

**Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Meeting Minutes**

Pursuant to Governor Sisolak's May 21, 2020 Declaration of Emergency Directive 020, the requirement contained in NRS 241.023 (1)(b) that there be a physical location designated for meetings of public bodies where members of the public are permitted to attend and participate is suspended in order to mitigate the possible exposure or transmission of COVID-19 (Coronavirus). Accordingly, anyone planning to participate in the meeting must participate via the web link provided below.

***The meeting will be broadcast live at the NDOW Commission YouTube page:***

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCrFHgHLM0MZA2Hx7og8pFcQ>

***If you wish to make public comment, please use this link for Friday, March 19, 2021.***

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81548622564?pwd=TmEveC9WMkJK0p1SDRieXNaYjJJQT09>

***If you wish to make public comment, please use this link Saturday, March 20, 2021.***

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86771272938?pwd=WFI6T2cvdFBSc1RGbnNESVJsNXIzUT09>

**Meeting materials are available at:** [http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Com/Agenda/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Com/Agenda/)

Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners present for the meeting via Zoom:

Chairwoman Tiffany East  
Commissioner Jon Almborg  
Commissioner Kerstan Hubbs  
Commissioner Ron Pierini  
Commissioner Shane Rogers

Vice Chair Tom Barnes  
Commissioner Tommy Caviglia  
Commissioner David McNinch  
Commissioner Casey Kiel

Secretary Tony Wasley

Senior Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett

Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance for the meeting via Zoom:

Deputy Director Jack Robb  
Management Analyst Kailey Taylor  
Executive Assistant Missy Stanford  
Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne  
Game Division Administrator Mike Scott  
Fisheries Division Administrator Jon Sjöberg  
Captain Game Warden Brian Bowles  
Wildlife Specialist Pat Jackson  
Administrative Services Officer Marty Elzy  
Wildlife Staff Special Heather Reich  
Data and Technology Services Division Administrator Kim Munoz  
Conservation Education Division Administrator Chris Vasey

Deputy Director Bonnie Long  
Administrative Assistant III Alejandra Medina  
Management Analyst Megan Manfredi  
Chief Game Warden Michael Maynard  
Diversity Division Administrator Jen Newmark  
Game Warden Jake Creamer  
Wildlife Staff Specialist Mike Cox  
Wildlife Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme  
Wildlife Staff Special Carl Lackey  
Wildlife Staff Supervisor Cooper Munson

Public in Attendance via Zoom virtual forum channel:

Bob Cook, Douglas CABMW  
Jim Rhea, Washoe CABMW  
Larry Allen, Humboldt CABMW  
Joe Crawford, Lyon CABMW  
Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW  
Jim Cooney, Elko CABMW  
Becky Dwire, self  
Catherine Smith, self  
John Tarantino, self

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW  
Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW  
Mike Reese, Clark CABMW  
Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW  
Ted McElvain, Lander CABMW  
Colton Cole, self  
Fauna Tomlinson, self  
Michael Wesnart, self  
Clint McGarr, self

Rob Pierce, self  
Fred Voltz, self  
David Ricker, self  
Kathryn Bricker, self  
Elaine Carrick, self  
Zack Lambert, self  
David Gough, self  
Shannon Greene, self  
Dr. John Keener, self  
John McLennan, self  
Haley Stewart, self  
Caron Taylor, self  
Tony Gildone, self  
Mitch Bailey, self  
Jason Graham, self  
Sheila Sterling, self  
Trish Swain, self  
David VonSeggern, self  
Carol Garlington, self  
Larry Staley, self  
Michelle Lute, self  
Ron Stoker, self  
Kayleigh Dearstyne, self  
Preston Acuff, self  
Animal Wellness Action  
Mel Belding, self  
Bryan Cox, self  
Patrick Donnelly, self  
Sword Devans, self  
Donald Molde, self  
Brian Buress, self

Judi Caron, self  
Therese Campbell, self  
Rex Flowers, self  
Caron Tayloe, self  
Jana Wright, self  
Joseph Terry, self  
Jonathan Lesperance, self  
Callie Lynn, self  
Joel Blakeslee, self  
Bobbie McCullum, self  
Elaine Carrick, self  
Genelle Richards, self  
Dana Gentry, self  
Therese Campbell, self  
Randall Massaro, self  
Tobi Tyler, self  
Stephanie Myers, self  
Janice Medema, self  
Joe Olive, self  
Jana Hofeditz, self  
Dakota Neuffer, self  
Marni Brennan, self  
Derek Banks, self  
Brian Burris, self  
Chris Garnett, self  
Dakota Neuffer, self  
Daniel Davis, self  
Brett Adams, self  
Van Darkholme, self  
Jeff Dixon, self  
Shelbie Swartz, self

Public comment will be taken on each action item following Committee discussion and before any action is taken. **Persons wishing to comment are invited to raise their virtual hands in the virtual meeting forum during the appropriate time; each person offering public comment during this period will be limited to not more than 3 minutes.** The Chair 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 prior to the meeting at [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org) or attend and make comment during the meeting. Public comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint. To ensure the public has notice of all matters the Commission will consider, Commissioners may choose not to respond to public comments to avoid the appearance of deliberation on topics not listed for action on the agenda. Minutes of the meeting will be produced in summary format. All persons present are asked to sign-in using the chat, whether speaking or not.

**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 which antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.

**Friday, March 19, 2021 – 9:00 a.m.**

**1. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call of Commission Members and County Advisory Board Members to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) – Chairwoman East**

CABMW members who are present and viewing the meeting through the YouTube link should send an email to [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org) indicating their presence.

Chairwoman East called the meeting to order at 9:00am. Commissioner Kiel led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance. NDOW Executive Assistant Missy Stanford did roll call of Commission member noting that Commissioner Almberg was absent. Chairwoman East noted the CABMWs in attendance.

**2. Approval of Agenda – Chairwoman East – 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.

Chairwoman East asked for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Hubbs indicated her eagerness to attend to the Bear Hound discussion, has prior engagements but hoped to make it back for the discussion.

Chairwoman East asked for any more discussion. Hearing none, moved to public comment.

Mike Reese, representing the Clark County CABMW: On the original agenda that came out and that we discussed at our CABMW was item number 15, which was the Predator Management Plan. Has that been removed from the agenda?

Jim Cooney, representing the Elko County CABMW commented, I just wanted to make sure that my name is on the agenda's list.

Rebekah Stetson, private citizen: Good morning Chairwoman East. I just wanted to give comment and say thank you for agendizing our resolution and thank you to the Legislative Committee for taking the time to meet about SJR3 and for voting unanimously to support it.

Sheila Sterling, private citizen: I'd like to make a comment that, if you have an approximate time that you'll be discussing the hound dog bear hunt and the coyote killing contest because it seems to be an all-day agenda. Do you know if this will be in the morning or in the afternoon? Or am I able to make a comment about this now?

Chairwoman East stated she did not know an approximate time for those agenda items, suggested we only take comments on Agenda item 2 for now.

Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Burkett clarified that we are taking comment on the approval of the agenda at this time.

Chairwoman East brought it back to the Commission for a motion.

Commissioner Caviglia indicated we needed to go back to discussion regarding the Predator Management Plan.

Commissioner McNinch stated that we are too late to put this on the agenda for this meeting and indicated that we have an April meeting that is typically for legislative purposes and may be able to squeeze it in if we needed to.

Director Wasley stated that agenda item number 9 is a report from the Wildlife Damage Management Committee, I believe there was discussion of the Predator Management Plan though it was not agendized as such.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson stated that when reviewing the agenda for this meeting he pointed out that in years prior the Predator Plan was normally discussed at the same agenda item as the Wildlife Damage Management Committee report. Indicated that he presented that the Predator Management Plan presentation at the March 18<sup>th</sup> Wildlife Damage Management Committee meeting and the meeting did vote on the plan to accept it with no changes. Understood the results of that meeting would be provided to the Commission today.

**COMMISSIONER HUBBS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, SECONDED BY CHAIRWOMAN EAST. MOTION CARRIED 8-0, COMMISSIONER ALMBERG ABSENT.**

**3. Approval of Minutes – Chairwoman East – For Possible Action**

Commission minutes may be approved from the January 29 and 30, 2021, meeting.

Commissioner McNinch, Commissioner Rogers and Chairwoman East noted their changes to the minutes for the January 29 & 30, 2021 Meeting.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE WITH NOTED CHANGES. SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR BARNES. MOTION CARRIED 8-0, COMMISSIONER ALBERG ABSENT.**

**4. Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence – Chairwoman East – Informational**

Commissioners may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. The Commission will review and may discuss correspondence sent or received by the Commission since the last regular meeting and may provide copies for the exhibit file (Commissioners may provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record). Correspondence sent or received by Secretary Wasley may also be discussed.

Chairwoman East expressed her apologies for actions at the January 29 and 30 NBWC Commission Meeting. Asked Secretary Wasley and DAG Burkett for direction on the process regarding a letter received from the Humboldt CABMW.

DAG Burkett discussed the letter received from the Humboldt Country Advisory Board regarding their concerns about how the Commission goes about discussing recommendations received from the CABMWs. Paraphrased the statute that discussed when the Commission decides not to follow a CABMW recommendation, as soon as practicable, the Commission should place in writing the Commissions exception to that CABMW recommendation. Stated in the past that the meeting minutes have been considered that written exception to the CABMW recommendation and stated that he believed it complied with the statute. Cautioned the Department and the Commission that if there is an exception to a CABMW recommendation that it be clearly stated in the minutes.

Secretary Wasley addressed the points of contention in the Humboldt County Advisory Board letter. He read the 2015 legislative bill language brought about regarding the implementation of recommendation process. The department will go back and look at that and ensure our minutes, where we can, reflect the position of the commissioners, especially when its counter to positions of the counties. Going forward we will be more sensitive to capturing commissioners' perspectives as it pertains to county recommendations. I would be remiss if I did not address the statement that the Commission outright ignored the Humboldt CABMW recommendation. There is more than enough opportunity for perceived

loss and the Department certainly perceives loss when our recommendations aren't followed and would imagine counties do and certainly members of the general public feel that way as well. I understand the challenges you all face, I understand the opportunity for perceive loss in decisions, I know you all do the best you can to render decisions, so thank you for the job you do, and it is recognized that sometimes it can be thankless. Stated he wanted to speak generally to correspondence; the Department has received approximately 2200 emails pertaining to the hounding issue. Many of those fall into the category of one of two form letters, they come from all over the country and all over the world, we don't have statistics compiled specifically on the numbers and the geography from which they originate. On the coyote contests issue, the Department has received approximately 600 emails on that issue. Those have all been shared and there are a number of duplicates and triplicates on the list. He stated the last item that he wanted to share during this time was an award that the Department received this morning, [shared his screen to show a picture of Deputy Director Robb accepting the award] This morning at the Pepper Lane location, the Department received an award, it is the Cashman award for Good Governance from the Nevada Taxpayer's Association in the Government Agency category. Wanted to express his appreciation to the Cashman family as well as the Nevada Taxpayers Association and let you all know of the award.

Chairwoman East congratulated the Department. She agreed that there was a lot of correspondence received regarding the agenda items and reminded commissioners that if they have received emails that others may not have received to share with Missy so she can get the out to all of the commissioners.

Commissioner McNinch congratulated the Department. Commented on the correspondence that has been received. Thanked Missy, Kailey, Megan, and Ali for assisting him with the ability to receive and view correspondence.

Chairwoman East reiterated that we will be taking public comment through the zoom, people will be able to provide their comment in their voice to us for three minutes. Grateful for the Department for the ability to figure out the logistics so these meetings can be held in a transparent matter.

5. **County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Member Items – Informational**  
CABMW members may present emergent items at [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org); these comments will be shared with the Commission. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action will be scheduled on a future Commission agenda.

Chairwoman East asked the CABMW members if they had any comments.

Glenn Bunch, representing the Mineral County CABMW: There was discussion about rumors that NDOW will be assuming Carson Lake and we would like to know more about that. People were asking me about it, and I said I would ask for them to maybe put it on a later agenda.

Joe Crawford, representing the Lyon County CABMW: I received public comment at the Lyon CABMW meeting about the Fernley Wildlife Management Area, I think that might be related to what the previous CABMW spoke about. Wants information from the Department on what the plans for that area, there are some concerns.

6. **Commission Regulations – For Possible Action/Adoption – Public Comment Allowed**
  - A. **Commission Regulation 21-13, 2021-2022 Seasons, Bag Limits and Special Regulations for Migratory Game Birds – Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme – For Possible Action**  
The Commission will consider recommendations for seasons, bag limits and special regulations for migratory game birds for the 2021-2022 season and adopt regulations consistent with proposed regulations framework for the 2021-2022 hunting seasons on

certain migratory game birds established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Commission Regulation will also consider rules regulating public hunting on Wildlife Management Areas and designated state lands.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme reviewed the support material sent in advance to the Commissioners, County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife Chairmen and posted on the Department's website for the public for Ducks and Mergansers.

Commissioner Kiel addressed public comment wanting the Northwest zone dates to be moved through the end of January.

Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme clarified that under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and within the federal frame works for waterfowl hunting, states in the Pacific Flyway are allowed 107 hunting days for any one species. The regulation as presented reflects 105 total days and two youth hunt days. If the Commission prefers dates be moved for any zone the Department solely needs to ensure compliance with the 107-hunting day allotment.

Commissioner Pierini spoke to hunters being upset with having nine hunting days off in the Northwest zone during January. He suggested starting a week after October 9th to gain more hunting days in January.

Commissioner Hubbs referenced a Nevada Department of Wildlife social media post about salmonella, asking the public to take down or clean bird feeders. She went on to ask if game birds are impacted or susceptible to salmonella in the state of Nevada.

Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme clarified that waterfowl and migratory birds typically do not go to feeders with exceptions in urban settings. Regarding the regulation Mourning and White Winged Doves do go to feeders and are susceptible.

Commissioner Hubbs inquired if the Department was concerned about the harvest numbers given salmonella infections.

Secretary Wasley addressed the concern, stating that salmonella is common in many species. Issues arise when feeders are presents, causing a concentration of birds that more easily pass diseases or pathogens. Feeders may potentially disrupt migratory behavior as well. Concerns in natural/wild populations do not exist now for upland, waterfowl or otherwise.

Commissioner Rogers asked if Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme had comments on the mentioned season dates by Commissioner Pierini for the Northwest zone.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme responded that there was not much in the way of biological concern. The primary concern being that the Department stay within the Federal framework of 107 days. At the Commissions purview the season dates could be adjusted to October 16, 2021 through January 2, 2022 and January 5, 2022 through January 30, 2022 for the Northwest zone, Duck and Merganser season.

Secretary Wasley sought clarification on a concern relative to upland birds, at a certain time of year, when they are concentrated around water. He went on to ask if was the concern as well encompassed waterfowl being concentrated around water?

Commissioner Pierini discussed his thinking and in summation it was understood that by separating the opening days we are providing the weather an opportunity to improve and the birds a chance to separate to other water sources.

Break for public comment.

David Gough, private citizen: If we push back the season date to a week or have a nine to ten-day break, we would be able to have the start date for waterfowl later in the season. When many hunters are off hunting big game, a lot of the birds will not show up until later in the season, swans usually do not show up till late October early November, some ducks still are not in full plumage that early in October. He is suggesting that we either just push back the start date or leave the start date where it is but have the break in October, if you have that break in October or push back season dates, we will be able to provide more hunter opportunity.

Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme added that it is difficult to pick closure dates that works best for all with multi species group.

Commissioner Kiel questioned if by pushing back the season would we exacerbate Commissioner Pierini's concern that only upland game would be occurring October 9 and therefore adding more pressure on upland game or is upland game starting later as well?

Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme pointed out that upland game seasons are set at the June Commission meeting, as of now the season start date is October 9th for Chukar and quail but that may be amended come June.

**COMMISSIONER KIEL MOVED TO APPROVE CR 21-13 FOR DUCKS AND MERGANSERS WITH THE NORTHWEST ZONE ADJUSTING THE SEASON DATES TO OCTOBER 16, 2021 THROUGH JANUARY 2, 2022 AND JANUARY 5, 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2022 AND STRIKING THE LISTED COUNTIES IN THE SOUTH ZONE. COMMISSIONER PIERINI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG WAS ABSENT.**

Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme reviewed the support material sent in advance to the Commissioners, County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife Chairmen and posted on the Department's website for the public for Coots and Common Moorhens, Snipe, Canada Geese and Brant, White-Fronted Geese, and the Falconry Seasons for Migratory Game Birds.

Secretary Wasley commented that the CABMWs input for recommended season dates have been many. He went on to ask if a Commissioner is opposing a CABWM recommendations could they please articulate that opposition in ways that can be captured in the minutes so the CABMW understand.

Chairwoman East encouraged CABMW to speak during public comment.

Break for public comment.

Sheila Z Stirling provided public comment. She stated this was not her field of expertise but was curious since there seems to be a three-month period of hunting fowl, geese, and different species if there was a maximum number of hunters that were allowed or do thousands of people every day going out and decimating the number of birds. She was curious because it seems like a long hunting season and said fowls and birds are having a rough time with harsher weather's both winter and summer and was wondering if any of that was taken into consideration.

