

DOUGLAS COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD TO MANAGE WILDLIFE
Minutes of the May 10, 2016 Meeting

The Douglas County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting was scheduled for 5:30 pm on Tuesday, May 10, 2016 in the Douglas County Community Center, Carson Valley Medical Center Room, 1329 Waterloo Lane, Gardnerville, Nevada.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Craig Burnside, Chairman
Bob Cook, Vice Chairman
Mike Turnipseed
Robert Rittenhouse
Chad Foster

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Scott, NDOW Game Biologist/Western Region
Matt Maples NDOW Habitat Biologist
Carl Lackey, NDOW Biologist
Kenny Pirkle, NDOW Habitat Biologist

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Burnside called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm and determined a quorum was present.

ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Burnside introduced the NDOW staff in attendance and stated all members of the DCABMW were present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Out of consideration for the NDOW staff in attendance, Chairman Burnside stated item 5l would be moved to the beginning of the Administrative Agenda.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to approve the agenda with the stated change; carried unanimously.

FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **March 22, 2016**

No public comment.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Foster to approve the minutes as presented; carried with Cook abstaining.

1. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON THE ELECTION OF A CHAIRMAN AND A VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE DOUGLAS COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD TO MANAGE WILDLIFE.

Member Burnside offered to continue serving as Chairman, if it was the desire of the Board. If someone else wishes to serve in that capacity, he would be happy to relinquish the position.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Foster to retain Craig Burnside as Chairman and Robert Cook as Vice Chairman;

No public comment.

MOTION; carried unanimously.

2. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION TO RATIFY THE DOUGLAS COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD TO MANAGE WILDLIFE BUDGET SUBMITTAL TO THE NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE'S FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Chairman Burnside explained the budget request totaled approximately \$5400.

This was an informational item only.

3. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE TRI-COUNTY WILDLIFE WORKING GROUP.

The group has not met so no report was provided.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROCESSES FOR LICENSE SIMPLIFICATION AND HARVEST MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES.

Member Turnipseed would rather see the license fee, trout stamp, and habitat damage tag combined into one fee.

Member Foster provided the Arizona big game fee structure, a one-page document, and the Nevada big game fee structure, which is several pages. He indicated his desire to study this issue further before bringing anything forward.

No public comment.

This was a discussion only.

5. The following items, 5a through 5m, are items that will be heard before the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners at the next meeting, May 13 & 14, 2016, at the Truckee Meadows Community College, 7000 Dandini Boulevard, Sierra Building, Room 108, Reno, Nevada. The Douglas County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife may take the following action, or a variation thereof, on each item: support the item, not support the item or not take a position on the item. Public Comment will be allowed on each item.

5a–5m. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING WHETHER THE DOUGLAS COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD SHOULD TAKE A POSITION ON:

5I. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION REGULATION 16-12, 2016 BIG GAME QUOTAS FOR THE 2016-2017 SEASON. The Commission will establish regulations for the numbers of tags to be issued for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, black bear, and mountain goats for the 2016 - 2017 seasons.

BEAR

Carl Lackey, NDOW Biologist, stated there are no recommended changes with the bear hunt. He provided the historical and yearly success rates and statistics.

Chairman Burnside repeated the DCABMW's request that the number of tags be raised to 50 in an effort to have this qualify for a Governor's Tag. Mr. Lackey stated the agency is recommending that the quotas and tags remain status quo until the hunt guidelines are approved. Both Washoe County and Humboldt County have recommended an increase in tags.

Member Turnipseed asked if the revenue raised from a Governor's Tag could be dedicated only to bears. Mr. Lackey was unsure.

Vice Chairman Cook asked if there had been any discussion to change the Lake side boundary for the hunt and Mike Scott, NDOW Game Biologist, said the appropriate time for that discussion would be during season setting.

Chairman Burnside recalled that the DCABMW also recommended that shotguns be a legal weapon for bears. Mr. Lackey explained that they have no objection to doing that but a discussion on that would have to wait until the hunt guidelines are approved.

Mr. Lackey provided the bear hunt statistics relating to the number of applications submitted during the last six years by both residents and nonresidents. Those applications came from 36 states and 1 foreign country. Most of the bears harvested came from the Pine Nuts. When all the statistics are considered for the harvested bears, the data shows the population is being lightly harvested.

