



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: October 26, 2017
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 John Hiatt Brian Patterson
William Stanley Dave Talaga Howard Watts III

Excused: J. Michael Reese, Vice Chair

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: October 23, 2017

1. Call to Order

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

2. Pledge of Allegiance

- Chairman Paul Dixon requested all stand and asked Howard Watts III to lead the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.
- Chairman Paul Dixon announced the actions taken in the BCC meetings 10/4 and 10/17 where he was reappointed for another 3-year term, and he introduced Dave Talaga, the newest appointee to the Board. He asked Dave to share some of his background with the attendees.
- Dave Talaga stated that he was born in Bay City Michigan, grew up in Auburn Michigan, Father of 3, and Grandfather of 5. Grew up near 50 sq miles of forest. Started hunting, trapping, and fishing when he was 10. Hunted or trapped mostly Cotton Tail rabbits and pheasants. He considers himself an amateur woodsman. Left Michigan in 1978, went to Indiana, then Texas, then New York where he lived for about 30 years. Moved to Nevada in 2014. While in New

York, he hunted and fished all over and obtained his Coast Guard certified Captain's license. Started building long range guns and reloading. Moved to Vegas as the Director of Sales for an international pump company. Then assumed the role of GM. Is now working in Real Estate. His Son has since moved here with his family. He can't imagine living anywhere else. He loves having this opportunity and looks forward to being an asset on the Board.

3. **Approval of Minutes of the September 19, 2017 CCABMW Meeting (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)**
 - Chairman Paul Dixon asked the Board and attendees for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of the September 19, 2017 CCABMW Meeting.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon noted that the Secretary, Stacy Matthews had received some emails requesting corrections. Stacy read those requested corrections for the record.
 - Board Comments: None
 - Public comment: None
 - A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of September 19, 2017 CCABMW Meeting as with corrections as noted.
 - Motion passed 6-0.

4. **Approval of Agenda for October 26, 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.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic
 - Board comments: None
 - Public Comments: None
 - A motion was made to approve the agenda as written.
 - Motion passed unanimously. 6-0

5. **CCABMW Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence: (*Informational*)** CCABMW members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the CCABMW. Any item requiring CCABMW action will be scheduled on a future CCABMW agenda. CCABMW board members may discuss any correspondence sent or received. (CCABMW board members must provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record).
 - Brian Patterson noted there will be the Mule Deer Foundation banquet Saturday, November 4th at the Italian American Club.
 - John Hiatt shared that there are interesting things happening in other parts of west regarding access to public lands across private lands. It is a problem in Northern Nevada. He cited a recent court case in Montana that found that unless private land owner has been requiring permission to cross private line for at least five years, then there is an inherent right for the public to continue to use established trails to access public land across private land.
 - Bill Stanley noted that the Southern Nevada Sportsmen 9/30 trap shoot at shooting park Raised money for Clay Breakers.
 - Brian Patterson added that he had read about a moose population in Northern Nevada. He asked if we need to get the population listed.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon speculated that they migrated from Idaho or Utah. He said he had seen one during Elk hunting in Utah. He will ask NDOW about the Moose.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon pointed out to the other Board Members that when we attend Wildlife Committee Meetings during Public Comment, feel free to give your personal opinion. CAB Comment should be just what the CAB voted on, not your personal opinion. Be clear if representing your personal position or the CAB position.

- Chairman Paul Dixon highlighted what has been going on with Sportsmen's Access Rights Group (SAR). SAR and Tony Wasley (NDOW) have ensured that hunters have access to the Ellison Ranch. Every hunter that goes on the property gets a guide on the ranch. The ranch owner states there are no Elk on the ranch, they have never seen an Elk on the ranch, yet they are receiving incentive tags. It has been very controversial dealing with hunter access rights across private property. If you received incentive tags or compensation tags, you must allow sportsmen access to your property. Tony Wasley took this on personally and is making sure access is for everyone. He noted that on Ellison Ranch there are old settlement ruins that even non-hunters should have access to. If they are receiving tags, people should have access.
- Bill Stanley clarified that the Assemblyman is not the owner of Ellison Ranch.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that he had received from the Nevada Lands Council a write-up they had resubmitted regarding the Wild Horse and Burro Act. Their concern is reduced funding for BLM to manage the horses, along with the events at T Pickens Ranch and the disaster at Cold Creek where a lot of horses had to be euthanized due to disease. People in Washington are again talking about Wild Horses. He expects that over the next year there will be changes to help get the horse problem under control. In Nevada, we have maybe 80% of the wild horses in the US. We house them and take care of them. We have had an extended drought, and horses have been hard on landscape.
- John Hiatt added that most of the members of Congress do not have wild horses in their district, but they have wild horse advocates in their district. For them, there is a downside to vote for euthanasia or sale without restriction, etc. They vote how constituents want them to vote. There are more Representatives like them than there are ones with wild horses. This is a difficult problem!
- Chairman Paul Dixon said he tried to describe to people in the South what the horses are going through in Nevada. They don't comprehend how horses are suffering. He wants management of horses to change in a positive way for the horses.

