



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 23, 2018

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

Time: 5:30 pm

Board Members Present: Paul Dixon, Chair J. Michael Reese, Vice Chair John Hiatt
Brian Patterson William Stanley Dave Talaga Howard Watts III

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

- Nevada Department of Wildlife, 4747 West Vegas Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89107;
- Clark County Government Center, 500 Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89108;
- City of Henderson, City Hall, 240 Water Street, Henderson, Nevada, 89015;
- Boulder City, City Hall, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, Nevada, 89005;
- Laughlin Town Manager's Office; 101 Civic Way, Laughlin, Nevada, 89028;
- Moapa Valley Community Center, 320 North Moapa Valley Road, Overton, Nevada, 89040;
- Mesquite City Hall, 10 East Mesquite Boulevard, Mesquite, Nevada, 89027.

Date: January 17, 2018

.....

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 David Talaga to lead the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes of the October 26, 2017 CCABMW Meeting (*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*)

- Chairman Paul Dixon asked the Board and attendees for any comments or corrections to the Minutes of the October 26, 2017 CCABMW Meeting.
- Board Comments: None
- Public comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 26, 2017 CCABMW Meeting as written with corrections as noted.
- Motion passed 6-0 (Vice Chair Reese abstained).

4. **Approval of Agenda for January 23, 2018 (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 thanking the secretary, Stacy Matthews for cross referencing the Agenda with the Commission Agenda.
 - Board comments: None
 - Public Comments:
 - John Hiatt asked about Action Item 7. L
 - Chairman Paul Dixon stated that the Commission had removed the corresponding item from their Agenda, thus 7.L will not be addressed at this meeting.
 - A motion was made to approve the agenda as amended.
 - Motion passed unanimously.
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).
- Vice Chair Reese noted that the Ely Rotary Club has canceled ice fishing at Cave Lake due to unsafe ice conditions. He also stated that he had received an email from Dave Famiglietti:
This is his 2nd formal request email to the Wildlife Commission. Is the State okay with four of the seven members of the CCABMW not meeting requirements set forward in the NRS. If not, are they planning on briefing the Clark County Commissioners on the NRS before the next opening is voted on? He references NRS Section 501.265 section 3 3A appoint member of the board.
 - Brian Patterson stated that Nevada Sportsmen Unlimited and Safari Club International will both hold banquets at the Gold Coast this weekend. Also, the Shot show is in town this week. Great venue to check out.
 - Howard Watts III shared that there is a meeting at the Aliante Casino to discuss the environmental impact study to expand the Nevada Test and Training Range into the Desert National Wildlife Refuge. There is concern that some of the proposals would cut off access on Alamo Road, and that could lead to further limits or enlarge the area where you need to get permission from Air Force to hunt. And any access outside of the hunting season would be closed off. There are several options. They are accepting comments until March 8th. Other meetings in other towns. It is still possible to submit comments and make your voice heard.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon asked, related to that, the status of a similar bid to expand the Air Force Base near Fallon.
 - John Hiatt still want 600K acres of land.
 - Howard Watts III said this has to go through congress and there will be other opportunities to give feedback. He also noted that he has more copies of Back County Journal to pass out for anyone interested. There also was a meeting Sunday, Back Country with Randy Newberg. Howard thanked Brian for coming.
 - William Stanley stated that since the last Board meeting, there was a bull moose poached in Elko County. They cut the head off with chain saw. Two other Moose killings in Elko County that were mistaken for elk. More Moose are being spotted in Elko County.
 - Vice Chair Reese added that there is a \$10K reward for Moose killing.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon Shared that the Meadow Valley Wildlife Unlimited banquet will be March 17th in Caliente. Details \$30 per ticket. \$35 for table of 10. It has lots of kids, a lot of fun!

6. **Recap of November 3rd and 4th 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 left the October Commission Meeting unhappy.
 - Non Commercial Collection of Reptiles they did not see it as a problem. Everything brought up for Commercial Collection was ignored for Non-Commercial Collection. Paul was told that we are radicalized in our thoughts.
 - Shed Antlers and Trail Cameras had substantial changes. We will discuss tonight.
 - Predation Management changes for 2018 will be same.
 - He said that he brought up in CAB Comments Muzzle Loader Regulations. It is still not on the Wildlife Commission Agenda. They keep want to tie this to a bigger issues like caliber. They are trying to push through a package. While Laxalt is still Attorney Journal, they think they can make that happen...
 - Disappointed that Non-Commercial Collection not an issue for them.
 - Closed recap from November 3rd and 4th, 2017

7. **Action Items:**

Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners January 26th and 27th 2018 meeting agenda, as well as additional items brought forth to the CCABMW from the public for discussion. CCABMW agenda & support materials are available upon request to Stacy Matthews (702) 455-2705 or smatthews@co.clark.nv.us. The final Commission agenda & support at http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Agenda/.

