



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: August 9, 2016
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, Chair J. Michael Reese, Vice Chair Joe Luby
William Stanley Brian Patterson Howard Watts III

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

- Nevada Department of Wildlife, 4747 West Vegas Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89107;
- 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.

Date: August 3, 2016

.....

1. Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order at 5:32 pm by Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese.
- Roll call of Board Members was performed by the Secretary, Stacy Matthews. A quorum was present. John Hiatt, excused. Howard Watts III arrived 5:37 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

- Vice Chair Reese requested all stand and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes of June 21, 2016 CCABMW Meeting (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

- Vice Chair Reese asked the Board and attendees for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of June 21, 2016 CCABMW Meeting.
- A motion was made and seconded to that the minutes be approved as written.
- Motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of Agenda for August 9, 2016 – (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic.

- Jana Wright suggested Item 8H be removed as no back-up is available and this item is not on the Nevada Wildlife Commission Agenda.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the Agenda for the June 21, 2016 Board Meeting as written, noting that Item 8H will be skipped. The motion passed unanimously.

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.

5. **CAB Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence: (Informational)** Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (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).
 - Bill Stanley noted that on September 24th, the sixth annual Southern Nevada Building Trades Sportsmen's Trap Shoot will be held at the Clark County Shooting Complex. Shooting starting at 9 am. They will give away 4 shot guns at the event. Give away guns to kids a pink and a blue gun. They expect 200-300 shooters. Ammunition will be supplied.
6. **Recap of June 24th and 25th, 2016 Commission Meeting Actions (Informational)** – A recap of actions taken by the Wildlife Commission will be compared to Clark Recommendations.
 - Vice Chair Reese noted that 75% of the CABs recommended 120 day season for Bobcat. The Commission voted 8-0 to leave it at 94 days.
7. **Announcement:** The Clark CABMW will have a vacancy as Board Member Brian Patterson term expires in November 2016. The position will be advertised and filled in November 2016. If you are interested in applying please see CABMW secretary Stacy Matthews.
 - Brian Patterson wants to be reappointed.
 - Secretary Stacy Matthews stated there is a new form for those who wish to apply. She added that active solicitation for applications will begin in September.
8. **Action Items:**

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners August 12th and 13th, 2016 meeting agenda, as well as additional items brought forth to the Clark 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 Wildlife Contest Policy, First Reading (For Possible Action)** The Clark CABMW Board will discuss and make recommendations about establishing regulations about Wildlife Contests.
 - Vice Chair Reese introduced this item noting that Stephanie Myers had sent a letter to the Board Members regarding Wildlife Killing Contests. He asked Stephanie if she would like to address the attendees with a summary of her letter.
 - Stephanie Myers told those in attendance that NDOW has come up with new guide for wildlife killing contests. She stated that the purpose of her letter is to inform the public how the Wildlife Commission views wildlife killing contests. The proposed Policy stated that participants must follow all laws, support ethical and respectful killing of wildlife in these contests, and want to adhere to the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. Does

not support glorifying the death of wildlife. She referenced a Policy rebuttal from Project Coyote, which takes each position and responds to them. Commission needs to define ethical personal skills. The Policy states it encourages participation and outdoor traditions, but when did killing wildlife become an outdoor tradition? The Policy and the rebuttal talk about wildlife laws. The Model of Wildlife Conservation calls wildlife a public trust resource. It is hard to reconcile that with wildlife killing. The Model requires a legitimate purpose for taking wildlife. Cash prizes are given for most dead bodies. Opposed to wildlife killing contest.