Joe Crawford with the Lyon CABMW provided public comment. They support the season as presented by the Department.

Mike Reese with the Clark CABMW provided public comment. They voted 7-0 to accept unanimously.

Secretary Wasley dispelled the notion that waterfowl are being decimated, he added that waterfowl, and other migratory species are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, with Canada and Mexico. The federal government administers the program through U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. Great care is paid to nesting habitats and the country is divided into specific flyways through which the birds are monitored and managed. Addressing the North American Bird Conservation Initiative referenced from Commissioner Hubbs he added while there has been a large loss of birds some species are showing growth such as waterfowl. Ducks and geese are showing increased populations, a lot is attributed to the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, a management plan that spans Canada, the United States and Mexico. Modeling and science show that the populations are thriving.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme voiced that he works with the Pacific Flyway on the Technical Committee. Eleven Western States gather several times a year. Management plans are administered and monitored closely in conjunction with USFWS, the Canadian government and on occasion Mexico to ensure that the populations are not being exploited along their entire migration and return. He added that waterfowl almost across the board are at an all-time high. Within the flyway Nevada represents two percent of the flyways harvest.

**COMMISSIONER KIEL MOVED TO APPROVE CR 21-13 FOR COOTS AND COMMON MOORHENS, SNIPE, CANADA GEESE AND BRANT, WHITE-FRONTED GEESE AND FALCONRY SEASONS FOR MIGRATORY GAME BIRDS WITH THE NORTHWEST ZONE ADJUSTING THE SEASON DATES TO OCTOBER 16, 2021 THROUGH JANUARY 2, 2022 AND JANUARY 5, 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2022 AND STRIKING THE LISTED COUNTIES IN THE SOUTH ZONE. COMMISSIONER CAVIGLIA SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG WAS ABSENT.**

Wildlife Staff Specialist Russell Woolstenhulme reviewed the support material sent in advance to the Commissioners, County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife Chairmen and posted on the Department's website for the public for Mourning and White Winged Dove, American Crow, Special Youth Waterfowl Hunt, Scaup, Snow and Ross' Geese and Swan.

Break for public comment.

Mike Reese with the Clark CABMW provided public comment. They voted 7-0 to accept unanimously.

Joe Crawford with the Lyon CABMW provided public comment. They supported the season dates as presented.

Ted McElvain with the Lander CABMW provided public comment.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE CR 21-13 FOR MOURNING AND WHITE-WINGED DOVE, AMERICAN CROW, SPECIAL YOUTH WATERFOWL HUNT, SCAUP, SNOW AND ROSS' GEESE AND SWAN. MOURNING AND WHITE-WINGED DOVE AS PRESENTED. AMERICAN CROW AS PRESENTED. THE NORTHWEST ZONE FOR SPECIAL YOUTH WATERFOWL HUNT WOULD HAVE HUNTING DATES OF OCTOBER 2, 2021 AND FEBRUARY 12, 2020. AS FOR THE DAILY BAG LIMIT, THE LANGUAGE OF SNIPE AND SCAUP WOULD BE ADDED. THE NORTHWEST ZONE FOR SCAUP WOULD HAVE SEASON DATES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2021 THROUGH JANUARY 2, 2022 AND JANUARY 5, 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2022. THE NORTHWEST ZONE FOR SNOW AND ROSS' GEESE WOULD HAVE THE SEASON DATES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2021 THROUGH JANUARY 2, 2022, JANUARY 5, 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2022, AND FEBRUARY 19, 2022 THROUGH MARCH 9, 2022 AND STRIKING THE LISTED COUNTIES IN THE SOUTH ZONE. THE SEASON DATES FOR SWAN WOULD BE OCTOBER 16, 2021 THROUGH JANUARY 2, 2022 AND JANUARY 5, 2022 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2022. COMMISSIONER PIERINI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 8 – 0. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG WAS ABSENT.**

Break

- 7. Legislative Committee Report – Committee Chairwoman Tiffany East – For Possible Action**  
A report will be provided on the recent Legislative Committee Meeting. Legislative items. The Commission may vote on positions for certain bills.

Chairwoman East asked Management Analyst Kailey Taylor to begin presenting on committee activity.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor discussed the two recent committee meetings. Started with AB117, which revises provisions governing wildlife tags brought about by Assemblywoman Titus. The Committee voted to oppose this language as written, but it is believed after a discussion with Assemblywoman Titus that there won't be any movement on the bill.

Chairwoman East asked for questions on AB117. Explained why the Committee was in opposition.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor reminded the public that the support material could be on the NDOW website.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued with SB 78; expands the members of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners. Senator Goicoechea submitted an amendment that would require the appointed member to the Commission to be chosen from that list of recommended from the CABMWs submitted to the Governor. The Committee did vote to oppose this bill as written in a 5-0 vote. It was already heard in Senate Committee on Natural Resources, there was much opposition on multiple sides.

Chairwoman East asked for questions. Hearing none, moved on.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued with SB125, which revises provisions governing falconry. Brought by Senator Settelmeyer and a group of falconers. The Department did submit an amendment, changing the entire bill to make it only allowable for falconers to obtain a golden eagle for rehabilitation purposes or other circumstances as set by the Commission, so the commission could set a regulation allowing other purposes for possession of a golden eagle besides rehabilitation, if this bill were to pass. The Committee did vote to support a rehabilitation platform, it was supported 4-0 vote with member Greg Smith absent at that meeting.

Chairwoman East stated the Committee voted to support the bill with the amendment. Chairwoman East clarified that the Commission has not taken any action on these. The Committee has. The Commission is intended to take position on the bills today.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued to SJR3, a Senate Joint Resolution that urges Congress to provide funding to reduce the wild horse and burro population to appropriate management levels. The Committee did vote to support this in a 4-0 vote, member Smith was absent.

Chairwoman East added that the Commission has been asked by the Coalition for Healthy Nevada to submit a letter of support for SJR3; the Commission would need to add it into their approval as well.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued with AJR4, an Assembly Joint Resolution that urges Congress to designate certain land in Spring Valley as a National Heritage Area. The bill had been heard in the Assembly on Natural Resources Committee already. The committee did vote to support this resolution in a 4-0 vote, member Smith was absent. Waited for commissioner questions, seeing none, moved on to AB89, revises provisions relating to wildlife, brought by Assemblywoman Titus. The committee did vote to support this bill in a 5-0 vote.

Chairwoman East stated she testified on this bill, it has been work-sessioned and passed out of the Assembly. Asked for questions.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued to AB299, which revises provisions relating to wildlife. It was brought by Assemblywoman Bilbary-Axlerod. The committee has not had time to discuss this bill and it has not been voted on yet.

Chairwoman East asked if there was any Department discussion on AB299.

Secretary Wasley indicated that the Department has discussed AB299 and from different perspectives. Spoke about the public health concerns, public safety concerns and the possibility of disease in roadkill.

Commissioner McNinch echoed Secretary Wasley. Stated the health codes and the public health concerns.

Chairwoman East thanked them. Asked for any other thoughts or questions. Seeing none, moved on.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued with AB211, which establishes provisions relating to a plan to address impacts to wildlife. The committee did vote to support this bill in a 4-0 vote, member Smith was absent. Has been heard in the Assembly Government Affairs committee already. Asked for questions. Seeing none, moved on to SB180, revises provisions relating to fire prevention. The Committee did vote to support this bill in a 3-0 vote, member Smith was absent Chairwoman East abstained. Continued with SB52, requires the establishment of a program for awarding a dark sky designation to certain sites in this State. The bill has passed Senate and is now at Assembly. There was

a lot of support for this bill. The Committee did vote to support it, as well in a 4-0 vote, member Smith was absent.

Chairwoman East asked for questions. Seeing none, moved on.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued with SB170, which makes various changes relating to off-highway vehicles. There was a lot of support for the bill, it has already been heard in Senate Growth and Infrastructure Committee. This bill was supported in a 3-1 vote, Commissioner Pierini was in opposition and member Smith was absent.

Chairwoman East asked for questions. Seeing none, moved one.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor continued with AJR3, an Assembly Joint Resolution that urges various actions relating to the protection and conservation of land and water. The 30x30 bill. The committee did vote to support this bill in a 4-0 vote, member Smith was absent. Moved on to bills she put onto the Committee tracking sheet that the Department is currently tracking, and the Committee decided to remove AB2, AB78, AB80, SB192.

Chairwoman East indicated she heard about another firearms bill, AB286 and suggested we may want to add it to our list.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor indicated that that bill has already been heard so if the Commission would like to take a position they would have to do soon. Also, indicated there was a lot a public opposition to it.

Chairwoman East asked for questions.

Commissioner Caviglia asked about AJR4 and if there has been discussion of limits of the areas in the Spring Valley designation.

NDOW Habitat Administrator Alan Jenne indicated he had reached out to Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF), has not received a reply. Figured it would be something they would designate in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) rather than Nevada Revised Statute (NRS), but he had not heard back.

Chairwoman East asked for any more questions. Seeing none, went out for public comment.

David Ricker, private citizen: Thank you Chairwoman East for taking this public comment on AB299. I would like to I guess give a little more background. I'm not exactly looking for the commissions support of AB299 but just for a little more info, I would say that it's a bit of a push back against the wildlife collisions being a rare incident on a per capita basis. It happens at a minimum of about 500 times per year from NDOT data and this doesn't include those instances not reported along (inaudible) which is common by owner/operator truckers. So, this number would constitute of 4 percent of all the animals harvested by hunters every year, so it is definitely an issue. I would say additionally, the scientific literature is conclusive on how roadkill helps sustain ravens and the connection between ravens and sage grouse and their dwindling populations is also conclusive. Additionally, a greater understanding of wildlife crossing hotspots could be obtained by the acceptance to AB299. Currently most data points from Nevada Highway Patrol are given to the nearest mile marker with an option in this bill to institute an electronic platform exact coordinate of instances would be given and the food safety issue is I think more about a personal freedom argument. With that I would defer. Thank you.

Mike Reese, representing himself: This is my own opinion. I would love to see the record of the commission taking stance on AB286. As you stated, a lot of people go and stay in hotels and stuff like

that. Not just camping and stuff so I believe that it behooves of us to take a position and know on AB286. Thank you.

Chairwoman East asked if there were any more comments. Seeing none, brought it back to this commission for discussion. I would like to state that a lot of thought goes into these. We discuss these at length and develop a platform and Ms. Taylor and I and other commissioners on the committee sit through the committee meeting and listen to the testimony both in support and opposition so I feel like we've got a pretty good understanding of all of these bills and we are they may be headed sometimes changes because they get massaged and nuanced in different ways.

Commissioner Hubbs asked Management Analyst Kailey Taylor to go over the falconry legislation. Management Analyst Kailey Taylor discussed the falconry legislation and answered Commissioner Hubbs' additional questions.

Chairwoman East stated that she wanted to mention that we did have a public comment from Mr. Massaro, "They suggest that all animal roadkill be donated to animal wildlife rescues or sanctuaries or zoos that are in need of the meat this is not fit for human consumption", I just wanted to share that with you.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that the ranching community was concerned about what the protection language means and how that would affect them.

Commissioner Hubbs asked Chairwoman East if she was ready for a motion.

Commissioner McNinch told Commissioner Hubbs that he would make the motion.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDED PLATFORMS AND OR POSITIONS FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILLS AB117, SB78, SB125, AJR4, AB89, AB211, SB52, SB170. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HUBBS. MOTION CARRIED 8-0, COMMISSIONER ALMBERG ABSENT.**

Chairwoman East stated we needed to circle back to the other bills.

Commissioner Hubbs noted she had to leave.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE SB180 AS RECOMMENDED AND SUPPORTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS. MOTION CARRIED, 6-0. CHAIRWOMAN EAST ABSTAINED, COMMISSIONER ALMBERG AND COMMISSIONER HUBBS ABSENT.**

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE SJR3 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE, INCLUDING THE LETTER THAT WAS PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE AS WRITTEN AND WRITING THE LETTER. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CAVIGLIA. MOTION CARRIED, 7-0. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG AND COMMISSIONER HUBBS ABSENT.**

Chairwoman East spoke about AB299, stated the Commission had that public comment about donating the meat. Asked for thoughts on AB299. Asked if wanted to wait to see where it heads to get more information.

Commissioner McNinch stated his reasons for not supporting AB299, which included public health reasons.

Vice Chair Barnes agreed with Commissioner McNinch.

Commissioner Caviglia agreed with Commissioner McNinch and Vice Chair Barnes.

Chairwoman East asked for any more thoughts or comments.

Commissioner Pierini agreed with Mike Reese and Secretary Wasley's comments.

Chairwoman East asked for a motion.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MADE A MOTION TO OPPOSE AB299 AS ITS CURRENTLY WRITTEN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CAVIGLIA. MOTION CARRIED 6-0, COMMISSIONERS ALMBERG AND COMMISSIONER HUBBS ABSENT.**

Chairwoman East asked for comments on AJR3, the 30x30 proposal. Stated that she understood that several sportsman's organizations are supporting it.

Commissioner Caviglia stated that he was concerned with how open-ended it was.

Vice Chair Barnes dovetailed onto what Commissioner Caviglia stated. Indicated that a lot of well-intended bills have ill-intended consequences.

Commissioner McNinch asked Vice Chair Barnes and Commissioner Caviglia what it would take to become supportive of the concept of the 30x30 proposal.

Commissioner Caviglia and Vice Chair Barnes expressed their concerns and comfort levels to Commissioner McNinch. All for conserving land but want multi-use lands available to other groups as well.

Chairwoman East asked if the Commission wanted to remain neutral on AJR3 for now.

Secretary Wasley talked about the North American Conference hosted by the Wildlife Management Institute. Indicated the HuntFish3030.com website had a tremendous amount of information and the emerging support for the concept of protecting from certain activities but maintaining the multi-use that would relate to this Commission and the Department activities. Stated he would commit sharing letters from the Congressional Democrats and Congressional Republicans as they are answered with the Commission and Committee and indicated it may assist in making a position in the future.

Commissioner McNinch suggested we wait for the April meeting to discuss AJR3.

Chairwoman East moved on to AB2.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor noted that AB2 was her in Committee and was scheduled for work session on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner McNinch stated that he did not believe the Commission had a dog in the fight on the bill.

Chairwoman East agreed and moved on to AB286. Asked for questions, seeing none. Moved on.

**8. Regulation Simplification Committee Report – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – Informational**

A report will be provided on the recent Regulation Simplification Committee meeting.

Commissioner Caviglia stated that the Regulation Simplification Committee met on February 21, 2021. Majority of the discussion was in relation to NAC 503, specifically, the suitcase trap. Depending on what the Commission decided today, the Committee looks to be wrapping up.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor agreed with Commissioner Caviglia.

**9. Wildlife Damage Management Committee Report – Committee Chairman Jon Alberg – Informational – For Possible Action**

A report will be provided on the recent Wildlife Damage Management Committee meeting.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that the Committee review what Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson reported and accepted it.

Chairwoman East asked for public comment. Seeing none, asked Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson if he has any comments.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson answered no.

**10. Commission General Regulations - Workshop / Public Comment Allowed**

**A. Commission General Regulation 496, NAC 503 Simplification – Management Analyst Kailey Taylor – For Possible Action**

The Commission will review the Regulation Simplification Committee’s recommendations regarding language updates and simplification of Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 503 relating to wildlife. \*Once the Commission members have discussed this agenda item, a recess of a specific duration will be taken. Persons wishing to comment are invited to raise their hands in the virtual meeting forum and will be individually called upon until all wishing to comment have had the chance to do so.

Management Analyst Kailey Taylor reviewed the support material sent in advance to the Commissioners, County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife Chairmen and posted on the Department’s website for the public.

Commissioner Caviglia stated that the Washoe CABMW had concerns with the language, he would like to hear what the concerns are. He added that he would like to see clarification.

Break for public comment.

Fred Voltz, private citizen: The proposed additions to NAC 503.165 concerning suitcase trap usage are the antithesis of protecting and promoting wildlife in Nevada, explicitly adding these traps allows yet another brutal prolonged method of killing the public's wildlife. The Washington State Trappers Association confessed that suitcase traps are dangerous, and care must be used in their placement, quite a concession from an organization profiting from the carnage. While this traps primarily intent is to kill beavers there is no recognition of the positive impact beavers create in the ecosystems they inhabit. Beavers can improve water quality by slowing water currents, allowing water purifying plants to thrive, helping waterfowl raise their young, building natural nest boxes for birds and mammals, and promoting tree health and diversity in those situations where beavers are considered a nuisance. Available non-lethal methods for coexistence are not promoted or explicitly identified by the proposed NAC modification, non-lethal remedies from the University of Arkansas beaver study included installing a water leveling device through the dam or lodge using perforated PVC pipe encased in heavy gauge hog wire, a 3-log drain, exclusion fencing, and electric fencing another non-lethal approach would be painting the base of

the trunk with a mix of latex paint and sand. Given the regressive 96-hour trap inspection interval Nevada continues to allow plus ineffective attempts at dynamiting beaver dams this proposed modification perpetuates the same type of species carnage that commercial pitfall trapping caused before a previous commission wisely chose to end it. Suitcase traps also place non target species in harms ways when they intentionally trigger one of these traps and are killed. Commercial trappers have more than enough killing tools to destroy our wildlife, these trappers haven't made a compelling case that another one is needed or appropriate, wide stewardship of Nevada's wildlife suggest explicitly excluding the use of suitcase traps in revising NAC 501.165(2E)(3E).

