



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 21, 2017
Location: Clark County Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Parkway ODC-1
Las Vegas, NV 89155
Time: 5:30 pm
Board Members Present: Paul Dixon, Chair J. Michael Reese, Vice Chair Joe Luby
Howard Watts III Brian Patterson John Hiatt

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: March 15, 2017

1. Call to Order

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

2. Pledge of Allegiance

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

3. Approval of Minutes of the February 7, 2017 CCABMW Meeting (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

- Vice Chair Reese asked the Board and attendees for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of the February 7, 2017 CCABMW Meeting.
- Board Comments: None
- Public comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of February 7, 2017 CCABMW Meeting as written.
- Motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

4. **Approval of Agenda for February 7, 2017 – (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 Chair 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.
 - Item I – Change 2017 to 2018
 - Public Comment – None
 - A motion was made to approve the agenda as Amended for the March 21, 2017 Board Meeting
 - The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

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 shared that April 29th, the Nevada Firearms Coalition will hold their banquet at the Gold Coast, the Fraternity of the Desert Big Horn will hold their banquet on May 20th at the South Point, Las Vegas Woods and Waters is having their Spring Feast and Shooting Event on April 15th at the Shooting Park, Big Game applications opened yesterday due by April 17th. Brian also brought up an article, dated 12/28/16, that he was unable to discuss at the last meeting. It has to do with Mylar balloons in the desert. He feels there is nothing we can do as a Board, but on hunts, he always see balloons. He was sheep hunting and collected 248 balloons. Mylar balloons are an eye soar. On any given day, he'll pick up at least 3 balloons, once it was 14. The public probably does not realize what a mess they are. There must be something we can do. They are just flashing and shinning. It's pollution and an eye sore. Anything we can do as board or NDOW would be great.
 - John Hiatt added that Mylar balloons are conductive. If they get tangled in power line they can short it out. This is air borne litter uniformly distributed on the landscape. They are bunched together. More articles can help. He feels there should be warnings posted on balloons: "Do not release this Balloon". They are a real nuisance. In the desert pick up every balloon.
 - Mark Transue noted that every time he goes to Cold Creek he finds several.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon reminded attendees that the Commission Meeting is Friday and Saturday at the Clark County Shooting Park. He urged everyone to participate in the meeting.
 - Vice Chair Reese cited from an article in the RJ that two young men who are fishermen that live in Overton, were recognized at March's BCC meeting for saving a 52 year old woman whose car had run off the road into the river and was underwater. He also reported on the WHIN banquet where 240 people attended, and the Heritage Tag for Mule Deer went for \$145,000 and two Turkey tags sold for \$1400 each. The other Mule Deer Heritage Tag went to Salt Lake and sold for \$130K. Also, Meadow Valley Wildlife Unlimited had their Banquet last Saturday night. 475 people attended. Raised a ton of money that they will use locally. They already have two desert projects in mind. For any organizations wishing to apply, Heritage Tag application deadline is April 17th. And, Woods and Waters had 360 people at their banquet.

6. **Recap of February 10th and 11th Commission Meeting Actions (Informational)** – A recap of actions taken by the Wildlife Commission will be compared to Clark Recommendations.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon reported that
 - Black Bear Season passed unanimously with no changes to regulation.
 - Mountain Lion Harvest Limits Regulation went forward. The Commission felt the wording implied open season they did not want to consider open season. There was controversy in

discussion of Mountain Lion harvesting during cubing season. Biologists stated that lions can cub from February through the summer months. Our proposal was discussed but not taken forward. They do see that we have dissenting views, and often, a Commissioner will pick that up a discuss it.

