

**Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting – DRAFT MINUTES**

***Telephonic Commission Meeting***

3

The public is invited to attend and provide public comment from the following locations:

Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Headquarters – Main Conference Room  
6980 Sierra Center Parkway, Suite 120  
Reno, NV 89511

Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Southern Region Office  
4747 Vegas Dr.  
Las Vegas, NV 89108

Public comment will be taken on every action item after discussion but before action on each item and is limited to three minutes per person. The Chairman may allow persons representing groups to speak for six minutes. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers. Persons are invited to submit written comments on items or attend and make comment during the meeting and are asked to complete a speaker card and present it to the Recording Secretary. To ensure the public has notice of all matters the Commission will consider, Commissioners may choose not to respond to public comments in order to avoid the appearance of deliberation on topics not listed for action on the agenda.

Forum restrictions and orderly business: The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks that antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.

Please provide the Board of Wildlife Commissioners ("Commission") with the complete electronic or written copies of testimony and visual presentations to include as exhibits with the minutes. Minutes of the meeting will be produced in summary format.

**NOTE: Public comment allowed on each action item and regulation workshop items and at the end of the meeting.**

**Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners present for meeting:**

Chairman Brad Johnston  
Commissioner Casey Kiel

Commissioner Tiffany East  
Commissioner David McNinch

Secretary Tony Wasley  
Recording Secretary Brandy Arroyo

Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett

**Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners participating telephonically:**

Vice Chairman Paul E. Valentine  
Commissioner Tommy Caviglia

Commissioner Tom Barnes  
Commissioner Jon Almberg

Commissioner Kerstan Hubbs (not present)

**Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance:**

Deputy Director Jack Robb  
Administrative Assistant III Megan Manfredi  
Chief Game Warden Tyler Turnipseed

Management Analyst III Kailey Taylor  
Administrative Assistant II Bernadette Keane  
Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne

**Public in Attendance in Las Vegas:**

Mike Reese, Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife

**Public in Attendance in Reno:**

Rex Flowers, self

Bill Miller, self

Fred Voltz, self

Judi Caron, self

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW

Tina Nappe, self

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trappers Association

Karen Boeger, Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers

**Monday, April 8, 2019 – 8:00 a.m.**

1. Call to Order, Introduction and Roll Call of Commission and County Advisory Board Members to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) – Chairman Johnston

Chairman Johnston called the telephonic Commission meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Roll call was conducted and Commissioners present were: Chairman Johnston, Vice Chairman Valentine (telephonic), Commissioners East, Kiel, McNinch in Reno; Commissioners Almberg, Barnes, and Caviglia appeared telephonically. Commissioner Hubbs was absent.

CABMW members present: Paul Dixon, Clark.

Chairman Johnston stated that as we move forward and have comments, he will go to Las Vegas first and then ask Commissioners Barnes and Almberg separately if they have comments so that we do not speak over one another on the telephone.

2. Approval of Agenda – Chairman Johnston– For Possible Action  
The Commission will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Commission may remove items from the agenda, continue items for consideration or take items out of order.

No public comment in Reno or Las Vegas.

**COMMISSIONER ALMBERG MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER EAST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER HUBBS WAS ABSENT.**

- 3.\* Legislative Committee Report – Commissioner and Committee Chairman East – For Possible Action  
A report will be presented on the committee's recent meetings. The Commission may review bills of interest and any associated amendments, consider legislative committee recommendations and may take official positions on those bills. The Commission may also choose to develop platforms on bills by supporting or opposing general concepts. (Support materials are as of the Legislative Committee meeting held on March 26, 2019. Bill and BDR language may be viewed online at: <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019/Bills/List>)

Chairman Johnston thanked Commissioner East for her work during the legislative session. He provided that she has been the spokesperson for the Commission as the Chairman of the Legislative Committee; she is doing it very well and he is appreciative of that. He also thanked Management Analyst Kailey Taylor and the Department's staff for their work in keeping track of the bills and all the work they do during the legislative session. He has received a lot of positive

feedback and heard good things about the Legislative Committee.

Commissioner East thanked the Legislative Committee including Chairman Johnston, Vice Chairman Valentine and Greg Smith. She provided that Mr. Smith was chosen to fill Assemblyman Sprinkles seat in the Assembly. She further stated that Kailey Taylor has been awesome, and everybody else has been great during the committee meetings.