A. Commission Regulation 18 - 02, 2018 Black Bear Seasons, (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting 2018 hunting season dates, open management units, hunting hours, special regulations, animal sex, legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and dates and times for indoctrination courses for black bear.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- No board or public comment
- A motion was made and second to approve Commission Regulation 18 - 02, 2018 Black Bear Seasons as written.
- Motion passes 7-0

B. Commission Regulation 18 - 03, 2018–2019 Mountain Lion Season and Harvest Limits (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting 2018–2019 mountain lion hunting season open units, harvest limits by unit group, hunting hours, and special regulations.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item
- No board or public comment
- A motion was made and second to approve Commission Regulation 18 - 03, written.
- Motion passes 7-0

C. Commission Regulation 17 - 05, Amendment 2, 2017 - 2018 and 2018 - 2019 Big Game Seasons (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider amendments to the

2018–2019 hunting seasons and dates for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, and mountain goat, including limits, hunting hours, special hunt eligibility, animal sex, physical characteristics and legal weapon requirements, hunt boundary restrictions, and legal weapon requirements, and emergency depredation hunt structure and statewide quotas.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- Brian Patterson asked didn't we talk about shortening dates on Elk to shorten season.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that this Board has been recommending that for four years. Only two Commissioners feel it is a good idea. We can continue to beat our head against the wall and be called radical. We have been unsuccessful. Shed antler collection cannot take place in January because it disturbs the animals, yet, you can hunt cow elk in January. He added that he refuses to hunt in January. He had a cow elk tag and was unable to hunt in December, but would not hunt in January.
- Brian Patterson noted that we start pushing Elk around in August to January. We have an overabundance of Elk. We can harvest without pushing them around 5 months a year. Wait until they are on the winter range and harvest is easy and quick, that way you obtain the objective of harvesting Elk.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that we can try again, but he is not expecting a different outcome.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to accept Commission Regulation 17 - 05, Amendment 2, 2017 - 2018 and 2018 - 2019 Big Game Seasons as presented except end the Elk Season the first Sunday in January.
- Motion passed 7-0

D. Commission Regulation 18-04, 2019 Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas (*For Possible Action*)
The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting regulation to set the 2019 Heritage Tag species, seasons and quotas.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- Vice Chair Reese proposed the Heritage tag season be year-round. This would increase the value of the tag and increase revenue.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that both the Silver State and Heritage would have to follow the same schedule.
- Brian Patterson said the tags need to be awarded so they could be bid on at the banquet.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added that these tags are for 2019.
- Vice Chair Reese questioned is there an appetite for this.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said he sees no deterrent for doing this.
- Public Comment: None
- Brian Patterson stated that there are 4 silver state tags and 9 heritage tags for big game species.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend Commission Regulation 18-04, 2019 Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas to make them year round August 1st and July 31st
- John Hiatt raised the question if people are hunting out of traditional season most people are not going to be aware of this they can think someone is poaching. Is that a potential concern that the hunter might have to deal with law enforcement? Game Wardens would know, but that's probably who someone reporting a possible poacher would call. They could call the Sheriff.

- Vice Chair Reese added that you have that potential if you shoot the day before the season. He does not see this as a big issue, the word would get out faster.
- Brian Patterson noted that people would probably be in the back country chasing Elk. He sees John's points. Brian suggested checking in with Law Enforcement to say where they are planning on hunting as an FYI.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said you don't want to desensitize people to hunters to not report gun shots.
- Vice Chair Reese added that coyotes are hunted year round.
- John Hiatt offered that if someone sees that you are shooting Big Game not a coyote, if I have a special tag, rules don't apply to me?
- Vice Chair Reese thinks NDOW can educate the 17 County Sheriffs for the 13 specialty tags.
- Motion passes 7-0

E. Commission Regulation 18-05, 2019 Partnership in Wildlife (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting regulation to set the 2019 Heritage Tag species, seasons and quotas.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments: None
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Commission Regulation 18-05, 2019 Partnership in Wildlife as written.
- Brian Paterson noted that while four Big Horn Sheep tags were issued, only two were harvested. It seems NDOW could potentially allow two more Big Horn Sheep tag based on NDOW biologists input.
- Chairman Paul Dixon asked Brian if he was seeking an amendment to the motion to set the number of PIW tags to four. Brian: yes. Motion and second agreed to amend the motion.
- Re-open Public Comment
- Jelindo Tiberti stated that they already have the right to issue up to 4 tags, so you don't need to go ask for 4. Tag went for \$170K at the Sheep Show. Mike Cox NDOW biologist says there are more sheep then in the last 50 years.
- Closed public comment
- The amended motion is to recommend approval of Commission Regulation 18-05, 2019 Partnership in Wildlife as written with the caveat that NDOW potentially raise the number of PIW tags up to the statutory limit. Motion was seconded.
- Motion passed 7-0

F. Commission Regulation 18-06, 2018 Silver State (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting regulation to set the 2018 Silver State Tag species, seasons and quotas.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item stating that by NRS, Silver State has to match Heritage tag.
- Board Comments: None
- Public Comment:
- Jelindo Tiberti asked what amount was collected last year.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded the amount collected heritage funding in 2017 we had 75% of gifted donations was almost a million dollars. Revenue went from \$998K to \$1.097M.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of CR 18-06, 2018 Silver State as proposed with the change of the season date from August 1 – July 31st.