- Big Game Seasons: there were 12 changes suggested by northern county cabs that were adjusted by the Commission. There were no major changes. Did have Big Game Seasons.
- Heritage Tag, Dream Tag, PIW passed as presented.
- Silver State supported.
- Big Game Application deadline was supported.
- Big Game Application Eligibility for Elk was set at 7 & 7, instead of the recommended 5 & 5.
- Vice Chair Reese asked what prompted that change?
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that some of the Commissioners felt that a 5 year limit would impact bull harvest, assuming that many hunters would not settle for available bulls, but would wait for the next chance at a bigger bull. People might start harvesting some smaller bulls instead of waiting 7 years.
 - The Hunting near dwellings matter was tabled
 - Guidelines for Harvest Management resulted in extensive discussion. The end result is that the Harvest Guidelines will have major changes made to the document and it will be brought back to the Commission at a later date.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon brought up the Antler spread as part of the Harvest Guidelines discussion. Some Commissioners were against that. Commissioner Valentine supported it.
 - Predation Management Plan generated much discussion on what changes are to come, areas where there would be change. Dr. Layne brought up that we have a plan sitting there when we go to the reports, we do not see the plan documents. It would be nice if you can reference section and page number so people can have a cross reference.
 - SJR1 Land Management –Congressman Amodei has a bill in Washington DC regardin transfer of federal lands to communities. He spoke to the Commission. Both Consumptive and Non Consumptive members of the public in attendance gave him a serious tongue lashing. Hard meeting to sit at. He did not defend. Over 100 people in Commission Chambers. Good report.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon did not hear discussions about transparency, appeals, or the special assistance permit as he needed to leave to catch his plane.
- Joe Luby asked if there was any discussion letting hunters have two Cow Elk Tags.
- Chairman Paul Dixon answered that the Commissioners felt they have enough seasons set to get the cow elk harvest they need, but they would consider in the TAACH Committee in the future, to see if any tags were left over, then someone else could buy one over the counter.

7. Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners March 24th and 25th, 2017 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 - 12, Migratory Game Bird Seasons, Bag Limits, and Special Regulations for Waterfowl and Webless Migratory Game Birds; Public Hunting Limited on Wildlife Management Areas and Designated State Lands – 2017- 2018 Season (For Possible Action)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about recommendations for seasons, bag limits, and special regulations for migratory game birds for 2017 - 2018 seasons and adopt regulations that comply with the proposed regulations framework for the 2017- 2018 hunting seasons on certain migratory game birds established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Commission will also consider rules regulating public hunting on Wildlife Management Areas and designated state lands.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item by reading item. No board members had comments.
- Public Comment:
- Mike Kowal referenced the Overton Management Plan, noting that some areas of the State are hunting into February. He cannot find the Federal Framework for waterfowl. What is the Federal Framework for Clark County? At Overton, we only hunt every other day so we don't get the 107 day season they allow. We generally hunt from the last day of October/ first of November. He feels the season should go a week or two into February.
- Frank Mirabelli noted that they have a second season for the youth hunt in February.
- Bennie Vann, NDOW, responded that the Federal Framework allows for four special hunts, and the seasons maximize the time allowed by the Framework. They run the seasons as late as they can. Overton only has about a 60 day hunt because of the every other day rule.
- The special hunts still fall into 107 days.
- Closed Public Comment
- A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposed Regulation 17-12 as written.
- The motion passes unanimously, 6-0.

B. Legislative Committee Report (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the following bills currently before the state legislature: AB101, SJR1, SJR11 and SB221.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic.
- SJR1 in previous session.
- Jana Wright SJR1 is a Clemency Bill from 2015 so we cannot take any action.
- Vice Chair Reese in discussion with Chairman Paul Dixon agreed that no action can be taken on SJR1 as it is from the 2015 Legislative Session. SJR11, AB101, and SB221 are part of the 2017 Legislative Session.
- Vice Chair Reese asked for Board comments on AB101.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that he had written a letter regarding AB101 addressing the wording coming out of committee. It was for protection of Big Game and it had to have federal funds. Lethal and Non Lethal were taken out. They took out the education piece, took out sage grouse, etc. Looking for money to come out of somewhere else for Sage Grouse. The Predator fee will only be for Big Game Species.
- Vice Chair Reese noted that AB101 is still sitting on the Assembly Floor.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added when the Predator Fee was first introduced, it was to be for Big Game only, but the Committee added education and small game. The impact of the bill is what they voted on. AB101 brings back to the original language. Paul Dixon disagrees with removing protection for sage grouse and other small game species. If we do not protect them with predator fees we will have problem. NDOW should determine on a yearly basis what is needed to fund programs and what percentage should be for lethal vs. non-lethal predator control projects.
- Chairman Paul Dixon supports SJR11 as it allows people to have the right to hunt and fish. He sees no harm in doing this. It will make it a little more difficult to make more changes to hunting and fishing rights, but that's a good thing. We need to maintain our rights. And it utilizes federally funded dollars.