Vice Chairman Cook asked if the harvest limit is too high and Mr. Lackey responded it is

not and is very, very conservative. However, he would like to increase the number of tags but leave the harvest limit where it is.

Chairman Burnside thinks more hunters hunt in the Pine Nuts because of the confusion with the boundaries in the Sierras. He asked if there is a large population of bears not being hunted because of the Lake Tahoe issues. Mr. Lackey thought a lot more pressure could be put on the Carson Range bears as well as targeting the conflict bears if there was bear hunting inside the Basin.

Vice Chairman Cook stated bears are the only thing that cannot be hunted down to the Lake.

As for the concern that someone could be shot if bear hunting were allowed in the Basin, Chairman Burnside added there are more deer tags in the Basin than there would be bear tags so that concern is misplaced.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to increase the bear tag quota to 51, 46 for residents and 5 for non-residents, with the intent to create a Governor's Tag, and the harvest limit should remain the same; carried unanimously.

ANTELOPE

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval; carried unanimously.

DESERT BIGHORN SHEEP

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes.

Chairman Burnside asked which areas in the state are being monitored for disease and die off. Mr. Scott responded many areas are being monitored and testing is being done whenever possible. The one area in the state that is disease free is the Muddy Mountains. They are keeping a close eye on the big herds in the Tonopah area and will continue to watch, monitor, and study the herds.

No public comment.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Foster to recommend approval of the Desert Bighorn quotas; carried unanimously.

CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval for the California Bighorn Sheep; carried unanimously.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN SHEEP

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes.

Member Turnipseed would like to see 074 opened up even if it is only 1 or 2 tags.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval for the Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep; carried unanimously.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GOAT

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval on Mountain Goats; carried unanimously.

ELK

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes. He noted a correction to the Resident Elk Antlered Archery Hunt 4161, 076/077/079/081. Due to that change, the total was adjusted upward.

In 081, Member Turnipseed said there are four different cow seasons to decrease the congestion but there is no cow/deer hunt there. If the goal is to decrease the elk populations, why not combine them with the deer tag?

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval of the elk harvest limits with the inclusion of deer/elk tag in 081; carried unanimously.

MULE DEER

Mr. Scott reviewed the rationale and science behind the recommended quotas and changes.

Chairman Burnside reiterated the DCABMW's history of support for the youth hunt. DCABMW supports having 10% of the overall tags go to youth and never go below 3000. Mr. Scott stated youth tags are 25% of the total tags.

Chairman Burnside asked what percentage of youth shoot does over bucks. Mr. Scott said 82% harvested bucks last year.

No public comment.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Cook to recommend approval of the deer harvest quotas; carried unanimously.

5h. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 461, INDUSTRIAL ARTIFICIAL POND PERMITS (IAP), LCB FILE NO. R014-16. The Commission will hold a workshop to consider regulation changes relating to amending Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). It revises provisions relating to artificial industrial ponds; adds a provision on the purpose of permits; adds definitions for permanent closure and stabilized; adds new provisions and revises existing provisions relating to application, compliance, modification, renewal, and transfer of permits; and modifies provisions relating to assessment fee structure and payment tiers.

The regulation change regarding application, compliance, modification, renewal and transfer of permits will provide clarity on how to manage permits when certain operational or administrative changes occur. The regulation change regarding assessment fee structures and payment tiers will expand the number of active permit holders required to pay an annual assessment and will increase certain payment tiers. Existing NAC language results in only 55 percent of active IAP permit holders paying an annual assessment, yet NDOW is responsible for managing permits and conducting inspections at all facilities with an IAP permit. The proposed regulation change will eliminate this shortfall, which is currently offset with sportsman dollars, and will create an industry-funded permitting program.

(This item is agendized as a Workshop Item on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda)

Matt Maples, NDOW Habitat Biologist, provided an overview of the proposed regulation.

Member Rittenhouse asked if the fee is determined by the size of the pond or the quantity of the effluent. Mr. Maples responded both. In order to capture all the various industries in the fee schedules, the new regulations consider the number of ponds, total acreage of all the ponds at the project, and tons of ore processed. The maximum fee is capped by NRS.

Chairman Burnside cited Section 3 as it relates to a modification to an existing permit and said significant changes could be made which would result in more monitoring by the Department yet their fee would not change. Mr. Maples explained there is a permit fee and an annual assessment and that is only referring to the \$125 permit fee.