Commissioner East provided the following remarks regarding the legislative tracking sheet. She stated that there have been some changes and comments from the Department staff and the Director on some of the bills.

Assembly Bill (A.B.) 74 has been heard, but there is no known update.

Senate Bill (S.B.) 55 has a do pass out of the Senate.

A.B. 83 was amended to include manned and unmanned aircraft which was also in another bill; she does not know what will happen with the other bill. This one received a do pass.

S.B. 85 was amended and was passed out of the Committee and is on to the Assembly.

S.B. 17 was the child support obligation bill and received a do pass.

Commissioner East provided that nothing has been done on the water bills as there is a wildlife provision in most of them anyway.

A.B. 404 will be heard today. The Committee supports this bill; however, there is a similar bill in A.B. 474 which was heard last week. She asked Secretary Wasley if he knew what would happen with A.B. 404 and understood that the Department felt that A.B. 474 was somewhat better to implement than A.B. 404 and asked Secretary Wasley's opinion.

Secretary Wasley speculated that there is a lot of similarity between the two bills and it is the intention of both bills to provide the Commission the opportunity to draft and adopt regulation governing the transference of tags. He stated there is a challenge with drafting a bill to provide enough information to where the Commission can adopt regulation consistent with the intent, but not be so specific in the language that it unintentionally excludes some of the scenarios. He has worked with the bill sponsor on A.B. 474 to ensure that all scenarios that the Commission and the Department have encountered in the last couple years have been included. He has not had the same level of engagement on A.B. 404. Secretary Wasley's assumption is that most of everything in A.B. 404 will be encompassed and there will not be a need for two bills.

A.B. 473 is the trapping bill; it was heard last week and will have a work session this afternoon. Commissioner East heard over the weekend that they are going to propose a 72-hour trap check time and remove the ban on the device. In the hearing last week, they proposed a ban on any "body gripping" trap to be taken upon land any wild animal. "Body gripping" means, any device regardless of the size of the device that is designed, built or made to kill an animal through the use of rotating jaws to strike the neck or chest of an animal; this term does not include a trap that is designed, built or made to capture or kill a mouse or rat. There was tremendous opposition to this bill by the trappers and sportsman's groups. Commissioner East believes we will hear more on this soon but offered to discuss it now.

Chairman Johnston asked about the status of the bill, as it is drafted now. Chairman East confirmed that the draft language is as of 48 hours ago, with change in the language with respect to the device. The hearing last week was long, it was covered well, and the Chairman only allowed thirty minutes of testimony for each position of opposition, support and neutral. Some people did not get to speak but it was recognized that there were a lot of people in the room for opposition.

A.B. 479 was heard, and she does not think it pertains to the Department. It is the sale, possession, transfer and breeding of dangerous wild animals; it is more about exotic animals.

S.B. 140 is the water basin transfer and received do pass.

S.B. 275 creates the board to license master guides and subguides; the Legislative Committee opposed this and thinks there will be a work session on it soon because the deadline is April 12, 2019.

S.B. 280 was heard, but there are no updates.

S.B. 316 received no action.

S.B. 454 is the manned and unmanned aircraft bill; it was heard and received a do pass.

Assembly Joint Resolution (A.J.R.) 2 is the opposition to the expansion of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge; it has an amend and do pass.

A.J.R. 7 is the opposition to the Fallon training range and has a hearing on April 8, 2019.

A.J.R. 8 is the opposition to the elimination of the Nevada office of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM); the Committee supports this resolution, and there will be a hearing on April 8, 2019.

Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 3 is the Desert Wildlife Refuge and that received an amend and do pass.

S.J.R. 4 is about Recovering America's Wildlife and received a do pass last week.

Commissioner East provided that Commissioner McNinch previously asked that we follow S.B. 96 to track it; it is the public lands grant program. This bill received an amend and do pass. This is being tracked but no position has been taken at this time.

Chairman Johnston asked for an update on S.B. 487, which was the coyote contest bill.

Commissioner East provided that this bill received no action and has not been heard.

No public comment in Reno.