- Jana Wright stated that the policy is broad. She requested that a 5th bullet be added to the list of "The Commission does not support contests" in the Policy stating that they do not support contests "that kill mammals for fun or prizes".
- Karen Layne recalled that when this came up in front of the Commission regarding what constitutes a contest. You have fishing contests, largest Elk, the idea biggest and greatest. Real concern on trying to differentiate between contests on unprotected animals. Largest take wins prizes. Commission is concerned with that killing for killing sake is not what attempting to do. Very broad policy. Commission should take a stand. This is a beginning. Need to address this issue much more. We need to go beyond what is here. The Board, as a committee needs to decide where this needs to go.
- Close Public Comment.
- Joe Luby said that he cannot figure out the purpose of this policy. It is a waste of time and resources to create words on paper that have no regulatory impact. When this was brought to the Commission, the data included with the petition showed that the average number of contests across the US amounted to less than 5 per state per year. We are spending time on issue that is almost nonexistent. Why designate mammals.
- Brian Patterson agreed that policy written so broadly that it has no teeth to it. It mimics other rules and regulations. Agrees with quantities of coyote hunts. Everyone is trying to get around it and stop coyote hunts. It is a social media issue not a wanton waste or an issue of killing unregulated animals. Postings on FB or online cause the issue.
- Bill Stanley agreed that the Policy is extremely broad. Disagree with others about the contest issue. Focused on coyote here, but there are other contests on ranches for other animals. From a sportsman perspective, these contests cause a public relation nightmare when they hit the internet. Our ability to hunt and fish is jeopardized. He has hunted on the same ranch since he was 12. He recalled the yearly "deer hunting contest". You paid \$10, scored your animal and went home. The guy with the biggest deer took the kitty. That's been going on in rural Nevada forever. He wondered how we get to the issue of people wantonly killing as many coyotes as they can and putting it on the internet believing that those who object will go away. The opposite occurs and causes an internet nightmare. How do you separate this from fishing contests, which is predominately catch and release? He doesn't think this policy is necessary.
- Howard Watts III in agreement with policy is really broad. Memo states that the department says has no regulatory power over this. Optics issue. Attempt at agency level to address optics. Contests that enumerates take. Stepping back, the larger issue is the disagreement and conflict over how state manages coyotes. You don't need license, there is no limit, no need to harvest any part of animal. Introduce contest and bad optics creates bad situation. The Policy is more of a statement not a policy to address optics issues towards sporting community to behave ethically towards non sportsmen. There are still bigger issues we are going to need to address.
- Paul Dixon noted that Commission does not have teeth to regulate how an unprotected animal is taken in this State. The proposed Policy states that it should be done in an ethical fashion. There is wording in the Policy regarding insensitive and inappropriate. There is very ambiguous language in this Policy. The goal is to get people to agree we should do things in ethical and non-inflammatory way. People believe it is my right to put in your face. How do you write a policy that makes everyone happy? Does this help ethically show hunting

community behave a different way? Removes 10K coyotes a year to ranchers by aerial gunning or other things. Fish and Wildlife Service does not post pictures of dozens of coyotes. Unprotected animal it is a prey predator animal that has gotten out of population control. Policy that says hunters should be ethical. Recommendation to support, but it has no teeth. Future discussions. Opening of dialog.

- Vice Chair Reese noted that with respect to enumerating animals taken, when we hire an exterminator, we don't tell him to stop when he gets five crickets. The goal is, the more bugs the better, then come back next month. You can call it a Challenge, a tournament, a contest. Please adhere to all wildlife rules and regulation. No teeth to enforce. Do we need policy? Will leave up to everyone else to decide. We can't have a coyote killing contest, but we will pay \$500K to US Fish and Wildlife Service to go get as many coyotes as they can. He has a problem with that. This Policy should simply state that you must adhere to all rules and regulations. DMV does not have policy to tell us how to drive.
- Motion was made and to take no action on this item.
- Motion withdrawn.
- Motion was made and seconded to take no action on this Policy because it is vague and appears unenforceable.
- Motion passed 6-0

B. Commission Policy 10, Wildlife Heritage Tags and Vendors, First Reading (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about language requiring the Department to post the vendor solicitation packets on the Department's website in addition to mailing the packets and clarification on considering vendor proposals received after the deadline. Recommendations also include fiscal clean-up and editorial changes from the June committee meeting.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic.
- Brian Patterson stated that everything seems to be in order, nothing jumps out.
- Bill Stanley noted that it appears to be a cleanup. He will support it.
- Joe Luby no comments.
- Motion was made and seconded to approve agenda Commission Policy 10 as written.
- Motion passed 6-0.

C. Commission Policy 11, Wildlife Heritage Grants, First Reading (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about recommendations, fiscal clean-up and editorial changes from the June committee meeting.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic.
- Motion was made and seconded to approve Commission Policy 11 as written.
- Vice Chair Reese wondered about the one remaining Turkey tag and what happened with it.
- Paul Dixon no one applied for it within the required timeframe. No one requested it. It was never issued tag.
- Motion passes 6-0

D. Commission General Regulation 467, Special Assistance Permit, LCB File No. R105-16 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will discuss and make recommendations about amending Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). Through Assembly Bill 136 of the 2015 legislative session, the Nevada State Legislature mandated the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to adopt regulations prescribing the circumstances under which a person may assist a licensed hunter with certain disabilities in the killing and retrieval of a big game mammal.