Trish Swain, private citizen: There is no need to allow suitcase traps in areas presently closed to them, here are my reasons. Until modern times people considered beavers nearly a nuisance, some people did, has our discussion here included any new information about the beavers themselves. Modern science now demonstrates the amazing extent to which these natures engineers benefit environment and biodiversity. They are respected as a vital keystone species; our public policies need to reflect this scientific advance. The north American beaver could weigh between 24 to 71 pounds, how miserable will one of these beavers be if he squished into a chain link trap where he can't move at all. Another reason that I oppose it is that trappers stand to gain a more positive image by telling the public suitcase traps are quote "non-lethal", but the sad truth is that trapped beaver will be quote "eliminated" or quota "destroyed" or quote "managed" whatever you call it, it is a solution the public does not want. The public want their wildlife alive in its natural habitat. Amending an NAC 503.165 would enable trappers to trap in areas where lethal and dangerous traps are prohibited, when the public worked long and hard to define areas where trapping should be evident. Suitcase traps are more dangerous than currently allowed box and cage traps and the public demands safety. Our policy should reflect consideration of the will of the public. Any trap can be used to hold an animal under water until it drowns or is subjected to restraint, starvation, predation, and the elements because our state gives trappers 96 hours to let the animals suffer until the trapper shows up and kills it. When granting wildlife depredation permits for property owners the Nevada Department of Wildlife could require them to demonstrate they have tried a series of non-lethal solutions to their problems. For instance, pond levelers, beaver deceivers, and painting trees are non-lethal and effective solutions. The Sierra Wildlife Coalition are nearby, ready, and able to provide these solutions and we certainly applaud NDOW for the work they have already done with this group and strongly encourage them to continue to work with that group, therefore we ask you to please not re-classify suitcase traps as in a similar category to box traps for the sake of the public and most of all for the sake of the north American beaver.

***\*Commissioner Caviglia excused himself for the remainder of the Commission meeting.***

Caron Tayloe, private citizen: I have done some of her own research and the Wildlife Service's 2017 report talks about the suitcase traps, also known as the first traps. They are usually referring to the bailey or Hancock traps and I just wanted to make sure that the proposed NAC 503.157 revision regarding the use of bait will also apply to the suitcase traps, we seem to be singling out suitcase trap, so I want to make sure that the whole bait thing applies to that also. One of the things in this 2017 Wildlife Service's report is that suitcase traps are "large" and "heavy", they also mentioned that the Hancock traps had to be modified by users since the safety mechanism was right near the trigger mechanism and I can't help but wonder if Nevada trappers are using the suitcase traps that have safety and/or release mechanisms near the edges of the suitcase trap for easy release and this is because of NRS 503.454. How will these large and heavy suitcase traps affect NRS 503.454 situations when the public needs to protect people and pets in the water and the congested areas mentioned in NAC 503.165. It is my impression that the trappers want to be able to employ these in congested areas, if I am understanding that correctly and I would like to know if these traps are a lot more easily released then what Wildlife Service's mentioned in their report. Also, animals in the suitcase traps are often alive when the trapper comes to kill them and today Nevadans would like trappers to describe to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners how they killed the live animals and what they find in the suitcase traps.

Deputy Director Jack Robb expressed that since people and entities became aware of the regulation being discussed they are concerned that suitcase traps are still in the toolbox for public safety reasons. He added that Nevada is not a historical place where beavers are present, noting our habitat/landscape cannot take the pressure of a large beaver population.

Commissioner McNinch acknowledged that he was open to suggestion, but the intent of NAC 503.165 was to provide a level of protection to the people utilizing the high trafficked areas. To his understanding suitcase traps are used sparingly in the state, primarily in the Reno area and concerns are probably exclusively public health related and water quality related. He believed that people coming into contact or pets getting caught in them were low since they are used at night. Lastly, he added that the intent of the regulation was to minimize negative interaction in highly trafficked areas, and he would like to maintain integrity of that. If it is a kill system right on sight it takes away from what was trying to be accomplished.

Commissioner Kiel commented he prefers to strike out NAC 503.165(2E) and include suitcase traps in section 1, believing they meet the definition for box or cage traps.

Deputy Director Jack Robb stated that this was an item which the Department and Law Enforcement had worked on. He added that there was language that may accommodate the public health safety concern while keeping this tool on the toolbox without having it be always open and free for use.

Chief Game Warden Mike Maynard pointed out there were two issues from Law Enforcements perspective that need answering. Box and cage traps definitions do not adequately encompass what a suitcase trap is from our research. We need clarification. That is why we provided the suggested definition. Secondly, is it a tool, which under certain circumstances, may be utilized when needed.

Game Warden Jake Kreamer reiterated Chief Game Warden Mike Maynard. He added in accordance with language in 503.165 and NAC 504.340 where do they fit. Box traps are allowed extra privileges in some areas, which other traps are not. We simply need to know where it fits.

Commissioner McNinch commented that the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) offers a definition for box or cage traps that includes suitcase traps. For him it may be considered a box or cage if it is used in a non-lethal manner. He added, since it may be used lethally than it is not a box or cage trap, those are meant for live trapping and that would maintain the integrity of NAC 503.165. Areas where restrictions are present need to be talked about, should these traps be permitted or approved for certain uses if they will be used lethally.

Commissioner McNinch directed a question to Commissioner Kiel, asking without the definition what his suggestion would be for maintaining the integrity of the regulation in respect to highly used areas given his concern with NAC 503.165. He then asked if Commissioner Kiel had concerns with the addition of NAC 503.165(2E).

Commissioner Kiel responded he would prefer to remove NAC 503.165(2E) but would compromise to leave the language there as long as clarifying language provided by Joel Blakeslee was added to NAC 503.165(3E).

Chairwoman East informed the Commission that Joel Blakeslee did not have problem if brand types were listed on NAC503.165(3E).

Commissioner McNinch asked Law Enforcement to run through scenarios that pertain to “under the written authority of a state agency, the Federal Government or a local government agency”.

Chief Game Warden Mike Maynard responded that an instance would include beavers being near a water source which they are contaminating, they carry diseases and parasitic infections such as giardia, that can be spread to humans. If there is a public health issue this allows the government to remove them as potential health threat.

Deputy Director Jack Robb added that the language was crafted in a manner that allows protection of public health and safety and stays in spirit of where the Commission has gone in past actions. The language additionally allows Law Enforcement to carry out their duties. He added that the proposed language prevents the traps from being recreational and converts them to a management tool when needed.

**CHAIRWOMAN EAST MOVED TO APPROVE CGR 496 PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE BE ADDED TO NAC 503.165(3E) "SUITCASE" TRAP INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO BRANDED NAMES OF 'BAILEY TRAP', 'KORO' TRAP OR 'HANCOCK' TRAP" AND IN NAC 503.180 "AS THOSE REGULATIONS EXIST ON OCTOBER 1, 1990" BE STRUCK OUT. VICE CHAIR BARNES SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-0. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG, COMMISSIONER HUBBS AND COMMISSIONER CAVIGLIA WERE ABSENT.**

**RECESS 1:00 PM  
RECONVIENE 1:50 PM**

**B. Commission General Regulation 498, NAC 503.147 – Ms. Cathy Smith - Petition Bear Hounds – Game Division Administrator Mike Scott– For Possible Action**

Ms. Smith has submitted a petition to change language in NAC 503.147 to withdraw dogs from bear hunts. The Commission accepted the petition during the November 6, 2020 Commission meeting. \*Once the Commission members have discussed this agenda item, a recess of a specific duration will be taken. Persons wishing to comment are invited to raise their hands in the virtual meeting forum and will be individually called upon until all wishing to comment have had the chance to do so.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott reviewed a PowerPoint presentation titled *Use of Hounds on Bear Hunts*.

Commissioner McNinch questioned if from the information submitted anything was statistically valid. If not how far out of statistical inferences was the Department.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott answered that a t-test was only ran on age differences.

Secretary Wasley added in the biological arena a 95 percent confidence interval is used, therefore a p-value of 0.05. If a confidence interval of 90 percent were used the data would have been significantly different but for biological data it is standard to use 95 percent confidence interval, at that level they were not significantly different.

Commissioner McNinch commented that the justifications he had heard from proponents of hounding were that bigger bears were being harvested, and that sex, size, and age were benefiting from hounding. He did not feel he was seeing those benefits given that the statistics may have not fallen into confidence levels that were being looked for.

Commissioner Rogers pointed out that the black bear population was increasing, he was curious about contributing factors to that growth.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott responded that across the western United States there is an increase, as for our population he believed part of it was bear habitat and another part was bears taking advantage of things humans provide. He added that the Department has Project 45 in the predator management plan which is a non-lethal project that helps to estimate bear populations using camera traps. He hoped that the collected data could be put into an integrated population model to help estimate the number of bears.

Vice Chair Barnes informed the Commission that an article spoke to hunter success dropping after the use of hounds had stopped in California. He asked for historical information since the inception of the bear hunt.

Deputy Director Jack Robb responded that the season once ran from September 1 through December, but the season shortened over time for numerous reasons. When the hunt first opened the quota was 20 bears and open across all occupied areas, the Tahoe Basin and the Mount Rose Meadows area have been removed from the hunt. Lastly, the Department went to a female, male harvest quota in each specific unit.

Commissioner Pierini asked Administrator Mike Scott if in the last ten years had bears gotten into houses, cars, garbage and destroyed items. Have bears gone after people.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott responded yes; incidents occur all the time. In Nevada there are two bear biologists and several game wardens that respond to bears in houses and/or cars. There have been instances where people feel threatened but no specific attacks.

Chairwoman East questioned how often older bears with health issues are checked in.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott responded that on occasion different injuries are seen, one troubling instance a bear had 9mm slugs in it, shot gun pellets in it and possibly air gun pellets in it.

Chairwoman East sought clarification on the Small Business Impact Statement, asking if the \$20,000 to \$50,000 represented indirect and direct costs.

Deputy Director Jack Robb replied that the original SBIS stated there was no impact. The Department sent out a survey to its own guides and outfitters asking what the language change would mean for their business and how it would affect them financially. The Department SBIS does not reflect indirect costs.

Break for public comment.

***\*Persons wishing to comment are invited to raise their virtual hands in the virtual meeting forum during the appropriate time; each person offering public comment during this period will be limited to not more than 3 minutes.***

Sheila Z Stirling, private citizen: I thank you very much for the opportunity. I am chiming in it today not only as a citizen and a resident of Nevada for a very long time but also, I'm the head of Saving Wild Horses Nevada and I'm also a member of the Union Members for the Preservation of Wildlife. My stances are completely against bear hunting altogether, but especially the hound dog bear hunt and there is a number of reasons why. Only thirteen percent of Nevadans think it's okay. It is a barbaric way to hunt and something that really needs to be brought to the forefront is that when you're using hound dogs the stress of the chase causes life-threatening long-term problems for the bears, even if the bear isn't killed mothers can be separated from cubs, bears can overheat causing brain damage and death, females who have successfully mated can lose their embryos. Non target species are also disrupted by the packs of hounds, that to me is really critical because it's really the whole ecosystem that is being disturbed when

you start using hounds to do this. People love wildlife, they probably pay to see/have a viewing of a live bear or something like that. Maybe there could be some kind of a tourist thing started, people would like that a lot more than they would to killing the species. There is a lot of reasons besides it being, to me, barbaric and it would be great if Nevada obviously would join the nineteen states that have completely banned it, that would be the ultimate but at the very least we would certainly like to see you discontinue the hound dog. As seen in your graphs, the impact on the bear population when using hounds is quite more significant on the females and the heavier weight which represents the older ones who are in childbearing age, it can be so detrimental not only to the bears but the whole ecosystem that you're having there, we would like to see you discontinue the hound dog bear hunt for these reasons. it really causes major and irrefutable damage not only on the wildlife but the whole ecosystem around it and it's great that you have these... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Tobi Tyler, representing the Sierra Clubs Toiyabe Chapter: Good afternoon and thank you Chairwoman East. I am speaking on behalf of Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter and it's 40,000 members and supporters in support of a ban on the use of hounds in Nevada's black bear hunt. We have provided written comment from our conservation committee chair Connie Howard, I highlight here some of the points made in that letter as well as adding some personal perspective as one who lives in their country. We join eighty seven percent of Nevadan's opposed to the use of hounds or hounding as a hunting practice and ask that you acknowledge the will of the people by approving this ban. NDOW's mission is to protect, manage and restore wildlife and its habitat as you were charged with managing Nevada's wildlife resources for everyone, we strongly urge you to pass policy based on science and ecological health of species, not hunter opportunity. NDOW has confirmed that their hunt is not needed for population control, or to reduce their human conflict. Moreover, data has shown that male female kill ratios do not change with the use of hounds. The argument that females will be spared by using hounds is patently false. Bear hunting is trophy hunting and is therefore contrary to the mission of NDOW and the wishes of the majority of the people in this state. There is no sport or skill involved in following hounds to a treed bear and shooting it. This practice defies any principle of fair chase and honor code of North American hunters for over a century and the principle underlining many of North Americas hunting laws. This atrocious and inhumane practice must end, it is time to manage wildlife resources with the professionalism and respect the public expects and deserves. As one who lives in bear country at 7500 feet and has done so for close to 18 years, I have great admiration for bears. I realize I live in their habitat, not the other way around. Provided humans learn how to behave properly and act responsibly, the bears intelligence and ability to survive and raise their young in close proximity to humans is truly astounding. Please I strongly urge you to ban this horrendous practice and if you have any questions let me know. Thanks.

Haley Stewart, representing the Humane Society of the United States: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to provide comments, I am a wildlife protection program manager for the Humane Society of the United states. The HSUS supports this petition an urge you to prohibit the hunting of black bears with dogs. In the 2018 survey mentioned by Mr. Scott and sponsored by the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife agencies, researchers found that only 30 percent of Nevadans approve of a recreational bear hunt and 63 percent oppose the use of dogs to hunt bears. Only 13 percent of Nevadans surveyed said they support using dogs to hunt black bears. Hounding or using packs of dogs to pursue bears is considered unsporting, even among many hunters because it gives unfair advantage to the hunter. Mispractice pits dogs against bears and either species can be maimed or killed especially if the bear is bayed on the ground. Small bears and cubs are particularly at risk from people/dog attacks and if the mother bear is killed young of the year cubs will die from starvation, exposure to the elements, or predation. Data actually shows hounding does not protect females, it's already been stated but around 30 to 35 percent of bears killed by hunters are females in states with and without hounding. While pursuing bears dogs may chase, startle, or even kill or other non target wildlife. Additionally, neither dogs nor bears sweat and so pursuit during hot weather can cause physical stress to both dogs and bears. Bears who have engaged in prolonged pursuits experience physical stress because their heavy pelts and fat layers can make them overheat, and this can actually lead to death. Hounding disrupts bears

in the early Fall when they should be foraging, not hiding from hunters so they can prepare for winter. Dogs disrupt feeding patterns for both bears who are chased as well as for other nearby animals including deer. Finally hunting dogs invariably trespass on lands whether that's private land, special refuges, or certain federal lands where hounds are not permitted. Hunting is essentially a recreational sport practice by very few hunters in Nevada it has no place in conservation. It is a threat to public safety, and it is just disrespectful to Nevada landowners, residents, pets, and livestock, as well as to the bears and the dogs themselves. Hounding needs to be banned permanently, it unsporting, inhumane and does not align with values of the vast majority of Nevadans. For these reasons we urge you to support and end bear hunting... ***Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Joe Crawford, representing the Lyon CABMW: Lyon CABMW voted unanimously to deny the petition to remove hounds from black bear hunting. Our discussion included letters to the Lyon CABMW and the Commission that have previously been received at prior meetings. From Sporting Dog Alliance, because the Commissioners received it, I'm only going to highlight on some of the points that were addressed in the letter. Seventy one percent of successful bear hunters employed the use of trained dogs to tree and take ninety-nine bears compared to forty bears taken by all methods, this represents a two to one take method. Again from 2011 to 2021 ninety-nine successful bear hunters used dogs to tree and took a total of 148 bears passed and not harvested, representing 1.5 bears passed per hunter using dogs. In 2011 to 2021 ninety-nine of the bears harvested by hunters using dogs, sows only constituted twenty nine percent of the harvest compared to the sow harvest composition of forty one percent by the forty successful hunters using other methods. The statistics support the use of hounds as a selective form of hunting that should remain intact and the Lyon CABMW recommends the Commission deny the petition to remove hounds, thank you.