Commissioner Almberg noted that the language in A.B. 404 and A.B. 474 and suggested that the age limit should be consistent with the youth program age limit of 17.

Commissioner Barnes inquired about A.B. 473 and asked what it said about the body gripping trap. Commissioner East read the bill which states: "it is unlawful for a person at any time to

set, operate or otherwise use a trap to take upon land any wild animal. As used in this section, “body gripping trap” means, any device regardless of the size of the device that is designed, built or made to kill an animal through the use of rotating jaws to strike the neck or chest of any animal; this term does not include a trap that is designed, built or made to capture or kill a mouse or rat.” Commissioner East provided that the above language is in the amendment.

Commissioner Barnes stated this bill could possibly eliminate the gopher traps for farmers.

Secretary Wasley indicated that there was considerable testimony raising the same concern that Commissioner Barnes just raised. It is his understanding that there is a desire to provide an exemption for pest control in association with agricultural interests. We will know more tonight once this bill goes through a work session. He believes that the bill sponsor will be sensitive to those concerns that were raised during the work session last week.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

Chairman Johnston indicated that now that the report has been provided, the Committee has taken action on certain bills that are set out in the tracking form and there are certain bills that the Commission has not taken action on. He suggested focusing on pending bills.

Commissioner East stated that the Commission did support A.B. 474; however, there is no opposition on A.B. 404.

Chairman Johnston started with A.B. 404 which relates to the transfer of tags and would allow the Commission to draft regulations for tag transfer.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

Public comment in Reno:

Rex Flowers, private citizen, indicated that he has some issues with the first part of A.B. 404, about allowing a transfer tags from one family member to another. He stated that he agrees with the transfer of tags for the disabled and disadvantaged. He provided that there will be family members who are non-hunters within hunting families that will apply for tags to build bonus points to give their child a second opportunity. He stated that he would like to see those kids hunt, but we have to bring them up being respectful of the system that is in place.

Karen Boeger, representing Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated that she concurs with everything that Mr. Flowers said; she thinks those are wise, thoughtful remarks and hopes the Commission will take them seriously.

Bill Miller, private citizen, stated that he is in support of A.B. 404. He acknowledges the loop holes that were just mentioned but those need to be left to the Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) to resolve. He stated that the White Pine CABMW is in full support of this and he also supports Commissioner Almberg’s recommendation to coincide the age stipulation with the youth tags.

Paul Dixon, representing Clark CABMW, stated their CABMW support this whole heartedly.

Vice Chairman Valentine and Commissioners Almberg and Kiel stated they support both A.B. 404 and A.B. 474.

Commissioner East stated that it would be good to support both in case one of them makes it out of the Committee or dies in the Senate and the other does not.

Commissioner McNinch asked Secretary Wasley if the Department had any concerns with A.B. 404.

Secretary Wasley responded by saying the Department has supported the idea of having more discretion as it pertains to the transference of tags. There have been many instances that have occurred over the last couple of years where individuals were unable to use their tag and were unable to transfer it to family members or others; or there have been individuals who desired to transfer their tag to non-profits for use by a disabled person or others and were unable to do so. As far as the competing bills and the administration of it, he suggests that the Commission look at the broader intent. Although both bills do a good job of dealing with particular circumstances, the circumstances that the Department deals with are far broader. For example, A.B. 474 talks about an individual giving a tag to an organization; it does not, as introduced, provide an opportunity for an individual to transfer a tag to his or her family member. There are many details, and each of these bills look at one particular instance. It is ultimately going to be dependent upon the Commission, the regulation and the TAAHC to work out those details. My recommendation would be to have a concept position from the Commission, and if the Commission chooses to support both, then any concerns that the Department may have in implementation can be addressed through Commission regulations. As we look at the implementation and think about things such as burden of proof and demonstrating the one hundred and fifty percent of poverty level, or whatever is encompassed in A.B. 474, there could be some unintended administrative costs to the Department. Ultimately, a lot of that can be dealt with in the regulation. His concern is that if we open the door too wide and allow anyone to transfer any tag to any child, grandchild, stepchild, or step grandchild, there would be a burden of proof on the Department to establish the relationship.

Commissioner McNinch stated that A.B. 404 says “shall” with regards to a family member. He is fine with the concepts but is wondering if this ties their hands as a Commission to address that exact thing that Secretary Wasley brought up, which is having to fine tune the bill in regulation.

