

CHAIRMAN TOMMY CAVIGLIA
COMMISSIONER TIFFANY EAST
COMMISSIONER RON PIERNI
COMMISSIONER SHANE ROGERS
CABMW REP. JOE CRIM
CABMW REP. ARNIE PITTS
PUBLIC REP. MEGHAN BROWN

STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE:
KIM MUNOZ, DATS DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR
kim.munoz@ndow.org, 775-688-1565
MEGAN MANFREDI, MANAGEMENT ANALYST
mmmanfredi@ndow.org, 775-688-1881

MINUTES
NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS
TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2022 @ 3:00PM

Please click this URL to join.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86461085438?pwd=OTlwN0VGazBzQnVGR2VhZ2RkanVWQT09>

Passcode: 658770

Committee Members in attendance: Chairman Tommy Caviglia, Commissioner Tiffany East, Public Representative Meghan Brown, CABMW Representative Joe Crim, Commissioner Shane Rogers, Commissioner Ron Pierini, CABMW Representative Arnie Pitts

Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance: Data and Technology Services (DATS) Division Administrator Kim Munoz, Management Analyst Megan Manfredi, Management Analyst Kailey Musso, Game Division Administrator Mike Scott, Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne, Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder, Deputy Director Bonnie Long, Conservation Educator Martin Olsen

County advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Members and public in attendance: Brian Cimperman, Kevin Billows, Rex Flowers, Jim Cooney, Paul Dixon, Judi Caron, Matt Malarkey, Mike Reese, Carl Erquiaga

1. Call to Order, Pledge and Roll Call – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia

Chairman Caviglia called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM. Commissioner Pierini led the pledge. Chairman Tommy Caviglia, Commissioner Tiffany East, Commissioner Ron Pierini, Commissioner Rogers, CABMW Representative Joe Crim, Public Representative Meghan Brown were present. and CABMW Representative Arnie Pitts was absent.

2. Approval of Agenda – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action

The Committee will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Committee may remove items from the agenda, continue items for consideration or take items out of order.

CABMW REPRESENTATIVE CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER EAST. MOTION PASSED 6-0 WITH CABMW REPRESENTATIVE PITTS ABSENT.

3.* Approval of Minutes – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action

The Committee may take action to approve Committee minutes from the November 3, 2021 meeting.

Commissioner East noted amending the word “our” to “out” on page three as well as making the word “point” to plural in the following paragraph on the same page.

COMMISSIONER EAST MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED WITH THE NOTED CHANGES, SECONDED BY PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE BROWN. MOTION PASSED 6-0 WITH CABMW REPRESENTATIVE PITTS ABSENT.

- 4.* Commission Policy 24 Changes – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – For Possible Action
The Committee will review Commission Policy 24 and may take action to recommend revising, suspending or repealing the policy. Any revision will be provided to the Administrative Procedures, Regulations, and Policy (APRP) Committee for review and approval.

Management Analyst Megan Manfredi stated that the changes incorporated in the support materials were the product of several meetings by the Game division and Game Division Administrator Mike Scott was available to answer any questions.

Chairman Caviglia asked if the age of participants for the Junior Hunt Program would change if that direction was determined by the Committee. He suggested including the six-month residency requirement in the resident definition.

Game Division Administrator Scott answered that the age would amend in the policy if the regulation is amended in the future. He added that the policy originally contained a table that the Game Division proposed removing as it did not add much value since the definitions are included and contain a more thorough definition.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz added that including the definition of the six-month residency into the policy would be easy to add as it is already defined in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) and most of the definitions included in the policy are taken straight from NAC.

Commission Rogers agreed that including the definition would be helpful.

Commissioner East asked if the term “ration” was part of the original policy and requested that it be updated to different verbiage.

Game Division Administrator Scott confirmed that the term came from the original policy and that it could be updated if the Committee wished.

CABMW Representative Arnie Pitts arrived at the meeting.

Commissioner East noted on page three that bull should be added to antlered elk and antlered moose to keep consistent with other species definitions. On page eight, under the sheep classes the word “having” should be amended to “have.” The word inch should be spelled out under elk by weapon group.

Public comment:

Brian Cimperman asked if the language presented would be changed back to 18 for the junior hunt. He added that changing the age would be taking opportunities away from the youth, he disagreed with the change and would like to see the kids receive as much opportunity as can be allowed.

Rex Flowers stated that there is no mention of the junior hunts under item two of the policy and that juniors are not represented in the portion of desired harvest. Consideration is needed for all

sportsmen. The either sex tags that the juniors are awarded is also not included anywhere in the policy and it should be addressed. He stated he would like to see the junior any sex tags be included where mule deer antlerless tags are approved for the same season under section five on page five.

Chairman Caviglia asked if the policy needed language addressing how the number of junior tags are determined every year. He also stated that juniors being allowed to harvest doe mule deer is a bigger discussion than this agenda item but would not mind seeing it addressed in the policy.

