



Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MEETING MINUTES

Date: December 3, 2013
Location: Clark County Government Center
500 S. Grand Central Pkwy.,
Las Vegas, NV 89155-1111

Time: 5:30 pm

Board Members Present: Paul Dixon, Chair J. Michael Reese, Vice Chair
John Sullivan Brian Patterson Ryan Anderson

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

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

Date: November 26, 2013

.....

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 Stacy Matthews. A quorum was present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

- Chairman Paul Dixon requested all stand and Asked Vice Chair Reese to lead the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes of September 17, 2013 CCABMW Meeting - Action

- A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes of the Board Meeting held on September 17, 2013 as written. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Approval of Agenda for December 3, 2013 – Action

- Chairman Paul Dixon noted that informational item #7, Disease Event Update will need to be taken out of sequence, as the speaker, NDOW Biologist Peregrine Wolff, is in the air and will present via conference call once she has landed and is available via phone.
- Chairman Paul Dixon also noted that there is a typo on agenda item #14. The Commission Meeting is December 6th and 7th in Reno, not December 3rd.

- Chairman Paul Dixon asked that Commissioners in attendance keep their comments to 6 minutes and the public to 3 minutes unless representing a group, and then they are allowed 6 minutes.
- A motion was made and seconded to accept the Meeting Agenda as written with the addition of a restroom break around 7:30, and allowing for the Disease Report to be taken out of sequence, and the correction to the dates listed in Item #14. Motion passed unanimously.

Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda, and two or more items may be combined for consideration. The Board may also remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.

5. **CAB Member Items/Announcements/Correspondence: (*Informational*):** Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (CCABMW) members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the CCABMW. Any item requiring CCABMW action will be scheduled on a future CCABMW agenda. CCABMW board members may discuss any correspondence sent or received. (CCABMW board members must provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record).
 - Vice Chair Reese stated that he had received a call from someone who had observed an animal being poached, but was unable to find a phone number to notify NDOW.
 - Robert Gaudet shared 1-800-992-3030.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon advised attendees that he has not officially noted any dissenting views from the general public in his action report to the Commission when the Board members agree unanimously. He has and will note dissenting opinions from the Board explicitly.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon highlighted an article from Time Magazine that discusses the explosive growth of urban wildlife densities since 1950 and the impact that growth has had on cities in America. He also discussed a study from Yale University that determined that the Yellowstone elk numbers have declined due to a change in diet among grizzly bears that now prefer cow elk and calves rather than the normal trout which are now in reduced numbers in the National Park streams.
6. **Reappointment of Brian Patterson (*Informational*)** – Brian was reappointment to the CCABMW to represent the interests of the general public.
 - Brian will represent the General Public and as such will be a primary contact for members of the general public for information and issues relating to Board business.
7. **Disease Event Update – Southern California Desert Bighorn Sheep – Dr. Peregrine Wolff (*Informational*)** – A wild sheep disease report will be provided and impacts on the Southern Nevada Big Horn populations.
 - Dr. Wolff by phone: Evidence of pneumonia was found throughout the samples collected. Phone communication was lost.
8. **Wild Horse Update - (*Informational*)** - An NDOW representative will lead a discussion about the status of the wild horse issues pending in Southern Nevada.
 - Brad Hardenbrook, NDOW Biologist, stated that there are no updates since the September meeting.
9. **Desert Tortoise Program update - (*Informational*)** - An NDOW representative will lead a discussion about the status of the tortoise issues in Southern Nevada.

- Chairman Paul Dixon read from an update prepared by NDOW Biologist regarding progress made in reducing the numbers of unwanted pet desert tortoises.

10. Heritage Proposal - (Informational) – Chairman Dixon will lead a discussion about the Heritage Program and when proposals are due to NDOW.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic. He recommended submitting applications for Heritage funds for FY2015 early. The deadline is March 1st, 2014. Go on the NDOW website to apply. Bruce McDaniel is the NDOW person to contact for questions. He added a recommendation that anyone submitting an application let the Board members know so they can help push them through.