- Motion passed 7-0

G. Commission Regulation 18-07, 2018 Dream Tag (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting regulation to set the 2018 Dream Tag species, seasons and quotas.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- Public Comment:
- Jana Wright oppose the addition of the Black Bear.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that Black Bear does not qualify for Dream Tag per statute have to be 50 tags.
- Vice Chair Reese quoted the NRS, Section 502.219, which states Dream Tags can only be awarded for those species for which at least 50 tags are available for general hunts.
- Brian Patterson noted that by definition you could have a Cow Elk Dream Tag, etc.
- Closed Public Comment
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend Approve Commission Regulation 18-07, 2018 Dream Tag as presented striking Black Bear hunt 6500 as it is not allowed under statute.
- Motion passed 7-0

H. Commission Regulation 18-08, 2018 Big Game Application Deadlines (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting regulation to set the 2018 big game tag application deadlines and related information.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item stating that as of January 1, 2018 the Departments new independent licensing contractor is Kalkomey Enterprises, LLC. This contractor has been used for boat registration, but there have been problems involving Social Security Numbers. It should work fine for hunters since NDOW has more personal information on hunters.
- Board Comments:
- William Stanley voiced his hope that NDOW owns the domain name ndowlicensing.com so they don't go through this again.
- William Stanley said he guarantees that people will go where they know, to huntnevada.com, and it will not be going to the right website and they will end up calling NDOW.
- Brian Patterson said he tried to get online for a week until he read the backup material and saw that it changed.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said he will ask if they own the domain.
- Public Comment: None
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of CR 18-08, 2018 Big Game Application Deadlines as presented.
- Motion passed 7-0

I. Commission Regulation 18-09, 2018 Big Game Tag Application Eligibility and Tag Limits (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider adopting regulation to set the 2018 big game tag application eligibility and tag limits and related information.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments: None
- Public Comments: None

- A motion was made and seconded to recommend to accept Commission Regulation 18-09, 2018 Big Game Tag Application Eligibility and Tag Limits as proposed.
- Motion passed 7-0

J. 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 from January 1st through March 31st inclusive.

The Commission also directed the Department to include collection hour's limitations. For the months of April and May, collection is only allowed between 10am to sunset. All of these restrictions would apply only to public lands in Elko, Eureka, Lander, Lincoln, Nye, and White Pine Counties.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item highlighting the proposed changes. The proposed regulations change would place a seasonal closure on the field. The change for the 6 restricted counties would establish a season open from April 1st to May 31st. But recall that for the month of January, you cannot collect shed antlers but we can shoot cow elk.
- Board Comments:
- Vice Chair Reese stated that he thinks Nevada should match what Utah does. If Utah does a complete regulation we should match or we will be inundated with Utah people.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that there is some consistency with Utah in that for the months of January, February, and March, there is no collecting sheds in Utah.
- Brian Patterson asked why 10am start for April or May.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that the idea is to let the animals eat and drink and then bed down and be out of field. If we get late season snows detrimental to animals. If people are out early they will be out hunting until well after day light.
- Vice Chair Reese asked if the antler falls off the animal is it still the jurisdiction of NDOW. His belief is that if it hits the ground it is mineral.
- Chairman Paul Dixon answered that the main reason for regulating the collecting of Shed Antlers is to be on record with neighbor states. Collecting shed antlers can be a very profitable business. With the influx of collectors from other states, many locals have not been able to partake of the activity.
- John Hiatt stated that winter extends to April 21st by calendar, and animals are in the poorest condition at the end of the winter. The idea of opening this up April 1st does not help animals at all. It does not address potential damage to the land and the wet land. They are not helping the habitat or the animals.
- Public Comment:
- Frank Mirabelli asked what is legal and not legal as far as hunting shed. Drones are getting real popular. Like flying an airplane.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that there has been no discussion he is aware of regarding use of drones for shed hunting. He said he can add to comments to ask about drones.
- Vice Chair Reese added that if it falls off it is a resource. Same as an arrow head.
- Jelindo Tiberti stated that in conversations with an official in Utah, he learned that there was a state-wide emergency closure on shed hunting because of waist-deep snow in Northern Utah. It was a tough time for animals and they were worried about people getting stuck. The official expressed no concern for the Southern Regions. Jelindo also checked with Lincoln County, and they are not concerned at all. Why we are doing this at all. Effects of a one-time deal in Utah will harm citizens of the state of Nevada. Animals don't start losing antlers until February. Why restrict from January 1st? Makes no sense.