- Chairman Paul Dixon has no opinion on SB 221.
- John Hiatt stated that, with regards to AB101, he feels that Jerry Clayborn's original bill was ill advised. When you mandate money be collected and used for killing a certain class of animals or a group of animals, you are tying the hands of biologists. In a situation where you are giving someone money and they are told to only spend it on certain things, you are creating a big problem. As to SJR11, when you put something in the constitution, then when there is a dispute about it, you will be in the courts. There is language in the bill that talks about taking animals by all traditional means. Your tradition and my tradition may not be the same. The Commission won't be deciding this, it will be the courts. Courts can make decisions you don't anticipate. He is wary of putting something into the Constitution that mandates terms like "traditional" which are ill defined terms.
- Howard Watts noted, on AB101, he went to the hearing and testified neutral on it. In out Board meetings, we have discussed dissatisfaction with where the funds are going. The legislation was not run by any sportsmen or sportsmen groups to work out some of the weird inconsistencies with the language. There is new language which is not to remove predator management, but the language is not very clear. He was hoping there would be changes to address these inconsistencies, but he is disappointed that the language not change. There are bigger things to discuss, like do we need to continue having predator management fee? Does it need to be \$3. This bill does not address this. It's like having the predator fee but turning it into a generic add-on to your application fees. Only using towards big game does not make sense. He is not in support of it right now. His opinion of SJR11, is that he thinks it does not do much of anything since we still have an authority to regulate how hunting, fishing, and trapping is conducted. Some people want to eliminate those activities in the long run. He will support it. For SB221, he has no opinion.
- Joe Luby stated that AB101 is not the bill we would like to see. The bill he would like to see is one to do away with the Predation Management Fee all together. Joe pays the fee multiple times. No one seems to be happy with it. Now we have this money, lets argue how to spend the money. How about not taking the money? Sportsmen should do for free what government employees are getting paid to do. NDOW killing 1000's of coyotes in our state every year. Sportsmen would do it for free. He would like to see a bill that does away with the predator management fee all together, then we would end all of this controversy. He does not support. He does support SJR11. Hunting and fishing is how he feeds his family. He supports having it stated in the Constitution to protect his ability to choose what his family eats. For SB221, he neutral as long as it does not come with additional revenue requirements. As long as it uses existing funding, he will support.
- Brian Patterson stated he is not adamant one way or another on any of them. Changing constitution is a pretty big deal, he would not take that lightly. Not strong one way or the other for support or nonsupport. Should not change constitution. As to the predator fee, he agrees with a lot of what Joe and Howard have said. He applies for at least 10 tags a year. It's mandatory. How money is spent, we have all argued about it. We need something in place to manage predators.
- Vice Chair Reese stated, on AB101, when you apply for a tag you pay a predator fee, but in reality, it is an application fee. You must pay for tags. It applies to tags you have to do that. You should have fund for emergency needs for habitat restoration, for example. Every year we have a fire that will burn 500K to 1 million acres. There should be a fund for restoration. We need to take a close look at everything we do. He agrees with NDOW that predator control is only good if it is strategically done. It's only effective fawning season March - July. Coyote in November is looking at small game. Quail average life span is 18 months. He feels there should be a fund for habitat and predator control. He stated further, that he takes exception to SJR11. He referenced the Second Amendment in that, if you want to defend yourself it's a right, if you want to feed yourself, it is a also a right, not a privilege. With respect to SB221, he sees it as a public education vehicle. Hug a hunter, stimulates a

question. A 30 second commercial of someone fishing. It can stimulate us to change our priorities. If it's not in our sight, we forget about it. It can be social media, commercials, etc. He is in favor of SB221.