Secretary Wasley stated that he would defer to the Deputy Attorney General where it says “may” or “shall” adopt a regulation. He further stated that the Commission has received similar direction from the Legislature in the past regarding the shed antler collection; that was a direction that the Commission “shall” adopt regulation for the collection of shed antlers. Without a window of time in which that has to happen, and if it is the intent and desire of the Commission, that would probably worry him less. He prefers to see “may” is in A.B. 474 as opposed to the “shall” that is in A.B. 404. The Department and the Commission recognize the desire to have something in place.

Chairman Johnston commented that he likes the idea presented in A.B. 404 on the tag transfer; it is something that has a lot of support through the TAAHC committee. Any law that allows for the transfer of any tags is potentially subject to abuse. If you create a program where you can transfer a tag to a non-profit organization under whatever circumstances, then you could have the exact same scenario that people are talking about now where a non-hunting parent starts applying for tags and then transfer to the kids. It could be a very good program, and for that reason he supports A.B. 404 and A.B. 474.

Discussion between Secretary Wasley and Chairman Johnston regarding whether A.B. 404 contains the language that would prohibit selling or exchanging tags for money; that this could be handled through regulation; that there could be additional fees associated with the tag transfer.

**COMMISSIONER EAST MOVED TO SUPPORT A.B. 404 AS WRITTEN, UNDERSTANDING THAT THE COMMISSION WOULD LIKE TO ASK FOR MORE DISCRETION IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE REGULATION AND TO RECOMMEND THAT THE AGE STIPULATION OF 17 YEARS OLD COINCIDE WITH THE YOUTH PROGRAM; COMMISSIONER ALMBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8-0; COMMISSIONER HUBBS WAS ABSENT.**

Chairman Johnston stated that the Legislative Committee voted 4-0 to oppose A.B. 473. There have been changes to the trapping bill since the Committee voted which increased the trap check time from 24 to 48-hours. This is a reduction from 96 to 48-hours and changes the language regarding the prohibited devices.

Public comment in Las Vegas:

Mike Reese, representing Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife, stated he would assume that the Department would oppose A.B. 473 because there has been a sharp increase in predators and there is data that shows Nevada can do something about animal vaccinations.

Public comment in Reno:

Joel Blakeslee, representing Nevada Trappers Association, provided that the way the bill is written, there are two components. One is the 48-hour trap check, and the other is a prohibition of body gripping traps on land. The problems with this is the pest control aspect and what constitutes dry land as there are fluctuating water levels in our state. This bill is political, so he would urge the Commission to consider the scientific aspects and ramifications. There is no scientific reason to support a shorter trap check and there are reasons to support a longer trap check. Distribution of the trappers is important as this could impact local populations and show an under harvest in the outback. This is the fourteenth time in twenty-two sessions that we have dealt with trapping in the Nevada Legislature; so far everyone has seen fit to leave it at 96-hours. The calendar day concept worked better because we were not managing it down to the minute and the second.

Fred Voltz, private citizen, stated it has been mischaracterized that there was overwhelming opposition to the bill as it was amended. There is quite a bit of support for it and he was there, so he can speak to that. There are 36 other states that have a 24-hour trap inspection time. Only three states have zero inspection and allow trappers to do whatever they choose. He has an issue of trapper convenience opportunity and success and that seems to be the primary driver behind the opposition. We have heard things about agriculture and pest control not being able to do what they want and need to do. That is not part of the bill. When it comes to animals and wildlife specifically, the Commission's and the State's responsibility is to manage wildlife in the public trust and it is not about trying to kill as many animals as possible, as fast as possible, or as easily as possible. It is a science issue because of indiscriminate killing, which is what trapping does. We have seen the statistics and have killed many non-target species as well as endangered species. If we want to be responsible as a state, not only should we support the 48-hours and the body gripping traps as in the bill presently, but we really should go to 24-hours.

Rex Flowers, private citizen, stated that he is opposed to the bill and thinks we should keep trapping the way it is.