6. **Recap of September 22nd and 23rd Commission Meeting Actions (*Informational*)** A recap of actions taken by the Wildlife Commission will be compared to CCABMW Recommendations.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic stating that he did not attend the meeting. He asked John Hiatt to summarize since John had attended.
 - To the surprise of everyone there the Commissioners voted to ban reptile collection.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon said banning it does not fix the issue, there is no way to repair what's been lost.
 - John Hiatt noted that Commissioner Brad Johnston was swayed by seeing all of the Pitfall Traps, and how much inadvertent deaths of reptiles there were due to those traps.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon stated that we don't have an active program to remove the Pitfall Traps so reptile deaths will continue.
 - John Hiatt responded that BLM is working on that area and they know where the majority of them are located. The reptile collection data GIS locator information seems to correlate closely with where the traps are located. One could use that data and reverse engineer it so you can figure out where they are. He added that even though it is one family operating the collection business, they are not organized or coordinated. There is practically no communication between factions of the family, and very apparent hard feelings between them.
 - Bill Stanley asked where the other CABS opinions on this issue.
 - John Hiatt responded that Gil Yanuck, Carson City, was the only CAB member that made some comments.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon added that all of the CABS decided it should be regulated, no one choose banning it.

7. Action Items:

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners November 3rd and 4th, 2017 meeting agenda, as well as additional items brought forth to the CCABMW from the public for discussion. CCABMW agenda & support materials are available upon request to Stacy Matthews (702) 455-2705 or smatthews@co.clark.nv.us. The final Commission agenda & support at http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Agenda/.

A. Commission General Regulation 475, Shed Antlers (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to amending Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). This regulation prohibits a person from collecting shed antlers at any time during a year unless the shed antlers are collected by the person from the field from April 15 to December 31, inclusive, of that year.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item stating that he spoke with Corey Lytle. He said that sportsmen from White Pine and Lincoln Counties got together with Game Warden John Anderson and looked at Shed Antlers and Trail Cameras and came up with recommendations. Those recommendation have been made available to the Board and attendees.
- Board Comments:
- Dave Famiglietti asked for clarification between the hand-out and what is on the website.
- Chairman Paul Dixon opened the discussion reading from the Draft Regulation "A person shall not collect shed antlers at any time during a year unless the shed antlers are collected by the person from the field from April 15 to December 31, inclusive, of that year. As used in the section 'collect' means to gather, stockpile, or possess shed antlers".
- Chairman Paul Dixon asked Paul Hearn of NDOW if he had read the proposal. He had not.
- Chairman Paul Dixon voiced his concern over the use of "possess". The only reason people collect them is to possess them.
- John Hiatt voiced his belief about regulations, they should be concise, clear, and understandable. This regulation is not, and that is true of other regulations. If I want to shoot elk, I need a tag and a hunting license. Commercial shed antler collectors pay no fee, no permit etc needed. If NDOW is managing wildlife for the people of Nevada, have a permit and pay a fee.
- Howard Watts III said he has seen commercial collection in the eastern part of the state. His question is what the behavior is causing the problems. He's hearing about the pressure and stress on the animals. That would be more with winter collection. He said he has been hiking and scouting in early April and been lucky to pick up sheds. Commercial collection is the issue.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that like mineral collection, NDOW should be able to put limit on the shed antlers commercially over this time period. Then it becomes an enforcement issue.
- Howard Watts III further stated that hobbyists should be able to collect when they are out and about. The State should only regulate commercial collection and have a fee. This would generate a more detailed regulatory process. But when it comes to enforcement, it will be easier to enforce. If we have framework for commercial collection, bust a couple of people for not following the regulation and they will fall in line with new framework. There is an issue with Commercial collection with damaging habitat and pressuring wildlife.
- Brian Patterson tends to agree with Howard. Utah has a season date established which forces people to Nevada, the wild, Wild West, where there are no restrictions on commercial

collection. He echoed what Howard said about enforcement and more regulation, and defining what constitutes commercial collection. Like fishing limits. If you have nine, you're ok, but if you have 10, that's another story. You can be a commercial guy but look like a hobbyist. There will always be a loop hole. 99% of what we talk about becomes an enforcement issue. He feels the wording on this needs to be cleaned up a little.

- Bill Stanley feels the issue has always been get the pressure off the animals when they are most stressed. That has not changed. How do you regulate that people pick them up when hunting. How do you delineate what is commercial vs personal.
- John Hiatt interjected that when you have guys on ATVs running a grid search with shed piles forming, you can assume this is not just happenstance.
- Bill Stanley continued stating that this is a resource of the state. It is not unreasonable to have folks contribute to management wildlife and other resources of the state when they are benefiting financially from it. It would mean a Statue change, but that's not impossible to do just to require some type of permitting. How many pounds, tons, etc. puts pressure on law enforcement. He doesn't see the value of it.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said it is simple write a regulation pay a fee have a limit as commercial vs hobbyist. More than two horns in the field then you are not a hobbyist and need a permit. Shed collecting tends to occur during wettest months of the year and vehicles tear up the roads. The other problem is disturbing wildlife during this, their most fragile time. However, due to the elk herd populations we are hunting Elk until January 31. We should end Elk hunting December 31st. To stop resource issue, issue permits as a way to pay for shed, establish tonnage and a range of dates. If you are in the field with more than two sheds, you must have a permit.
- Dave Talaga noted that based on research he has done on this, some of the practices collectors use include stringing wires across runs, or male shed cages of wire to get them to jam into the wires to break off antlers. That has not been mentioned. Is shed hunting so important in Nevada that it cannot be done away with from January 1 to April 15th.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that commercial collectors want to get shed while they are fresh. Usually after deep snow late Feb/March/early April time frame. You want to get the fresher the better. They create huge ruts on the road.
- Dave Talaga asked are we talking about Deer.
- Chairman Paul Dixon answered no, we're talking about Elk. If you drop the season it will impact other things.
- Dave Talaga asked for clarification that this is about business.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded yes. So, if you are going to collect as commercial collectors, you should have license.
- John Hiatt said a kid should be able to pick up an antler any time. Regulate commercial people and let everyone else be considered a hobbyist.
- Dave Talaga asked if the regulation says no commercial shed collecting, how does that get enforced.
- Paul Hearn, NDOW, responded that it would depend on language of the regulation. Group of guys vs a father and son, where a group of guys are riding ATVs, they may be taking it to the next level.
- Dave Talaga noted that the language is too vague.
- Chairman Paul Dixon suggested the Board draft language we want to present, language to regulate commercial collectors and allow hobbyist collection that cannot be abused. Or simply state the objective of the regulation and see what comes back.
- Public Comment:
- Dave Famiglietti commended Howard and John on their views. His club (Las Vegas Woods and Waters) will agree with you 100%. They don't condone extreme collection methods. Personal collection should not be affected by a regulation. Much of the problem would be