- J Michael Reese introduced this topic and opened public comment.
- Bill DeJuncker what does assisting mean? It is pretty broad.
- Vice Chair Reese clarified what assisting means in this proposed regulation.
- HWIII added clarification.
- Brian Patterson noted that Maine has a similar regulation for able-bodied hunters, not just disabled or physically challenged hunters.
- Joe Luby suggested that there be a change to Section C to allow the tag holder OR the assistant to make the initial shot. You have to get permit in advance. Here we're talking about a substantial disability and we should afford them the same opportunity and benefit.
- Paul Dixon stated that he strongly supports this. His father is disabled. It allows some of us with older parents or disabled friends or family to relive experiences they had when they were younger.
- A motion was made to approve Commission General Regulation 467. Paragraph 2 C modified to allow to special assistant or tag holder to fire initial shot. Modify sentence to remove "good faith belief". Section 5.2.C to read "the holder of a special assistance permit, may discharge his or her weapon to assist in the taking of the big game mammal".
- Paul asked if this change was based on other states having that rule.
- Joe Luby answered that this rule applies in other states with two able-bodied hunters.
- Vice Chair Reese shared that he has two friends with cancer that could use and assistant. He agrees with the proposal. He will second the motion.
- Bill Stanley we need to clarify the weapon. Thought it was one weapon in field.
- Joe Luby clarified that the assistant cannot have a weapon not authorized for the hunt.
- Motion passes 6-0.

E. Commission Regulation 15 - 09, Amendment #3, Big Game Seasons *(For Possible Action)*

The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Regulation 15-09, Amendment #3.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item noting that it concerns changed hunt dates 091 season Sept 10 – Oct 7th
- CPD added this has to do with interstate herd due to Utah hunt. We are not allowed to hunt in that portion of the 091 hunt in Utah from Sept 10-September 16th.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission Regulation 15-09 as written.
- Motion passes 6-0.

F. Commission Regulation 16 - 03, Amendment #2, 2017 Heritage Wild Turkey Tag Season and Hours Adjustment *(For Possible Action)* The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Regulation 16 - 03, Amendment #2.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item.
- Bill DeJuncker asked what exactly has changed.
- Bill Stanly replied that the hunting hours have changed to sunrise-sunset instead of sunrise-4pm.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission Regulation 16-03 as written.
- Motion passes 6-0.

G. Commission General Regulation 464, Appeals, LCB File No. R074-16 *(For Possible Action)*
The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending Chapter 501 of the Nevada Administrative Code

(NAC) to provide more efficiency in scheduling appeals, will define that "calendar" days are used for calculation of deadlines, and more clearly notify the appellant in advance of a hearing that the Commission has limited jurisdiction, there will not be a rehearing, but is confined to the record on review. Provide for two, separate Attorneys General (one for the commission, one for the agency) to avoid conflicts with one advising two sides of the appeal. It also requires appellants to give the agency advance notice of legal representation to improve scheduling for a separate lengthier time needed on agendas.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission GR 464, LCB File No. R074-16 as presented.
- Motion passes 6-0

H. Commission General Regulation 470, Miscellaneous Petitions, LCB File No. R095-16 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending Chapter 501 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). The amendments simplify the petition and form requirements, require Deputy Attorney General and Department review for legal authority in advance, and moves the decision for acceptance or denial of the petition to the Department, simplifying compliance with NRS 233B.100 for agencies to act within 30 days of a petition. These changes were approved by the Wildlife Commission's APRPC after several public meetings, and they incorporate relevant suggestions from the public and legal counsel.

- Tabled no back up.
-

I. Commission General Regulation 468, Bonus Point Transfer, LCB File R104-16 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about amending Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). Existing regulation provides for the accumulation of bonus points by a person who applies for certain drawings for tags required for hunting certain species. Such bonus points accumulate and give the person a mathematical advantage in subsequent drawings for a tag. Under existing regulations, a person who changes his or her state of residence may request a transfer of any accumulated bonus points to himself or herself as a resident or nonresident of this State, as appropriate. This regulation change provides the authority to the Department to make such a transfer automatic upon the person's change of residence.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 468, LCB File No. R104-16 approved as written.
- Vice Chair Reese clarified that if you move out of state your bonus points will transfer with you and your license and you are a non-resident.
- Motion passes 6-0.