11. Status update on the Overton Conceptual Management Plan - (Informational) – An NDOW representative will lead a discussion about the status of the Overton CMP.

- Brad Hardenbrook (NDOW) presented an update on the status of the Overton CMP. The CMP is expected to reduce the conflicts between visiting staff. A budget and draft of the CMP are expected in the first quarter of 2014.

12. Action Items:

A. Discuss & make recommendations regarding the following Action Items from the Board of Wildlife Commissioners December 6th and 7th, 2013 Agenda and additional items brought forth to the Clark CABMW 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 materials should be available on December 2, 2013 at http://www.ndow.org/Commission/Schedule_and_Agenda/

1. Commission Policy #23, Predation Management - (For Possible Action) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about Commission Policy #23: Predation Management.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this item, reading from the NRS regarding the \$3 fee collected with each license and its proscribed use. He then opened the floor for public comment.
- Jana Wright voiced her total support of Policy 23 noting that it is proactive rather than reactive.
- Robert Gaudet, Nevada Wildlife Federation, voiced his objection to the \$3 fee, noting that it is an application fee. He further stated that sage grouse predation control should be covered by the upland game bird stamp, and a diet study on cougars is silly since we all know cougars eat deer and bighorn sheep.
- John Hiatt cited a study that followed cougars and analyzed their kills. That study found that about 70% of their diet was deer and 30% bighorn sheep. The study also found that the cougars and deer are not active at the same time of day.
- Bill DeJuncker highlighted the statistics from the previous speakers stating that if the cougar diet is at least 80% deer and sheep, why is it necessary to fund another study.
- Vikki Werner asked if some of the proposed studies are being done just to get the funds.
- Chairman Paul Dixon gave examples of where studies can provide valuable information that can lead to projects that improve wildlife habitat and survival rates.

- Commissioner Karen Layne advised the attendees to focus on the Policy rather than the Plan. What the Board will vote on at this meeting is the Policy. The Policy defines how the Plan will be developed and reviewed.
- Chairman Paul Dixon closed public comment and asked Vice Chair Reese to lead Board discussion.
- Vice Chair Reese raised some objections to the proposed Policy in that it lacks any provision for accountability, it does not have a summary calendar showing dates for Plan events, and he does not understand what non-lethal predator control is.
- Brian Patterson noted that he sees predator funds being used mostly in "react" mode as when a rancher reports predator problems.
- Steve Kimble (NDOW) noted that there has been a Committee in place for some time, but there has not been a Policy in place. He stated that he is not aware of any Predator funds going to livestock. He further noted that most of the available funds are spent every year barring logistical problems, and all of the approved projects are targeted toward wildlife preservation.
- Commissioner Karen Layne stated that she had attended some of the sessions involving AB345, and that the 50% allocation for research was a compromise between Senators, and the push to non-lethal management is looking at ways to impact predation through environmental measures rather than use of lethal measures. Predator control needs to have clear objectives and a review of results. This Policy is intended to provide that oversight for Plans going forward.
- Brian Patterson stated that the public needs education on where the money is being spent.
- Robert Gaudet agreed that the belief is that the \$3 fee is to get rid of predators. If that's not what it's being used for, the public needs to know.
- John Sullivan agreed with Brian Patterson in that a hunter putting in a tag application believes the \$3 is going to remove predators from areas where he may hunt, but would be shocked to learn that the money is going to projects dealing with road kill, etc. instead.
- Chairman Paul Dixon asked John Sullivan and Brian Patterson how they would propose to educate the public.
- Ryan Anderson proposed that a simple pop-up on the tag application website can provide information or links to detailed information on the use of the \$3 fee.
- Brian Patterson suggested changing the name of the fee to something like "Wildlife Study Fee".
- Dave Stowater agreed to change the name to Study Program fee.
- Chairman Paul Dixon liked the pop-up suggestion since 98% of the tag applications last year were submitted online.
- Vikki Werner likes the idea of the pop-up, but the info should also appear on the website as well.
- Bill DeJuncker suggested a question mark to trigger a pop-up to explain the use of the fee.
- Robert Gaudet also likes the proposed pop-up and suggested that the NDOW website have a reference to GameThief on the home page.
- Vice Chair Reese noted that originally the proposed fee was \$5. Most were OK with that. But 2 years ago, a man from Utah was paid \$100k to collar three coyotes, one of which turned up dead.
- Ryan Anderson reiterated what Commissioner Karen Layne stated regarding the lack of accountability.
- Vice Chair Reese would like to see a cap on management spending and allow the CABs to monitor spending and results.