Fred Voltz, private citizen: The current situation where bear hunters use packs of dogs equipped with GPS collars, ATV vehicles, and other technological enhancements give the human hunters an unfair advantage in seeking bears to kill. That's reality regardless of what other states do or don't do, if it is really a test of equally mad skill between wildlife and humans, hunters should pursue bears on their own, on foot only, without packs of dogs or technology to help them chase bears to exhaustion and probably death. We have no studies indicating the negative health impacts of chasing bears over long distances; however, bears are not physically equipped to be marathon runners and their often-futile attempts to escape the dog packs do nothing to help the species survive. Destruction of and harm to other non target species, the dogs themselves, and the landscape as multiple dogs indiscriminately race crossland have not been formally inventoried either. We have no economic analysis of loss to the public when bears are killed even though NDOW chose to chronicle economic impact to hunter guides, which are questionable if they're still guiding bear hunters to perspective bears. Why wasn't NDOW's PowerPoint posted with the support materials before this meeting for the public, and Commissioners to review? The specious claim that hunters selectively and judiciously decide which bears to kill or might allow to live lacks independently sourced evidence. The self-reported statistics regarding bears not killed from such organizations as the Nevada Sporting Dog Alliance are just as suspect as those reported by trappers. There is no audit or assurance that these numbers represent reality since there is a decided incentive to undercount what is reported. This Commission would be well advised to instruct NDOW to begin drafting regulatory language that bars bear hunting as soon as possible, given its negative impacts on the environment and multiple species, thank you.

Bobbie McCollum, private citizen: I support the petition to ban hounding. One of the reasons that I thought of and looking at the statutes regards NRS 503.631 and NRS 503.636, which specifically state that it's unlawful to permit a dog to run at large, if such dog is actively tracking, pursuing, harassing, attacking, or killing any wildlife in this state or in a state-owned wildlife management area. Further, NRS 503.150, it's unlawful to hunt any big game mammal except mountain lions with a dog of any breed. I haven't heard anyone address those areas at all, I don't think you have a lot of data to evaluate the effects of hounding regarding the hounds that are equipped with radio collars, the injuries to the dogs that perhaps

encountered a terrified bear who didn't climb a tree. What happened with the dog, how many were taken to the veterinarian, what were the extent of the damage to the dogs, I'm sure that's very important. I also want to point to the Nevada Wildlife Values report which has been done today and page twenty-two of that report reveals that eighty three percent of non-hunting hunting Nevadans and sixty three percent of hunting Nevadans disagree with using dogs to hunt bear, that is a clear statement of the public's disapproval. The Commission I think has been allowing hunting based solely on the guesses and opinions of the proponents of it. I believe that you should reconsider your responsibility to the majority of Nevada citizens not just to the wishes of those who lobby for the use of hounding. Just as a side to the end comment, I emailed my comments this morning, but I became concerned that my comments had not been provided to the Commissioners, early in the meeting Mr. Wasley I believe stated that more than 2000 comments were received, and he added that duplicates or format wording were used in those comments. He didn't give any details on the number of duplicates just kind of a broad statement. I don't understand the reason for casting doubt on someone who uses format language, not everyone is comfortable writing comments or speaking them in a public setting. There's nothing wrong with using format wording if you feel strongly enough to take the time to submit comments on an issue, thank you.

Joseph Terry, private citizen: I'm a resident of Las Vegas and I support allowing hunters and guides to use hounds while hunting bears in Nevada. I'm a hunter, but never hunted bears not due to lack of applying but just the lack of drawing the tag. Last year there was over 3000 applicants that applied for bear tags in Nevada and obviously only the 45 resident tags that were available. I think NDOW has done a great job and prove that they're doing research and have data to prove that there are bears in the state, how many bears there are, the ages, the weights, all that. They tried doing the hair snare, they're doing trail cameras, I think they're trying their best and bringing data to us, as many people say there's no data to support any populations out there, I think there is. This is not what some call a trophy hunt, this allows the hunter to take an animal, provide the meat to their family but this way assist in determining the sex, age, of the bear effectively and also manages the numbers in Nevada. I think if we don't allow the hounds to be used, we'll see lower bears being taken which would increase the population and then increase more interaction with people, thank you.

Dr. Jon Keehner, private citizen: Thank you for taking my comment I'm a carnivore ecologist having earned my PhD in carnivore ecology, studying mountain lions in northeastern Washington state. I'm commenting to bring attention to the fact that many of these types of petitions brought about by groups or individuals who seek to profit from the emotional responses by the public to their claims of inhumane treatment are not based in science. As a scientist I find this very concerning, I am not affiliated with any group, advocacy, organization, or government agency, my interest in this phenomenon is solely as a concerned scientist. The science behind stress induced reactions to hunting by the pursuit of hounds is mostly based upon a series of publications in the scientific literature focusing on the pursuit of red deer, herbivores, by dozens and sometimes hundreds of hounds. Few if any studies have been conducted with respect to the stress on bears as a result of being pursued by hounds. Surprisingly, a recent study published in *Animals* by (could not make out name) and colleagues in 2020 suggested the following, and I quote "we predicted that the hunting activity would act as a stressor inducing increase short- and long-term stress levels in the population results showed an increase in hair cortisol levels during the month harvesting. Surprisingly, the tendency for plasma cortisol levels was to decrease during the hunting season which could be interpreted as habituation to hunting activity or due to the hunting duration contrary to our predictions fecal cortisol metabolite did not show any clear patterns across the months." Again, these results are based upon the pursuit of red deer by hounds, as a carnivore ecologist I would like to point out that black bears and mountain lions, unlike red deer which were the subject of these studies, have evolved an escape response to wolves over the millennia. It stands to reason that the pursuit of bears with hounds from the black bears perspective is not much different. Lastly, carnivore management in its core relies upon the ability of wildlife managers to actively manage carnivore populations with predictable results. Hound hunting provides this type of stability in a manner that is consistent with most definitions of fair chase. Removing this type of stability in the predictability of

outcomes with respect population objectives would hamper overall carnivore conservation efforts. Hound hunters are some of the most passionate, ethical, and active constituencies and carnivore and wildlife conservation overall. I ask the Commissioners reject any efforts to eliminate the pursuit of bears through the use of hounds, thank you.

Paul Dixon, representing the Clark County CABMW: Our CABMW had a lively discussion. We had a fair number of people from the public that gave written testimony to the CABMW, as well as verbal testimony to the CABMW. In a 6-1 split vote, the CABMW recommended continued use of hounds and did not support Cathy Smith's petition a presented. The dissenting vote against bear hunting on my committee, the CABMW believed it's a trophy hunt and this board member does not believe in trophy hunts. This board member also feels the use of hounds violates fair chase. One of the other things brought up in our CABMW meeting which I thought was interesting by one of the CABMW members is we commonly refer to the Wildlife Values Report by a lot of people and the Wildlife Values Report surveyed eleven or twelve hundred people in a state of 3.4 million. When you look at that number bear people who applied for bear tags was 3400, so just looking at the number of tags that was requested by hunters and you look at the number of people surveyed in the values report I'm wondering how accurately the values report really represents the state of Nevada. If they represent populations, it may represent who did things, but I don't think 1200 people really represents 3.4 million people in Nevada myself personally and we had that discussion, we didn't vote on that, but you know that's a personal opinion by the Chair of the Clark CABMW. I think if we're going to refer to the values report one should basically redo the values report and look at a larger sampling that's more representative. We hear Commissioner McNinch talk about statistically significant results in bears and bear numbers and stuff. I don't believe that 1200 is statistically significant sampling of the Nevada population to give us any clue of what we really feel about bear hunting or other hunting methods, thank you.

Mitch Bailey, representing Nevada Hunting Services of Professional Guide and Outfitting: I am currently the owner and operator of Nevada Hunting Services of Professional Guide and Outfitting business here in northern Nevada, license through the Nevada Department of Wildlife stated of Nevada. Eleven years ago, when the black bear hunt came into the Commission and voted thereupon and it was decided that we were going to have a bear hunt I collected my sub guides and myself, having hunted bears in other states. We decided that we were going to do this the right way, we're going to make sure that everybody that came hunting with us would do it the right way, based on my past experience with bears, hounds hunting etc... I've been a hounds man for over 35 years and I figured that the population of Nevadans putting in for bear tags were likely going to be deer hunters. elk hunters, antelope hunters and probably didn't have a lot of experience hunting bears. We started off really well, my youngest daughter was actually the first successful female to harvest a bear in the state. Both my daughters were fortunate to drop their tags, we rejoiced in their harvest, consumed the harvest, and we built a really good reputation. One of the big issues that I have personally is the opposition to this continues to be opposed for the last ten years. Their opposition never goes away, rather than select to just not participate in our activities they continue to oppose it. Well, I can tell you, one of the key key factors that I think has been missed in all the testimony today, not only from Mike Scott, but from anybody else who testified. I can assure you that my business is responsible for or was involved in about thirty percent of the overall harvest of 140 bears and of the bears that we've harvested a number probably close to 40 not one bear has been wounded, left, lost etc. and that's because of the use of hounds. You don't, and you seldom would be close enough to a black bear using spot and stock methods or otherwise to take a shot that renders that bear basically vitalists within seconds of the shot being fired and not running off, not having to track them through the brush, and not losing that animal. Not only that, of the 40 bears that we've personally harvested as our outfit, we have likely treed over 80, so we don't shoot every bear we put up a tree. We look for the biggest bears, and the best bears, many of which are on the decline both in their dental structure, their physiology. I've done skeletal put backs for studies for the Department of Wildlife and the damage to some of these bears, their joints, their arthritis, their dental work... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

John McLennan, private citizen: I just want to thank the Commission and all of you for your dedication to Nevada's wildlife. I'm a Nevada resident, born and raised and thoroughly enjoy Nevada's natural resources. I wanted to voice my opinion and support the Nevada bear hunt and the use of hounds to pursue and harvest them. The skill required to train hounds is not only admirable but there's hours and hours of dedication put forth in doing so to train the hounds and pursuing hounds. Those pursuing them with hounds they have a strong desire to see the bears flourish because as the bears flourish they get to continue on with their passion and so if the bear population was to decrease then I'd consider putting limitations on the bear hunt but as seen the hunt is not jeopardizing the Nevada bear population and for those who say that it's inhumane or barbaric I just believe there's a disconnect in that reality of the pursuit and highly recommend and encourage those to have engaging conversations with hounds man and guides that are familiar in that expertise. That's all I have, thank you again for your time, appreciate it.

Jason Graham, representing the Nevada Sporting Dog Alliance: As you all know we've provided multiple letters in regard to Nevada's black bear hunt and the data involved since inception. This petition is emotionally driven has no scientific support to back their claims. We hope we can continue to base our decisions on the actual data provided by NDOW and biologists working closely with our wildlife. We oppose this petition and ask the Commission to do the same, thank you.

Joel Blakeslee, private citizen: I applaud Paul Dixon and Mitch Bailey for what they said, they gave great testimony but, on this survey, that's been talked about, was there a question on that survey on whether it was OK to hunt pheasants with dogs, or ducks, or chukars, or any other animal, or was that question specifically made to discriminate against bear hunters. Anyway, this isn't about hunting with dogs, it's about the culture of hunting period. If you support the consumptive use of wildlife, then I don't see how you can go against this. The Coalition for Nevada Wildlife which I'm board of directors sent in a letter, I am president of the Trapper Association we stand with the guides and the bear hunters. Anyway, that's about all I have to say, I don't see how it's any different than hunting birds. Talk to you later.

Jim Cooney, representing the Elko County CABMW: Our CABMW is totally against this particular petition. I would also like to point out I believe all of the Commission members receive the resolution from the Elko County Commission in support of the use of hounds. I would encourage the Commission to deny this petition. thank you.

Genelle Richards, private citizen: I am talking in support of the petition. I'm constantly astounded by the many ways that we continue to find to abuse animals in the name of sport. So how is it right for hunters to use dogs in hunting bears. I know my father was a hunter and he never would have done something as despicable as using another animal to track down and hunt the animal in question. Not doing any of the work themselves how is that a fair chase, how is that possibly the true spirit of hunting and being fair in doing so and as has been pointed out many times today sixty three percent of the people in the value survey support do not support using dogs. So, there you see the majority of Nevadans do not want this to be. They do not want dogs to be hounding bears and them being killed that way and it really is brutal to both animals too, if you think about it but I won't go into the overheating and the chasing. The fact is the bear hunt has never been popular, it was always a trophy hunt, the Nevadans at the beginning didn't want it, we've never wanted it all the way through, and we still don't want it. So, I ask you, who do you work for? I think you work for the people of Nevada, so if you work for the people of Nevada how can you with a clear conscience allow this to continue for just a handful of hunters who want to be able to do this way. Hunting bears should be disallowed anyway, I feel, but definitely this idea of hounding them. It's an abhorrent practice, it's ghastly and it's not wanted by the majority of Nevada. You work for us right, you're the Commission for the state of Nevada, so for once can the people in favor of wildlife win something, thank you.

Larry Allen, representing the Humboldt County CABMW: During our meeting earlier this week the CABMW voted unanimously 5-0 to oppose any regulation regression to change regulation by the Commission to the Department of Wildlife. Just like many speakers have stated before me, the use of hounds is beneficial in identifying sex, establishing close proximity when harvesting. When hunters choose to harvest an animal, this luck leads to much less chance of wounding loss and harvesting sows or sows with cubs as well. It's been a long tradition from the get-go when this hunt was starting in Nevada to hunt with hounds, so it's a tradition for many of these people and outfitters that pursue the bears, so the Humboldt CABMW stands with the hounds man and sportsman in support of continuing the use of hounds for bear hunting, thank you.

Bob Cook, representing the Douglas CABMW: We had a meeting Tuesday night, and we had a unanimous vote to deny the petition and we did have a lot of public comment involved but I've lived here in Lake Tahoe, Nevada for over fifty years and I don't even remember having a bear till about 25 years ago when I saw an article on *60 Minutes* about bears coming up from Yellow Stone, Yosemite. Hunting is not abusing animals; they've been hunting animals since mankind. I do believe it's emotionally driven I believe a lot of the facts that were said in the beginning were not based on actual facts. I have to say that Douglas County was instrumental, I believe, in getting the five additional tags which brought the dream tag, which incurs extra money for research and habitat for bears to keep the population healthy. I do know that at one point in time we also were part of the decision to stop bear hunting down to the lake and it was really a bad decision and the reason I say that is because as soon as that happened, they to stop all hunting. So, the anti-groups not only did they want to stop bears they want to stop hunting. For all of those reasons I would like to ask the Commission considering denying this petition, thank you.

Elaine Carrick, private citizen: I support this petition to ban the use of hounds to hunt the black bears. When making any decision we look at the negatives and we look at the positives. I'd like to give you a list of the negatives and these are not the ones that I have just listed, I have gotten them from animal biologists and other people that are involved with the animal community. Female bears can be separated from their cub and can starve to death, female bears can lose an embryo after a long hot chase by hounds, both hounds and bear can be severely wounded or killed by fighting on the ground, bears being chased by hounds during their hyperphagia period can lessen their food intake and affect their health and time in hibernation and then you have packs of hounds running through the forest that can disturb or kill other wildlife. Again, these are statements that have been said by bear biologists, the last one is Fair chase which is described by Boone and Crockett Club as the pursuit and taking of a big game animal in a manner that does not give an improper advantage over such animals. My question is the opportunity to kill a bear more easily by using hounds to hunt a bear is this s legitimate positive that outweighs all the negatives I've listed. We currently have five western states that have banned using hounds for bear hunting as they see that the negatives grossly outweigh the positive. There is no positive science that says using hounds to hunt black bears is good for the bears, their population, the environment, or for the public which sixty three percent in a survey are against this. It is time for Nevada to ban the hunting of its bears with hounds and I thank you for your time.

Caron Tayloe, private citizen: Since the 2010 decision to create a bear hunt, I have seen many people, including professionals, try to justify this hunt for reasons that only seem to serve themselves and don't serve the bears. Trying to find any reason for a hunt that should not even exist has only made this problem worse and I believe it was Chairman Barnes a little bit ago that was asking about history, I'm not sure was he talking about the history of how this all came about but it certainly is worth checking into because this hunt was created with problems that the previous 2010 Board of Wildlife Commissioners had and were not based on any kind of science, did not even take public opinion into account other than hunter public opinion. So, there's a lot at stake here with respect to making right this decade long mistake. This is a pretty malignant hunt, ending the hunting of bears is a courageous first step in making right something that should not have happened in the first place eleven years ago, thank you.

Clint McGarr, private citizen: I am a native Nevadan, born and raised here I've been hunting my whole life I hear a lot of people talking about this survey that's been completed. I think if you survey the licensed hunters in this state, you'd get a whole different number of this beyond the sixty three percent that are against this. Hounds have been used for ages, there's no reason to ban this, it's more off of emotion then it is off of facts. I don't think we should go on with banning the hounds I appreciate you guys listening to this, the only other thing I would say is we shouldn't even be considering this in the current situation with Covid, if we can't go in as a person and do this should be doing it over zoom a lot of other problems that we've seen happen but thank you again and again vote against this ban, thank you.