- Public Comment:
- Mike Kowal addressed Joe Luby's comment that sportsmen would kill coyotes for free. He noted that some states have a bounty on Coyotes. With a bounty on coyotes, you give someone an incentive to go out and shoot them. Someone asked why aren't we going fishing. We are getting priced out of hunting and fishing. You need to find a way a guy can take his family out to fish. The license fees are incredible. It costs \$150 to take boat to lake. When is it going to stop. Think about our side of the costs.
- Frank Mirabelli asked if on the Predator Fee, if guy buys 10 tags, can he pay 1 fee.
- Vice Chair Reese responded that the Legislature set the fees, not NDOW.
- Stephanie Myers stated on AB101, she agrees that the Predator Fee should be abolished. Science tells us it's not effect. On SJR11, she stated that she testified at the hearing that hunting, fishing and trapping do not rise to the level of amending the constitution. Fishing and hunting are pretty well regulated, but trapping is not. SJR11 should not pass. As to SR221, if we need a hug a hunter campaign, then how about hug a hiker or hug a camper. Why do we need another layer.
- Jana Wright said that on AB101, she testified in support to get rid of 80%. She would also support getting rid of the \$3 fee. The \$3 fee at 80% is not working. Use for predator management, and habitat restoration. As to SJR11, in 2015, she testified against it because amending the constitution is a big deal. Right to hunt is in the constitution. Trapping needs to be better regulated. That is her primary objection to this Bill. She hopes it dies in this session. On SB221, she doesn't think we need another Council. There are millions of dollars in Heritage Funds. If they want to direct money to NDOW's Education Department for a commercial, that would be fine. We don't need another board. She dislikes SB221 the most.
- Mark Transue said he believes that SJR11 could go to the voters, why not let it go to the voters. He is in favor of SB221. We need more education even from outside source. People do not have any idea we have so much wildlife.
- Mike Kowal offered a rebuttal to Jana & Stephanie. Hikers don't need to pay for a license to hike. Hunters pay for what they do.
- Chairman Paul Dixon commented on SB 221 saying that we have a \$7 Million balance in the Heritage account. Hunters and hunter conservationists have paid fees into that account. It is not a public trust account. Hunters use the funds to better wildlife with matching funds. People who bought licenses and specialty tags built this account. Sportsmen should be the ones who decide how to spend the money. Having the legislature dictate how the money should be spent is wrong. Everything they do with Heritage is not lethal. Sportsmen should let NDOW manage the fund. We will lose control if we start another group to administer funds.
- Vice Chair Reese explained the source of funds in the Heritage account. For example, when a Heritage tag sold for \$145K, 75% goes into principal the other 25% goes to Heritage Fund. The available funds for Heritage Projects is the sum of any left over from the previous year, the 25% from sale of Tags the previous year, and interest on the accumulated principal. This year it was \$800K to spend on projects. There is \$8 million in the Heritage Principal.
- Brian Patterson added that the guy buying the \$145K tag is counting on the money going to the mountain. \$275K was raised on two tags. It impacts what we do for wildlife. His wife is a hiker and birder and doesn't pay anything. Dollars spent from a Sportsmen are helping everyone.
- Vice Chair Reese made a motion: oppose AB101, in favor of SJR11, and in favor of SB221.
- Howard Watts agrees with what Paul said and what some of the audience said. NDOW does education. They have already put stuff on Facebook, done pod casts. Creating a new group

dipping into Heritage Fund dollars doesn't make sense. He does not support the current motion because he does not support SB221. He also requested to amend the motion to add a statement around AB101 that reiterates removing 80% requirement and/or removing the predator fee.

