



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: November 15, 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
Howard Watts III Brian Patterson John Hiatt

Excused: Joe Luby & William Stanley

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: November 9, 2016

.....

1. Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm by Vice-Chairman J. Michael Reese.
- Roll call of Board Members was performed by the Secretary, Stacy Matthews. A quorum was present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese requested all stand and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes of September 20, 2016 CCABMW Meeting (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese asked the Board and attendees for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of September 20, 2016 CCABMW Meeting.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese thanked Stacy Matthews for accuracy of minutes.
- No public comment.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of September 20, 2016 CCABMW Meeting as written.
- Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

4. **Approval of Agenda for November 15, 2016 – (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.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this topic stating that he reserves the right to pull agenda items out of order, and he may call for a break as needed.
 - Public Comment – none.
 - A motion was made to approve the agenda for the November 15, 2016 Board Meeting as written.
 - The motion passed unanimously. 4-0
 - John Hiatt arrived 5:33 pm

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).
- Brian Patterson was re-appointed to CCABMW for a new three year term.
 - John Hiatt reported on a conference held by the US Fish and Wildlife Service in Palm Springs. The subject was ravens and sage grouse. It is a well known fact that the raven population is growing. The highest rate of increase is 118% in British Columbia. In the Western Mojave, the raven population in the winter is 7K to 15K birds. We are learning about raven behavior. If you target one group, it may not do anything to other groups. Migratory Bird Treaty Act can have impact on what you can do. Killing ravens is not a feasible alternative. We need to affect fertility. OvoControl is used in pigeons, but never tried in ravens. Research needs to be done to see if this would work. Because the ravens gather in one area in the winter, it could be possible to administer a drug to a large number of birds through food to see the effect. Further, if you want to see what is preying a sage grouse nest, you need cameras to capture what is happening. Important to have good data. Money needs to be allocated for further research. So many people involved hard to manage subsidy issue. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act is a multi-nation treaty, so Congress cannot unilaterally modify the Act. So far, crow populations are not impacted.
 - Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese noted that Governor Sandoval issued a proclamation that September 24th, 2016 Hunting and Fishing Day in Nevada. Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese added that on Election Day, November 8th, Indiana and Kansas passed the right to hunt and fish in the state. He then provided the actual vote tallies.
 - Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese also summarized an article he received discussing a new coyote program in the State of South Carolina. The article stated that sixteen coyotes were captured and tagged and released. If you take one of these coyotes by any means, including hitting it with a car, you will receive a lifetime license. In that state they harvest over 30K coyotes a year. Their hunter survey asks if, while hunting a deer, did you harvest a coyote, if so, how many?
 - Stacy announced that the 2017 CCABMW and Commission meeting dates are available on a handout on the sign-in table.
6. **Recap of September 23rd and 24th, 2016 Commission Meeting Actions (Informational)** – A recap of actions taken by the Wildlife Commission will be compared to Clark Recommendations.
- Chairman Paul Dixon reviewed the actions taken by the Commission with respect to the recommendations submitted by this Board.

- Fishing season was approved without serious changes.
- On the Cartridge length/caliber regulation, the Commission followed the recommendation of 4 CABS that were for the restrictions on large caliber guns while 3 CABS were against. Hunting with a large caliber rifle is an issue.
- Emergency Antlerless Deer Hunt - there was much discussion. Given that the deer herds will face starvation this winter, BLM declined to do anything with Wild Horses that share the diminished habitat. NDOW is trying to move 600 to 700 does out of the area by issuing 1000 tags.
- John Hiatt offered that the problem with Wild Horses is not BLM, it's Congress. There is no budget. The budget is to remove 3500 horses, but Nevada slated for zero horses to be removed. Bureau of Land Management does not have the resources to take care of the horse problem.
- Paul Dixon agreed that Congress is not allocating as much to Nevada. There is some money there just how it is being allocated in the states. We should have an emergency removal. If we have medium to hard winter we will lose deer as well as some number of horses. We should take photos of the horses to show they are not managing horses properly.
- Most things coming back on this agenda for a vote today. Wildlife Simplification strategy and the guidelines will be covered. Jeremy discussed how the NDOW did not provide back up in time for CABS to discuss. Commission tabled those items. Policies 31 and 33 are back on this meeting's agenda.
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that Gila Monsters were brought to the Commission meeting.
- Jana Wright nothing to add to report.