Mike Reese, private citizen: A couple of items I'd like to bring up, Mr. Scott talked about the other states that have hounding, what I'd like them to see is, I don't think there's any data on it, but I would venture to say that a majority of those have had hounding for probably more than two decades. Probably even from the inception of their bear hunts in that since they started in the other states. With that being said, with the use of hounds we still only have a sixty percent take. I am willing to see if come next quota season, I feel that we need to raise the amount of tags that are allocated for the bear. We can safely do that and still stay probably under the 20 or right at the 20 bears taken or with our population being up around 700, it may even be time to go ahead and raise that. If you outlaw, the use of hounds it'd be probably three times the amount of tags that are out there to get that take. I am not in favor of the petition; I think the data is there to warn to keep doing what we're doing. It worked we've got 10 years' worth of data and I urge you to decline the petition, thank you.

Becky Dwire, private citizen: I have already sent in all my scientific explanations as to why the bear hunt should be continued to you guys, as you have read. I'm basically going to point out the nonscientific things that the antis are stating. In reference to sows being childbearing I'd like to point out the fact that bears are not human, do not have children. As far as the claims that dogs do not sweat during the hunt and therefore overheat, dogs do in fact sweat through their paws and have other cooling mechanisms like panting. I'd like to know how many of these people who are saying how cruel the bear hunt is, and how cruel hounding is, have actually first-hand experience with either hounds, hunting, or bears in a natural environment, not urbanized bears, which is basically a false wildlife setting. As far as no effort or skill, I put eleven miles on my boots yesterday alone, on a fruitless hunt, I'm not mad about it. I'm out there for the dogs, for the wildlife, this shows how little correct information that they really have. As a ex professional dog trainer, training from working dogs, to at home lap dogs and pets I have seen very few pets as happy, mentally stable, mentally fulfilled and having their genetic instincts, which are wired into them fulfilled as hunting dogs. especially hounds. This really shows how hypocritical the slamming of NDOW's facts and scientific facts are by the anti-hounders while claiming animal facts that have no clue what they're talking about working dogs. Do these people object to biologists using hounds to capture animals for research studies they pulled these facts they slammed from and cherry picking the fact. The term trophy hunt is an absolutely ridiculous statement what would the people prefer that we do, leave parts of the animal in the woods, like heads, hides, skulls, all of that just take the meat. Would that not be more wasteful than how we're doing it now. I also like to point out the majority of the population that were claiming on the all majority of the population doesn't support it. Majority of the population doesn't have any interest in wildlife management, nor do they have any formal training in wildlife management biology or ecology. I would urge you to look at the facts and continue to support the Nevada bear hunt and the facts brought forward by trained individuals with wonderful access to the ability or wonderful access to facts and a different side of wildlife than the public sees, thank you very much.

Shannon Greene, private citizen: I've heard quite a few comments about how sows can get separated from their cubs and I want to remind this committee and gathering of individuals that the dogs allow an opportunity that would not be allowed in a spot and stock situation. If a sow is nursing when you're looking up at it in that tree you're going to know, and any ethical hunter is going to let that sow down so that she can reunite with her cubs and that is unquestionable in any kind of experience that I know any of my personal acquaintances to have been in while guiding or been on a bear hunt. So, I'd like to redirect the

emotion versus what the opportunities are gained and how hunting in the field, and hopefully we stick with that versus, we don't like hunting we're going to use that were stressing dogs rather than allowing a working dog to work as a decision in this matter. So once again I'd like to support the Nevada bear hunt and I appreciate your time.

Catherine Smith, private citizen: Thank you guys again for letting the petition proceed until today's meeting. I just have a couple of comments that have come up repeatedly and it's been really fascinating. The first though is, I guess my question is if we're not going to follow or even use the surveys that the Department commissions then maybe we need to come up with a minimum number that is required to be surveyed before it will be accepted by the Commission because if I remember correctly it costs about \$40,000 for these questions to be asked by WAFWA and if we're not going to use that information maybe we should spend that money you for better outcome somewhere else and just tell the legislature that we're not interested in public opinion and that's fine, that's a way we can go, it's a choice. The other thing that keeps coming up this the emotional call to end hounding and unfortunately this is one of those difficult decisions on wildlife, when we don't have a management goal there really is no reason for this hunt with the exception of hunter opportunity and I think the Department has come on the record and said that there are no population objectives. So basically, to use hounds is also an emotional argument, there is really no reason to use them with the exception of emotion or you want to do it. So, it's actually equal, those are two equal stances there's no scientific reason to use hounds either, because we have huge, thousands, literally hundreds of thousands of bears of data that showed that sex kill ratios do not change with hounds, so we already have all that information, so this is an emotional argument on both sides. The other thing I'm hoping is that maybe you can change the petition process, I don't know if it's fair to have a petitioner try to come up with economic outcomes or economic effects of petition. It's really challenging for a private citizen to do this that's why I said not that there was no effect, that there was minimal effect due to disallowing hounds and there is minimal effect if you look at the whole economy of hunting and that industry, but I don't know if that's even really a legitimate question on a petition. It's just too big of an ask for a private citizen to come up with that information and clearly, I can't send out surveys to all the houndsman to ask that question. The other thing I found really fascinating... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Judi Caron, private citizen: Please know I have great admiration for all the participants and comments presented today. Currently I'm opposed to moving forward with the rulemaking process specific to agenda item 10B as presented today for the following two reasons that I feel strongly need to be addressed and discussed before we can engage in true meaningful discussions. You can hear my voice cracking; this is how much I admire our Department and the Commission when we get to these issues. I think it is vital to understand the Department's recommendation and reasoning to be heard by the public become part of support material and be on the record as our Department is highly respected and a knowledgeable agency. The two pieces that I think are still missing, before we can really come to consensus of whether to initiate or move forward with this rule making process is number one, what is the Departments perspective and their stance on the petition, what's the broad scope, what are we engage in, but I haven't heard where the Department truly stands on this petition. Mr. Scott did a wonderful job today in his PowerPoint with data, but I want to know what our Department feels, what Mr. Wasley and the leadership feels for all their participant and WAFWA and different things. Number two, I respectfully request the Department to provide biologically sound scientific data outlining the negative impacts to the species of black bear when hunted with dogs, thank you again and those are my comments.

Chairwoman East read the following comment for the record "Chairwoman East, Lander County CABMW has written a letter to NDOW and is strongly against the language to stop the use of hounds in bear hunting."

Chairwoman East questioned if there were any biological reasons bears should not be pursued by hounds, is there undue stress caused to the bears when they are being pursued by hounds.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson responded he was not intimately familiar with literature of stress hormones but added that on a population impact standpoint there was not based on how long hounding has existed and been used.

Chairwoman East continued to ask if there had been females killed due to the use of hounds that left cubs orphaned.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott answered that the only instance he could recall was several years ago a lactating female was brought in, he added that there was no hair around nipple and that females can continue lactating even when they are done nursing.

Chairwoman East quired if the Department had an idea how many bears were consumed based off the number of bears harvested.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson stated that question is asked during check in, he went on to inform the Commission that for the last three years 44 bears were checked in and 1 out of 44 reported taking only the hide and skull, the other 43 reported taking the entire animal or just the meat, head, and hide. Based on that information he believed the vast majority were taking that meat with them but cannot confirm they are eating it.

Chairwoman East asked how many applications were received for last year's bear hunt.

Deputy Director Jack Robb responded that there were 259 non-resident applications, 3213 resident applications, and an additional 2899 individuals bought bonus points. This was a total 6371, not including dream tag applicants.

Commissioner McNinch commented the Commission was allowing things to divide and remain divided if they were not proactive in respect to being polarized in all respects all the time. He continued he would ask a series of questions that could show his biases, his first question was whether the conducted wildlife value survey was statistically valid and did it have a statistically valid number of sportsmen included in the study.

Secretary Wasley responded that the wildlife value survey was statistically valid, it had been conducted by professors in the social sciences between Colorado State University and Ohio State University. He added when the study was presented to the Commission it was with the understanding that social views do not dictate wildlife management. He provided the example of being able to conduct a survey at a certain time asking whether the Earth was flat, while many would have said yes it did not make it so. The Department uses the survey, it is statistically valid, but it does not change science and science counters the publics views.

Commissioner McNinch thanked Secretary Wasley and added it was important to take the public's views into consideration to make informed decisions. There needed to ne an understanding of how the Commission would impact people with their decisions. He went on to ask how many bears were pursued for fun? There had been talk about the number of released bears but not about how many of those were pursued just for purposed of training or running dogs.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott responded that were numbers of bears pursued in the data, bears may only be pursued legally by a tag holder and during open season. If people were doing it for

fun, it would be illegal and a Law Enforcement issue. Lastly, to his knowledge he has not heard of it being an issue in Nevada because it is illegal.

Commissioner McNinch asked if the assumption would be that bears which had been turned down were treed with the intent of hunting whether the animal was taken or not. Game Division Administrator Mike Scott said that would be his assumption.

Commissioner McNinch referenced the PowerPoint presentation noting that the age of female bears taken in a ten-year average was 5.4 years with hounds and 7.8 years with other methods. He continued to ask if the data was not statistically valid at a 95 percent confidence level, was he correctly understanding that it would be statistically valid at a 90 percent confidence interval?

Secretary Wasley replied had a p value of 0.1 been used rather than 0.05 it could have been. After the analysis was performed, it was asked what level of significance would be appropriate and as with all biological studies 0.05 is standard. He added that he believed it was significant at a 90 percent confidence level.

Commissioner McNinch commented that without being statistical it was still the best data available. He added that there was a gap in the ages of bears taken with hounds versus other methods. Those numbers concerned him in respect to selectivity not working on females during hounding and he was not convinced selectivity on sex is a key item in a sportsman's selectivity criteria. Of the 139 bears harvested to date 71 percent were taken with hounds, of those 99 bears taken with hounds 1/3 were female, so there was still a level of female take despite the use of hounds. He mentioned a matrix received annually that reflects annual harvest numbers with a three-year running average. Lastly, he asked, with the idea that the mean average of females and males being taken in two of those three metrics fall into the heavy range would the Departments recommendation to the Commission be to shut the season down.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson the recommendation would be to reduce the harvest limit, reduce the number of tags issued, potentially shorten, alter, or not have a season.

Commissioner McNinch stated that since 2011 there have been times when some of the metrics have fallen in the moderate status and with time there had been heavy harvests on female take and heavy harvest on the mean average of the females within the matrix. In 2018 there was a moderate and light. In 2019 there was a light, heavy, light. In 2020 there was heavy, moderate, and light. More often those boundaries are being pushed annually and it is showing in the three-year average. He reiterated his earlier thoughts on hounding and selectivity, ending with expressing his concerns with the population, especially as it relates to females.

Commissioner Kiel asked how well the Department educated hunters on management objectives and the matrix that were mentioned.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson responded he does not personally teach the indoctrination course and could not recall if they reviewed the matrix, he did however know they reviewed extensively how to identify a mature bear and female cub.

Commissioner Kiel noticed spot and stalk hunters were harvesting older and larger females which made sense to him, asking is there any credence to that.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott replied that hunters were harvesting older females but not necessarily heavier females, those were taken using hounds. Age is harder to ascertain from looking at a bear, their condition may sometimes tell their age but a bear five to seven years old is a lot harder to determine whether it is in a tree or using spot and stalk.

Vice Chair Barnes pointed out this was an emotional issue, when the hunt started it was in the Tahoe basin, that was removed, as a hunter where would they eventually end up. The population chart is increasing, at some point in time would the Department be looking at needing population limits. In a personal conversation about disease numbers, it was brought up that when population numbers of any species are high there are disease issues, that has been seen with wildlife populations and livestock. Do we want to limit the tools we have to reach something if needed? He ended by stating it was not a tool he wanted to remove incase it was need in the future.

Commissioner Pierini explained that about eleven years ago was when bears could start to be hunted. At that time there were 300 to 400 bears, it has now gone up to roughly 700. With less than 20 bears a year being harvested he did not see an issue with hounding. He acknowledged that it was a difficult hunt and a new type of wildlife to hunt. In respect to hunting he continues believing in the hunt.

Chairwoman East questioned with respect to the ten-year age average of 5.4 using hounds and 7.8 using other methods, how many females may have been released based on cubs, lactation, or other factors. She acknowledged the question was hypothetical. Administrator Mile Scott replied that the Department did not have that type of data.

Commissioner McNinch spoke out loud personal reflective questions, what if we are not able to measure change of female health in a timely manner. What if hounding had no impact on age, sex, or size of bears taken, then what does he think about the concept of hounding. He was struggling with the biological benefit of hounding for those reasons. He commented that last year and a year or two a certain area was closed because the female take in that area had been reached, which tells him the selectivity is not necessarily working. He continued speaking towards selectivity based on a comment he has read, if a hunter hired a guide, they may take the first available bear that is seen solely because it is the last day of the hunting season and not based on selectivity.

Chairwoman East used a real-life hunters experience to counter that an argument could be made in respect to selectivity, a female hunter had passed on two sows because she specifically wanted to take a boar.

Commissioner McNinch asked if there was a high level of confidence with hounding to determine male versus female sex, why was there a required parameter that if more than three females are to shut down the hunt. If a season were shut down what criteria would be used to reopen it, why would not that criteria be used to measure how the hunt is performing as opposed to the three post-harvest aspects.

Deputy Director Jack Robb kept going back to the fact that the Department and its biologist do not only look at the data derived by the bear harvest but also data from every other bear that is handled or known about. There are capture and release or capture and euthanize due to conflict situations. The harvest data is a small component of the total knowledge the Department has on the bear population. The Department is using a whole host of items to make informed decisions.

Commissioner Pierini was impressed by the correspondence that was received regarding the bear hounding regulation and the amount of research that had been done by individuals. He felt the hunt was working well and suggested the Commission could change the hunt next year should anything change. He believed a lot of good had been done and referenced that many had spoken to the Commission wanting to keep the hunt the same.

***\*Commissioner Hubbs rejoined the Commission meeting.***

Chairwoman East questioned if the Commission wanted to limit the tools currently present, the short answer was no. She mentioned changes could be done down the road, the Commission Regulations pertaining to the bear hunt could be changed as needed at a future time as well as quotas come May. She reiterated she would not be for limiting tools provided the low number of tags available.

Commissioner Hubbs commented that those who supported bear hounding felt it helped with sexing, sizing, and treeing the bear. She acknowledged the spectrum of comments she had received from, it is just a hunt for fun, dogs were meant to do this, to its an inhumane way to hunt and that it was a repugnant hunt all together. Overall, she did not support the bear hunt and therefore could not support the hounding of bears. Looking at the social science where eighty seven percent of the public were against hound hunting made it clear to her that the public did not want this hunt. She did not believe the Commission would motion in her favor and asked of hunters who are using hounds not to upload videos of dogs mauling bears or any other footage that places sportsman in a negative light and that would be disheartening to the public.

Vice Chair Barnes echoed Commissioner Hubbs, hunters need to be responsible and hunt ethically, while most do there are a few that do not. This should be promoted amongst sportsman as well.

Commissioner McNinch stated that he would not support the motion. He thanked the Commission for hearing the petition and clarified he did not think ill of hounding, rather he looked at the hunt through a biological lens.

Vice Chair Barnes commented that he had a tremendous amount of Commissioner McNinch, noting he appreciated his point of view.

**VICE CHAIR BARNES MOVED TO LEAVE LANGUAGE AS IT EXISTS IN NAC 503.147. COMMISSIONER KIEL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5-2. COMMISSIONER HUBBS AND COMMISSIONER MCNINCH DISSENTED. COMMISSIONER CAVIGLIA AND COMMISSIONER ALMBERG WERE ABSENT.**

Break for public comment.

Adjourned to reconvene Saturday, March 20, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

**Saturday, March 20, 2021 – 9:00 a.m.**

***If you wish to make public comment, please use this link:***

**<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86771272938?pwd=WFl6T2cvdFBsc1RGbnNESVJsNXIzUT09>**

- 11. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call of Commission Members and County Advisory Board Members to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) – Chairwoman East**  
CABMW members who are present and viewing the meeting through the YouTube link should send an email to [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org) indicating their presence.

Chairwoman East called the meeting to order at 9:00am. Commissioner Pierini led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance. Executive Assistant Missy Stanford called Commission roll call; Commissioner Almberg joined late. Chairwoman East noted the six CABMWs in attendance.

- 12. Approval of Agenda – Chairwoman East – 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.

Chairwoman East asked for questions on the agenda, seeing none, noted it was an action item and went out for public comment.

Jana Hofeditz, private citizen: Hi, I'm not sure if I'm supposed to speak yet on this issue because I don't know what the lineup is, for say. My issue I'm speaking on would be about the wildlife killing contests.

Chairwoman East answered that she would have to speak on the agenda items she wanted to discuss.

Jana Hofeditz, private citizen: I had a feeling. I'm sorry. It was a broad question, so I wasn't sure if I was supposed to chime in, I'm sorry.

Chairwoman East asked for additional comments. Seeing none, brought it back for a motion.