- Joe Luby recommended withdrawing the motion and addressing each bill separately.
- Motion withdrawn.
- Vice Chair Reese made a motion to oppose AB101 as written. Motion was seconded.
- Joe Luby suggested adding a statement to the Wildlife Commission that says we, as the Board, would like to see the predator management fee removed completely.
- Motion and second were withdrawn.
- New motion was made and seconded to oppose AB101 and to inform the Wildlife Commission that we, as the Board, would like to see the predator management fee removed completely.
- Vice Chair Reese stated that he cannot vote for the motion. He wants to leave the \$3 fee for Sage Grouse.
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that the Heritage Fund was changed to allow lethal predator control. We can move Sage Grouse management underneath Heritage Fund. He opposes the bill as written.
- The motion passes: Aye's 5 No's 1 (Reese - Protect Sage Grouse)
- A motion was made and seconded to approve SJR11 as written.
- John Hiatt reiterated that once you put this in the constitution, the courts will be involved and the Wildlife Commission is taken out of the picture. If someone takes this to court, the court will decide what the wording means. I would worry you will get an unanticipated result which will be the opposite of what you actually intend..
- Joe Luby stated that he does not understand what John is trying to say. There are a lot of things going to court and get odd results. He would be more comfortable taking this to court, knowing the right to hunt and fish is a constitutional right.
- Motion passes: Aye's 5 No's 1 (Hiatt - should not be a constitutional amendment)
- A motion was made and seconded to oppose SB221 as written.
- Joe Luby stated that the Board was generally neutral.
- Motion passes: Aye's 4 No's 2. (Reese - we need an outreach program other than NDOW) (Patterson - need to make people more aware of issues to open up discussion)

C. **2018 and 2019 Commission Meeting Schedules (*For Possible Action*)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a schedule of meetings and locations for calendar years 2018 and 2019.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic.
- Stacy Matthews, Board Secretary, reviewed prospective CCABMW 2018 Meeting dates:
- January 23rd, March 13th, May 1st, June 19th, August 7th, September 18th, October 30th.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the dates supplied by Stacy.
- Motion passes. 6-0

D. **State Fiscal Year 2018 CAB Budget Requests (*For Possible Action*)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about their 2018 CABMW budget request.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item. The 2018 requested budget amount is \$7, 245.00 to cover travel and Administrative Support for the year.
- Public comment: No public comment.

- A motion was made and seconded to accept as proposed.
- Motion passes 6-0

E. **Second Reading, Commission Policy 26A, Transparency (*For Possible Action*)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Policy 26A, Transparency, and recommend they amend or repeal it as the policy is currently outdated and unnecessary.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that he feels this is a redundant policy that should be deleted. There was lack of transparency in 2011 and he had filed a lawsuit because of it. Since that time, the policies have become more transparent. It is no longer an issue and this policy is no longer needed.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to oppose amending CP 26A, Transparency due to redundancy and it should be removed.
- Motion passes 6-0.

F. **Commission General Regulation 466, Partnership in Wildlife (PIW) Drawing, Changes to Nonresident Restricted Deer Tag, and Changes to Big Game Return Card Questionnaire Deadline, 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 a regulation relating to amending Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). This regulation defines the term “main drawing;” revises the order in which the Silver State Tag drawing, PIW drawing and main drawings for tags are conducted; authorizes an applicant for a nonresident restricted deer tag to apply for a nonresident deer tag in the Partnership in Wildlife Drawing and the Silver State tag drawing in the same year; and revises the big game return card questionnaire deadline from 5 p.m. to 11 p.m.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item.
- Public Comment:
- Mark Transue noticed the change in the questionnaire deadline from 5pm to 11pm. Why?
- Board responses: some questionnaires still come snail mail, some people work until 5:30, etc.
- Vice Chair Reese noted that he keeps getting an email from NDOW asking for his small game questionnaire. It asks for hunter registration number, but the number on his license is not working.
- Chairman Paul Dixon migratory hunter questionnaire. Hip number, got a questionnaire.
- Vice Chair Reese stated that a couple of people in audience indicated they had same issue.
- Frank Mirabelli said he keeps getting a dove and water fowl questionnaire with no question about dove. He sent in the questionnaire on computer got another request.
- Vice Chair Reese a ton of comments that the deadline was 11 pm at night so they want them all consistent.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve CGR 466 as written.
- Motion passes 5-0 Abstained - 1 (Patterson)