Game Division Administrator Scott answered that the junior tags were addressed in the table that was removed but language could be added to incorporate the junior tags.

Chairman Caviglia asked for the timeline of completion to changes made to the policy.

Game Division Administrator Scott answered that any changes the Committee would like made can be brought back to the next Committee meeting for review and approval.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz added that the Administrative Policies, Regulations, and Procedures (APRP) Committee directed this Committee to review and complete changes to the policy.

Management Analyst Kailey Musso confirmed that DATS Division Administrator Munoz was correct, and that the policy could either go back to the APRP Committee for review if Chairman McNinch of the APRP Committee wished to review it, otherwise it could go straight to the Commission for approval.

Chairman Caviglia stated some concerns he had with adding the term bull next to antlered moose as there are occasionally cow moose that have horns.

Game Division Administrator Scott confirmed with Chairman Caviglia that some types of females have horns and would be considered legal to harvest. He added that language can be added similar to what is used in other species such as generally considered to be male can be added for clarification.

CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA MOVED TO DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT TO INCORPORATE CHANGES TO COMMISSION POLICY 24 THAT INCLUDE UPDATING TO THE TERM "RATION" TO A DIFFERENT WORD. INCLUDE THE GENERAL MALE TERMINOLOGY USED IN THE MULE DEER DEFINITION IN THE DEFINITION OF ANTERLED ELK. KEEP THE JUNIOR HUNT AGE AS IS FOR THE TIME BEING. INCLUDE THE MONTHS OF RESIDENCY IN THE RESIDENCY DEFINITIONS. INCLUDE VERBIAGE PERTAINING TO THE JUNIOR HUNT ALLOCATION UNDER THE MULE DEER SPECIFIC RULES. ADD VERBIAGE ADDRESSING FEMALE MULE DEER HARVESTS NOT BEING ALLOWED ON JUNIOR TAGS IN UNITS WHERE ANTLERLESS MULE DEER ARE NOT ALLOWED. CLEAN UP THE "HAVING" TO "HAVE" ON PAGE EIGHT. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER EAST. MOTION PASSED 7-0.

5.* Commission General Regulation 502 – Junior Hunt Program – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi - For Possible Action

The Committee will review the draft language amending Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 502 chapters that would change the age eligibility to apply for the Junior Hunt Program to 16-years-old and the eligibility to participate based on draw success to four years.

Management Analyst Manfredi opened by updating the Committee that the draft language for the Junior Hunt Program changes is currently still being drafted by Legislative Council Bureau (LCB). There was discussion during the last meeting that the intent was not captured correctly, and the Department was opening the floor for additional discussion and direction on the intent of the Committee to change the years a junior can apply in the program or update the times a junior could be successful in the program.

Commissioner East stated that her preference would be to limit the number of times a junior could be successful in the program and leave the number of times a junior could apply.

Chairman Caviglia agreed that with the multiple draws and programs available to receive a tag in a single year, that the applications should not be limited.

Discussion was had updating new Committee members on the reasoning the Junior Hunt Program was being discussed, including why changes were being proposed and the thought process around those changes. Data was shared from the September 2021 meeting showing potential tags that would be made available to different juniors participating in the program if some changes were made to the program. Commission Policy 24 was brought up with the potential need to include the weapon class breakout within the policy.

Public comment:

Rex Flowers stated that the age should remain at 18 to afford more opportunity to juniors of that age but the number of successfully awarded junior tags should be limited to three. Three awarded junior tags are more than sufficient and would provide opportunities to other junior hunters.

Brian Cimperman asked why the Committee was considering removing opportunities from junior hunters when the intent is to get the youth involved at a young age. The Committee should leave the program as written and not take into consideration the greed of sportsmen.

Paul Dixon stated that he has been on the Clark CABMW for 15 years and years ago there used to be more tags than the youth applying. Over the years there has been success in adding more youth into our hunting regime. A limit to successfully awarded tags is needed in the system. If a youth draws three tags, they are doing good. Guaranteeing the junior tags, the way we used to was nice but is not something that can be afforded or offered any more.

Kevin Billows did not want to see the weapon class broken out just to award more tags to juniors. He shared a story about hunting a junior tag with his son who got to try archery and decided that was what he liked to do. Breaking up the weapon class would remove that opportunity to experiment with different weapon types.

Matt Malarkey didn't see this conversation as an indictment of junior hunters but as a management strategy for the mule deer herds. Limiting the number of successful tags or harvested animals as a junior is a good strategy because it allows the juniors to enter the general hunt at an earlier age. If limiting the Junior Hunt Program shows the deer populations improve, the Committee could always change it back to what it was.

Commissioner East clarified that changing the Junior Hunt Program was not intended to give the herds a rest but to get additional kids an opportunity to get a tag and into the field. She added that she would like to see more kids getting a tag.

Game Division Administrator Scott added that the Mule Deer Enhancement Program was created to brainstorm and execute ways to enhance the mule deer populations.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz asked for clarification around data that the Committee requested.