Vice Chairman Cook asked if the ponds are lined and Mr. Maples said almost all are lined, which is a requirement of NDEP. Vice Chairman Cook pointed out that this regulation will allow them to recapture their shortfall.

Mr. Maples added Nevada Mining Association is in agreement with the proposed regulation. Stakeholder meetings were held to gain input from active and potential permit holders.

Kenny Pirkle, NDOW Habitat Biologist, said a benefit of permitting the projects is there are wildlife protection measures in place.

Member Rittenhouse asked who determines when the pond becomes dangerous to wildlife. Mr. Maples said the NRS that provides the ultimate authority for NDOW's pond program states "cause or will cause the death of wildlife" and does not place any water quality numerical quantitative concentration on it. If the pond will cause the death of wildlife, then it has to be covered and fenced.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Foster to support the proposed regulation; carried unanimously.

5a. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION POLICY 26. Currently there are two existing Commission Policies that are numbered "26." One is entitled "Transparency (2011)," and the other is entitled "Re-establishing, Introducing, Transplanting and Managing Pioneering Rocky Mountain Elk (1995)." The Department is recommending that "Re-establishing, Introducing, Transplanting and Managing Pioneering Rocky Mountain Elk (1995)" be reaffirmed as Policy 26 and that "Transparency" be renumbered as Commission Policy 26A. The Commission may also take action to review the revised Commission Policy index and numbering system.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval; carried unanimously.

5b. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON THE SECOND READING OF THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY ELK SUB-PLAN. The Commission will be presented with the draft Humboldt County Elk Sub-plan for review and possible action. The draft Humboldt County Elk Sub-plan has incorporated edits from discussion with the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Humboldt County Commission, and at a sub-planning meeting held on April 12, 2016. This draft is provided for final review and possible adoption.

Mike Scott, NDOW Game Biologist, explained some of the ranchers see this as a potential threat and have hired a consultant, who has provided the Department with input. The Department has assured the ranchers that if there are ever any private land issues or if there are any grazing cuts that are due to elk then they will be reimbursed. He pointed out that there are only a minimal number of elk in some of those units.

No public comment.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Cook to support; carried unanimously.

5c. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON THE PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 DRAFT PREDATION MANAGEMENT PLAN. The Commission will review with the Department the third and final draft of the Fiscal Year 2017 Draft Predation Management Plan. The Commission may take action to modify or endorse the plan.

No public comment.

MOTION by Foster/Cook to recommend approval of the 2017 draft predation management plan; carried unanimously.

5d. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON THE CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO EXISTING COMMISSION POLICY 23 ON PREDATION MANAGEMENT (SECOND READING). On March 24, 2016, the Commission heard a proposed revision to make existing Policy 23 consistent with provisions included in Assembly Bill 78 (AB 78) from the 2015 legislative session and current practice. The Commission moved the policy forward with removal of predation policies in subsection B.6. and B.7. on page 3 of the policy because these dealt with expenditures on habitat management, which had been specifically excluded through AB 78. The Commission may take action to modify or adopt this revision of Policy 23.

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval; carried unanimously.

5e. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICY (APRP) COMMITTEE REPORT AND AMENDMENTS TO COMMISSION POLICY 1, GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMISSION.

A **APRP Report – A report will be provided from recent APRP Committee meetings.**

(This item is agendaized as an Informational Item on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda

B **First Reading, Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission - The Commission will have a first reading of Commission Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission, and may take action on changes to Policy 1 as recommended by the APRP Committee. Recommendations include changes to reflect current practices and standards, including a section on Commission Policy record-keeping, and spacing the number of a Commission Policy's "first and second readings" from one meeting to the**

next before a change to a policy is adopted. The Commission may advance Policy 1 to a second reading for possible adoption at a future meeting.

(This item is agendaized as an Action Item on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda)

No public comment.

MOTION by Cook/Turnipseed to recommend approval of the proposed regulation changes; carried unanimously.

5f. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON THE DUCK STAMP CONTEST SPONSOR. In accordance with Commission Policy 50 the Commission will be asked to select a sponsor for the 2017 and 2018 duck stamp contests.

No public comment.

No action was taken since the sponsor has not been selected at this time.