7. **Living with Coyotes: A Clark County Perspective and Discussion (*Informational*)** - The Clark CABMW along with NDOW will discuss how to safely coexist with coyotes in Clark County.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced Doug Nielsen.
- Doug Nielsen, NDOW, noted that one of the side effects of the population growth in the Las Vegas Valley from 1985 to today, is an increase in human-wildlife conflict. Some species expand into Downtown such as coyotes. To natives, coyotes are part of the landscape, but some people come to Nevada and do not realize we have coyotes. His job is to help people understand why coyotes are here, why they do what they do. Some people have a fear of coyotes. Retirees have small dogs and cats and are afraid of losing a pet. Now we have master planned communities that often include golf courses, parks, etc. These spaces attract birds, rabbits, mice, creating an artificial buffet for predators. As part of the natural flow, coyotes will come where food is easy to get. His job is to teach people how to limit negative impacts, and to try to discourage coyotes. one approach is to haze them: raise your arms, holler at them, try to look big. Also, the crackles and pops of a Taser scares them away. At a Symposium for the communities on the Eastern slope of Rockies, the people have really taken to heart the practice of hazing the animals. Doug stated that between Nov. 2015 – Oct. 2016, the NDOW Urban Wildlife contact fielded 989 calls in Las Vegas. 314 of those were coyote related. Some slipped through documenting calls. In south Josh Certa brought in GIS mapping by species, by day, by time. Sun City Summerlin, Southern Highlands, Anthem especially have high incidents. All are built around extra water and golf courses. Feral Cats are a food source as well. They encourage people to follow leash laws. Keep small dogs on a tight leash. Keep garbage cleaned up and a lid on the can. Pick up food. Be extra cautious at dawn and dusk. Clean up bushes and vegetation to limit hiding places.
- NDOW has attended HOA meetings and public meetings with a good exchange of information. There is real emotion on this topic. There have been meetings where attendees have become hostile. NDOW has been the subject of 44 media stories in the last year (24 coyote related). NDOW does everything they can to educate the public. Clark County Fair in April has given NDOW a larger venue, so the plan is to add a section on living with urban wildlife. If you wipe out coyotes, you have more rabbits. We need to teach people. NDOW got funding for 2 positions to deal with Urban Wildlife.
- Mark Transue asked if there have been any attacks on humans.

- Doug Nielsen cited statistics from 1997-2010 where Animal Control reported an average of 1K dog bites annually. In that same period, there were three coyote bites reported. These involved people separating dog and coyote and one was camping. It is not known if the bites were from the coyote or the owner's dog.
 - Jana Wright asked if Doug has pamphlets he gives out?
 - Doug Nielsen responded that they have multiple pamphlets dealing with living with coyotes and other native predators and wildlife in Nevada. Translocating is an issue. Coyotes are territorial, so inserting a coyote in a new area causes conflicts with coyotes already living in that area. Also, coyotes can have rabies. Do not want to ship coyotes and risk spreading rabies. Other pamphlets discuss living in bear country, living with Mountain Lions. Biology of species.
 - John Hiatt asked if anger at the hostile meetings was directed at NDOW or at other members of public.
 - Doug Nielsen answered that it was aimed at NDOW out of fear. Trying to deal with people's fear by educating them. We need to change our behavior, change our landscape, and haze the coyotes. Do not feed them on purpose or by accident. Clap your hands, make noise, and be big.
 - Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese clarified that Animal Control has no jurisdiction over wildlife.
 - Doug Nielsen noted that coyotes fall into an interesting group. They are an unprotected species, much like a rat, a badger, or a skunk. You can kill a coyote 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. In rural community, this is not an issue. In Las Vegas incorporated, this is not an option. There are a couple of agencies who are permitted to legally remove them.
 - Bill Halverson asked if any human interactions are from people feeding them.
 - Doug Nielsen responded that you are creating a nuisance by feeding the animal. NDOW is trying to educate people. Coming up on the winter months, they will store up fat to get through the winter. Therefore, they will go where the food is easiest to find.
 - John Hiatt noted that during breeding season, coyotes would protect their den.
 - Doug Nielsen Stated that there are a couple of times a year when the activity is highest: in breeding season when they are out walking around looking to mate, and when pups are old enough to be booted out of den, and the pups start walking around. When it is cool enough for humans to be outside, so are coyotes. They are not comfortable around human beings. The more time they spend in the human environment, they develop a higher tolerance for us.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon thanked Doug Nielsen for presenting.
8. **Restart of Willow Beach National Fish Hatchery (*Informational*)** -The Clark CABMW along with NDOW will discuss the reopening of the Willow beach hatchery for trout production.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese asked Doug Nielson to give an update on the Fish Hatchery.
 - Doug Nielsen stated that recently they had a ribbon cutting for water intake system. The old system was not working. Some financing was obtained. Arizona provided 60K fingerlings. As soon as they are big enough to stock, they will start planting. Eggs coming in this winter. Once this starts going will have releases at Willow Beach and further down.
 - Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese asked would the trout come down to Nevada.
 - Doug Nielsen stated that with a Nevada fishing license and the Colorado River stamp, Nevadans could fish both sides including Willow Beach.
 - Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese asked how long for fingerlings to be released.
 - Doug Nielsen replied 6 months. If from egg, it is closer to one year. In 4-5 years, it will be great.