- Ralph Willits asked when they lose their antlers. If we are overlapping hunting with the time animals drop antlers, then in an antlerless hunt would it be possible to shoot big bulls with no antlers?
- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that we have been talking about this since Commissioner McBeath time. This is the first time we have had a draft regulation. What are we trying to regulate, commercial collection and people from out of state. You will find sheds in February and March and collect antlers why can't you do this anytime you want. Riding up on horse. It really is the commercial collection.
- Howard Watts III stated that the more complicated we make it the more NDOW has to figure out how to make it work. How do we send message without a new licensing system, commercial vs non-commercial? Who gets educated? Who is told to drop shed? We have heard from folks in that area that this is a problem. Howard supports it.
- Chairman Paul Dixon read comments from last meeting. Should there be a limit on poundage or tonnage. On BML land or Forest Service. We have not seen any negative issue with personal shed antlers. Disrespect of land and influx of people from Utah.
- Vice Chair Reese noted that last year he saw 14 rigs, all with Utah plates, collecting. Most of them sitting around camp, knew why they were there. He added that he doesn't think NDOW has the authority to regulate an antler.
- William Stanley agreed that NDOW does not have jurisdiction over shed antlers. What they do have jurisdiction over is harassment of animals. They are talking about harassment of animals.
- David Talaga wondered if the reason for the regulation is that the herd coming under stress from shed collection, who is causing stress? Is it commercial collectors or private collectors? We pretty much know that the answer is commercial. What makes more sense is to ban non-residents or impose regulations. As this reads, it is banning everyone.
- Vice Chair Reese said he wants to see data on fawn recruitment or mortality rates that proves that the population is impacted by shed collection.
- William Stanley noted that the reason for increased interest in shed antlers is currently there is a decorating trend which could change on a moment's notice. Are we going to chase every trend?
- John Hiatt offered that first real regulations was for birds to protect plumage.
- Mike Kowal said this should not be an NDOW issue. There are already laws that if you harass animals you are breaking the law. It should not be a shed hunting it should be shed collecting. Let NDOW deal with the harassment issue. He agrees with Vice Chair Reese
- Frank Mirabelli asked is this issue in Northern Nevada?
- Chairman Paul Dixon answered that it is mainly Lincoln, White Pine and Elko Counties, and they added Lander, Eureka and Nye Counties as a buffer.
- Ralph Willits added there is use of antlers in Asian markets. Harassment of Wildlife and habitat depredation BLM or Forest Service land.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said there is documentation of people riding off road and making new trails and making long term damage. We have evidence but don't know if NDOW has enforced this. As for licensing, Utah has course you have to take every year. Comes down to people do not want people from Utah collecting a Nevada Resource.
- Mark Transue, Las Vegas Woods and Waters, asked what jurisdiction does NDOW have over Federal Land?
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that each state manages the wildlife on Federal Land. Antlers are a resource of wildlife.
- Mark Transue said he agrees with Vice Chair Reese that shed antlers are a mineral.
- Close public comment
- Howard Watts III noted that the original version was longer. This one says gather. If it is an issue with out of state, we can change to out of state etc. We can do that but be mindful and

have a specific way to lay that out. Then NDOW will need to carry that out. Harassment is on the books, but sometimes it is about being clearer. Maybe harassment is vague. This is putting out our position. A delineation between resident's vs non-residents that could be good.

- Vice Chair Reese wants to see the science. Wildlife is stressed 365 days a year. Harassment definition is caused to be disturbed. How many fines were issued? We need science and data. How many violations do we have? How much of an effect is that?
- John Hiatt countered that there are very few Game Wardens in this state. To issue a citation for harassment, the Warden has to see the activity, the wildlife harassed. We know there are areas where the people are going to shed hunt. With regards to out of state collectors, banning them without any licensing thing could be problematic from a legal standpoint.
- Vice Chair Reese said the locals know the hot spots where game is. If a Warden goes to those areas, they won't see anything. He would like to see documentation, how many people are coming across.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that we know the number of people who took the course @ 1K people, and most of them came to Nevada because there was no restriction. Being in the field is not harassment. The regulation is trying to restrict the times people can be in the field or you make it where if you do not hold a resident hunting license you cannot collect shed antlers. Must be a registered hunter.
- Vice Chair Reese here is what we have to solve, how we are harassing elk?
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded we are harassing deer which are stressed more than elk. Elk population is just now plateau.
- Vice Chair Reese cited statistics for area 23 deer count was over 3000, but 1500 are sitting on farmers' fields. That is why land owner tags in area 23 are through the roof. What are we solving for? Why do we want to regulate this? He does not see what we are solving for.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said he believes what we are solving is people from out of state collecting and removing our resources. He has suggested that if you are collecting you have to have a Nevada Big Game License.
- Chairman Paul Dixon offered that to collect shed antlers in Nevada you must have a valid Nevada Hunting License
- William Stanley noted that NDOW is trying to solve a problem. If we take literally, they have described an activity that has negative effects on wildlife when they are most vulnerable. Does the verbiage of the proposed regulation address what NDOW is trying to regulate.
- William Stanley NDOW does issue tickets for driving off road.
- Chairman Paul Dixon BLM backed off and did not enforce ticket.
- William Stanley how much have we spent on Sage Grouse.
- John Hiatt the antlers are not the issue the activity is the issue.
- A motion was made to table this item. No second. Motion dies.
- A new motion was made and seconded to approve Commission General Regulation 475, Shed Antlers as written with a change of instead of "a person shall not take", start new language with "only holders of a valid Nevada Hunting License may take".
- Vice Chair Reese said if we pass this we will not get science or NDOW input and data. How big of problem is this.
- William Stanley asked for motion to be re-read.
- Vice Chair Reese stated that NDOW cannot enforce
- David Talaga countered that NDOW could enforce if they observe a dully licensed person walking a grid pattern encountering and disturbing animal along the way.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added doing nothing, we'll have people destroying things because we're taking no action. You have a right to be in the field if you are a licensed hunter.
- Vice Chair Reese responded that the claim is that collectors are destroying wildlife and habitat