J. Commission General Regulation 469, Truckee River Tackle Restriction, LCB File No. R094-16 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners amending Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). The change revises NAC 503.504 to require the use of certain types of fishing tackle in portions of the Truckee River. Only artificial lures with single barbless hooks may be used on the Truckee River from 1,000 feet downstream of Derby Dam to the Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservation boundary from Feb. 1 through May 31 each year, to reduce incidental mortality of spawning adult Lahontan cutthroat trout.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item stating that the proposed restriction is to use barbless hooks and catch and release during spawning season.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 469, Truckee River Tackle Restriction, LCB File No. R094-16
- Motion passes 6-0

K. Specialty Tags Closed Units (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners regarding options that are being proposed by the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) in connection with the closure of bighorn sheep units for specialist tags resulting from previous year's harvest by specialty tag holders in those units.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item.
- Specialty Tags bring forth to public for discussion.
- Vice Chair Reese clarified the proposal. This is just for Bighorn Sheep.
- California and Desert Big Horn special units for downplay too many rams for special units. Option 1 closed to specialty tag holders if the Unit only has 2 or less tags allocated. If you hunt a Unit with three to five tags allocated, the Specialty Hunt for that Unit will close after one Specialty Tag is harvested. You have to call in daily. If you hunt a Unit with 6 to 8 tags allocated, the Specialty Hunt for that Unit closes after two Specialty Tags are harvested.
- Option 2 A tag number is assigned to each Specialty Tag. You cannot hunt a Unit where the Specialty Tag with that number from the previous year harvested an animal.
- Option 3 No longer consider any of these tags as statewide tags. Split the Nelson units into North and South units and the California units into east and west units. Switch between north and south/east or west for odd/even years. For the Nelson units, have one action tag for each the north and south.
- Brian Patterson feels they are making this so difficult to hunt and track, it is cumbersome. Keep it simple.
- Bill Stanley noted that Option 1 is the most straight forward.
- Howard Watts III stated that when tags are auctioned off, you want to maximize value.
- Bill Stanley added that Montana has the same situation. You have to call in every day.
- Brian Patterson agreed adding that we run the bear hunt this way.
- Paul Dixon shared that if you are a sheep hunter people, you have a lot of passion about this.
- Vice Chair Reese feels that option 1 is the fairest.
- Brian Patterson feels Option 1 is the easiest to understand.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Specialty Tags Closed Units approve Option 1 as our choice.
- Motion passed 6-0

9. Public Comment: Members of the public who wish to address the Board may speak on matters within the jurisdiction of the Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife. No action may be taken on a matter not listed on the posted agenda. Any item requiring Board action not on this agenda may be scheduled on a future agenda. Public comments on posted agenda items will be allowed at the time the agenda item is considered before the Board takes any action on the item. Comments will be limited to three minutes; unless you represent a group then you will be limited to six minutes.

NOTE: Please complete the Public Comment Interest - Card and submit to Vice Chair Reese.

- Bill DeJuncker on behalf of WHIN wanted to thank the Board for any involvement they may have had with getting WHIN a Mule Deer Tag last two years. They raised almost \$250K. Thank you!

- Stephanie Myers commented that the Wildlife Commission and NDOW, as public Agencies, it is distressing that the Saturday Wildlife Meeting not being video conferenced. The Public is not allowed to express public comment.
- Tyler Christenson asked what can be done to allow a youth to shoot with my tag, a direct relative like a son or daughter. This is similar to the disabled assistant, only for youth assistant. Would like this added to a future agenda.

10. Authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Commission for its consideration at its August 12th and 13th, 2016 meeting in Reno, Nevada. (For Possible Action)

- A motion was made and seconded to authorize that Chairman to prepare and submit recommendations to Wildlife Commission.
- Motioned passed unanimously. 6-0.

11. The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for September 20th, 2016 in the Clark County Government Cent Center Pueblo Room, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway to support the scheduled Wildlife Commission meeting on September 23rd and 24th, 2016 meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada.

12. Adjournment

- Meeting was adjourned at 6:53 pm.