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA BY COMMISSIONER CAVIGLIA. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS. MOTIOIN CARRIED 8-0. COMMISSIONER ALMBERG ABSENT.**

- 13. Member Items/Announcements and Correspondence – Chairwoman East – Informational**  
Commissioners may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. The Commission will review and may discuss correspondence sent or received by the Commission since the last regular meeting and may provide copies for the exhibit file (Commissioners may provide hard copies of their correspondence for the written record). Correspondence sent or received by Secretary Wasley may also be discussed.

Secretary Wasley clarified when the Department spoke to the volume of comments mostly pertaining to the hounding issue, the Department was not casting doubt on the veracity of contents and just wanted the record to show that it was actually the opposite intent.

Chairwoman East thanked him.

Commissioner Hubbs stated too that she appreciated all of the comments and was pleased to see emails from all over the world. Stated that the Commission takes all correspondence very seriously whether in a form letter or not.

Commissioner McNinch stated that his perspective was that the Department went to great lengths to simplify the correspondence so that the Commission could process it all.

Chairwoman East agreed and stated she appreciated all of the comments.

Vice Chair Barnes noted the letter received from the Humboldt CABMW. He stated that he would appreciate is CABMWs came to these Commission meetings with their thoughts, comments, and concerns to have more of a conversation.

Chairwoman East reminded the public, if you cannot get through that was through the zoom raising your hand would you please email the [WildlifeCommission@NDOW.org](mailto:WildlifeCommission@NDOW.org). If there is something that needs to be shared, Missy will let us know. Please do not text me or email me personally because I'm not going to be checking throughout the meeting.

Commissioner Hubbs asked why the Department turned off the chat box.

Chairwoman East, DAG Burkett, and Secretary Wasley all indicated it was to remove distraction, as there were comments being shared throughout meeting, it keeps everyone equal in terms of opportunity and it's not a form of public comment.

Chairwoman East asked for any more member items or announcements. Seeing none, moved on.

- 14. County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Member Items – Informational**  
CABMW members may present emergent items at [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org); these comments will be shared with the Commission. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action will be scheduled on a future Commission agenda.

Chairwoman East asked CABMW members for comment. Seeing none, moved on.

**15. Reports – Informational**

**A. Department Activity Report – Secretary Wasley and Division Administrators**

A report will be provided on Nevada Department of Wildlife activities.

**DIRECTOR'S OFFICE**

The Director's Office has been busy preparing for the current Legislative Session. Director's Office staff have already met with multiple legislators, including the Chairs of the Natural Resource Committees; Assemblyman Howard Watts and Senator Fabian Donate. Director Wasley gave a Department Overview presentation to the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources on February 3 and a budget presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation on March 9. Many staff have been busy reviewing bill language and preparing testimony for multiple bills related to wildlife and law enforcement this session. Deputy Director Bonnie Long and Administrative Services Officer 3 Jordan Goshert have been busy buttoning up the next biennial budget and answering many questions coming from the Governor's Finance Office.

Director Wasley and Deputy Director Robb have been busy participating in many trainings and meetings including NDOW Law Enforcement's Inservice. Deputy Director Robb also participated in the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation's (RBFF) working group at the end of February.

The Director's Office continues to work on the submittal of multiple petitions, lawsuits, audits and public records requests.

**GAME**

**Smith Valley Mule Deer Disease Investigation:** NDOW staff have been working on a potential disease outbreak in Smith Valley. At least six deer have been reported to have died with three being submitted for necropsy. One of these was darted and the decision was made to euthanize. Initial results from WADDL (Washington Animal Disease Diagnostic Lab) indicate a possible infectious etiology, most likely viral. Histopathology is most consistent with Malignant Catarrhal Fever however initial tests were negative, possibly due to serotype. We are working closely with WADDL to do additional testing and encourage area bios to continue reporting deaths.

**Bat handling permits:** Due to dropping COVID-19 rates Wildlife Health staff have been working with Diversity to create a tiered approach based on COVID-19 case load to allow some handling of bats and allow permittees to resume work. A kickoff meeting between was held between NDOW and federal agency partners to initiate the creation of what will be Nevada's White Nose Syndrome Response Plan.

**Big Game Quota Recommendations:** NDOW Staff are preparing for the annual quota recommendation process. This process begins with big game surveys and data analysis, population modeling, includes

harvest report analysis, updating Demand-Success formulas and Quota Arrays, providing quota recommendations, writing and editing status and trend reports which are ultimately consolidated into the annual Big Game Status and Trend book. During this process, the Conservation Education Division writes two books – the Nevada Big Game Seasons and Applications and the Nevada Big Game Hunting Guide. Big Game seasons are also set during this process, during the January Wildlife Commission meeting. This process ultimately concludes with a delightful day of discussion where quotas are adopted by the Wildlife Commission.

**Elk, Mule Deer, and Sage-Grouse Surveys:** Game Division personnel have concluded elk surveys and have begun spring mule deer surveys. Once mule deer surveys are completed, staff will be conducting Sage-Grouse surveys from both air and ground.

**Tonopah Game Biologist:** Hunter Burkett officially began as the Tonopah Game Biologist on February 22<sup>nd</sup>. Hunter has worked for NDOW for several years counting Sage-Grouse leks and most recently worked as a Wildlife Tech in Elko.

**Big Game Captures:** Fourteen bighorns were captured and translocated from the Black Rock Range to the Lake Range in cooperation with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe over 2 days. There were two mortalities, one due to a broken neck and one a presumptive combination of capture myopathy and a hip dislocation. Results are pending on the second one.

A total of 20 sheep was translocated from the Sheep Creek Range to McGee Mountain. Captures went better than expected with no mortalities and no IV placed, possibly a result of the use of midazolam to calm the sheep on the mountain.

Fifteen sheep were captured in the Snowstorm Mountains for disease sampling with two mortalities - one from a broken neck and second one succumbed to a fall from a cliff. One of the mortalities had a slightly thickened sinus lining and will be submitted for sinus tumor testing.

Three moose were captured with NDOW staff assisting. These captures went smoothly with drug induction times better than expected.

Basecamp captures were conducted in the Bloody Run Hills, and the Santa Rosa, and Tobin Ranges. Several animals with very high temperatures were brought in from the Bloody Runs. Eight animals were captured with 6 brought into basecamp. One came in with a temperature of 109 and died the next day. Two other rams had temperatures over 108. The area game biologist will be monitoring collar activity closely. A necropsy was suggestive that the cause of death was capture myopathy and hyperthermia. Due to the potential for added mortalities, we directed the capture crew to work up all the Santa Rosa captured animals on the mountain. One additional mortality was an older ram whose death was attributable to limited lung capacity due to pneumonia. Three ewes that had moved to the Slumbering Hills from the 2019 release were captured and translocated back to the Bloody Runs. The capture crew was unable to locate the Slumbering Hills ram.

Three ewes were caught and collared in the Tobin Range. One of the three had lung sounds consistent with previous or chronic pneumonia. Two of the three were pregnant. The capture crew was unable to locate any older age rams, so no rams were captured. This capture effort went very well, and the Desert Sheep appeared less stressed than the California sheep. These sheep were also administered midazolam on the mountain. The capture crew reported observing approximately 30 ewes while conducting captures.

Seven GPS collars were deployed on pronghorn in Management Area 1 to assess seasonal habitat delineation and interstate migration.

**Wild Turkey Webinar:** Game Division staff participated in a webinar with the Conservation Education Division and the National Wild Turkey Federation for wild turkey hunting in February.

**Development of Upland Game Forecasting Tool:** Game Division staff completed an interlocal agreement with the University of Maine to develop our upland game forecasting tool that will incorporate population and harvest data along with environmental variables to determine correlation and make predictions.

**Sage-Grouse Disturbance Prevention:** Game Division staff provided input to NDOT on their U.S. Highway 93 widening project and the use of a materials pit that was very near to active Sage-Grouse leks near Knoll Mountain. NDOT has agreed not to use that particular materials site.

**Oregon Wolf:** A collared male wolf from Oregon has made its way south in recent weeks. Its location was displayed near Verdi in mid-to-late February, then it moved around the west side of Lake Tahoe and continued south. Recently, it has been moving back and forth across the California-Nevada state line near Topaz Lake. We will continue to monitor this animal through updates received from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

**Bobcat Sealing:** Game Division personnel sealed a total of 875 bobcats in 2021. This is the second lowest all-time total with only 1995-96 being lower with a total of 806 bobcats sealed. Low demand is the primary reason for this year's take. Because of COVID-19 and various border closures (primarily Canada) last year's North American Harvest went largely un-purchased. This means, there is a glut in the market and buyers were very cautiously adding to their already large inventory, which resulted in driving prices lower.

## **HABITAT**

**Transfer of Carson Lake and Pasture:** Transfer of the Carson Lake and Pasture from US Bureau of Reclamation and BLM to the State of Nevada was recently finalized. This transfer was initiated by federal legislation and has been in the works for over 30 years. The department will be coming forward at future commission meetings to amend commission policy to officially add Carson Lake and Pasture as an NDOW wildlife management area.

**Fire Rehabilitation Season:** The fire rehabilitation season is wrapping up with NDOW crews completing a sagebrush seedling planting on 185 acres in Izzenhood Range north of Battle Mountain. This restoration season, NDOW has conducted 62,200 acres of restoration activities with 33,304 acres of aerial seeding, 1,629 acres of drill seeding, 27,187 acres of herbicide application and 16,185 acres of seedling plantings. This brings NDOW's wildfire restoration total to 422,240 acres since 2016. This success was due a broad coalition of over 15 different partnering entities that help generate over 8 million dollars of support over the last 5 years. This incredible milestone would never have been possible without the continued collective support of the dedicated sportsman's and non-governmental organizations, private landowners, industry partners, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, federal and state agency partners.

**Nevada's Water:** Southern Nevada's record setting lack of precipitation observed in 2020 seems to be continuing into 2021. Recent aerial surveys show the water levels at big game guzzlers remain low and will likely require further emergency intervention. Throughout the 2020 NDOW responded with emergency water hauls at an unprecedented scale with helicopters, 4 wheel-drive trucks and water tenders. In total, approximately 167,000 gallons of supplemental water was provided to 30 different guzzlers. Without supplemental water, a high proportion of bighorn sheep in certain mountains ranges would have likely died from dehydration.

**Technical Review Program:** The Technical Review Program has been devoting staff time to the Presidential and DOI Secretarial Orders issued in January, as many of these orders will influence NDOW comment into proposed federal land projects. The major actions we are working to better understand moving forward are a pause on Oil & Gas Lease Sales, the review of the Greater Sage-Grouse land use plans, changes affecting the Endangered Species Act (definitions to “Habitat”), the DOI Solicitor Opinion on “Take” under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and implications to the implementation of the Council on Environmental Quality National Environmental Policy Act regulations.

**Sagebrush Ecosystem Team:** The Sagebrush Ecosystem Team has recently completed its Conservation Credit System certified verifier training for the upcoming spring/summer 2021 field season. Private landowners conserving and enhancing sage grouse habitat, and developers proposing anthropogenic disturbances in Sage-Grouse habitat are preparing to collect field data this summer to analyze the habitat functionality of their credit or debit project. The next Sagebrush Ecosystem Council meeting is scheduled for March 30.

### **CONSERVATION EDUCATION**

**Events:** Conservation Educators participated in several virtual conferences and workshops including: The National Association for Interpretation. Presentations included NDOW’s new virtual education programs. Staff also attended the Conservation Education Conference and presented on NDOW’s program called Nevada Knockout.

Staff participated in the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation’s annual State Marketing Workshop to brainstorm and discuss issues and ideas for the coming year. Topics included diversity and inclusion, R3, and delighting the customer and how to make fishing easier and fun.

**Outreach and Education efforts:** The last week in February, our Urban Wildlife Coordinators from Western region and Southern region facilitated an online effort called Urban Wildlife Week. Throughout the week many live webinars covering many different Urban Wildlife topics were featured. Seven programs were facilitated throughout the week with a total of 353 participants. Topics covered included: living with coyotes, living with mule deer, rattlesnake’s vs gopher snakes, baby animals, and feeding urban wildlife.

Weekly big game tag application webinars are planned from March 23 through May 3 to help new and returning customers with their application questions. Staff have identified frequently asked questions and plan to address those questions to reduce barriers to applying. The webinars will be recorded and posted to NDOW’s YouTube channel.

Our Outdoor Connection Coordinator is developing new wildlife conservation campaigns so that we can better engage with a variety of audiences. One example of this is our Women’s History Month campaign in which throughout the month of March we are highlighting inspirational women throughout the conservation world and include NDOW’s female professionals. He is also exploring ways to communicate the value of wild food by sharing recipes on our social media platforms regularly.

**Media Highlight:** Conservation Education Staff posted their first “volunteer takeover” on the Department’s Instagram. For one week a Department volunteer took over the Department’s Instagram account, posting one post per day about their work and love of volunteering with the Department. The takeover had a very positive response from the public, and staff is working on posting more volunteer takeovers in the near future.

Staff has planned out various emails and social media posts to promote Nevada’s big game application period. The first email was sent out in late February encouraging residents and non-residents to remind their friends and family to complete their hunter education certification online. A variety of other emails

and social media posts covering important dates, and big game application period reminders will be sent through May.

Media interviews featuring Conservation Education staff over the last month, have included interviews with the Reno Gazette Journal and Sacramento Bee on practicing responsible recreation at Chickadee Ridge, an interview on securing attractants to ensure bears den for the winter with KRNv in Reno, and a sit down with Carson NOW on bear awareness. Multiple news stations across the state also covered the increase in outdoor recreation announced by Director Wasley in a COVID-19 response call with the press. Conservation Education's media monitoring service, Critical Mention, reported an audience of 12 million people nationwide for the month of February on broadcast, print and online news stories featuring NDOW. For the last several weeks, Conservation Education Staff has contributed a submission to the Governor's weekly newsletter to showcase the different projects and educational opportunities Department staff has worked on. So far, topics include water hauls to guzzlers, the Department's educational webinars, and fire restoration work. A video on fire restoration work that Conservation Education staff shared on social media and sent to the Governor's office was shared on the Governor's Twitter page and covered by the local media. Several other submissions to the Governor's newsletter have also been covered by the local media.

### **WILDLIFE DIVERSITY**

Wildlife Diversity Division staff have been preparing our annual grants and planning for the upcoming field season. During the often-slower winter months, staff work on reports, developing plans for upcoming field seasons, and compile and analyze their data. This past year, Diversity staff have spent significant amounts of time addressing our data backlog and have compiled over 7000 observation records from the past several years.

**Projects:** We are working on developing two expanded projects for the upcoming field season. One project focuses on expanding surveys for pale and dark kangaroo mice from central Nevada to the northwestern region. The focus of these surveys will be baseline information on where these species occur and how this distribution compares to historic surveys.

**Surveys:** Diversity staff will also be surveying for Humboldt yellow-pine chipmunks in the northwest region. This subspecies is a habitat specialist and lives in white-bark pine which is a limited habitat type in the area. Surveys will be focused on areas of suitable habitat that have not been previously surveyed. More refined habitat associations will also be described.

Typically, during the winter months, wildlife diversity staff survey known bat hibernation roosts to collect samples, both from bats and from rock surfaces, to test for White nose syndrome. Due to the pandemic, staff did not conduct these annual surveys, but are instead preparing a disease response plan for white nose syndrome. This will help the Department and our partners be better prepared if the disease is documented in Nevada.

Two other plans are being revised – the Nevada Bat Conservation Plan and the Nevada Wildlife Action Plan. The bat plan is a product of the Nevada Bat Working Group, of which NDOW is a member. This plan is being developed with partners from several other state and federal agencies, as well as NGOs and consultants. The plan was last revised in 2006 and since then, both our staff as well as partners have greatly increased our knowledge about bats necessitating the revision.

**Nevada Wildlife Action Plan:** The Nevada Wildlife Action Plan revision has formally kicked off. As the Commission knows, this plan is required to be revised every ten years. It is the biological strategic plan of the agency that currently highlights 256 species and 22 key habitat types as priorities and describes management goals and objectives. The revision will be a major focus for several divisions and is due in

September of 2022. You will be hearing much more about this in the future as we will be keeping the Commission informed of our progress.

## **FISHERIES**

**Personnel:** NDOW has received authority to hire contract personnel to fully staff our Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Watercraft Inspection Stations statewide for the 2021 boating season. Northern Nevada stations at Lahontan, Rye Patch and South Fork reservoirs and Topaz Lake will begin operations in early April. Lake Mead stations operate year around and have been averaging around 300 watercraft inspections per month, which will increase significantly as we move into spring.

**Invasive Zebra Mussels:** We recently received a notice that at least one major national pet shop chain had received shipments of aquarium plants from Thailand that were infested with invasive zebra mussels, and we're in the process of notifying vendors to remove those products from sale. This is just one example of the unexpected pathways where invasive species can create a threat to Nevada's fisheries and aquatic habitats.

**Reservoir Storage:** Projected reservoir storage and streamflow for this summer in northern Nevada continues to be a concern. As of mid-February, reservoir storage in eastern Sierra watersheds was around 30 percent below the levels at this time last year and 60 percent lower in the Humboldt Basin. Streamflow forecasts currently range from 50 percent to 80 percent of average depending on location unless we get significant late-winter precipitation.