- Chairman Paul Dixon agreed that this will come back again, but this adds a degree of clarity. If you don't want to participate in hunting then you should not be allowed to harvest wildlife resources.
- Motion passes Aye's 4 Nay's 2 1 abstained (W Stanley).

K. 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 August 1st to December 31st of each year. The proposed language would further prohibit the use of transmitting trail cameras at any location, prohibit the use of any trail camera from August 1st to December 31st of each year.

The Commission directed the Department to remove previously drafted language prohibiting the use of trail cameras only for the purposes of scouting or hunting, prohibit the use of transmitting trail cameras at any time during the year, and prohibit the use of trail cameras within 300 feet of a water source from January 1st through July 31st.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- Vice Chair Reese asked if NDOW was allowed to regulate photography.
- Chairman Paul Dixon used a hypothetical example: what is to stop a school teacher from having a trail camera filming sheep on water and then showing photos to her students that results in a student relating that to his/her father who offers to buy the photo for \$5000 knowing he can sell it to outfitters for ten times as much. Does a situation like that make trail cameras illegal for school teachers, for example? A lot of people who have trail cameras are outfitters. Some have hundreds of cameras. They have websites where they have pictures of animals. For a fee you can look at their pictures. For an additional fee they will tell you where trail camera GPS location is. It is big country. What we want to avoid was real time ability to track an animal using multiple cameras. In his opinion, it is hard to regulate trail cameras belonging to people that do not have active hunting or fishing licenses. Kids watch trail cameras and enjoy the pictures. Transmitting cameras are the real time issue.
- Vice Chair Reese asked where the science is. What are we solving? What detriment does a trail camera have? It does not pull the trigger or find the animal, it just records. People are outraged when they find 30-40-50 trail cameras on a water hole. Now they are proposing no use of trail cameras within 200 feet of a spring or a water hole. What about putting one on one of the two track roads to see what's going on, what the wildlife is doing? We can't do drones. We still have a limited quota we can kill we can't go over quota because of trail cameras. He is having a hard time finding out the science for why we are regulating this.
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that the rapid increase in trail cameras is a problem for because people check cameras at all different times disturbing animals attempting to get water there.
- William Stanley noted that transmitting camera is a fair chase issue. The camera tells you exactly when an animal is at a water source. He also stated that if he were a biology teacher at one of our local High Schools, and he wanted to set up a trail camera, he could coordinate with NDOW and do that. Regulation exempts that activity. Also, we can't camp within 300 feet of a water source, but when people are checking cameras at a water source several times a day, that's up to a 150 visits to a water source with 35 cameras daily. Limiting to 300 feet