solved if there was a way to enforce the laws that are already there. Personal collectors are not harassing the wildlife. They are hiking and scouting, and enjoying the outdoors. Stricter regulation for commercial collecting or an outright ban would stop use of close line, road damage, and herd damage. The only people who read the regulation are the sportsmen, and the regulation ends up punishing the law abiding citizens.

- Jana Wright stated that this regulation was brought up because Utah has a season and collectors are coming to Nevada. She is in support of the department's regulation to have a season, and a period you cannot collect. Law enforcement has discretion on whether they cite somebody or not.
- Cody Boor asked Paul Hearn, NDOW, how often, or have you ever come across a commercial shed collector vs a person.
- Paul Hearn, NDOW, responded that it would be hard to determine since they come across so infrequently.
- Cody Boor added that he saw a show that followed collectors. Some days they collect three sheds, other days maybe 15. A regulation like this would be hard to enforce.
- Jelindo Tiberti asked law enforcement for 2017 in the southern region only, how many harassment violations have been reported?
- Paul Hearn, NDOW, does not have any information.
- Jelindo Tiberti further stated that if there are current laws why we are putting another law in place.
- Mark Transue agreed with Jelindo, if you make more laws, it puts more work on the enforcement guys. They have trouble keeping up as it is. Why put more on them?
- Julius Fortuna, Nevada Firearms Coalition (NVFAC), stated that creating restrictive new laws on private use on national public land while providing questionable proof points on the negative wildlife effects troubles him. We have successful multiple use laws that did not come by accident. Congress directed federal changes in 1960. Multiple use means that for every citizen we have the right to be there. Not only for ranchers, or timber rights, for all of us. Whether using sheds to make money, it is not different than using multiple use in general. This could affect everything we do in general. Law abiding citizens who break no other law will be restricted. Our public lands are for everyone. Restricting multiple use goes against my rights.
- Close Public Comment
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that trying to regulate how much people collect, etc., the permit would serve to educate the commercial collectors. The fees would not make much impact. The permit would ensure the collector knows this is the time period to collect, how to respect the area. It will also serve to define commercial collection. Trappers need a license to trap on public land. If you are stockpiling antlers, you are a commercial collector and you need a permit. If there is a season for commercial collection, it's up to the discretion of law enforcement as to whether you qualify as a commercial collector. There should be no season for personal collection. If you see someone chasing an Elk that is a law enforcement issue. Dad and son should be able to pick up.
- Brian Patterson stated that we are all in agreement that we don't want wildlife harassed. We should do a season date that matches Utah. Leave it up to law enforcement to enforce the shed regulation. Let law enforcement decide if there is an issue. Follow Utah will fix issue on eastern border.
- Howard Watts III said that even a hobbyist who finds 4 sheds in a day, can find someone to buy them. People are making a lot of money on selling antlers especially a matched pair. The wording is weird, but it bans collecting for everyone. What if we get to where collection does not cause damage and harassment of the herd? Then, possibly, restrictions on hobbyists could be revisited. Commercial collectors should be permitted, educated and regulated. For now, he recommends to add season dates.