**Lahontan Cutthroat Trout:** The Fish and Wildlife Service's Lahontan National Fish Hatchery has been able to provide a full allocation of Lahontan cutthroat trout for Truckee River stocking in 2021 for the first time in several years, with over 70,000 catchable sized fish available. This will allow NDOW to reallocate some of our triploid rainbow trout to other northern Nevada waters including multiple urban fishing ponds to meet increased angler demand.

NDOW Western Region staff have been addressing an ongoing issue with periodic low flows in the East Walker River because of water releases from California that have been below the legally required minimum. This affects the sport fishery because of anchor ice development in the river during cold weather periods. We are working with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and other regulators to try to resolve the problem.

Staff are working with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game on a research project to use "YY" brook trout as an alternative method to remove nonnative fish and restore Lahontan cutthroat trout in two streams in Humboldt County. This process involves stocking only male brook trout along with mechanical removal to create an all-male brook trout population over time, eliminating the need for chemical treatments.

**Bass Tournament:** Bass Pro Shops will be hosting a US Open Amateur Team Championships bass tournament at Lake Mead on April 24<sup>th</sup> with an anticipated registration of 250 or more boats. Of significance, a portion of the entry fees for this tournament will be donated to the National Fish Habitat Partnership to support fisheries habitat enhancement projects in Nevada and other states nationwide. NDOW staff will be at the tournament to collect fisheries data from the weigh-in and to conduct AIS inspections and decontaminations as needed on participating watercraft.

In late February NDOW staff assisted the US Fish and Wildlife Service and other partners with the semi-annual population counts for the endangered Moapa Dace in the upper Muddy River, Clark County. The population estimate was 2033 fish, the highest winter count and the second highest estimate since before 2005. This speaks to the success of ongoing recovery efforts for the species in the upper river and its tributaries.

**Surveys:** Although the semi-annual population surveys for Devils Hole pupfish in Devils Hole itself have been suspended because of COVID concerns, it was possible to conduct a population count at the Ash Meadows Fish Conservation Facility near Devils Hole that has a refugium population of the pupfish in a large semi-underground tank. That count was completed in late January and found more than 150 adult fish, the highest count in history.

**Dixie Valley:** Western Region staff spent considerable time reviewing and providing comments on the Bureau of Land Management's final Environmental Assessment on the Dixie Meadows Geothermal Utilization Project in Dixie Valley near Fallon. The proposed project is adjacent to the only known populations of the Dixie Valley toad which has been petitioned for Endangered Species Act listing as endangered. We anticipate that if the project goes forward as planned it will likely result in significant litigation from one or more conservation organizations.

## **DATA AND TECHNOLOGY SERVICES**

**Big Game Season:** The Data and Technology Services Licensing & Hunt Application units wrapped up the 2020 Big Game season with the deadline for reporting harvest return cards. The final submission was 96.5 percent, leaving only 965 return cards not reported.

**Hunt Season:** We kicked off the 2021 Hunt Seasons with a very successful and smooth Spring Turkey draw. We had a 9 percent increase in turkey applications from 2020. The first turkey season open this month.

**Non-Resident Guided Mule Deer Hunt:** The Non-resident Guided Mule Deer Hunt applications opened on February 9<sup>th</sup> closed March 15<sup>th</sup>. We will be conducting the draw on Monday, March 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**Big Game Applications:** The division currently gearing up for the 2021 Big Game application to open on Monday, March 22<sup>nd</sup>. We are excited to have several new features in place for clients this application season. First, we now have the ability to allow for a hunter to edit their application before the deadline in order to join an existing party. In prior years, if you wanted to join a party after you submitted your app you had to withdraw your application losing your app fees and then reapply paying an additional application fee. This new feature makes the user experience easy and doesn't incur extra fees for our clients. Additionally, we have added an informational pop-up message explaining what it means to check to be an Alternate. Hunters will get this pop-up if they don't select the alternate box. We have also added new informational links about what is a party. We hope both make the user experience smoother and reduce common questions we receive every year.

**Heritage Committee:** The Heritage Committee is now accepting Vendor proposals the 2022 Heritage Auction Tags. The deadline for submission is April 19, 2021.

**GIS:** The Geographic Information System staff completed an all new raptor nest application for Diversity. Updated the biologist contact map by adding in the Game Warden, Game, Habitat and Diversity staff's contact information by region. They completed a new Wildhorse Reservoir map for the Law Enforcement division and a Harvest Check-in Dashboard for the Game Division.

**Mobile Device Manager:** Finally, the Information Technology staff got all the Game Warden's cell phones enrolled in a Mobile Device Manager (MDM). They got new firewalls installed at the Battle Mountain location which now gives them access to the Spillman software for case management. The laptops purchased with Care Act funding have come in and are actively being deployed to 38 staff members.

## **LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION**

**Wildlife Patrol and Investigations:** There have been numerous wildlife cases ongoing in the past month including game wardens conducting residency cases throughout the state, investigators work with Arizona, California, and Colorado with records regarding people that have been revoked in their state but are still applying in other states.

In the Eastern Region a poaching investigation involving a Texas resident poaching a trophy class mule deer buck, resulted in a suspect receiving a gross misdemeanor conviction with a \$5,000 civil penalty, plus \$2000 bail and fees issued to include forfeiture of a crossbow and the taxidermized head. Game wardens investigated a dead deer in the Harrison Pass with an apparent mountain lion kill, and investigation into an alleged shooting from a helicopter.

Game wardens have worked on a number of urban wildlife issues including alleged shooting of grey squirrels with a pellet gun, an individual killing ducks at the Boulder City Pond, a goose hitting a powerline, an alleged rabid coyote call that turned out to be a grey fox, a cooper's hawk that had been shot, and wardens investigated an ad on a local site trying to sell raccoons which turned out to be a long distance scam that the wardens reported and had the ad removed. There were also multiple reports of persons feeding deer across the state. There were multiple lion investigations including a call out in Las Vegas initiated by LVMPD and Animal Control this turned into community outreach contacts. This is now one of the busiest times of year for urban wildlife calls involving various species. It is anticipated that there will be a significant increase in calls for service in the months ahead.

In the Western Region the Department veterinarian accompanied a game warden on a dying sheep call possibly related to multiple sick or dead deer in the Wellington, Nevada area.

Multiple trapping cases were investigated including a baited trap set, a trap registration violation, an investigation of a trap too close to a road. Game wardens released a mountain lion caught in a trap.

**Boating Safety Patrol:** Two Southern Region game wardens performed a water rescue of three persons in the water during a severe weather event with waves over four feet high on Lake Mead. This resulted in the survival of all three subjects, including two who were not wearing a personal flotation device (PFD), and multiple emails/calls of commendation which came in from the public who witnessed the event. Another game warden made a rescue of a kayaker who capsized in high wind and waves on Lake Mead who was suffering from exposure due to the time of year.

**Headquarters and Administration:** The Law Enforcement Division continued participation in the COVID19 vaccination roll out for Tier One and Tier Two. Game wardens were in the initial Tier of persons offered vaccination due to their routine contact with the public. Enhanced Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) wear coupled with vaccination helps ensure a safer environment for the public and our officers.

The open recruitment for seven vacant game warden positions continued with physical testing on March 5, 2021 in Las Vegas. This will be followed by several days of interviews and several weeks of background investigation. The total process to get successful applicants through all the steps of hiring, academy, and completing the Field Training and Evaluation program is approximately one year start to finish, before solo officer status.

Pursuant to collective bargaining legislation passed in 2019, the Chief Game Warden has been involved in ongoing collective bargaining and mediation with the Nevada Police Union on behalf of the Department. All Law Enforcement Division command staff has been working on getting leadership and collective bargaining training, which is offered through state training, to better prepare for the transition ahead.

**B. Litigation Report – Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett**

A report will be provided on Nevada Department of Wildlife litigation.

Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett gave a brief description of the litigation report. Can be found on the NDOW website.

**C. Mule Deer Enhancement Program Update – Division Administrator Mike Scott - Informational**

The Department will provide an update on the current status of the Mule Deer Enhancement Program that was approved by the Commission at the June 26, 2020 meeting.

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott talked about the three team meetings; Lander area 15, Elko are 6, Elko 7,8,9 team. Discussed what these meeting consisted of. Encouraged public and CABMWs to start attending these meetings and get engaged. Stated that he needed to discuss with Commissioner Kiel a date on the next Oversight Committee meeting.

Commissioner Kiel stated they could schedule the meeting in conjunction with the April Commission Meeting.

Chairwoman East, Game Division Administrator Mike Scott, and Commissioner McNinch has discussion about the team meetings and urged the public to attend.

Chairwoman East asked for any other questions for Administrator Scott. Hearing none, moved on.

**D. Petition – Mr. Perry ‘Rob’ Pierce – Special Hunt Season for Disabled Persons – For Possible Action**

Mr. Pierce has submitted a petition requesting a special hunt season be made available to disabled persons. The Commission may take action to deny or accept the petition and initiate rulemaking.

Chairwoman East indicated that the petition as presented was missing the required language in accordance with NRS 501.195.

Rob Pierce: I got a message about language and I did not understand what it meant. So, I formed a little Word document less than 6 minutes long that explains what I am asking for. I did not realize I had to get in and look at the NRS and all that. I am basically just asking for a week or two before the general public gets out there, to allow the disabled to hunt, so that we can have a fair chance. That is all and I was going to leave that the language up to you guys to decide. I am not asking for anything special just asking for a chance.

Chairwoman East stated she was concerned that the Commission was not following their own laws.

Rob Pierce: I wrote up a 6-minute statement. I could read that, maybe you can get something out of that and then I was going to leave the language up to you, you are the professionals because I am definitely not a professional.

Chairwoman East consulted with DAG Burkett. DAG Burkett advised the petitioner to resubmit the petition with language and to work with the Department.

Chairwoman East agreed.

Commissioner Hubbs and Commissioner Almberg encouraged the petitioner to get assistance and return as it is a petition they would like to discuss.

Commissioner McNinch reminded that a motion needed to be made.

Chairwoman East asked if we should take public comment.

DAG Burkett suggested that we go to public comment. Stated that the petitioner could agree to resubmit the petition with language that is satisfactory for the Commission's review.

Chairwoman East asked Mr. Pierce if he had any questions before going out to public comment.

Rob Pierce: I do. I do not know who to talk to. If I could get a contact, that would be fantastic.

Deputy Director Robb stated he could be the point of contact but noted his concerns with the Department do a lot of the work on this as it may look to be a Department petition.

DAG Burkett offered to assist Deputy Director Robb and the petitioner as needed.

Commissioner Hubbs provided Mr. Pierce with some legal resources.

Chairwoman East went out for public comment.

Fred Voltz, private citizen: Good morning, for the record, Fred Voltz. I'd like to suggest a glitch here in this particular petition. It seems as though the petitioner has to submit all of the information well in advance of it being heard by the Commission, so I'm not understanding why the Department, whoever is reviewing this on their behalf wouldn't get back to the petitioner and say we're missing this, this, and this rather than waiting for the petition to come before the Commission and then have it delayed because indeed it is missing something that you need. This has been a problem with other petitions in the past as well, so it seems like process-wise you need to make some fixes in this so that when somebody actually has a petition coming before the Commission it is complete and can actually deliberate on it rather than having to prolong the issue, thank you.

Joseph Terry, private citizen: I am a resident here in Las Vegas. I do like the thought about having a disabled hunt. I looked up just in our local state or local neighboring States and Arizona they give a champ license hunt, which is a challenge access mobility permit. Also, New Mexico, they have a disabled permit for veterans. So, I do think us jumping on board with something like that would be good. As you have mentioned the language is not there as of now. I do think talking about that and figuring out what is disabled getting some guidelines in there would be the main fuel and try to figure out how to regulate that, make sure the person is disabled and no one's taken advantage of it. I do like the thought, I think that there would be good thing for state, thank you.

Chairwoman East asked for any further public comment, seeing none. Thanked Mr. Pierce for his time. Brought it back to the Commission for discussion.

Secretary Wasley went over the petition process and timelines. Stated that the Department will follow the process, determine if the authority exists under the Commission and then recommend that the Commission take whatever action they feel is most appropriate.

Chairwoman East thanked Secretary Wasley and moved on.

**16. Nevada Department of Wildlife Project Updates – Secretary Wasley – Informational**

The Commission has requested that the Department provide regular project updates for ongoing projects and programs as appropriate based on geography and timing of meetings. These

updates are intended to provide additional detail in addition to the summaries provided as part of the regular Department Activity Report and are intended to educate the Commission and public as to the Department's ongoing duties and responsibilities.

Secretary Wasley stated that the project update would be from the Law Enforcement Division.

Law Enforcement Division Chief Maynard, Jake Kremer and Game Warden Brian Bowles gave an update on Law Enforcement activities.

Commissioners shared gratitude to the Law Enforcement Division.

Secretary Wasley expressed his appreciation and gratitude for our Law Enforcement Division and the risks that they take day-in and day-out.

Lunch Break.

**17. Wildlife Killing Contests – Commissioner McNinch – For Possible Action**

An update will be provided on the Wildlife Killing Contests in the State and recent action taken by the Clark County Commission specific to Wildlife Killing Contests. The Commission may provide direction to the Department to draft regulatory language prohibiting Wildlife Killing Contests for consideration by the Commission at a future meeting.

Commissioner McNinch gave his statement about the wildlife contests. Acknowledged that broad public interest surrounding these contests. Asked the Commission to look beyond the values, opinions, values, statements, data used and misused and focus on the merits or lack thereof, of the wildlife killing contests. Gave history about the petition introduced in 2015 to initiate rulemaking and the Commission realized that the proposed policy from August 2016, the wildlife killing contests would immediately violate it, the policy in November 2016 lacked enforcement so the Commission voted to discontinue the rulemaking process at that time. Fast forwarded to 2021, where the Clark County Commission voted to have the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners take action to ban wildlife killing contests. Further discussed the status of western states surrounding Nevada banning these contests; seven states so far. Clarified that his intention was not to ban all coyote hunting. Talked about the WCCC moving to Elko, NV due to New Mexico and Arizona banning them. Discussed the proposed language he would put out for consideration, suggested having workshops to discuss. Hoping to have conversations about how these contests could align with wide-use principles and how they support moral and ethical use of wildlife.

Chairwoman East thanked Commissioner McNinch and asked for any questions.

Commissioner Alberg thanked Commissioner McNinch and asked for clarification in Arizona.

Commissioner McNinch read the Arizona Revised Statute regarding contests for predator and furbearing species as an unlawful manner and method of take.

Commissioner Alberg thanked him.

Commissioner Hubbs asked Commissioner McNinch to clarify if the Commission should ask the Department to draft regulatory code.

Commissioner McNinch stated that he would propose to have the Department create some language for the Commission to consider and go from there.

Commissioner Kiel indicated that he appreciated hearing Commissioner McNinch's comments about what would not be prohibited in his proposed language. Stated he would really like to start having conversations regarding the other species and habitats in Nevada as the Commission seems to have the same discussions around the same species.

Commissioner McNinch discussed the economics, revenue generation, regulation process and that there is no money from these contests going to the Department.

Commissioner Kiel clarified that the discussion was not intended to be about the economics or the revenue generation, it was more about the habitat and health of all of the other species that are regarded when our discussions are on 4 or 5 animals.

Commissioner McNinch agreed that he looked forward to the day the Commission can start talking about other species. Plugged the Recovering America's Wildlife Act (RAWA).

Commissioner Caviglia asked the Department about the data on coyotes in these contests and if the Department sees a biological benefit to the contests.

Secretary Wasley stated that the Department did not have the data to provide a clear answer. Absent the data, the Department is unable to give prey and predator information.

Commissioner Caviglia thanked Secretary Wasley.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if the reality of these contests were as bad at the perception.

Commissioner AlMBERG agreed with Vice Chair Barnes' comment and stated that this was a difficult conversation.

Commissioner Pierini agreed with Vice Chair Barnes and Commissioner AlMBERG. Stated he has spoken to different people throughout the State who do not have a problem with these contests.

Commissioner Hubbs asked Secretary Wasley about the what the ecosystem would look like without predators without management. Secretary Wasley gave in depths details about affects removing a species would have to an ecosystem, gave the Yellowstone ecosystem as an example. Explained the predator pit. Stated that there are some instances in which the removal of predators may provide for some ecosystem-wide benefits if its already out of balance, but there are situations where it could provide some impacts and be detrimental to the species dynamics.

Commissioner Hubbs asked Secretary Wasley knew if the contest participants are informed of proper science.

Secretary Wasley stated that he was unaware but indicated that from his observation there were not coordination of the contests to try to strategically provide relief to prey populations in areas where predators have been determined to be limiting those populations. Explained tangible and intangible mortality.

Commissioner Kiel asked Sectary Wasley for clarification on if the Department did not perceive any detrimental biological effect by way of these contests.

Secretary Wasley stated that Commissioners Kiel's comment was a fair and accurate statement.