9. **Action Items:**

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners November 18th and 19th, 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 Regulation 17-01, Taking of Raptors for Falconry for 2017- 2018 (For Possible Action) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the 2017 - 2018 season dates, species, quotas, limits, closed areas, application procedures and deadlines, and take of raptors for falconry.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- John Hiatt asked how many were taken last year.
- Chris Tomlinson, NDOW, cited data going back to 2012 that six raptors all together were taken last year, consisting of five northern goshawks and one red-tailed hawk.
- John Hiatt asked how does the license system work.
- Chris Tomlinson responded that you have to take a test, go through training; there are apprentice falconers and master falconers. You have to have a proper space for the raptor and know how to care for them. After taking the test, you can apply for a permit to capture a bird, two if you lose one, but no more than 2. Chris deferred to Joe Barnes, NDOW, for further information.
- Joe Barnes, NDOW, shared that taking birds from the nest can only be done when they are between 10 days and 28 days of age. Before 10 days, you put the siblings at risk if you push out the parents. Breeding can fail. After 28 days can result in forced fledging, where birds typically fledge 35-45 days after they hatch. If you go in later than 28 days, you can force fledging when the birds are too young to care for themselves. If they jump, they are exposed to dehydration and all the elements.
- Chris Tomlinson added that there is a regulation that one young bird must be left in nest for reproduction.
- Joe Barnes stated that there may be anywhere from one to six young in clutch. If it is a single individual, you cannot take birds.
- John Hiatt asked if the department makes recommendations. If you remove one bird from the nest, you can reduce food competition among the siblings.
- Joe Barnes answered no they do not make recommendations, but they do close off areas where the raptor populations are not what they should be. For example, with the Northern Goshawk, historical data showed a big drop off in the Independence Range in Elko County. Fifteen years ago, there were 22 or 23 territories in that range. Today there are two or three territories. NDOW does not allow birds to be taken if there are lower populations. There is an allowable take per year. They do not direct folks they do not define successful breeding attempt until 28 days or later. Precipitation and other factors can give you erroneous information. Many Falconers will probably not take NDOW advice anyway. They like to do things their own way. They have their special area and method of taking birds.
- Brian Patterson shared that he and Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese had seen a presentation by a Master Falconer. She said that there are only about 60 licensed falconers in the State of Nevada.
- Chris Tomlinson added that there are only about 30-45 permits issued each year.
- Brian Patterson went on to say that, the Master Falconer stated that she captured a bird and trained it in a few weeks and was hunting with it. When it molts, she returns it to wild. She kept each bird for one season and then had to get it acclimated to the wild.
- John Hiatt – captive cross breeding.
- Brian Patterson said it is fascinating that the Falconer's bag limit is less than a shotgun hunter. Did not think that was fair.
- Public Comment: none.
- A motion was made and seconded to accept Regulation 17-01 as written.
- The motion passes 5-0.

B. Commission Regulation 17-02 Noncommercial Collection of Reptiles and Amphibians for 2017 - 2018 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the 2017 - 2018 season and limits for noncommercial hobby collecting of live, unprotected reptiles and amphibians.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this topic.
- John Hiatt asked the purpose of a regulation restricting the collection of unprotected animals.
- Chris Tomlinson, NDOW, responded that there is no license required. This is to make it legal for a youngster to catch a lizard or frog. If there was an investigation, the bag limit will apply. Just for hobby.
- John Hiatt asked if this is non-consumptive use, what about kids collecting lizards to feed snakes?
- Chris Tomlinson answered that it does not make sense to slap the cuffs on a kid because he caught a lizard.
- Chairman Paul Dixon asked if there have been any changes to limits.
- Chris Tomlinson stated that the bag limits have been the same for the last six years.
- Public Comment: none
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission Regulation 17-02 Noncommercial Collection of Reptiles and Amphibians for 2017 – 2018 as written.
- Motion passes 5-0.

C. Commission General Regulation 466, Partnership in Wildlife (PIW) Drawing and Restricted Nonresident Guided Deer Draw Applicant Eligibility, LCB File No. R140-16 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about two amendments to Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). Presently, the main tag drawing precedes the PIW tag drawing during the main draw. Consequently, those applicants who elected to participate in the PIW program but draw a big game tag in the main drawing cannot compete in the PIW drawing. Endorsed by the Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC), the amendment to the regulation would change the draw sequence by having the PIW drawing precede the main drawing, allowing all applicants who opt into the PIW program to compete for coveted PIW tags. Furthermore, as recommended by the TAAHC, the second amendment will result in the allowance of restricted nonresident guided deer draw applicants to also apply for deer tags in the Silver State tag, PIW and the main drawing if otherwise eligible.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this topic.
- Public Comment - none
- Howard Watts III asked what was the rationale for leaving the PIW applicants out of the PIW draw if they drew a big game tag.
- Brian Patterson explained that if you drew tag in first round, you are not allowed two tags so you were eliminated from the PIW draw.
- Paul Dixon clarified that there are two options being reviewed: one would move the PIW to be the first draw, or the other option is to have the PIW draw as a separate draw. Two separate methods. The Silver State is a separate draw.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese added that more people apply for PIW and that draw goes first, if you prefer to do the draw by area, you will have to issue tags by area. Would rather leave it statewide and not convolute it.