- Motion made and seconded to recommend approval of the proposed Policy with the recommendation that an education component be added to the tag application website, that a concise calendar be added to the Policy to make dates easily available, that the Commission consider a change to the name of the Predator Control Plan to Predation Management and Study Plan. The motion passed unanimously.
2. **Elk Hunt Management Strategies - (*For Possible Action*)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about new elk hunt management strategies to include: removal of depredation hunts from the bonus point program; antlerless elk management tag awarded when a deer tag is drawn within specified units; antlerless elk management tag awarded when an antlered elk tag is drawn; allow applications for both antlered elk and antlerless elk in the same draw period; and implementation of spike hunts.
- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced Maureen Hullinger (NDOW) to address this topic.
 - Maureen Hullinger gave a summary of her career and background and discussed the proposed seven strategies presented to the Commission in September by Mike Cox. She noted that two of the strategies fit with current regulations, but the remaining five would require possible regulation changes.
 - Vice Chair Reese asked if there is a time limit on these strategies, will they go away?
 - Maureen responded that while there is no planned end date, availability of the "Delk" (deer and elk) tag, for example, will vary by area and by herd sizes.
 - Vice Chair Reese asked Steve Kimble (NDOW) what percentages statewide.
 - Steve Kimble stated that for Area 23, the elk herd goal is 350 adult animals but the current herd is around 650 animals. He stated that there has been no agreement to execute all of these strategies, but something needs to be done.
 - Maureen reviewed the proposed strategies, the rationale behind them, and potential regulatory changes requires for each.
 - Brian Patterson stated that he agrees with Strategy #1, Removing Depredation Hunts from the bonus point program.
 - Maureen was asked if youth hunt applicants were eligible for the "Delk" tags. No.
 - Public comment was opened for Strategy #1. No public comment.
 - A motion was made and seconded to recommend adoption of Strategy #1, Removing Depredation Hunts from the bonus point program. Motion passed unanimously.
 - Public comment was opened for Strategy #2, Antlerless Elk Management Tag Awarded if Deer Tag Drawn ("Delk" Tag).
 - Robert Gaudet, NWF, voiced concern involving cows with calves. He drew a cow tag this year and all of the cows he saw during his hunt in October had calves with them.
 - Ryan Anderson responded that taking a nursing cow is a means toward the goal of reducing the antlerless elk population.
 - Steve Kimble was asked to address the question of wet cows. He responded that he was not sure if a calf would still be nursing in October or what its chances of survival would be without its mother.
 - Vikki Werner asked why the emphasis on cows.
 - Steve Kimble answered that the Commission limits the number of bull tags, but herd management requires removing cows from the population. If the cow is pregnant or with a young calf, then removing the cow also removes the calf.
 - Dave Stowater asked if there is reduced opportunity to get a tag.
 - A motion was made and seconded to recommend adoption of Strategy #2, Antlerless Elk Management Tag Awarded if Deer Tag Drawn ("Delk" Tag) with the addition of

eligibility for the youth hunt and reduction of the fee for the Elk Management Tag to \$60. Motion passed unanimously.