Karen Boeger, private citizen and representing Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated that she is glad to hear Fred Voltz mention the science side of things. The decision to micro-manage the animals belongs with the Commission and the Department. A brief work session does not do the bill credit. She has not seen a purpose or a need that has been presented to visit this topic again. She sees Nevada different from any other state because we have the largest amount of public land and the least amount of population within those public lands. She believes that the option of 96-hours needs to be maintained.

Paul Dixon, private citizen, stated that he echoes what Ms. Boeger just said that you cannot compare Nevada to other states. We have two large population centers in Reno and Las Vegas where five percent of the population is located. In the outer lying counties the trappers need more time.

Judi Caron, private citizen, stated she agrees with everyone so far, mainly for the same reasons that Ms. Boeger and Mr. Dixon stated; the vastness of our state cannot be compared to any other state. She supports this bill and believes we should leave it how it is.

Bill Miller, private citizen, stated that he echoes what Mr. Blakeslee, Ms. Boeger and Mr. Dixon had to say. He stated that 96-hours is ample as they travel long hours to trap and if you narrow that down it will consolidate everyone. He provided that in 96-hours you will have less impact to the other animals and that we need to look at the disturbance levels.

Commissioner Almberg stated that the distribution of the trappers out in the field tend to target the higher populations which have the greatest impact on other animals. He stated that he opposes the bill and thinks we need to keep it at 96-hours.

Chairman Johnston, Vice Chairman Valentine and Commissioners Barnes, Caviglia, Kiel and East stated that they oppose this bill and presented argument as to why.

Commissioner McNinch stated that he thinks the 96-hour trap check is too long and that 48-hours or 72-hours is more appropriate. He will not support opposing the bill.

**CHAIRMAN JOHNSTON MOVED TO ADOPT THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION TO OPPOSE A.B. 473. COMMISSIONER EAST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 7-1. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH VOTED NO AND COMMISSIONER HUBBS WAS ABSENT.**

Chairman Johnston stated that the Legislative Committee has not taken action on S.B. 487, which is the bill to outlaw coyote contests and asked Commissioner East if the Commission needed to take action today.

Commissioner East confirmed that yes, we need to take action on the bill.

Public Comment in Las Vegas:

Mike Reese, representing Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife, stated that he opposes this bill. He believes that this is more of a cultural goal and to get a group of two or more people to hunt is ridiculous.

Public Comment in Reno:

Rex Flowers, private citizen, stated that he opposes this bill and he believes it is a Category D felony if you are found guilty. He commented that this could take away from the Department managing coyotes in the future.

Tina Nappe, private citizen, stated that she opposes the Legislature dealing with this issue and she is disappointed that the Commission has not dealt with it. She resents people coming in from out of state to kill coyotes, or anything here. It is time that the Commission deals with something that is disrespectful of our Nevada wildlife. She stated that she would like to see the Commission setup a working group to deal with this issue.

Joe Blakeslee, private citizen, stated that he will speak to how the bill is written. He provided that the bill says it is illegal to have a contest to hunt coyotes; but then if you do have an illegal contest and you wound the animal, you must take it to the veterinarian. To him, if you are breaking the law by having a contest, you would not admit it by taking it to the veterinarian. The biggest problem he has is with the word "entertainment".

Judi Caron, private citizen, stated that the bill is poorly written, and she opposes this bill. If the accused can be charged with a Category D felony, it is beyond our management of the wildlife. There is room for discussion at the Commission level but not beyond.

Bill Miller, private citizen, stated that he opposes this bill.

Karen Boeger, private citizen, stated that she opposes this bill and concurs with Mr. Flowers and Ms. Caron's comments. She stated that she would like to learn more as to the science-based aspects and to know how it affects coyote depredation. There is a degree of cultural bias in the proposal and that it should be a local decision by each county on whether they agree to use this as a means of management. As a representative of the Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunter and Anglers group, they were opposed to the bill as the Legislature is the wrong venue to hear it and that it belongs with the Commission.

Paul Dixon, private citizen, stated that he opposes the bill. As worded, it is telling anyone to take a wounded wild animal to a veterinarian. The bill is brought with danger as it would be difficult to get a veterinarian to accept the coyote in their clinic.