- Brian Patterson noted that there are only 22 deer tags for the PIW, so the first 22 people will get the special tags and the rest will fall into the regular draw.
- Howard Watts III agreed.
- Chairman Paul Dixon this makes it possible for non-residents to participate in PIW to increase revenue.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Commission General Regulation 466, Partnership in Wildlife (PIW) Drawing and Restricted Nonresident Guided Deer Draw Applicant Eligibility, LCB File No. R140-16 in support of method one.
- Motion passes 5-0.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese believes the fee is a participation fee, since application for PIW tags is optional. The
- Chairman Paul Dixon agreed that since it is voluntary, it really is a participation fee.
- Howard Watts III noted that since the Board is recommending method one, we should keep this as participation fee.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese proceeded with discussion of Questions 1 and 2.
- Public Comment:
- Doug Nielsen, NDOW, stated that the word you want to note on Question 2 is reinstate. He went on to review the history of the PIW tag program. Originally, non-residents could have applied for two tags while residents were allowed only one. Question 2 will reinstate much of the original plan.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese said we would have tons of non-resident people apply.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend participation fee for Question 1.
- Motion passed 5-0
- A motion was made and seconded for Question 2 to recommend the Commission reinstate eligibility for NRGH applicants for PIW and Silver State tags.
- Motion passes 5-0.

D. Nevada Department of Wildlife License Simplification Strategy Update (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about license structures along with suggestions for bundled privileges and fees.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item resident should not pay more than non-residents.
- Howard Watts III looks at this as the difference between people who get the basics who would see their cost going up vs. the people who want the extras (trout stamp, second rod stamp, etc.). Those people will have their costs going down. As a person who enjoys fishing for trout, He is happy with what add-ons he gets with an all-inclusive package. Another great feature of the proposal are all of the specialty licenses, and Disabled Vets, seniors, will get a break. Keep it revenue neutral.
- John Hiatt agrees that simplification is better for department and applicants.
- Brian Patterson noted that he hunts fishes in other states. It would be good to have ala cart at times. Each state has tried to do something similar. As long as there are enough options, Brian is for the simplification.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese is in favor of this. People are not driven by price. If it is a household doing this, it adds up. In favor of reducing resident fees and marking non-residents up.
- Public Comment:
- Mark Transue stated that he is all for the lesser price, but how does that affect NDOW?

- Brian Patterson responded that the proposal claims that the net result financially will be revenue neutral.
- Howard Watts III added that the revenue from those who usually buy a basic license would increase. The estimate from NDOW is that this structure will bring in 15K more than currently. It is projected to be a little bit above. Some folks will save money, but the folks that normally purchase the basic incense will pay more and get more.
- Brian Patterson noted that with the three-day license, you also get the second rod and trout stamp.
- Bill Halverson asked what about hunting. Is there any option for a 3-year or a 5-year license?
- Brian Patterson stated he would like to have to renew his license every year.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese said that part of the proposal is your license expires 365 days from day you buy it.
- Bill Halverson added that people he talked to would like multi-year licenses.
- Chairman Paul Dixon reiterated that residents should not have an increase, but he goes along with the statement from Howard Watts III.
- A motion was made and seconded to adopt Nevada Wildlife License Simplification Strategy as written.
- Motion passes 4-1. (Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese feels the Nevada resident should get a better bang for their buck.)