- Maureen explained the options for "Delk" tags for a deer party application.
- Board discussion tended toward option 2 (single applicants on a deer party can opt for the "Delk" tag).
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend adoption of Option 2 under Strategy #2A, "Delk" Deer Party Applications. Motion passed unanimously.
- Maureen explained the four options under Strategy 2B.
- Ryan Anderson voiced his preference for option 3.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend adoption of Option 3 under Strategy #2B, "Delk" Application Eligibility. Motion passed unanimously.
- Maureen explained Strategy 2C.
- Brian Patterson stated that if he drew a "Delk" tag and a bull tag and harvested both a deer and a cow elk, he would only take a "trophy" bull since his freezer is already full. Thus the harvest rate would go down.
- Bill DeJuncker proposed selling antlerless elk tags over the counter.
- Steve Kimble responded that the number of tags has been increasing yearly, but the harvest remains low. He speculates that congestion in the hunt areas is the reason.
- Dave Stowater offered an idea of having a two week hunt for over-the-counter tags, analyzing the harvest and then having a second two-week hunt to address the shortfall.
- Ryan Anderson stated that that would be a statistical nightmare as not all of the data would be available in time.
- Vikki Werner agrees with the idea of over-the-counter antlerless elk management tags.
- Bill DeJuncker offered the following ideas: 1) sell over-the-counter antlerless elk management tags on first come/first served basis with no bonus point penalty, 2) set dates for antlerless elk management hunts for the second and third weeks of August, and 3) for areas where the numbers of cow elk need to be reduced, if a cow tag is drawn, preserve the hunter's bonus points.
- A motion was made and seconded to recommend adoption of Strategy #2C, "Delk" Application Eligibility with Antlered Elk. Motion passed Yea: 4, Nay: 1. Dissenting: Vice Chair Reese.
- Vikki Werner asked if she drew both a "Delk" tag and a bull elk tag, could she turn in the cow tag and still keep the deer and bull elk tags?
- Maureen answered yes, but she would still pay the cow elk tag fee.
- Maureen explained Strategy #3, Antlerless Elk Management Tag Awarded if Bull Elk Tag Drawn. This is the Elk version of "Delk".
- Vikki Werner asked what areas would be eligible for this option.
- Ryan Anderson answered that the areas would not be defined until the seasons are set.
- A motion was made and seconded to oppose Strategy #3. Motion passed unanimously.
- Maureen explained Strategy #4, Allow Both Antlered and Antlerless Elk Application in the Same Draw Period.
- Chairman Paul Dixon is in favor of this strategy.
- Vice Chair Reese noted that with eligibility option 2, a hunter could conceivably draw three elk tags and a deer tag in the same year.
- Vice Chair Reese prefers Option 5. Chairman Paul Dixon prefers Option 1.

- A motion was made and seconded to recommend adoption of Strategy #4, with eligibility Option 1. Allow Both Antlered and Antlerless Elk Application in the Same Draw Period... Motion passed Yea: 4, Nay: 1. Dissenting: Vice Chair Reese.
 - A motion was made and seconded to oppose Strategy #4 Options 2, 3, and 4. Motion passed unanimously.
 - Maureen explained Strategy #5, Spike Elk Hunts.
 - Vikki Werner suggested a youth hunt with education on how to look for antlers.
 - Dave Stowater voiced concern that someone would shoot an animal without spikes.
 - Ryan Anderson noted that there is already a spike hunt.
 - Steve Kimble corrected Ryan in that while there is currently no spike season set, there is a definition of "spike" in the regulations.
 - Chairman Paul Dixon voiced preference for approval of Strategy #5 with Option 5.
 - Ryan Anderson proposed clarification of Option 5 to exclude the "Delk" cow elk tag.
 - A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Strategy #5 with eligibility Option 5 clarified to state that once an elk application is drawn all other elk applications, excluding "Delk" applications, are declared unsuccessful. Motion passed unanimously.
- 3. Commission General Regulation 431, LCB File No. R054-13, Aquatic Invasive Species Decal Use Defined - (For Possible Action)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to watercraft; revising provisions properly relating thereto. The regulation is needed to exempt certain government vessels and aligns the Aquatic Invasive Species decal regulation with the boating registration decal regulation; allows for less confusion with the public and statewide enforcement personnel and allows the Department to invalidate decals if appropriate fees are not paid.
- This topic was tabled due to lack of time to discuss.
- 4. Commission General Regulation 432, LCB File No. R055-13, Jiggs Flatwake (For Possible Action)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to wildlife; revising provisions related to waters on which a reduced speed is required; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. Currently Jiggs Reservoir has no special regulation limiting boating speed, but does prohibit water skiing. The reservoir is too small (max 45 surface acres) and shallow (max 10 feet) to safely accommodate water skiing and other high speed activities. The reservoir has not been maintained at full capacity for many years since water seeps from the permeable bottom soil. Nevada Department of Wildlife is currently sealing the bottom in order to increase the water level that will restore the trout and bass fisheries. Recreational fishing is the principal management for this reservoir. It is expected that Jet Ski use will increase as the water level increases and the agency feels that excessive speeds from jet skis and larger boats will become unsafe. Most users are expected to come from Elko, about 35 miles to the north. However, South Fork Reservoir is located 20 miles south of Elko, which has vast boating and jet skiing accommodations and use because of its large size (1,640 acres and depth of 67 feet).
- This topic was tabled due to lack of time to discuss.
- 5. Commission General Regulation 433, LCB File No. R056-13, Remove Fishing Tackle Restrictions - (For Possible Action)** The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners

about a regulation relating to fishing; removing Andorno Creek, Coleman Creek and the North Fork of Battle Creek from the waters restricted to use only artificial lures with single barbless hooks; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. NDOW proposes to change the special fishing regulations (use of artificial lures and single barbless hooks only) for Andorno, Coleman, and North Fork Battle creeks to a general fishing regulation (any legal fishing method) for Humboldt County. These streams fall within of the Lahontan cutthroat trout (LCT) recovery program and fish populations have been restored and are self-sustaining. These streams are remote and receive very little angling use and, therefore, they are to the point that the public can now harvest some of these fish. Local public support for future LCT restoration may increase by allowing anglers to use less restrictive fishing tackle for catching a Nevada native fish.

- This topic was tabled due to lack of time to discuss.

6. Commission General Regulation 434, LCB File No. R057-13, Unit Boundaries - (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to wildlife management areas and units; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. Inconsistencies exist between the hunt units map and corresponding written boundary descriptions. This regulation legally describes wildlife management units throughout the state that are used for the management of wildlife species. The written description provides a legal basis for the enforcement of unit specific harvest regulations.

- This topic was tabled due to lack of time to discuss.

7. Commission General Regulation 436, LCB File No. R089-13, Reciprocal Lake Mead, Lake Mohave and Colorado River Fishing Licenses – (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to wildlife; revising provisions relating to licenses required for fishing in the reciprocal waters of the Colorado River, Lake Mead and Lake Mohave; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. This regulation amends language making the requirement for a minor to fish in the Colorado River, Lake Mead and Lake Mohave system consistent with the rest of the state. Recent changes in Arizona fishing license requirements, and the Memorandum of Understanding under which both states administer reciprocal waters makes differential age requirements unnecessary.

- This topic was tabled due to lack of time to discuss.

8. Commission General Regulation 437, LCB File No. R090-13, Creating Ewe Hunt – (*For Possible Action*) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to wildlife; revising provisions relating to the assessment of demerit points for conviction of certain wildlife violations; establishing distinct tags for the hunting of ram and ewe bighorn sheep; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. The request for regulation change to establish the authority for a ewe hunt will assist the Department in addressing concerns related to bighorn sheep population densities, disease events and water and resource impacts.

- Chairman Paul Dixon voiced his objections to the ewe hunt given potential disease situations.
- Brian Patterson is in favor of a ewe hunt as areas with diseases would be excluded from a ewe hunt.
- Ryan Anderson sees a ewe hunt as a revenue builder.
- John Sullivan noted that the sheep in Nevada are very well regulated. He sees a ewe hunt as a valuable tool for herd management.
- Vice Chair Reese would rather see sheep transplant to another state.
- Robert Gaudet is opposed to ewe hunts. He prefers transplant.
- Commissioner Karen Layne stated that there are no requests to transplant sheep to other states. If we can't move them, what are we going to do?
- Steve Kimble noted that NDOW would like to have this as a tool for herd management. Further, disease events seem to be related to population density, so it is imperative that the population is maintained. NDOW has been hunting ewes for years from helicopters. Allowing hunters to take ewes is a revenue source. Water is an issue: it costs \$4 per gallon to transport water to dry areas. A ewe hunt is not the first choice, but it costs about \$1K per animal to capture and trailer. Many of the herds in Southern Nevada are bulging at the seams.
- A motion was made and seconded to support proposed regulation 437, LCB File No. R090-13 as written. Motion passed unanimously.