- Dave Talaga stated that if he were tasked to write the regulation language, where would he direct the language? Clearly toward reducing stress on herd and habitat. To do that he would have to minimize the people who do the most damage. That would be the commercial collectors. He would also have to take into account the personal collector and how much time they spend in the field, etc. The goal is to take pressure off of the herd. In trying to craft the language, we are not punishing commercial collectors, we just need to limit their access during certain times of the year. That seems to be what we are trying to accomplish.
- Bill Stanley noted that we were trying to do something and now we expanded in four other areas that seem cool. We want to take away pressure on herd and take other steps in the future. He agrees with Brian, just set a season.
- John Hiatt stated that to him this is a resource impact issue, and the impact to animals and habitat with soft roads. The impact on Warden and enforcement is negligible. When they come across someone like this, he has another tool to address the issue.
- A motion was made and seconded to set a Shed Antler collecting season from April 15th to December 31st same as Utah to eliminate time frame we don't want impact on wildlife.
- Chairman Paul Dixon collect means to gather, stockpile or possess. Second.
- John Hiatt stated that possess is a bad word.
- Chairman Paul Dixon set a season for Shed Antler Collecting from April 15th to December 31st outside season you cannot collect which means gather or stockpile. (Dates need to match with Utah) Second.
- John Hiatt feels there should be an exception for someone who sees an antler and picks it up.
- Howard Watts III suggested that the intent of the CAB is in that regard. That should be in our motion or include in comments to commission. Lenience with law enforcement for casual hobbyists.
- Bill Stanley drew a parallel with fishing. Kids fishing who don't have a license that is not an excuse you are an amateur fisherman. The law says you need a fishing license. Make it simple, during this time of year, if you find an antler, drop it. Law enforcement will enforce. Make it zero tolerance. Match Utah for season dates. There will be fewer folks in field because there will be a wider area for Shed Antlers and Utah people.
- John Hiatt agrees with the motion, but feels that opportunistic collecting is not addressed.
- Chairman Paul Dixon if people are stopped by a NDOW Game Warden, they can take the shed from the person.
- Dave Talaga read from the Utah Department of Wildlife Resources. Antler Gathering Ethics Course is required, Shed Antlers or horns, one Feb 1 – April 15th while collecting Antlers or Sheds, a free certificate for completing the annual course must be on your person.
- Brian Patterson then in our state there is no issue from Feb 1st – April 15th in Utah.
- Dave Talaga caution total ban will result in some negative feedback.
- Bill Stanley stated that most people that are ethical are not on 4 wheeler are not running towards animals. We are not talking about sportsmen, but those who don't enjoy those types of lifestyles. These people are usually not on a trail, and they are destroying forest areas.
- Brian Patterson said there is duck season, deer season, we need shed season.
- Howard Watts III called for a vote.
- Motion passed 6-0.

- B. Commission General Regulation 440, Trail Cameras and Other Devices, LCB File No. R012-16 (For Possible Action)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider a regulation relating to amending Chapter 503 of the Nevada Administrative Code. The proposed regulation change is intended to restrict the use of motion and heat sensing cameras that are left for a period of time, and not held in the hand. The proposed

language would prohibit (with certain exemptions) the use of trail cameras within 200 feet of a spring, water hole, or artificial basin from Aug. 1 to Dec. 31 of each year. The proposed language would further prohibit the use of transmitting trail cameras at any location from Aug. 1 to Dec. 31 of each year. The Commission held a workshop on March 25, 2016 and directed the Department to revise previously drafted language prohibiting the use of trail cameras only for the purposes of scouting or hunting.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item discussing the technology change in recent years and the ways they are being exploited today. Trail cameras now use infrared rather than flash, they transmit images and can stream live action, can mark the GPS location and date a photo was taken. Big game photos from trail cameras have become a commodity. There is an ethics concern here. We don't commercialize our wildlife. When you are selling photos of where the wildlife is, you are selling wildlife. Every water source in Nevada has a camera on it. In some cases as many as 35 cameras on a water source. We now have an issue with Guides in the Muddies. They live stream the Big Horn Sheep. A Guide will sell a picture to someone with a tag. How do you stop the person who is showing his kids a photo of wildlife vs the guys with 700 cameras selling to the highest bidder? Do we want Trail Cameras in the field during the hunting season that now runs from August 1st thru January 31st? The language in this in this proposed regulation is very convoluted.
- Dave Talaga asked about the limit of 200 feet from a water source, who came up with that?
- Chairman Paul Dixon answered that he believes it comes from law enforcement for camping, etc. near a spring, hunting off roads, etc.
- Paul Hearn, NDOW, said he would need to ask, it has been long tradition.
- John Hiatt noted that depending on the location of a spring with respect to surrounding terrain, in a canyon, for instance, you can have a trail camera a distance from a spring and still see the animals that use it. He feels the 200 foot distance is rather arbitrary.
- Chairman Paul Dixon knows of people archery hunting that have to be fairly close to a water source, that have had people change out their cameras while they are sitting in their blind. The upside of trail cameras if you are a guide, is your ability to market animals.
- John Hiatt said he feels that even for a guide, there should be some rules of fair chase, to put in trail camera on every water spring is not fair chase.
- Dave Talaga asked if John was referring to live streaming or photos.
- John Hiatt responded both.
- Brian Patterson noted that for live stream, you would need cell reception. Not many areas have cell reception.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that in Southern Nevada, if you get on top of any mountain you will probably have cell reception. He added that he knows people who use cameras for educational purposes. Hard to regulate. You need regulation that allows no camera use or do nothing.
- Dave Talaga said that agreed with Paul that we are talking about technology that is moving into the field in a big way. He looked at sites Paul is talking about. He reluctantly agrees that a minimalist approach might be good start but we need to reevaluate down the road. Eventually we will have to write language that allows some use at some times.
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that we are fast approaching the point when cell towers are not needed. GPS uplink is getting more reasonable.
- Bill Stanley said that there is an impact to wildlife in getting to a resource called water. The commercial aspect one piece of it. There are places that people are going in and out of water sources so frequently they are impacting access to water which is stressing wildlife. He again addressed fair chase. He feels use of trail cameras violates fair chase, and they are impacting animals around water. This is not what true sportsmen do.

