

- Public comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its September 19th and 20th, 2019 meeting in Las Vegas, NV.
- Motion passed 6-0.

11. The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for October 29, 2019 in the Clark County Government Center Pueblo Room, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas. This meeting will be in support of the November 1st and 2nd, 2019. Commission meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada.

12. Adjournment

- Meeting was adjourned at 7:59pm