G. **Commission Regulation 17 - 05, Amendment #1, Big Game Seasons 2017 – 2018, Nonresident Desert (Nelson) Bighorn Ewe Hunts (*For Possible Action*)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about an Amendment to the 2017 - 2018 Big Game Hunting Seasons and Dates, to specifically address nonresident Desert (Nelson) Bighorn ewe hunts that were inadvertently omitted at the February Commission meeting.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this topic noting that this was left off last meeting.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve as written.
- Motion passes 6-0

H. California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges Request for Up to 20 Wild-trapped Greater Sage Grouse Per Year for Up to Three Years for Translocation to the Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuge in California (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will discuss and make recommendations about a request from the Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges and the California Department of Wildlife to capture and translocate up to 20 greater sage-grouse per year for up to three years for translocation to the Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuge.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item.
- Brian Patterson asked will 20 a year do any good? Is 20 enough to augment a population anywhere?
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that he believes they have to determine if there is a predation issue. You will only lose 20 birds if there are any issues.
- Vice Chair Reese noted that California removed the hunters off of their wildlife board. He has a hard time giving birds to someone who does not have sportsmen managing wildlife.
- John Hiatt offered that it is to everyone's benefit to have sage grouse spread as wide as possible. The birds need to come from very similar habitats.
- Joe Luby asked who pays for the trapping and transport.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that whoever requests the transplant pays all fees up front.
- Public Comment:
- Mark Transue believes we don't have enough birds to begin with. Why should we give anything to California? No way! Why give something we don't have enough of.
- Mike Kowal remembered hearing sage grouse were threatened. Why are we giving them away? Can we get something out of it more than covering costs of capture and transport?.
- Frank Mirabelli we are giving them something we are short of. Why give something we are short of to anyone else, especially California.
- Steve Linder, Las Vegas Woods and Waters, offered that if the area where they are being move to is conducive to breeding and they increase the population, we can potentially borrow back. It would be like a hatchery with the ability to get them back, should we need to in the future.
- Close public comment.
- Howard Watts noted that in contrast with the hundreds of birds we harvest each year, capturing 60 to move and establish a population is not a big deal.
- Brian Patterson asked why are we not moving birds around in our own state. It's only 60 birds over three years. If it is a relocation, they will collar them and study them. It is a good idea to support this.
- Joe Luby supports this.
- Vice Chair Reese is opposed to this. Why are we not growing these in our state. He objects to a Department with no sportsmen on their board trying to do this stuff. Is this being done to feed predators. In favor of increasing the sage grouse population. He agrees with Brian that transfer our birds within our own state.
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that last year's sage grouse harvest was in the thousands. Taking 20 birds is not going to hurt us. NDOW is trying to determine if California has the right environment, predator issues we will know. The likelihood they will translocate additional birds will be zero if all the birds die. He added that we can do a Heritage Project to

translocate sage grouse in our state, but nobody has put one in. He is in support of this plan. When we kill a thousand or more birds in a year, 20 birds are not going to be missed.

- John Hiatt commented that this is about birds not California politics. The biggest problem here is habitat to support the birds. California has habitat and needs birds, where we have birds and are losing habitat. He supports this.
- Vice Chair Reese asked do we have too much Sage Grouse?
- John Hiatt said we have habitat loss. We have birds here, we need to let them flourish.
- A motion was made and seconded to accept the request from California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges Request for Up to 20 Wild-trapped Greater Sage Grouse Per Year for up to Three Years for Translocation to the Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuge in California.
- Motion passes: Aye's 5 No's 1 (Reese - no Sportsmen on the Wildlife board in California)

I. Wildlife Damage Management Committee Report and Fiscal Year 2018 Draft Predation Management Plan (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the proposed Fiscal Year 2018 Predator Management Plan.