5g. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 456, SPECIAL INCENTIVE ELK ARBITRATION PANEL. LCB FILE NO. R031-15. The Commission will hold a workshop on the temporary regulation which expired Nov. 1, 2015, relating to amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502.42283 by which the Commission may facilitate decisions by appointing or serving as the arbitration panel should arbitration of elk incentive tag awards become necessary.

During adoption of the permanent NAC, the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and the Legislative Commission have questioned specific language choices recommended by the Department that directly influence the application of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). The primary concern expressed by the Legislative Commission deals with the ability of an arbitration panel to issue a final and binding decision without providing a means for appeal. In short, an appointed panel may be able to provide such a decision, yet when the Commission acts in this capacity it may be deemed an administrative act that must be consistent with the provisions of the APA. The LCB suggested the Department add "subject to judicial review" to clarify the appeals process.

(This item is agendaized as a Workshop Item on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda)

Chairman Burnside reviewed past actions on this item. His understanding is they were trying to get away from the White Pine County Arbitration Panel because they were having difficulty in getting people to serve.

Mike Scott, NDOW Game Biologist, knows this has appeared on the agenda numerous times. He thought they may be appointing the White Pine Arbitration Panel to take care of an existing issue under the regulations as they appear now while working to change the process at the same time.

Chairman Burnside talked about the six appeals of decisions, all from the same person.

No public comment.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Rittenhouse to support the Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel; carried unanimously.

5h. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 461, INDUSTRIAL ARTIFICIAL POND PERMITS (IAP), LCB FILE NO. R014-16. The Commission will hold a workshop to consider regulation changes relating to amending Chapter 502 of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). It revises provisions relating to artificial industrial ponds; adds a provision on the purpose of permits; adds definitions for permanent closure and stabilized; adds new provisions and revises existing provisions relating to application, compliance, modification, renewal, and transfer of permits; and modifies provisions relating to assessment fee structure and payment tiers.

The regulation change regarding application, compliance, modification, renewal and transfer of permits will provide clarity on how to manage permits when certain operational or administrative changes occur. The regulation change regarding assessment fee structures and payment tiers will expand the number of active permit holders required to pay an annual assessment and will increase certain payment tiers. Existing NAC language results in only 55 percent of active IAP permit holders paying an annual assessment, yet NDOW is responsible for managing permits and conducting inspections at all facilities with an IAP permit. The proposed regulation change will eliminate this shortfall, which is currently offset with sportsman dollars, and will create an industry-funded permitting program.

(This item is agendaized as a Workshop Item on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda)

This item was heard earlier in the meeting.

5i. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 462, ISSUING AND VERIFYING HULL NUMBERS OF VESSELS, LCB FILE NO. R015-16. The Commission will hold a workshop to consider regulation changes to address federal regulatory changes the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) has requested states to implement pertaining to hull numbers for vessels and the verification and issuance of these numbers; the processing of certificate of number applications for vessels to include language definitions, standardization of terminology regarding vessels and personal identification information of owners.

In order to receive federal matching funds associated with the Dingle Johnson Act, all states report vessel information annually to the USCG. In an effort to modernize and standardize their vessel database information, which the USCG collects from all of the states, the USCG amended federal law. This federal change standardizes terminology across all of the states and provides direction regarding the method that states assign and verify hull numbers. Ultimately, these federal

changes are expected to improve state reporting. As a result the Department must amend state regulation to implement this standardization effort in order to meet the USCG reporting requirements. These changes must be implemented by Jan. 1, 2017.

(This item is agendized as a Workshop Item on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda)

Chairman Burnside said new state hull numbers will be assigned for vessels.

No public comment.

No action was taken since the workshop has not been held at this time and more information is needed.

5j. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 460, DEFINITION OF "SPIKE ELK", LCB FILE NO. R013-16. The Commission will consider amending NAC 502.104 and 502.1045 to define "Spike Elk" in a manner that limits inadvertent errors in the field. The intent is to consider and possibly broaden the definition of spike in a manner that is consistent with the management objective of defining a spike while reducing the likelihood of errors in harvest identification.

A workshop was held in Yerington on March 25, 2016. The Commission directed the Department to contact Utah to identify if they have had any issues with enforcement regarding the way that their language is written, which is similar to the Department's proposed language. Alternative language, including whether to use the number of branches or antlered points in the definition was also discussed.