- from water is reasonable. Transmitting trail camera should be eliminated. Some of it may push too far. Fair chase for most sportsmen is a big deal. Within less than 300 feet of a water source should be prohibited. The last thing he wants while sitting in his blind archery hunting antelope, staking out a water hole, and have people come in on ATV's to check trail cameras.
- David Talaga asked William Stanley if his ban of transmitting trail cameras is limited to hunting season.
 - William Stanley answered year-round. If you have a need for a transmitting camera, you can coordinate with NDOW and have that done.
 - David Talaga stated that if it's not in season who cares about transmitting trail cameras. Also, he questioned whether 300 feet is enough? People will still be checking cameras.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon added that the cameras are 10 feet or less from water holes currently. People are driving metal stakes in the ground close to watering holes and putting cameras on them.
 - Brian Patterson addressed the dates, August 1st to December 31st. Item C is eliminated based those dates. It does not matter if they automatically transmit or not. They are not allowed during hunting season. Why not allow them off season? C is irrelevant.
 - David Talaga said he sees no reason to ban transmitting cameras when it is not hunting season.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon noted that the proposed regulation bans the use of any trail cameras during hunting season and bans transmitting cameras totally. He then asked what is the impact of having a transmitting trail camera outside of hunting season.
 - William Stanley stated that we require other devices in the field by tag number or hunting license number attached to it. If you are going to enforce trail camera use, how do you find the people?
 - Vice Chair Reese suggested that NDOW will set up its own trail camera to catch the culprit.
 - Brian Patterson what's to keep some guy from moving other cameras closer so they get cited and cameras confiscated?
 - Vice Chair Reese stated that setting a minimum distance of 300 feet is a start in the right direction.
 - John Hiatt brought up the use of webcams by conservancy group that, for example broadcast the activities of a family of bald eagles. Those would now be illegal.
 - William Stanley countered, that with section 2A4 you can coordinate that use with NDOW.
 - Vice Chair Reese said he know trappers who use trail cameras.
 - William Stanley stated that he feels there is an issue with cameras around watering holes, with cameras during hunting season, and with transmitting cameras.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon stated that the Commission tried to capture the comments we have had on this. He told them there are a lot of non-hunters who want to use trail cameras for personal enjoyment. If you look at total trail cameras in Clark County, most are for non-hunters. We would be doing a disservice to the large numbers of non-hunters if we did not take their interests under consideration.
 - Dave Talaga asked how you know that a particular camera is authorized under subsection 2 of the regulation. The trail camera needs to identify the owner so NDOW can identify the camera.
 - Vice Chair Reese suggested taking incremental steps. Why not just enact the 300 feet limit. Why are we solving other stuff?
 - Chairman Paul Dixon responded that the only reason we are looking to enact a more rigorous regulation is that people are selling our resources online. If you have a valid reason to be out there, you can be, you are in the exemption. But you cannot be selling our resources during hunting season.
 - Public Comment:

- Ralph Willits said if you regulate commercial use of trail camera photos that will keep the teacher from selling photos. You would need enforcement. What have other states done?
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that he believes Idaho has trail camera laws.
- David Talaga said he called Arizona, and they are banned during hunting season.
- Vice Chair Reese added that Montana has trail camera restrictions.
- Mark Transue, LV Woods and Waters, stated you guys need to watch *North Woods Law* a little more. He added that he has a problem with Transmitting cameras. Counter to fair chase. He feels that distance 200 – 300 feet is ridiculous. Drive stake in to the ground or tie a camera to the sage brush. He has a problem with that.
- David Talaga asked what the issue with the distance is.
- Mark Transue responded that when the water hole is in the sage brush, there is nothing taller than 3 feet high to mount a camera to. He suggested to hide it in the sage brush. He sat in a blind and saw a lot of deer come in. He has a problem with the distance.
- Public comment closed
- Howard Watts III stated that Montana is even more restrictive on trail cameras.
- A motion was made to adopt Commission General Regulation 440, Trail Cameras and Other Devices, LCB File No. R012-16 as proposed with the following changes: strike subsection 1A and amend subsection 1C to say "at any time during any Commission approved hunting season (August 1st – January 31st)". Withdraw motion.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that subsection 1A is in there to stop the selling of our resources. We have some of the largest Elk harvested. Mule Deer largest taken, we are in the top 5. All of the animals that were harvested were severely tracked and hunted.
- David Talaga added that outlawing cameras that can transmit means more traffic to getting pictures. It is better to have transmitting cameras. Transmitting cameras are ok out of the hunting seasons.
- Chairman Paul Dixon has no problem banning any trail camera during hunting season. A hobbyist can go to NDOW to get an exception.
- Howard Watts III withdrew the motion.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Commission General Regulation 440, Trail Cameras and Other Devices, LCB File No. R012-16 as proposed except strike subsection 1c.
- Motion passed 6-1
- Vice Chair Reese dissented based on commercialization. We all buy hunting license and tags.

L. Commission General Regulation 473, Safe Hunting Distance, LCB File No. R111-17 – (*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 (NAC). This regulation would make it unlawful for a person to discharge a firearm, to draw or release an arrow from a bow or to draw or release a crossbow arrow or bolt from a crossbow within a certain distance of any occupied dwelling without the consent of the owner or occupant of the dwelling.

- Tabled - Removed from Commission Agenda

M. Predation Management Fiscal Year 2019 Plan (*For Possible Action*) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about the draft Fiscal Year 2019 Predation Management Plan will be presented to the Commission for initial review. Following this review, the draft plan will be updated and shared with the State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee (PARC).