E. Nevada Department of Wildlife Update of Guidelines for Harvest Management in Nevada (For Possible Action) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about an update on the status and process of refining the draft harvest guidelines.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item, adding that he had a hard time with the "liberal season", "conservative season", etc. Looking at bobcat vs. coyote, last year there were 1179 bobcats harvested. He estimated that there were between 9,000 and 14,000 coyotes taken last year. For a long time, there was no season on bobcats. Then they decided there should be a season and set it at 120 days. Now the season is being cut down to 105 days. The proposed Guidelines set the "liberal season" as 120 days. He feels the "standard season" should be 120 days and reduce the season to 105 days or 90 days based on conditions. They also want to take harvest data for bobcat over a three-year period.
- Public Comment:
- Jana Wright again voiced her objection to the Black Bear Hunt. We have not heard anything about Black Bears. She also observed that for the furbearers, there are no quotas mentioned. It looks like you can take as many as you want. She also objects to that.
- Stephanie Myers noted her second to everything Jana said. We need bag limits on trapping. It is out of hand the number of animals trappers take. There are no limits. In addition, Black Bear hunts should not be allowed. There are other ways to do this.
- Howard Watts III noted that the Guidelines are not binding. Will these Guidelines appear in a more binding plan?
- Paul Dixon differed to one of the NDOW attendees for an answer.
- Steve Kimble, NDOW, responded that these are just guidelines, that season setting and quota setting will be done as it has been in the past. The Department will be using guidelines so they do not have to make it up each time. Regarding other plans, where existing plans or guidelines might be in conflict with other plans, the Department will need to decide what to do. Most plans are old and probably in need have update. The Department will have to deal with them in some fashion. There is no intention to put in any legislation. Most changes will be done in Regulations. We want to streamline the process as much as possible. It is a

recommendation and guideline. The Commission might change the way they do things someday, but that is not the intent of this.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese has looked at the number of trap nights. He feels not as much weight should be put on trap nights. It should be based on harvest. He is fine with the big game guidelines.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that this document simply gathers information from a plethora of other documents, repeating what already exists. The document will be updated annually. It captures harvest guidelines in one place.
- Steve Kimble, NDOW, noted that it is not NDOW's intent to update guidelines annually it is a three-year document. If something needs to be changed, they can address that.
- Chairman Paul Dixon argued that if there were changes in other documents, they would need to update the Harvest Management Guidelines for Hunting Seasons.
- Steve Kimble said he believes that may be true over the first few years, but it is not intended to change annually.
- Chairman Paul Dixon agreed that changes need to be made in corresponding documentation.
- Steve Kimble stated that the Big Horn Sheep Management Plan has no provision for Ewe hunts. The Plan may need to be updated to reflect what Harvest Management Guidelines is for Hunting Seasons. If they do that, it will be based on a list of priorities.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese noted that the bobcat season was originally 120 days and then for good reason, it was shortened to 90 days. This document sets the normal season to 90 days and a "liberal" season to 120 days. He does not want 90 days to be set as the base line. If someone is looking at this to navigate and understand, he wants the standard or base line season to be 120 days for bobcat.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that is what Commission decided to do. The only way to change this is next year get the CAB, Sportsmen, and public input to change the season. We have to change it in the right place.
- Brian Patterson agreed with Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese that the standard season should be 120 days. He gets Paul's point that it is guideline.
- John Hiatt stated he would prefer greater flexibility. NDOW should have flexibility to regulate it accordingly.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese made a motion to accept the Harvest Guidelines as written with the exception that the bobcat seasons be defined as the "standard" season of 120 days, a "restrictive" season of 105 days, and an "ultra restrictive" season of 90 days. The season should be set at 120 days. Then if data comes back indicating a shorter season is needed, you can use the other two levels.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that the guidelines are a reflection of the regulation. You cannot change the bobcat season now. You can recommend changes during Furbearer Season next year.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese said that trappers would help regulate the season. Looking over all the data over the last 30 years, the trappers limit their activities based on the weather and the price of pelts. If you want to establish a standard season length, it should be 120 days. Trappers will not do that. This will regulate itself.
- Brian Patterson seconded the motion.
- Howard Watts III stated that we need change at the source. Get where Mike is coming from that this process lead to this change. Let us discuss the root of it. You are looking for a note that we disagree with this element. We should not change the guidelines we need to change the process.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese stated that the guidelines have to guide you.
- Howard Watts III responded that some other regulations are leading to the guidelines.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese noted that we had the highest recruitment of kittens this year, the highest kitten to female ratio, yet the season is 105 days. That is perceived as the norm. He feels that is wrong.
- Howard Watts III reasserted that what is in Policies or Regulations, etc., is what is found in the Guidelines document.
- John Hiatt Stated that he is debating whether chickens or eggs come first. He endorses sticking with guidelines the way they are.
- A vote was taken. Motion fails For-2, Against-3
- A new motion was made and seconded to approve the Harvest Guidelines as written.
- Motion passes 3-2.