Mike Scott, NDOW Game Biologist, reviewed the recommendation made by the Washoe CAB.

A discussion took place on what qualifies as a "spike".

Vice Chairman Cook stated nothing in the language defines the length of spikes.

While he understands the goal to decriminalize people, Member Foster supports the language as proposed.

No public comment.

MOTION by Burnside/Foster to support the definition as written- "an elk that has on one side a single antler that is not branched above the ears"; carried unanimously.

5k. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 456, SPECIAL INCENTIVE ELK ARBITRATION PANEL, LCB FILE NO. R031-15. The Commission will consider amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502.42283 by which the Commission may facilitate decisions by appointing or serving as the arbitration panel should arbitration of elk incentive

tag awards become necessary.

During adoption of the permanent NAC, the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) and the Legislative Commission have questioned specific language choices recommended by the Department that directly influence the application of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). The primary concern expressed by the Legislative Commission deals with the ability of an arbitration panel to issue a final and binding decision without providing a means for appeal. In short, an appointed panel may be able to provide such a decision, yet when the Commission acts in this capacity it may be deemed an administrative act that must be consistent with the provisions of the APA. The attempts by the Department to recommend acceptable language to adequately describe this nuance have thus far been unclear.

At the request of the Board, the discussion from item 5g is carried forward to this item.

Chairman Burnside reviewed past actions on this item. His understanding is they were trying to get away from the White Pine County Arbitration Panel because they were having difficulty in getting people to serve.

Mike Scott, NDOW Game Biologist, knows this has appeared on the agenda numerous times. He thought they may be appointing the White Pine Arbitration Panel to take care of an existing issue under the regulations as they appear now while working to change the process at the same time.

Chairman Burnside talked about the six appeals of decisions, all from the same person.

No public comment.

MOTION by Turnipseed/Rittenhouse to support the Special Incentive Elk Arbitration Panel; carried unanimously.

5I. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON COMMISSION REGULATION 16-12, 2016 BIG GAME QUOTAS FOR THE 2016-2017 SEASON. The Commission will establish regulations for the numbers of tags to be issued for mule deer, pronghorn antelope, elk, bighorn sheep, black bear, and mountain goats for the 2016 - 2017 seasons.

This item was heard earlier in the meeting.

5m. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION ON WHITE PINE COUNTY ELK INCENTIVE AND DAMAGE ARBITRATION PANEL. The Commission may take action to make three appointments to the White Pine County Elk and Damage Arbitration Panel to serve for the next two years (NAC 502.44283 and NAC 504.430).

No public comment.

No action was taken.

6. CORRESPONDENCE OR COMMUNICATIONS BOARD MEMBERS HAVE RECEIVED.

All members received an invitation to the Big Game Draw.

Vice Chairman Cook said the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is to receive a \$5 million SNPLMA grant. There is a proposal to make Emerald Bay a fishery.

Member Turnipseed disclosed communication with Tyler Turnipseed on trail cameras.

This was a discussion only.

7. DISCUSSION ON THE RESULTS OF THE MARCH 24 & 25, 2016 NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSION MEETINGS.

Member Turnipseed said there was much discussion about caliber, trail cameras, drones, and electronic triggers.

This was informational only.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION REGARDING ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER COMMITMENTS TO ATTEND UPCOMING WILDLIFE COMMISSION MEETINGS AND TO REPRESENT THE FINDINGS OF THE DOUGLAS COUNTY WILDLIFE ADVISORY BOARD. ONE MEMBER WILL BE DESIGNATED AS A SPOKESMAN FOR THE DOUGLAS COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD.

Vice Chairman Cook will attend the Saturday meeting. Member Rittenhouse will attend the Elko meeting.

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION. DISCUSSION TO SCHEDULE THE NEXT WILDLIFE ADVISORY BOARD MEETING. The next Commission meeting is scheduled for June 24 and 25, 2016, in Elko and the Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change the date and meeting location at this time. The chairman may designate and adjust committee assignments as necessary at this time.

The next Douglas County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, June 21, 2016.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

- Tri County Wildlife Working Group
- License Simplification

MOTION by Turnipseed/Cook to adjourn the meeting; carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the DCABMW, the meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

The minutes of the May 10, 2016 meeting of the Douglas County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife are so approved this 21st day of June, 2016.

Respectfully submitted:

Craig Burnside, Chairman