All comments from the PARC, County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife, and any other interested entity will be compiled and shared with the Wildlife Damage Management Committee (WDMC) for their consideration at their March 2018 meeting. The Commission will receive an update at the March 2018 meeting from the Wildlife Damage Management Committee and may provide additional direction at that time.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Public Comment:
- Jana Wright stated that the Predation Management Plan is the same every time it comes up. Under the budget box for each Project, she (and others) would like to see a running total expenditure if the projects have been for several years. It would be good to know how much is being spent on each of these projects.
- Public Comment: Closed
- Howard Watts III said he sees no need to make detailed comments on Projects as it has been done over and over. He only had to scan a couple of projects to see that there was no attempt to modify the format to incorporate our requests. It does not include a summary of the results from the previous report, it fails to reference the previous report, or tall what happened. There is a box entitled "2017 Predator Report", and all it says is "NDOW supports continuing this project". Instead of actual results. He would add the same reoccurring comments, running totals, impact, results, etc., rather than detailing comments on specific projects.
- Vice Chair Reese cited Project 42 mountain lion harvest, and asked what we are paying our biologists for. Why are we using predator funds for this?
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that the predator funds are invested to get Pittman-Robertson Grant money so someone can write a report for a month.
- Vice Chair Reese also cited Project Raven Removal at \$100K a year. Thus far, almost 1 million dollars has been spent on Raven removal. Some money should be going to doing a NEEP analysis. Who is going to go in and get new NEEP analysis? The raven is the single biggest predator to desert tortoise and sage grouse. What did you do to keep them off the list?
- Brian Patterson totaled the projects by species - Mountain Lions: 4 projects for \$145K, Coyotes: 2 projects - \$150K, and Ravens: 3 projects - \$525K. The lion's share of the money goes to Ravens where nothing happens.
- Vice Chair Reese added this happens year after year.
- William Stanley noted if sage grouse gets listed you are not hunting on that land anymore. People complained about sage grouse restoration.
- Vice Chair Reese agreed this is black mail money. We have to pay it. We have no choice.
- William Stanley is hoping maybe we saved a few bucks.
- John Hiatt stated that we have talked about this for years. The report is an embarrassment. John read part of the report into the record. He feels we should not spend a lot more time on this. The plan is the same embarrassingly poor quality we have seen for years and we strongly recommend they write the report in a way that makes sense.
- A motion was made and seconded to state that the CCABMW has reviewed the Predation Management Fiscal Year 2019 Plan and found it to be the same poor quality plan that has been reviewed and commented on multiple times in the past, and the recommendation is to have NDOW come up with a comprehensive worthwhile plan or abandon the effort.
- Motion passed 7-0

N. Landowner Deer and Antelope Compensation Tag Program (*For Possible Action*)

The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about on ideas generated by stakeholders regarding processes by which compensation tags might be equitably distributed should the

allocation of tags reach the statutory limit as amended during the 2017 legislative session. The Commission will discuss and may direct the Department to develop a draft Commission General Regulation regarding the general concepts presented.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- Vice Chair Reese noted that the Legislature changed the rate from 1.5 to 2.5 percent. If the mule deer population continues to decline, we will be at threshold once again. For Area 23, there are 389 tags allocated, 63 of which are landowner tags or 6.17% of the tags are landowner tags. Most other areas aren't probably close to that. He proclaimed that in the southern part of state a lot more deer are being habituated. They don't go to mountains, they stay in or near the fields. It is more prevalent as we watch the amount of landowner tags go up. So this is a moot point unless the population goes back up. Hopefully we don't need to raise that percentage. He would like to see predator programs based on how to increase the mule deer population.
- William Stanley recalled comments from farmers several years back saying you can solve this issue by moving away from the brokers take all land owner fees and then have NDOW manage the program. Put the money into a pool and auction them off and compensate with a live check for a farmer.
- Vice Chair Reese pointed out that the same 125 deer can be counted in one field then half an hour later they go to another field and are counted there, and then to another field. Multiple landowner tags are being awarded for the same herd.
- William Stanley clarified that the landowner tag is compensation for the farmer's loss of revenue. The same herd will do the same amount of damage no matter what field they are in. We are compensating the farmer for feeding the animals. Farmers are saying the same thing, if you want to compensate them, put the tags in a pool and auction them through NDOW.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said that when the farmer gets a tag and hands it to a broker to sell, that has commercialized that animal. Paul said Tony Wasley, and he agreed, the best way to compensate the farmer is to determine the number of landowner tags to be awarded, NDOW have a special sale of those tags, put the money in a pool and compensate the farmer directly.
- Brian Patterson they could put up 12 foot fences
- John Hiatt stated that we need to remember that Nevada is the driest state in the country and becoming drier. And that the farmers are providing water/habitat for big game animals. It is not unreasonable to compensate the farmers for his losses. He feels it is totally reasonable that land owners and farmers with fields should be compensated. John added that he feels they have a problem with 50 animals per tag. He suggested a carryover provision that if the farmer has fewer than 50 animals, he can carry that to next year would get a tag next year.
- William Stanley said if you live in Pioche, tonight may not see any the next day could be more. In White Pine 20 Elk would eat an acre.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added that the Elk can crush a field too, laying in it.
- William Stanley when land owner tags are auctioned evenly distribute. 50% on the dollar they are getting now.
- Chairman Paul Dixon stated that through auction the value of the tag will be more than the farmers are getting now, and all of the money will go back to the farmers, not to brokerage firms.
- William Stanley said has bought an elk tag and paid \$10K for it. He knows what the broker bought them for.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said there will be a lot of pressure on the Commissioners to oppose an auction because there are brokers who are well connected politically.
- William Stanley stated that there are people in Elko County that make more on tag sales (since they are also the broker) then on ranching.