- Howard Watts III stated that he aligns with Bill: just say no; keep it simple. Trail cameras that are transmitting are absolutely violating fair chase, period. He feels we need to draw the line before there are more cell towers, more uploads of animals at a water source.
- Public Comment:
- Dave Famiglietti acknowledged the fact that there are a lot of negatives associated with trail cameras. He added that any information gained before the seasons start is of no value for the late season hunts. If you think that because you have a trail camera picture, you are going to shoot this deer, guess again. You have to think of range animals cover. They are not sleeping next to water. It is a tool to allow them time to scout. As to fair chase, transmitting pictures is a tool serving a purpose. Some responsible game management. The youth hunt parents are the worst abusers. They are shooting immature bucks. Only 1 in 49 states regulate trail cameras. That one state has seasons. The one piece of wording in the proposal he agrees with is access to water, and not disturbing game. Hiking four times a month to a water source, versus hunters checking trail cameras, both activities disturb game. People hike to falls, springs, etc. Target the problem, don't blanket punish the people.
- Cody Boor stated that he was unaware as a hunter and someone who uses trail cameras of online sites. Rather than outlawing cameras, why not make it illegal for photos or videos to be sold on any site. Instead of no trail cameras for anyone, go after the problem. Don't screw over everyone.
- Julius Fortuna said that he agrees with Dave Famiglietti. He will challenge this Board and the Commission to look at the Multiple Use Act of 1960 that regulates BLM and the Forest Service. In reviewing that ACT you will see that additional laws and regulations will not solve the problem and are perhaps illegal. The abusive types with camera, etc., should be penalized by law enforcement. We should not be penalized as sportsmen. We cannot be at risk of breaking the law in our own public lands. If they are not breaking the law, not being abusive, not impacting wildlife, don't create a law or regulation to impact them. Do not change the law for those using this in a fair way.
- Jelindo Tiberti agreed that it shouldn't be too restrictive on trail camera use, but he agrees that there should be a setback distance for a single source water source like a guzzler, something like the current camping regulations. This should not be viewed as a simple issue and outlaw cameras across the state.
- Public Comment Closed.
- Brian Patterson sees this as a progression of technology. We are talking about limiting the use of another tool. What Mr. Fortuna said about multiple use is true, it is public land for everyone. How can we block the ability to use land as a US citizen.
- Howard Watts III said he is totally for multiple use. Grazing is multiple use and is permitted and regulated, hunting and fishing is multiple use that is permitted and regulated, so coming up with smart restrictions does not conflict with multiple use. We had conversation about electronically controlled rifles where it takes marksmanship out of the equation. If you can use trail camera and you get a live image of an animal while sitting in a tent or in a motel, and then you can go out to pursue that animal, with no scouting or stalking. That is a destruction of fair chase. He feels the proposed regulation states what he believes is fair and appropriate.
- John Hiatt stated that fair chase is a big issue. To say we can use any technology we dream up, the next step is using live streaming to locate the animal and direct a remote gun to take the animal. This is supposed to be a sport and we should keep some sporting aspects to it. Selling live streaming is taking away fair chase.
- Dave Talaga said the fair chase is fair chase, and technology is a new thing and we have to deal with it. The question is, how you regulate technology so you don't encroach on fair chase. Transmitting a still photo to a cell phone or computer and then going out into the field, is not an easy find and shoot the animal. The live streaming video with a quadrant of cameras set up in a field you are familiar with, where you can see the field and you know you can set

yourself up and be confident you can harvest an animal. That is a violation of fair chase. Do not want to take away a tool from hunters, we just don't want to give an unfair advantage to outfitters and guides that can guarantee a trophy animal and wipe out a whole herd of trophy animals. He is not in favor of a blanket ban on the use of trail cameras. More thought needs to go into an equitable regulation.

- Bill Stanley reminded everyone that the use of helicopters and airplanes to spot animals and transmit their location to hunters for decades. This violates fair chase.
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that the Governors' tag for mule deer and elk for the past five years have all been well documented on a guide's trail cameras. Given there are 2 Million people in this County, there are more non-hunters using trail cameras than there are hunters. Hunter ethics are impossible to regulate. If they are not doing fair chase, this community has to put pressure on them to change. Trying to regulate trail camera use will be difficult. So many people use trail cameras that are not in hunting community. The big commercial groups put out a lot of cameras and hire people to manage them. The mule deer that Blake Sartini shot this year, probably a 280/290 deer, was found with trail cameras. Unless they are having an impact on animals or habitat, this will be hard to enforce. He is in favor of a set up distance set by NDOW for camping. Put how close you can put cameras to a water source. Hard to regulate. The people who are doing wrong now, will continue doing it wrong. Dark web pictures will still be sold. We don't have cyber-crimes unit at NDOW.
- Howard Watts III said we need to take to position to educate people on how to behave ethically. These cameras that can transmit images, it is a technological innovation that is eroding fair chase. There are cameras that are not used for hunting. We need a take a stand and have language in the books to engage in that process. When technology advances further we will need to pull back further.
- John Hiatt feels laws help people behave ethically. Regulations are needed to help people with what is ethical for the greater community. Protection of animals is vital. It is also important to know that these regulation apply to the whole State and not just 20 miles outside of Las Vegas. In Lincoln County and White Pine County, most cameras are set by hunters. He has an issue with live streaming cameras.
- A motion was made and seconded to accept as written. Approve LCB File No. R012-16 as written.
- Motion failed 3-3
- A new motion was made and seconded to accept LCB File No. R012-16 striking exemption 1.b
- Brian Patterson asked what that achieves.
- Bill Stanley responded that it allows use during hunting season.
- Brian Patterson sought further clarification as to the intent of the motion.
- Motion and second withdrawn.
- Dave Talaga offered that using trail cameras is ok as long as they do not transmit real time video or images for the intent for tracking a particular animal. He does not want to impede hunters who have images of animals. Do not want to impede hunters who pay for the tag and hunt ethically. He offered language he would use for a motion: that restricts the use of cameras that transmit real time video or images.
- John Hiatt stated that the Board's job is to advise the Wildlife Commission. We should recommend elements we would like to see them incorporate into the language.
- Chairman Paul Dixon feels that putting a season on trail camera use is futile. The Trail Camera Board will eat you alive. We don't want people putting cameras on water holes because it disrupts animals.
- John Hiatt here are the elements we need to see incorporated into:

- A new motion was made and seconded to recommend that no trail cameras are to be permitted adjacent to or within 200 feet of a waterhole, and no cameras are permitted that are transmitting live feed.
- Brian Patterson sees the intent, but how do we enforce? How will law enforcement know what is transmitting vs non-transmitting?
- Chairman Paul Dixon said transmitting cameras have antennas.
- Brian Patterson is worried we are putting more and more on law enforcement.
- Motion passes 5-1 (Brian Patterson opposed)

C. **Predation Management Fiscal Year 2017 Report (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the annual Predation Management Status Report (Status Report) detailing results of the previous fiscal year's projects.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- John Hiatt noted 2500 Ravens killed met objective. He also commented on the Big Horn Sheep and Mountain Lions, in that collars should be put on Mountain Lions for predation plan to see what they kill rather than on the Sheep and wonder what happened.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said the collars on the sheep are providing other information, such as migration
- Howard Watts III remarked that twice a year there is a report and a plan, and they are separate documents. He has already expressed his frustration with the documents. When the Report says populations are improving, you have to reference projects in a different plan. Now there is an appendix on line you have to use to cross reference, and it has links to additional documents. He continually has asked that the documents need to be in the report. He agreed with John Hiatt that we should be doing as much as we can to see the effect on predation. One of the Coyote removal projects reported 3 Big Horn sheep killed by Lions. The funding balance is going up every year. Sometime soon, we need to have a conversation about the predator fee and make a recommendation to Commission on how we feel about it.
- Brian Patterson commented that this is a terribly put together document. There is no summary of results, no indication we are making headway, progress toward achieving a goal. They should summarize in half a page. We need more detail.
- John Hiatt defended NDOW saying that wildlife issues are multi-faceted. No way to simply decide if making progress in this issue. In some cases, progress is addressed.
- Brian Patterson noted in the discussion about Ravens, they found 48 nests on a 110 mile line. Why not pull eggs and baby Ravens to get rid of two Ravens per nest. It would be a lot cheaper that \$400 + per bird as stated in another project.
- Bill Stanley responded that if you do that, the PhD student doesn't have anything to write his dissertation on.
- Brian Patterson added it's not necessary to spend \$30K for Mountain Lion removal when sportsmen will do it for an eighth of that.
- Chairman Paul Dixon suggested the Board could approve and request more detail on report. Look at back up on line you can get more information, but you still cannot answer the questions Brian is asking.
- Brian Patterson stated that he pays up to \$39 a year in predations fees on the tags he applies for. What is he getting for his money?
- Public Comment:
- Julius Fortuna said the document contains only one project for Mule Deer. For sportsmen and CABMW members this should scare you. 85% of money being spent outside of the species. There are five Big Horn sheep projects. We once had 250K mule deer now less than 100k,

and we have one project directly concerning mule deer. The predator fee was instituted and "sold" to the sportsmen to protect mule deer.

- Dave Famiglietti echoed Julius' and Brian's comments. He spends \$30 – \$45 a year on predator fees. The monies are not getting used where they should. We have to question this stuff. Why are we spending \$435 to kill a Raven I could kill for free? I would pay you for a stamp to kill 20 Ravens. He urged the Board to question the management of this program and the feedback you are receiving. Please voice your opinion.
- Jana Wright stated that twice a year, a plan and a report and neither are satisfactory. The projects that go from year to year need to summarize how much money has been spent.
- Public Comment Closed
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that every year the Commission asks for suggestions, but nothing happens. He stated that he agrees with Julius Fortuna regarding mule deer. He sees one for the impacts to mule deer is urban sprawl. When you disrupt mule deer they go away. In the Rubies, mining will impact the winter migration corridor and our deer population. More money can be used on Mule Deer, not just for predator control, but for habitat and other factors that can help grow the mule deer population. Total tag sales Mule Deer by far out strip all other species. More can and should be done.
- John Hiatt noted that, as Julius stated, sportsmen were sold the idea that collecting a fee would solve the problem with Mule Deer. That is not true. Predators are not the issue. NDOW needs to have some money to address habitat issues, and as long as 80% of the predator funds need to go toward lethal programs, there will be little or nothing done for the habitat and thus the mule deer.
- Chairman Paul Dixon agreed it is a combination of things.
- Bill Stanley stated that this was brought by Sportsmen to Sportsmen to solve the depletion of herds in Nevada. A chunk of this was diverted when Sage Grouse ended up on the first watch list. This was a habitat issue and could restrict access to major hunting areas. Now, Sage Grouse moved off the radar. Now is the time to push the issue to move back to Mule Deer population improvement. Sportsmen wanted the fee to fix the issue, but it was hijacked in the middle. Now it is time to get it back to where it needs to be.
- A motion was made and seconded to state that the Board acknowledges receipt of the Predator Management Plan and is concerned that the way the plan is formulated is not solving the problems it needs to solve.
- Motion was amended and seconded to include "with respect to Mule Deer population recovery".
- Motion passed 6-0.