Commissioner Rogers clarified that the Committee would like to see data around how many extra tag opportunities would be created if a limit was applied as three and four successfully awarded junior tags as well as that limit in comparison to dropping the age of participation from 18 to 17 and 16.

CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA CLOSED THE AGENDA ITEM WITH NO MOTION.

6.* Mentor Program – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – For Possible Action

The Committee will review Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) that pertains to the mentoring of novice adult hunters to determine if regulation changes will be needed in order to establish a mentoring program.

Management Analyst Manfredi opened the agenda item but stating that the support materials show the current regulations in place that create a mentor program in companion with an apprentice license that the Department offers. The support material included the number of apprentice licenses sold over the last few years. The Department will look to the Committee for discussion on possible changes to the program.

Commissioner East stated that she did not realize this program existed. She asked for an example of who would be considered a mentor and the age range of people purchasing an apprentice license.

Management Analyst Manfredi answered that the affidavits that have been received by the Department show that mentors are normally members of the public.

Chairman Caviglia added that he did not know the program existed either. We could request that the Department advertise it more.

Commissioner Pierini expressed concerns that the apprentice license did not require the completion of a hunter's safety course. He stressed the importance that the hunter's safety courses provide to the student in both educational and hands-on experience of handling a hunting weapon.

Chairman Caviglia asked if the apprentice hunting license was valid for the entire season.

Management Analyst Manfredi answered that the apprentice hunting license was good for 365 days from the time of purchase, like other licenses.

Commissioner East clarified that hunter education is not needed to obtain an apprentice hunting license. She agreed with Commissioner Pierini's concerns regarding not needing to take the education course before being able to purchase the license as the course provides so much benefit to the sportsmen.

Commissioner Pierini added his concerns around the hunter's safety courses being only provided online, understandably due to the country shutdowns but so much more is provided during those in person classes.

Public Representative Brown added that she was also unaware of the program. It's challenging for those members of the public who want to get into hunting and finding a hunter's safety course

and taking it might become a barrier to participation and understands why this program could have been created without the need to take the class before buying the apprentice license. She was curious to know if the reason for the decline in participation of the program was that it has not been promoted as it once was in the past.

Chairman Caviglia pointed out that the apprentice license holder does not get to hunt for big game but is limited to upland game and migratory birds. It is a good program to get over that barrier of entry to see if a person would like to participate further.

DATS Division Administrator Munoz shared that the ages of those purchasing apprentice licenses range from 12 years old up to 44 years old with numbers in close to every age bucket.

Chairman Caviglia asked what the cost was for an apprentice hunting license.

Management Analyst Manfredi answered that it is 15 dollars charged to both residents and nonresidents.

Public comment:

Paul Dixon supported the apprentice program and agreed with Commissioner Pierini that the hunter education piece is extremely important. He asked if there has ever been an issue where an apprentice hunter obtained a big game tag. If so, he recommended that the Committee rethink the need for an apprentice license holder to take hunter education.

Rex Flowers stated that the apprentice program has been around for a long time and was created to give people the opportunity to see if they wanted to continue to hunt in the future. It was limited to only upland game and waterfowl. There are hunters under the age of 12 who hunt with their parents, but this gives those individuals who are 12 and older the same opportunity.

Public Representative Brown stated that it would be interesting to explore moving this program into big game animals or to a specific big game species.

Commissioner East was glad this program was brought to the Committee for discussion as few members were aware of its existence. She thought including big game would be a heavy lift but was open to including that in a future discussion.

Chairman Caviglia agreed that adding big game to the apprentice hunting license would be a heavy lift. No action is needed by the Committee at this time, but he would let the Commission know of the discussion and request that the Department advertise the program more in the future. He closed the agenda item with no motion.

7. Future Committee Meeting – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action
The committee will discuss possible future agenda topics set a date and time for the next committee meeting.

Chairman Caviglia listed that he would like to see changes made to Policy 24 brought back to the Committee as well as the data requested on the Junior Hunt Program.

Management Analyst Manfredi added that the tag transfer regulation was received back from LCB and is ready for additional discussion by the Committee.

Public comment:

Paul Dixon stated that he would like the crossbow regulations to be reviewed to allow for a disabled person to utilize a sight or scope on the crossbow as it is unclear in the current regulations with the advancement in scope technology.

Kevin Billows was curious if people are aware of how the First Come, First Served (FCFS) tags work. He stated his concerns on the ability for a nonresident to purchase a tag that was returned by a resident. He suggested leaving resident tags that are turned in and become available for junior hunters.

Management Analyst Manfredi added that the Commission will be given a presentation recapping the FCFS program and encouraged members of the public interested to join the Commission meeting and view agenda item 6H.

8. Public Comment Period

This period is for general comment on anything not on the agenda. No committee action will be taken but may be scheduled on a future committee agenda. The 3- and 6-minute time limits still apply.

No public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 PM.