F. Predation Management Fiscal Year 2016 Report (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the status of the 2016 Predation Management Report. Per Commission Policy 23, the Department shall prepare an annual Predation Management Status Report (Status Report) detailing results of the previous fiscal year's projects.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- John Hiatt noted that the rules for predator management changed mid-year, requiring 80% of the predation management funds to go toward lethal methods. John expressed his opinion that lethal management of wildlife goes against the policy of using science to manage wildlife. Since Big Horn Sheep do not move, they are sitting ducks for predators. Big Horn Sheep behavior is learned. When you introduce animals to a new area, they do not know to migrate or where water sources are. It can take years for a herd to become viable in that area. Killing predators is not the best way. It is unfortunate that the Legislature mandated that 80% of \$3 fee go to lethal means of predator management. He does not agree with that policy.
- Howard Watts III Stated that the reports he found most useful had a combination of a description of the plan and approach as well as the measured results. There needs to be a better link between reports and plans. What were last results and reference document? Encourage better link of information to get whole picture. He questioned Project 21-02: was the objective met and what was the impact on the sage grouse population? Was the level of brood failure average or expected or not? In addition, with Project 21-074, there was a failure to find coyote dens, and a contractor that was unable to take a single lion. Terminating Project 22-16 in the middle seems like a waste of money. He liked the summary for Project 32 as it was in depth on the process. He wonders what effects were noticed on lions and deer but did not draw any conclusions on impact on deer and lion populations. For Project 38, he did not see any information on the impact on domestic sheep and deer predation. There are some interesting findings in the report.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese said he was shocked that there were 120 trail cameras were purchased to be placed by coyote dens. In addition, collaring ravens with two different types of collars, and then they only lasted two weeks. The initial findings showed that ravens do not migrate when there is a viable food source. If you call 50 miles migration, then I guess they might migrate. He feels the Project results were somewhat inconclusive. He is hopeful that putting a fence around the trash will cut down on birth rate.
- John Hiatt referencing some information he learned from the Raven conference, noted that ravens are smart. If you close off one food source, they will look for another food source right where they are. Road kill is breakfast for Ravens. The number in an area will not decrease in an area unless things get bad. Every time we do more research, we have new findings.
- Public Comment:
- Jana Wright said she agrees with John Hiatt that the mandated 80% of funding go toward lethal predation management is wrong. We should all be onboard to repeal AB78. She found

- the she had to pull the plan and compare to the report to understand what was done or planned. Some kind of running commentary for projects that go from year to year would help. Some of the reports were thorough, but some are a work in progress.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese agreed that when you do project that is multi-year or multi-faceted, you should have a milestone. Where did we start, where did we go, and how much further do we have to go. As sportsmen, are we getting bang for our buck?
 - John Hiatt agreed that what is needed is a status report for the whole project.
 - A motion was made and seconded accept report as written with the request that when there is a multi-year project, the report should have a milestone report with complete status of that project in its entirety thus far.
 - John Hiatt added that the report should include enough data so a person does not have to refer to previous years reports.
 - Howard Watts III described it as a better link between reports and plans so you do not have to reference documents that are at different times. We need the big picture of the process.
 - John Hiatt noted that research is not a milestone, it requires a status report.
 - The motion was withdrawn.
 - A new motion was made and seconded to accept the report as written with the caveat that for multi-year projects the reports contain a complete status update.
 - Motion passes 5-0.

G. Development of a Commission Policy Regarding Wildlife Contests (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will discuss and make recommendations about a prior draft of a Wildlife Contest Policy forwarded by the Administrative Procedures, Regulations, and Policy Committee, which was discussed by the Commission at their August 12, 2016 meeting. The Commission may choose to discuss the merits of the policy and may amend, forward, discard, or reinstate development of a policy that articulates the Commission's perspective regarding contests of take of wildlife.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this topic noting that it appears that there are no changes from the last meeting. He went on to comment on the bulleted list of characteristics of sporting contests the Commission does not support. The first bullet references contests that "glorify the death of wildlife through insensitive photographs," He then displayed several pages of photos showing hunters posing with their kills published in the 2016 Hunting and Fishing Guide that was distributed with the Ely Times, Eureka Sentinel, and the Lincoln County Register the week of September 30, 2016. In one of the photos, the hunter still had blood on his hands and arms. He argued that what might seem harmless to some might be insensitive to others. He asked how you classify insensitive. He went on to the other bullet points stating that obviously, the Commission is not going to support a contest that violates wildlife laws (bullet 2) or contests that do not use all parts and edible portions of the wildlife taken (bullet 3). He is appalled that the Commission feels the need to put this in writing. He mentioned Carp Derbies, for example, where the intent is to reduce the carp population in a body of water, but very few people will attempt to eat a carp.
- John Hiatt offered that what needs to be included in the Policy is provisions for non-native invasive species, which includes carp. A carp derby is trying to remove invasive fish. The idea is trying to educate people that carp can be a problem. If you are writing rules, they need to make more sense than what are included in the proposed Policy.
- Howard Watts III noted that this is a contentious issue. People on both sides criticized this policy proposal stating it is too vague and unenforceable. It has not been changed at all, so he sees no reason to continue discussing it. It is still vague, unenforceable, and nobody likes it.
- Paul Dixon stated that he agrees with Howard's comments, at the last Commission meeting during Public Comment, the biggest opponent of Wildlife Killing Contest spoke. They do not care about anything except coyotes. Project Coyote wants something specific to deal with

Coyote Contests. This Policy will come back to the CABs before the next Commission Meeting in February and will be specific to coyotes. However, until we get something concrete, we cannot move forward.