D. Commission Regulation 17-02 Noncommercial Collection of Reptiles and Amphibians for 2017-2018, Amendment #1 (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about changes to Commission Regulation 17-02, Amendment #1, for the 2017-2018 season and limits for noncommercial hobby collecting of live, unprotected reptiles and amphibians.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- Howard Watts III said he does not know what is changed.
- Chairman Paul Dixon asked NDOW attendees if they know what changed.
- Joe Barnes, NDOW, stated that there were no changes with Non-commercial or Hobby Collections. He indicated they are in a holding pattern and to his knowledge, there are no proposed changes.

- Chairman Paul Dixon asked what species, like Chuckwalla and other lizards, that had declining population to a point where we were concerned. If there is concern, why would we allow hobbyist collecting?
- Joe Barnes said we have not had any time to write any new regulation changes. Seasons and bag limits are revisited every Legislative Session. There are 54 species that are documented for hobbyist collecting. NDOW has highlighted species as 1) conservation priority, 2) conservation priority and high commercial collection pressure, and 3) not conservation priority, but a high collection pressure.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said that we should have the same species that were an issue for commercial collecting be an issue for the hobbyist. If we continue to urbanize, we could also have a decline. We have no idea of how many hobbyists there are.
- John Hiatt asked how many species of lizards are there in Nevada that are not listed in the proposal.
- Joe Barnes answered that only a handful. The Gila monster, Dessert Tortoise, everything protected is not available for collection. He offered a handout providing a list, looking at regulations as they stand, and nearby state comparisons. He suggested the Board consider whether current regulations are sufficient. Bag limits as they stand.
- Brian Patterson raised the point that NDOW was adamant that collection of 14k animals a year was excessive. But if 1% of the population of Nevada take one lizard, that's 30K animals, more than twice what the commercial collectors were taking in a year, yet they were shut down to a screeching halt. He has a hard time understanding the logic of that.
- Joe Barnes, NDOW, noted that the American Pet Product Manufacturers Association did two studies, 1988 & 2016, on National Level of people with pets. In terms of reptiles, 4% of US households have reptiles, 15% of those have reptiles collected in the wild. Extrapolating those numbers against the Nevada population, 6000 houses have a reptile. 50% of reptiles as pets tend to be turtles/tortoises. So about 3000 households have wild reptiles. Nevada ranks 4th in the US for number of residents with animals crossing state lines. So, NDOW estimates that 25-30% of the reptiles in captivity are from out of state. Using scientific literature, roughly 2250 reptiles collected by hobbyists from the Nevada wilds. Initially no fee no license required in order to not price people out. Historically they are trying to be inclusive. Once lid opened up then potentially non-commercial is needed. Based on math on national census, over 2K animals a year are expected to be collected.
- Brian Patterson noted that the best information you had came from your commercial collectors, but that's gone now. You are a one man shop in term of reptiles for NDOW.
- Joe Barnes responded that Jason Jones of NDOW is. We will continue to look at wild life and non-commercial hobby collections. Just looking at hobbyists is not enough. We looked at the most glaring thing, and that was commercial collection.
- Brian Patterson responded that you have some decent math, but in the end, you have 2K to 3K households in Nevada and when the bag limits are 2-4 each, that's a lot of animals. He went on to say he cannot support any hobby collection at all. It should be shut down completely. If it is a big issue for Commercial Collectors it should be an issue for Hobbyists.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added that if we are concerned about the species and they get listed, urban development will come to a screeching halt. If we are going to maintain a hobbyist collection, anything that is a conservation species these species are no longer allowed.
- Brian Patterson asked how many citation have ever been written for a hobbyist over the limit. His guess is none.
- Joe Barnes responded that there have been citations issued for illegal collections of prohibited species.
- Chairman Paul Dixon summarized that Brian Patterson wants no hobbyist collection, Paul wants "conservation priority species" off the list of allowed species.