- Vice Chair Reese introduced this item.
- John Hiatt commented that the document is poorly written. Almost incomprehensible.
- Public Comment
- Jana Wright stated that it doesn't seem like the department took anything we said to heart. There is going to be a Wildlife Damage Committee Meeting on Thursday. She is very disappointed with the plan and that they ignored our comments.
- Closed Public Comment
- Vice Chair Reese with respect to Project 32 (Page 17) Comments from FY2016 Predator Report "None".
- Bennie Vann, NDOW, offered that one of the Projects for Overton, just started.
- Vice Chair Reese stated that a lot of money and emphasis spent in Overton, and it shows.
- Vice Chair Reese also pointed out Project 22-074 with no comments from FY2016 Predator Report.
- Chairman Paul Dixon summarized that the report does not tell us anything.
- Howard Watts seconded what Vice Chair Reese said: we made very specific comments. There are multitudes of ongoing projects. We made the same comments a year ago. To add comments and say none is unbelievable. Just cross reference reports so we can have a quick reference of the outcomes from before so we can continue funding on projects. The fact that we must dig up a separate report to justify expenses. We asked for rough break down of how the funds are being spent. A few general categories, that is not there. Those two things alone, we asked for this at last meeting, brought up these critiques before, is a breaking point for him.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that this is proof we are doing things with predator fees, yet we have no measurable results reported. If we had measurable results we can get Pittman-Robinson federal dollars.
- Vice Chair Reese requested that Paul raise this issue during public comment supposing Tony Wasley was to ask Pat Johnson, which one project was the most successful and why was it so successful. The answer should have appeared in this document.
- Brian Patterson feels this is a slap in the face.
- Paul Dixon we are not spending our dollars in any demonstrable results. We have nothing measurable. Keep giving us money and we will spend it.
- John Hiatt stated most of the document is a cut and paste. The narrative is exactly the same. We have not even been out there to see it, but here's what we are going to do! Project 21-02 is totally incomprehensible. They propose to send people out to see what anti-perch devices are

in place. This is ridiculous! Just ask the power company. He is embarrassed for the department.

- A motion was made and seconded to adamantly oppose the 2018 plan as written. Paul will add comments: lack of comments, previously reports, incomprehensible, cost break down is not there.
- Motion passes 6-0

8. 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.

- Michael Kowal feels Hunter Education needs to be revised. We had issues with water fowl misidentification, 20 minutes would help. Heritage Funds who determines where it goes, how does that work. We have so many hunters we are not getting our fair share. Habitat needs work. Operating budget is way low, these funds need to go to Overton.
- Stephanie Myers stated her understanding that the goal of the Board is to gather public comment and pass that on to the Wildlife Commission. She feels that it should become a standard practice to not only supply the votes from the Board, but also to add comments and dissenting opinions on the report from the Clark County Advisory Board. Should be a regular practice.
- Jana Wright clarified that the NRS does not require that the Chair attend the Commission Meeting in person, but that any board member can represent them at that particular meeting.
- Closed public comment.

9. Authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Commission for its consideration at its March 24th and 25th, 2017 meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada. (*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 Commission for its consideration at its March 24th and 25th, 2017 meeting in Las Vegas, NV.
- Motion passed unanimously 6-0.
- Chairman Paul Dixon will send these out to the Board members tonight. Board members please forward comments to Mike for submittal to Suzanne.

10. The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for May 9th, 2017 in the Clark County Government Center Pueblo Room, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway to support the scheduled Wildlife Commission meeting on May 12th and 13th, 2017 in Reno, Nevada.

11. Adjournment

- Meeting was adjourned at 7:52 pm.