- Howard Watts III, upon request, summarized Chairman Paul Dixon's comments for the other attendees.
- John Hiatt noted that there was a specific problem, Coyote Killing Contests, and the Commission wrote a general policy. I did not work.
- Public Comment:
- Stephanie Myers stated that at the last Commission meeting there was a lot of discussion of hunting ethics, trail cameras, fair chase. This proposal, as everyone has said, is too broad and unenforceable. We are talking about killing mammals for fun and prizes. This is not specific enough.
- Jana Wright stated that the Commissioners should not talk about wildlife contests, but Coyote Killing contests. If a Policy were to ban coyote killing contests, she would support it. This proposal is too vague.
- A motion was made and seconded to reject the Commission Policy regarding Wildlife Contests due to it being vague, unenforceable and having a lack of any stakeholder support.
- John Hiatt suggested that a note to the Commission should make clear that they were tasked to address a specific problem and they fell far short of what was needed or expected.
- Motion passes 5-0.
- Paul Dixon notes that a lawsuit was filed and focused on coyote contests.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese asked Paul to ask the Commission the difference between a bounty and a contest.

H. Commission General Regulation 465, Antelope and Elk Waiting Periods, LCB File R141-16

(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). The TAAHC recommended the amendment to the regulation to standardize the waiting period for a person to be eligible to apply for each of the species antelope and elk after receiving a tag. Regardless of harvest, the antelope-waiting period after receiving a tag would be three years, and the antlered elk-waiting period after receiving a tag would be five years.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item
- Public Comment:
- Bill Halverson said he is in favor of having a waiting period if you successfully harvest, but you should be eligible the next year if you do not.
- Daryl Sneed is in favor of shortening to five years the waiting period for bull elk, to three years for antelope, and increase the number of tags.
- John Hiatt stated that he does not understand why if you did not fill tag you must wait 5 or 10 years to reapply. You should be able to come back next year and reapply. He finds it hard to defend as rational given how many animals we have.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that if people can reapply the next year, they could become selective in what they harvest. Why take this animal today when chances are I can get a bigger/better animal next year? By imposing a waiting period regardless of whether successful or not, will increase harvest objectives, by forcing people to harvest an animal.
- John Hiatt replied that obviously it does not seem to work very well.
- Bill Halverson argued that when it gets down to the last day, hunters end up taking animals younger than NDOW may have wanted taken. That defeats the purpose.
- A motion was made and seconded to support Commission General Regulation 465, Antelope and Elk Waiting Periods, LCB File R141-16as written.

- Motion passes 5-0.

I. Commission General Regulation 463, Duties of Person Transporting Vessel or Conveyance, LCB File No. R093-16 (For Possible Action) The Clark CABMW Board will discuss and make recommendations about amending Chapter 488 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). The change amends Chapter 488 of NAC by adding a new section that requires the owner, operator or person in control of any vessel or conveyance that is launched on any body of water in this State to drain the water from the vessel or conveyance and any equipment on the vessel or conveyance and also requires the owner, operator or person in control of a vessel or conveyance that is transported on a public road in this State or has been taken out of any body of water in this State ensure that the drain plugs, drain valves and any other devices used to control the draining of water remain open while transporting the vessel or conveyance on public roads in this State. The proposed regulation also amends language in NAC 488.520 to accommodate the changes above and remove repetitive language.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- Howard Watts III highlighted a single edit to the previous version of the proposal document.
- Public Comment – None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 463, Duties of Person Transporting Vessel or Conveyance, LCB File No. R093-16 as written.
- Motion passes 5-0.

J. 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). This regulation revises provisions relating to practice before the Commission. It provides 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. It will also provide for two, separate Attorneys General (one for the Commission and one for the Department) to avoid conflicts with one attorney advising two sides of the appeal. It also requires the appellant to give the agency advance notice of legal representation to improve scheduling for a separate lengthier time needed on agendas.