Fred Voltz, private citizen, stated that previous Commission meetings have dealt with this issue but were dismissive and did not look at the science. When you mass kill wildlife you have more juvenile animals who are socially irresponsible and cause more problems. We need to get information on how to deal with our wild animals and respect their place in the process. Coyotes are a part of the food chain and they serve a useful function in getting rid of predators.

Chairman Johnston stated that he has problems with the language of the bill and the use of the word "entertainment". He does not think it is appropriate to take a lawful activity and turn it into a Category D felony. The notion that all farmers hate coyotes is false. The farmers want the coyotes as they eat the gophers and help control some pests on the farmland. He saw in the news that coyote contests were being conducted in other states, so it is not unique to Nevada.

Vice Chairman Valentine and Commissioners McNinch, Barnes, AlMBERG and Caviglia stated they will oppose this bill and presented argument as to why.

**COMMISSIONER KIEL MOVED TO OPPOSE S.B. 487 AS WRITTEN. COMMISSIONER EAST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8-0. COMMISSIONER HUBBS WAS ABSENT.**

Chairman Johnston stated that the last items in which the Committee has not taken action are related to both the Assembly and Senate resolutions on the expansions on both the Fallon Naval Air Station and the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, and the closure of the Nevada BLM office. Chairman Johnston inquired whether they could review the last three bills at the same time.

DAG Craig Burkett stated it would be best do them separate. However, at the request of Commissioner East, he agreed to take the expansions of the Fallon Naval Air Station and Desert National Wildlife Refuge together.

Chairman Johnston identified the resolutions as A.J.R. 7, A.J.R. 2 and S.J.R.3 which are joint resolutions out of the Senate and the Assembly with respect to the expansions of the Air Force into the Desert National Wildlife Refuge and the expansion of the Fallon training complex.

Commissioner East stated she believes that the Committee addressed A.J.R. 2 in concept at their meeting, but the Fallon Naval Air Station had not come up yet.

Chairman Johnston stated that the Commission has taken a view on most of these in concept, so we can broaden that to the specific joint resolutions.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

Public comment in Reno:

Paul Dixon, representing Clark CABMW, stated that they oppose both expansion pieces. Representing himself, he stated he works for Los Alamos National Laboratory, which is national security that supports our military and air force in training missions. From a national security perspective, he personally supports the expansions as they are important, even though they are impactive to our access to wildlife.

Judi Caron, representing the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated they have submitted public comments and are opposed to both expansions.

Karen Boeger, representing the Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated that they have submitted official comments and they have spoken publicly in support of the resolutions against the expansions. If you take the two expansions together, the cumulative effect is vast, not just on public land access but on wildlife in general.

Chairman Johnston stated the Air Force did a presentation about a year ago; the Commission offered written comments on both of the proposed expansions in Fallon and Las Vegas.

**COMMISSIONER EAST MADE A MOTION TO SUPPORT A.J.R. 2, A.J.R. 7 and S.J.R. 3. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8-0; COMMISSIONER HUBSS WAS ABSENT.**

Chairman Johnston stated that we will move to review A.J.R. 8 which is the opposition to the elimination of the Nevada office of the BLM. The Legislative Committee voted 4-0 to support this resolution.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

Public comment in Reno:

Judi Caron, private citizen, stated that she is opposed to the elimination of the BLM office in Nevada. With the number of horses that are in the field and the wildlife issues that need addressed, it is imperative that we have a local office within our state and not to be grouped with another state.

Karen Boeger, representing Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated that their organization is opposed to this bill. The notion that Nevada would be combined with California and a new Bureau of Land Management (BLM) district of management is backwards. It would further separate our state between the north and south.

Vice Chairman Valentine and Commissioners Barnes, Almberg, and Caviglia stated they support the resolution and presented argument as to why.

Chairman Johnston stated that people have expressed frustration over the management of federal lands and the notion that this resolution is supported does not mean those ideas have gone away. He does not understand the idea that we would no longer have a BLM office in Nevada with the amount of land in this state.

**CHAIRMAN JOHNSTON MADE A MOTION TO SUPPORT A.J.R. 8. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8-0; COMMISSIONER HUBBS WAS ABSENT.**

Chairman Johnston stated that the final resolution for review is S.J.R. 4, which expresses the support in the Nevada Legislature for the federal Recovering America's Wildlife Act (RAWA). This is a piece of federal legislation that this Commission has publicly supported for some time and they adopted a resolution in support of the legislation and have been receiving updates.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

Public comment in Reno:

Karen Boeger, representing Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated this resolution is one of the top three issues in Congress with the National Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, and we highly support it.