9. Commission General Regulation 438, LCB File No. R091-13, Bonus Point Program – (For Possible Action) The Clark CABMW Board will review, discuss and make recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners about a regulation relating to wildlife; providing an exception to the prohibition on the submission of applications for hunting tags and bonus points under certain circumstances; prohibiting the award of bonus points for depredation hunts and management hunts; providing for the award of bonus points in the categories of ewes of certain bighorn sheep; and providing other matters properly relating thereto. The regulation amendment would provide the Commission the ability to determine species application eligibility in annual regulation to meet the Department's management needs. Additionally the exclusion of depredation and management hunts from the bonus point program is to promote harvest regardless of age or antler size. The premise being that an applicant with a high number of bonus points is more likely to trophy hunt once they draw a tag for these types of hunts. This regulation also addresses the bonus point category for ewe hunts if the hunt becomes established by the Commission.

- Chairman Paul Dixon introduced this topic and asked Maureen Hullinger to provide details.
- Maureen Hullinger described the proposed changes to the LCB including a reference to a ewe hunt.
- A motion was made and seconded to support proposed regulation 438, LCB File No. R091-13 as written. Motion passed unanimously.

12. Public Comment: Members of the public who wish to address the Board may speak on matters within the jurisdiction of the Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife. No action may be taken on a matter not listed on the posted agenda. Any item requiring Board action not on this agenda may be scheduled on a future agenda. Public comments on posted agenda items will be allowed at

the time the agenda item is considered before the Board takes any action on the item. Comments will be limited to three minutes. **NOTE: Please complete the Public Comment Interest Card and submit to Chairman Dixon.**

- Jana Wright voiced her disagreement with the strategy that Chairman Paul Dixon stated earlier regarding his reports to the Commission on the decisions of the Board that do not include details of any dissenting views from the general public. Also, she expressed her concerns that the upcoming Commission Meeting lacks video conferencing and thus the public would have no way to provide real-time comments.
- Stephanie Meyers, Lee Canyon/Mt. Charleston, raised issue with the reappointment of Brian Patterson to the Board. She claimed that while the language of AB168 was ambiguous, the spirit of the bill was to ensure that a member of the Board would be a non-sportsman representing the interests of the General Public. She claimed that 96% of the residents are not hunters or trappers. She further asked when will there be an opportunity to propose a candidate who is not an angler, hunter or trapper?
- Chairman Paul Dixon responded that Brian Patterson was appointed by the Clark County Commission as the General Public representative on the Board. When his 3-year term is up, another General Public representative can be appointed. Other positions on the Board will be up for consideration between now and then, but those positions must, according to Regulation, represent farming, hunting, fishing, trapping, etc. Until then, Brian Patterson is the designated representative for the General Public on the Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife.
- Ryan Anderson added that the Clark County Board does not represent the 2.6 Million residents of the State of Nevada, only the residents of Clark County. Further, it was the Clark County Commission, not the Board that appointed Brian to the Board.
- Vikki Werner stated that she is thankful that Brian Patterson was selected to the Board as he knowledgeable and always prepared to address the issues brought before the Board.

13. Authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit any recommendations from today's meeting to the Commission for its consideration at its December 6th and 7th meeting in Reno, Nevada. (For Possible Action)

- A motion was made and seconded to authorize the Chairman to prepare and submit recommendations from this meeting to the Commission. Motion passed unanimously.

14. The next Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting is scheduled for January 28th, 2014, at the Clark County Government Center to support the scheduled Wildlife Commission meeting on January 31st and February 1st 2014 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

15. Adjournment

- A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 8:46PM.