These changes were approved at the May 12, 2016, meeting of the Wildlife Commission's APRPC, which included relevant suggestions from the public and legal counsel. The Commission held a workshop in Reno on August 12, 2016, where the Commission asked to include information regarding the notice to the appellant and to insert language that if a party fails to file certain information within 14 days they may waive their right to a hearing on the appeal. A revision of the regulation was requested from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) which, contained additional edit.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 464, Appeals, and LCB File No. R074-16 as written.
- Motion passes 5-0

K. Commission Policy 2, Publications, Second Reading (For Possible Action) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about repealing Commission Policy 2, Sale of Publications. The policy

is outdated and redundant with the Public Record fee schedule and requirements applicable to Executive Branch agency's limiting fee.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made to support the repeal of Commission Policy 2, Publications, Second Reading as recommended.
- Motion passes 5-0

L. Commission Policy 33, Fisheries Management Program, Second Reading (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 33.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission Policy 33, Fisheries Management Program as written.
- Motion passes 5-0

M. Commission Policy 31, Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Management Guidelines, Second Reading (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Policy 31.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael introduced this item.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission Policy 31, Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Management Guidelines as written.
- Motion passes 5-0

N. 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 regulation was developed by the Wildlife Commission's APRPC after several public meetings incorporating relevant suggestions from the public, legal counsel, the Department and the committee. The amendments will simplify petition form requirements and the petition process overall.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- Howard Watts III said that he feels this makes sense. It make is easier for a petitioner to submit a petition.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 470, Miscellaneous Petitions, and LCB File No. R095 -16 as written.
- Motion passes 5-0

O. Commission General Regulation 471, Closure of Truckee River to Motorized Vessels, LCB File No. R139-16 (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners amending Chapter 488 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). Existing regulation sets forth certain bodies of water

on which only vessels without motors are allowed and certain bodies of water on which only vessels without motors and vessels powered by electric motors are allowed. This regulation adds the Truckee River from the California-Nevada state line to the point where the river enters the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation to the list of waters with such a restriction. This regulation also extends the exception to the restrictions to all such specified waters and to any vessel that is owned, operated and used for official purposes by a federal, state or local governmental entity, or any vessel operating pursuant to a permit for a marine event that is requested by a federal, state or local governmental entity.

- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese introduced this item.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 471, Closure of Truckee River to Motorized Vessels, LCB File No. R139-16 as written.
- Motion passes 5-0

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

Comments will be limited to three minutes; unless you represent a group then you will be limited to six minutes. Any item requiring Board action not on this agenda may be scheduled on a future agenda. **NOTE: Please complete the Public Comment Interest - Card and submit to Vice Chair Reese.**

- Stephanie Myers brought up events of the Board of County Commissioners Meeting, BCC Agenda Item #62 - To appoint the Representative for the Public on the CCABMW. Commissioner Larry Brown moved to reappoint Brian Patterson. There was no Public Comment. She is not sure if it is a violation of the Open Meeting Law, but she feels it was patently unfair. The vote was taken. She wanted to point out that in 2013, AB176 passed to support a general public member to every CAB in the state and the intent was that that general public member be a non-consumptive user. The licensed are only 5% of the population of the State. The general public member is to support the public, the other 95%. There will be follow up on this. She feels it was extraordinarily unfair that the other six candidates were not given the chance to speak or to have anyone speak on their behalf. Talk about a rigged fixed election that was genuinely a rigged, fixed election.
- Bill Halverson, Fraternity of the Desert Big Horn, noted that at this Commission Meeting, it would be discussed that those units with less than ten tags will be closed to hunters with specialty tags. The Fraternity is in full support of the TAAHC proposal from 10/30/16 as written. They would prefer that it not affect the value of the Heritage Tag. He noted that the Heritage Tag last year was taken in unit with seven tags. The Fraternity stated that it fully supports the Department if it is necessary to restrict the Heritage Tag from a given unit.
- Daryl Sneed requested that NDOW look at Mule Deer Management plan in Elko County, and bring the numbers back up. They had three good years of precipitation. If they did video on ground, the herds are looking good. The Elko County CAB will not push it harder. Therefore, we have to bring the issue to NDOW to increase numbers.
- Paul Dixon addressed the composition of the CCABMW. He has worked with the County Commission to make sure we have a good balance on the Board. We have a seven-member board. He feels there are at least two support people who represent public on any given topic. Karen Layne filled the seat on the Commission as a non-consumptive user. Our job is to advise. We need diversity on the Board. Bill Stanley's seat will be open in December. We will probably take recommendations in January. We need diversity on board. Our board has greatest diversity. He will gladly entertain discussion of candidates for the Board to ensure diversity on the Board.
- Vice Chairman J. Michael Reese thanked NDOW for having five representatives in attendance.
- Mark Transue offered congratulations on reappointment to Brian Patterson.
- Closed public comment.

10. Authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Commission for its consideration at its November 18th and 19th, 2016 meeting in Reno, Nevada. (*For Possible Action*)

- No public comment.
- A motion was made and seconded to authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Commission for its consideration at its November 18th and 19th, 2016 meeting in Reno, Nevada.
- Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

11. The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for February 7th, 2017 in the Clark County Government Center Pueblo Room, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway to support the scheduled Wildlife Commission meeting on February 10th and 11th, 2017 in Reno, Nevada.

12. Adjournment

- Meeting was adjourned at 8:33 pm.