- Bill Stanley stated that if Chuckwalla was issue last month, it should still be an issue now. He agrees with Paul. At a minimum, species on the "conservation priority" list and those in the "top 8" need to be removed from the list.
- John Hiatt stated that we don't know if we have a problem.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded stating emphatically stating that we do have a problem, and that is why we ended commercial collecting.
- John Hiatt rephrased saying we don't know if we have a problem with hobby reptile collection. We should request NDOW look into how many hobbyist are doing it. Young people are looking at their phones. They are not out decimating the reptile population of Nevada. Request NDOW to take the best look they can on hobby collecting.
- Public Comment –
- Dave Famiglietti recommended stay consistent. We don't know anything, so ban everything. You just had a problem with shed hunting, ban it for everyone since we don't know if it's commercial or private. Same with trail cameras. For reptiles, take the poor guys who were not doing it, and ban it. Don't let these people take it if it is such a problem.
- Julius Fortuna said he is a reptile collector. Arizona made reptile collecting a licensable event. If you do so, you have a connection to a loyal group. You also can see \$100K in extra license fees. Allow us to connect a community where we can do some surveys, like "how many did you collect?" Make a decision to license and have a junior license. Arizona made the switch about 18-20 years ago. No one objected.
- Close Public Comment
- Joe Barnes, NDOW, referenced the back side of his handout that shows what western States' regulation are. Most states around us have licensed it. Utah has a hybrid allow put in for tags.
- Howard Watts III thanked the NDOW staff for additional information, following the math to give a sense of scope. For him, he looked at commercial collection, a lot of states have eliminated or greatly curtailed commercial collection. For hobby collecting, again, Nevada is out of sync with surrounding states. Some states have licensing, Nevada is open except for protected species.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend that the Non-commercial Collection of Reptiles and Amphibians be amended to restrict any Species of Conservation Priority and to consider a licensing system.
- Brian Patterson stated that he can't support anything that goes against the precedent that was set last month. The inconsistency is too glaring.
- Dave Talaga sees it as a reasonable motion. Take the endangered ones off the list and introduce licensing. He recommended collecting good data and see where we are.
- Bill Stanley noted that this motion is consistent with what the CCABMW did last month. The Commission went a different route. It squares with what we did.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that he can support this motion because it does what we need to do in this State, we should manage our resource. By putting licensing in there we can get data in the system. He added that he doesn't know how you tell a 5 year old he can't bring a lizard home, but that's one of the facts of life.
- Motion passed 5-1. (Brian Patterson opposed)

E. Commission Policy 26, Re-establishing, Introducing, Transplanting and Managing Pioneering Rocky Mountain Elk – First Reading (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about possible revisions to Commission Policy 26.

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

F. **Development of Draft Muzzle Loader Handgun Regulation Changes (*For Possible Action*)** The CAB will discuss potential muzzleloader hand gun regulations and prepare a proposal to be taken to NDOW at the November Commission meeting.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item. He would like authorization to draft a Muzzle Loader Handgun Regulation to submit to the Commission.
- Board Comments: None
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to authorize the Chairman to draft a proposal for the Commission.
- Motion passed 6-0.

G. **Possible Change to Future Commission Meetings and Commission Committee Assignments (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about putting muzzle loader hand regulation changes as an agenda item for the Jan. 26 and 27, 2018, meeting in Reno/Carson. In addition, the location and date of the June Commission 2018 meeting may be changed. The location may be changed from Pershing County to Esmeralda County, and the date from June 22 and 23 to June 15 and 16.

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

H. **Set Meeting dates and locations for CY18 and CY19 (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and set meeting dates and locations for calendar year 2018 and 2019.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- The Secretary, Stacy Matthews read for the record the proposed CCABMW Meeting dates for 2018 and 2019.
- Public Comment:
- Jana Wright mentioned that the Commission is possibly moving the date for the June meeting one week earlier, so the CCABMW meeting would have to be adjusted also.
- A motion was made and seconded to accept as written the proposed 2018 – 2019 CCABMW Meeting Dates with the provision that the June 19th CCABMW meeting date may be changed due to possible change in the June 2018 Commission meeting date.
- Motion passed 6-0.

I. **Commission Policy 27, Protection of Nevada Wildlife Resources, Second Reading (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to repeal or revise the policy.

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

J. **Commission Policy 65, Designation of Wildlife Management Areas, Second Reading (*For Possible Action*)** The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to repeal or revise the policy.

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

K. Review of Commission Policy 3, Appeals – First Reading (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about possible revisions to Commission Policy 3.

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

L. Commission General Regulation 470, Miscellaneous Petitions, LCB File No. R095-16 (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting amendments to Chapter 501 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). The amendments will simplify petition form requirements and the petition process overall.

- This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

8. Public Comment -Members of the public may provide public comment (*Informational*) Comments will be limited to three minutes. Any item requiring Board action not on this agenda may be scheduled on a future agenda.

- Dave Famiglietti read from a letter he addressed to the Wildlife Commission regarding the actions of the Clark County Commission with respect to NRS 501.265 3 A - selecting board members for the CCABMW. Secondly he requested that the 6 minute rule for comments from a representative of an organization needs to be reinstated. He can talk as representing an organization for six minutes, or he can bring 20 guys from that organization to talk for 3 minutes each.
- Mark Transue said to Howard and John that you don't have to pass a law to educate the public on anything.
- Julius Fortuna supports Dave's comments in that our ability to stay in the public eye as a Board relies how well we follow the mandates the Board was instituted with. The six minute rule is clearly a mistake. He represents a large organization of sportsmen and firearms enthusiasts in the State. He said if he comes with 15 people, it will be an hour to discuss the same topic. He also requested that the Board members meet with their constituents once every six months. Sportsmen talk to Sportsmen, etc. Let us look at how you voted, and how sportsmen are represented. There was a genuine concern recently that sportsmen were to be represented by a non-sportsman. Perhaps an "open mike" night where sportsmen can get your views on regulations, thoughts on conservation, etc., to make sure we are all represented. He asked the Board members to consider that.
- Close public comment.

9. Authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Wildlife Commission for its consideration at its November 3rd and 4th, 2017 meeting in Carson City, 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 November 3rd and 4th, 2017 meeting in Carson City, Nevada.
- Motion passed unanimously 6-0

10. **The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for January 23rd, 2018 in the Clark County Government Center Pueblo Room, 500 S. This meeting will support a Jan. 26 and 27, 2018 Commission meeting in Carson City, Nevada.**

11. **Adjournment**

- Meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm

DRAFT