- John Hiatt ranchers are looking for the money.
- Dave Talaga asked how you know NDOW will readily hand over money to the farmer based on his estimate of damage.
- William Stanley they would draft regulations to enforce policy.
- Vice Chair Reese noted in Area 23, one farmer had 1400 deer on his lands.
- Public Comment:
- Mark Transue. LV Woods and Waters, states that knows three people who own acreage in Echo Valley. They tell NDOW what day to come out and count. Randy has 80 acres, he got no tags this year, but he had 470 deer the day before.
- Chairman Paul Dixon said the way to compensate for damage go look at damage on farm. Don't count animals, look at damage and assess the value. Pretty easy to do damage count.
- John Hiatt noted that for alfalfa, that's true, but with grass hay is hard to see damage.
- William Stanley stated they will compensate so much per agriculture acre. Compensating farmer with the tag.
- Chairman Paul Dixon added that tag prices went down in 2008 and 2009.
- William Stanley the price is going to be going through the roof this year and next year. You will be getting a higher compensation per acre over 10 years.
- Vice Chair Reese reminded that the number of compensation tags cannot exceed 2.5% of the general tags for the same area.
- Mark Transue if we get all the tags they are going to get used up. They don't use the tags up. They don't use broker.
- Close public comment
- A motion was made to recommend to NDOW to consider that we have a 20-year decline in Mule Deer herds and the deer have become habituated to towns and fields due to drought and forage loss. Landowners are captive to Brokers and do not get full compensation from the sale of their tags. We suggest that NDOW keep all of the landowner compensation tags and sell them, put the money in pool and divide the pool to compensate for damage to crops, etc. There are multiple ways to calculate compensation. 2% of the quota. Reimbursed on per acre basis.
- William Stanley take 2% of quota for the year amount of animals' pool them sell them. What they bring at auction.
- John Hiatt doesn't consider the changes of where the deer population is living.
- William Stanley offered that the Legislature can change the percentage every year.
- Brian Patterson noted that now you get into supply and demand. Tags may not draw as much money.
- William Stanley added that when the quota is down we the price goes up.
- David Talaga asked do we change quotas annually. Yes
- The motion was amended to state that the total number of tags to be sold will be 2% of the quota, and no on-site census inspections would be needed.
- Motion was seconded.
- Motion passed 7-0

O. Commission General Regulation 476, Processing Fees, LCB File No. R142-17 (For Possible Action) The CCABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to consider amending Chapter 502.118 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). This regulation reduces the current convenience fee of \$2.00 for residents and \$3.50 for non-residents per item purchased online to a processing fee of \$1.00 per item purchased regardless of residency and method of purchase. This fee change will reduce fees to individual customers while

preserving the necessary means of paying the Department's credit card processing charges.

- This item tabled due to lack of time.

P. Commission Policy 26, Re-establishing, Introducing, Transplanting and Managing Pioneering Rocky Mountain Elk – Second 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 tabled due to lack of time.

Q. Review of Commission Policy 3, Appeals – Second 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 tabled due to lack of time.

R. Commission Policy 66 – Management and Use 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 about possible revisions to Commission Policy 66.

- This item tabled due to lack of time.

S. Commission Policy 51 – Wayne E. Kirch Nevada Wildlife – 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 51.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item.
- Board Comments:
- John Hiatt noted that the regulation states that the Award is for activities in the current year. Most of the people nominated are for their lifetime achievements. So either we change regulation so it honors lifetime achievement, or strongly enforce the regulation when giving out awards.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend we only evaluate people's contributions in the current year or change the policy to be a lifetime achievement award.
- Motion passed 7-0

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.

- No 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 January 26th and 27th, 2018 meeting in Reno, 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 January 26th and 27th, 2018 meeting in Reno, Nevada omitting any discussion of item O, P, Q, and R.
- Motion passed unanimously

10. **The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for March 13th, 2018 in the Clark County Government Center Pueblo Room, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas. This meeting will be in support of the March 16th & 17th, 2018 Commission meeting in Laughlin, Nevada.**

11. **Adjournment**

- Meeting was adjourned at 8:49 pm

DRAFT