Vice Chairman Valentine and Commissioners Almberg and Caviglia stated they will support the resolution.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MADE A MOTION TO SUPPORT S.J.R. 4 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER EAST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8-0; COMMISSIONER HUBBS WAS ABSENT.**

4. Future Commission Meetings – Secretary Tony Wasley – For Possible Action  
The next Commission meeting is scheduled for May 3 and 4, 2019, in Reno. The Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change the time and meeting location at this time. The chairman may designate and adjust committee assignments as necessary at this meeting.

Secretary Wasley stated that the primary order of business for the May 3 and 4, 2019, Commission meeting will be to establish quotas. At this time, we are still determining which subcommittees will be meeting.

Discussion ensued between Chairman Johnston, Secretary Wasley, Commissioners East and Barnes regarding which Committees will meet prior to the May Commission Meeting which will be the Legislative Committee, the Landowner Compensation Tag Committee, the Wildlife Heritage Committee and the Public Lands Committee.

Chairman Johnston stated that Greg Smith is no longer serving on the Legislative Committee with his appointment to the Assembly and he has decided not to fill the seat on the Legislative Committee at this time during the legislative process. He thanked Assemblyman Smith for his service on the Committee and congratulated him for his well-deserved appointment to the Assembly.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

Public comment in Reno:

Karen Boeger, representing Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated that they encouraged the Commission to hold a Public Lands Committee meeting at the next Commission meeting because the Silver State Trail Environmental Assessment (EA) draft has come out and they would like consideration of it.

5. Public Comment Period  
Persons wishing to speak are requested to complete a speaker's card and present it to the recording secretary. No action can be taken by the Commission at this time; any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda.

Public Comment in Reno:

Fred Voltz, private citizen, suggested that it would be helpful if the Legislative tracking sheet could be formatted with the bills in order like it is done on the legislature website.

Bill Miller, private citizen, stated he was previously a White Pine CABMW member for over 20 years, and during early 2000's he participated in the White Pine County Lands bill. Within that bill was the Silver State Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) trail. The Commissioners at that time had done a significant amount of research with other states and other trails. They declined to accept the direction from Congress to take on the Silver State Trail within White Pine County. Within Lincoln County's lands bill, it says they "shall" develop the Silver State Trail and they did. Within White Pine County's lands bill, it said they "may" develop the Silver State Trail. They failed to go in and do the research to determine the impacts on wildlife and ranching communities and natural resources and they declined the Silver State Trail in November 2011. Last year, this Commission again asked the BLM to develop an EA to increase tourism for the City of Ely and White Pine County. They were

unaware as outlined by Congress, that the trail could not have any negative impacts to traditional user groups such as hunting and ranching. The EA came out August 4, 2018. The three proposed routes go through deer winter range and sage grouse leks adjacent to the proposed trails. He further provided information in support of two mining companies that re-routed their power lines and traffic flow because of the crucial sage grouse habitats. He asked that the Commission get more involved in the EA and he would like to see the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners and Public Lands Committee look at it.

Karen Boeger, representing Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, stated that she agrees with all of Bill's pertinent information related to the Silver State Trail. The Nevada Chapter Backcountry Hunters and Anglers has been involved in this issue since the Lincoln County land bills and they are trying to slow down the notion that people can come and use the trail until there is effective management in place to deal with predictable impacts. She would like to see the Commission turn their attention to the lack of monitoring of the existing Lincoln County trail and the impacts to the wildlife and their habitat, along with the extension of trails and user created trails for a more thoughtful consideration of the new proposal for the White Pine County trail system. Also, she asks that they turn their thoughts to the accumulative effects should this trail be approved in White Pine County, as they could be profound.

Secretary Wasley introduced the new Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Craig Burkett; and noted that Craig has replaced the previous DAG Joshua Woodbury.

Chairman Johnston adjourned the meeting at 9:42 a.m.

Note: The minutes are only a summary of the meeting. A complete record of the meeting can be obtained at the Nevada Department of Wildlife Headquarters Office in Reno.