Commissioner McNinch stated that he did not want his comments to be perceived as tit for tat, wanted to explain the context of the item he brought forward. Stated that his issues were with where we were headed with our wise use principals and ethics in hunting. Stated his basis for calling them “killing contests”. Indicated that he read that there was a polygraph person at the Wildlife Coyote Calling contests for see that people are telling the truth about their intensions at the contest.

Commissioner Hubbs and Commissioner McNinch addressed the comments made about the contests.

Chairwoman East asked for any other comments. Seeing none, went out for public comment reminding folks that they need to use the zoom link to make public comment or send their comments to [WidlifeCommission@ndow.org](mailto:WidlifeCommission@ndow.org). Reminded everyone they had three minutes to speak.

Stephanie Myers, private citizen: Madam Chair and the Commissioner, I am Stephanie Myers from Clark County. We need to have predators on landscape for healthy ecosystems, we know that now through science. I mean no disrespect to Director Wasley, but I would certainly like hear from a coyote biologist. It is my understanding that when a bunch of coyotes are killed, that the females then double their efforts to produce more litters, meaning more coyotes. Killing contests are not part of any wildlife management strategy. There's no data showing there's any benefit, there's no data showing that they actually protect people or livestock or anything. New Mexico, California, Vermont, Washington, Massachusetts, Arizona, Colorado; all have banned wildlife killing contests. It's about leadership, it takes leaders who are willing to stand up and do the right thing, like the unanimous vote of the Clark County Commission, where 75 percent of the population of Nevada resides. 75 percent. We know that Washoe and the rural counties will say what about us? On the other hand, should 75 percent of the Nevada population be ignored? Please be wise and do the right thing for Nevada's wildlife. Let's get the process started. Thank You.

Joe Olive, private citizen: Good afternoon everybody. For one thing, I do enter the contests and I heard reference to a polygraph test. Not one of them that I've went to has a lie detector test and they're saying that there is also no evidence that it helps the ecosystem to limit the coyotes, but there's no numbers of how many coyotes are actually taken from these contests. I've been to three of them and you just don't go out and shoot a whole bunch of coyotes, that's not how it happened. You have to actually call them in. I've been to three of them and taken one. I think before anybody who make that decision, more research on both sides needs to be done. Coyotes are very aggressive; they are dangerous to humans. They will snatch young children and if there overpopulated, that means that there is not enough food out where they live. So, they are going to come into town and into cities and the only reason why they are doing that, is for easy prey, which is people's house pets, their dogs, young children. Heaven forbid it happens, but it could. If they are overpopulated, that's what's going to happen because there's not enough in their natural habitat to eat because there is too many of them. Thank you.

Cheyenne Neuffer, private citizen: I am from rural Nevada, North of Reno and just I'm just urging the Commission to keep this issue at the top the list. This is huge. Not only are these contests horrific, unethical, and disrespectful, but they paint traditional hunters in a very, very negative way that I think will overall hurt the hunting community and I think it has been. So, banning these contests would be huge for our state. Thank you.

Jana Hofeditz, private citizen: I live out here by Pyramid Lake, not quite at Pyramid Lake, but I'm surrounded by BLM. I've been a Nevada long time about a resident who would like to see the issue of wildlife killing contests move forward. I'm hoping within a reasonable amount of time, these events will be banned. Today though, I would like to quickly talk about the public land issue because I go out there every contest that happens from a particular bar in Lemmon Valley and I monitor it. I take photos, I know what goes on, I've talked to the owner of the bar who holds it, and I know quite a lot about it. So, if you could just hear me out for a minute. These are held, these contests are held primarily on our public lands, not all the time, sometimes they go on private but it's illegal. It is not legal to have these contests on our

public lands without a special recreation permit. Fact. I've been in touch with the BLM over the past three years, and as quoted by Miles Gurtler, who does run the BLM's travel management and trails coordinator, he emailed me this he said this "I will contact the officers for them to remind the representatives of the contests of our SRP rules and their lack of permit BLM lands. Our BLM staff will also do their best to monitor for illegal commercial use on our public lands". So, the reason I wanted to say that quote, is this is a serious issue that goes on in Nevada because a lot of our land is public lands. When I'm out there doing my work when I know there having this one particular Washoe County contest, I see ATV families out there, people riding horses, etc., and I don't think this is a thing that mixes well. When I let them know that there is a contest going on at that moment, they don't like it, it's very scary for them. So, anyway I also had that Mr. McNinch. Mr. McNinch has sound like has studied this a lot and learned about it. He's gotten wise about it and I appreciate him not being afraid or bullied and sharing this with everybody involved, because this is not a one-sided issue. Banning these events is not a slippery slope because I heard that a lot in the past few years. This will not lead to a rancher not being able to legally protect his or her animals, nor will it make someone who just wants to go out and kill a coyote for fun, that they can still do that legally. I think it's time we do what's right and keep this on the front burner and I appreciate you all hearing me out. Please let's do the right thing. Thank you very much.

Chairwoman East stated that she was asked by the Department that if you have a specific presentation or you're using information research, if you wouldn't mind sending that to the Department, [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org), so that they can appropriately reflect those comments in our minutes. That would be helpful.

Shelbie Swartz, private citizen: I am a resident of Las Vegas, NV and I frequently visit our beautiful lands, our mountain ranges, and I appreciate our wildlife and I'm deeply concerned that our state still allows for these wildlife killing contests. I've done research and have discovered that they're cruel, they're not representative of ethical hunting, as others have noted, there are not practical conservation methods, and as far as I can tell they benefit absolutely nobody. The participants in these contests indiscriminately kill animals, generally coyotes, to win nominal prizes and bragging rights on social media. Nevada is one of the last states in Southwest for these kinds of contests to occur. Surrounding states have banned these contests in recent years, which have driven participants and organizers to flock to our state. Now they come here, and they slaughter animals, they slaughter our wildlife, and they leave carnage and waste in their wake, which is different from fishing derbies and other competitions that the Department interacts. In the past year, there have been more 24 wildlife killing contests in Nevada including around my community. In Clark County, there have been four that we have been able to find that have their weigh-ins and celebrations in Las Vegas and Henderson. Putting the families that live here and the people who is it here, in danger whenever these contests occur as folks go and indiscriminately shoot on our lands. They're aware that the public does not support their contests and as such they try to evade public notice much as possible and we've been moved to a virtual checking system that allows anybody with a smartphone to compete, which means this reckless killing can and does occur absolutely everywhere in our state. Nevadans depend on Wildlife Commission to protect our families, our public lands, and our recreational areas that brings so much joy to residents, who range using a ban on wildlife killing contest, all you can galvanized the movement should provide a place for wildlife to thrive, ensure the public safety from straight bullets, that may injure or kill Nevadans that are enjoying the outdoor recreational areas we treasure, advance scientifically based wildlife management programs, and state that contest killing which rewards participants for killing the most, the heaviest, and the smallest of a given species, is not sportsmanship. Residents and visitors to Nevada use our public lands for hiking, rock climbing and other outdoor activities that require a healthy environment and activities of these contests pose a threat to their safety and well-being. Taking a neutral position towards wildlife killing contest... for end the families of Nevada, our equal tourism and tourism at large, and the future of ethical hunting. I sincerely hope that the Wildlife Commission will take a stance for Wildlife Conservation based on science, by prohibiting these grotesque events and I look forward to hearing the next steps that you all take with this proposed rule. Thank you.

Paul Dixon, representing Clark County CABMW: A quick question for you as chair of the Commission, County Advisory Boards used to not have a three-minute limit for testifying, is it a new rule that the CABMWs only have three minutes too?

Chairwoman East stated she did not know and would consult with the DAG.

DAG Burkett stated that there is a specific agenda items for the CABMWs to speak, deferred to Deputy Director Robb.

Deputy Director Robb explained that historically we gave the CABMWs more than three minutes as they are an integral part of getting information to the Commission.

Paul Dixon, representing Clark County CABMW: Thank for the clarification for everybody, I just wanted to make sure that I was doing things wrong. Just to know that this was a fairly controversial discussion of the Clark CABMW, in a split vote, the CABMW recommended the Board of Wildlife Commissioners take no action on this resolution by the Clark County Commission. One of the interesting things I wanted to point out is that in correspondence that I received written, the CABMW member did and at testimony at the Clark CABMW, there was an implied threat that our dismissal of the Clark County Commission was disrespectful to those who appointed us and since we report to them, we should have followed their lead. I want to make it clear to everybody that the advisory board, as a group, exists to take in all public comment, we are not there to be political appointees of the people who appointed us and follow their lead. I think that the more disturbing thing to me is that the people who forwarded this bill to the Clark County Commission did so and got it on agenda down here in Clark County. There was never a mention to me, as a Chair of the Clark County CABMW that this was going to be put on there or to any of the sportsman, was this announced that this was action going to be on the thing so we could have commented during the open comment period. So, I feel that it was a little underhanded to get this in and basically said there was no public comment against this, when in fact, it wasn't really agendized in such a way that these sportsman in Southern Nevada even knew it was coming. We get the reverse complaint with our CABMW agendas sometimes from people, so it needs to be fair play. I did have a dissented opinion in a 6-1 vote and that dissented opinion felt very strongly that we should follow the county Commission's recommendation and we should not go against that. I will kind of leave this with listing the things today, I think this really comes down to a personal opinion here and I said this in front of my CABMW, I think this really has little to do with the killing of coyotes or having a contest, this really comes down to the, I think the true misunderstanding and the questions that were asked, because people have this vision that when there is a coyote killing contest, where coyotes are killed that there are hundreds or thousands killed. To my knowledge, and in the ones that I've monitored and people I've talked to who have participated in these, even when you have a group of 20 or 30 people out there, the fact of the matter is that if you get the same number of coyotes kills that you have participants is rare. It is very rare. We are not killing vast amounts of these things, so it comes back in my viewpoint to, is this something that has become politically or socially unacceptable that its going to be a detriment to us? Or is it with a small group of people that its politically and socially unacceptable at this point. I will leave it there to say that I'm not convinced when we say that the general public doesn't accept this because I don't think we've had a true poll of the general public. If you ask them if they support coyote calling contests, the public will say, we don't care. If you ask them if they support coyote killing contests, I can guarantee you that they will tell you that they don't want to have a killing contest because that has a negative connotation. How you ask the question and how its being asked of the public out there really does drive what the public opinion is going to be on this. There are people that live in neighborhoods right now that are terrified of coyotes because they have small children, to be honest with you, as pointed out by Director Wasley, as we have consumed a lot of these small wildlife on our golf courses, pets become the next thing. When I say pets, I'm not talking small pets. There are basically large dogs that get killed, not just small dogs. It's a matter of time before we have somebody's child hurt unless we take of the urban coyote problems. I'm

not saying these contests do that, but I'm saying that once you start acquiescing to a contest here, you're going to end up somewhere else then you probably don't wanna end up. People are going to be less willing to remove problem coyotes out of an urban environment and I think it will ultimately cause a problem. They were not limited in numbers. Thank you.

Bobbie McCullum, private citizen: Thank you. Just a few comments, I'll try not to repeat what you've already heard. Yesterday I heard a lot of comments from Commissioners about having the right tools. These wildlife killing contests are not considered tools to control predator numbers, there are programs in place to do that. It would be really good if we can focus on the issue of these contests. No one is saying we're not going to be taking care of predators or problems, it's about the contest. Nevada allows residents from other states to conduct these contests, they cross state lines where it's illegal, they come into Nevada, they sponsor the contests, they collect money, they dispense money, all without any oversight. These aren't charitable organizations, these are events that are held, often they say they are helping someone with something, but these are not certified charitable organizations that are conducting these. I echo the comments made about the activity occurring on federal land, permits are required, who monitors that? I don't think that these equate with fishing derbies, many of which are catch and release. I can't think of coyote killing contests where coyotes were caught and released. So, I think it's a different issue. If you want to know how this has been going in the states where they banned, perhaps contacting California, Arizona, New Mexico's wildlife authorities would be a good avenue to pursue, to see if there's any problem with depredation. So. thank you. I hope that you will consider this on scientific thinking and not on your personal opinions. Thank you.

Joel Blakeslee, private citizen: I just thought I'd describe what a coyote contest actually is because after yesterday, there was a lot of discussion about traps and hounding and it was obvious that a lot of people have never participated in that. So let me just give you a quick rundown. I've been to two contests in my life. It started out, we went to Elko, we met with the organizers and the other hunters at the Red Lion Inn and Casino. We attended a banquet that was identical to the dozens of other wildlife banquets that I've attended in my life. We had a nice social hour; we had a few drinks. They had a dinner, we raffled off some merchandise. It could have been Rocky Mountain elk foundation, Ducks Unlimited, NBU any of the other dozens of banquets that I've attended in my life. Later that night, everybody took off to wherever they wanted to go hunting. My partner and I had to battle 100 mile an hour winds all weekend, we got two coyotes and we didn't even go to the check-in because obviously we weren't in the running. So, I ask you, is there anything in there that I've described that constitutes "given proper behavior". Dave McNinch said that term a little while ago. Is there anything there that was improper? Most of these hunts have many of the same components as a bunch of other organized events. I won't go into that; we've talk about fishing and all that stuff. The last thing I'd like to say is the biggest contest of the year is coming up and that's the big game draw. We are going to competing for tags, we have the Silver State Tag, the PIW, the Heritage tags. There is money involved all around and to discriminate against one group of people is just exactly that. I would ask you to not go along with the cancel culture that has infected our country lately. Last thing I'd like to say is the Nevada Legislature had this in front of them last session and chose not to go anywhere with it and I would ask you do to the same. Thank you.

Brian Buress, private citizen: Good morning members of the Commission. I heard a lot of testimony from people that claim that these contests are one thing or another, I heard from a Commissioner that says people are filling their trucks with 50 coyotes in the back of their trucks, and that's certainly not the case of these coyote calling contest. I think I heard from some other people talking about if you're lucky to get a coyote. In regard to the public lands hunting, these competitions do not have a check-in or anything on public land. A hunter is allowed to hunt on public land legally. They're allowed to go on any public land that they want to as long as it's not a closed area and go hunt whatever species they want to hunt. I will discuss the fishing derby versus a coyote calling contest issue; the difference between fishing derby and a coyote calling contest or quail derby or however you want to do it, is pretty simple. A fishing derby, a chukar tournament; those are regulated animals in the state of Nevada. Coyotes are not regulated in the

state of Nevada. So, you are asking us to take an unregulated animal and put regulations on it, it physically does not make sense. They are unregulated for a reason. Its estimated between 250,000 and 700,000 coyotes in the state of Nevada. Nobody knows the actual true number because there haven't been any studies. So, we are going to make a decision based on something we really don't know anything about. The science it not settled science. 100 percent is not settled science. We have an excellent scientific community within the NDOW organization, and I would ask you, before making any decisions, that we actually go through and try to get some of the science to make a scientifically informed decision. Words matter and from the beginning of this conversation, I've heard over and over again from several members of this board "wildlife killing contests". Wildlife killing contests" has two specific connotations; number one, is that you're killing wildlife. Wildlife in the state of Nevada is any game species, non- game species that occurs naturally or unnaturally in the state of Nevada. That includes fish, deer, any animal, skunks, chipmunks, whatever you're placing restrictions on as a county and actually push this agenda forward. Number two, killing is denoted for one particular reason and its to illicit and emotional response. So, our politics nowadays are driven by emotional response. We as a Wildlife Commission, as a sportsman, we need to be ruled by the science and not emotion. I ask this board to actually go through, find the science, follow the science and don't let Clark County, one small urban area, rule the state of Nevada and tell this Commission what they should be doing. I ask that you go to NDOW and ask NDOW to provide the science on the best path forward. I encourage you to table this item and take no action on this agenda item. Thank you.

Jeff Dixon, representing the Humane Society of the United States: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Commission. For the record, I'm Jeff Dixon, resident of Reno and the Nevada State Director for the Humane Society of United States. On behalf of our Nevada supporters, I'd like to thank you for having this conversation of coyote killing contests and urge you to initiate rulemaking. A ban on killing contest is narrowly tailored to games that offer cash and prizes for an animal's life. It would not reduce opportunities to hunt any wildlife species, nor would it prevent ranchers from using lethal control to protect livestock. If contests are banned, coyotes would remain an unprotected species that could be killed with no limits on seasons or quantity. Contest participants and organizers often claim that they're performing a service, reducing coyote numbers, saving livestock or boosting population of game animals like deer for hunters. Scientific studies do not support any of these claims, in fact, shows that randomly killing carnivores has the opposite effect. They cause coyotes to deliberate, and they create conflicts where there were none. When it comes to livestock, those who raise animals for food, already pay a fee that goes to USDA wildlife services which employs people whose sole year-round task is to kill coyotes and other native carnivores on behalf of ranchers. NDOW, on its website, states that the removal of coyotes should be limited to chronic problem animals. Simply put, these are false pretenses given to make this blood sport appear necessary and even respectable. There is nothing respectable about gains or violence as a point. When they are finished, the bodies are usually thrown into a dumpster, the very definition of "wanton waste". All to refer to Nevadan's orientation to wildlife as reported in the American Wildlife Values survey, Nevada State Report. 44 percent of us, are mutualist, who believe we should coexist with wildlife. 22 percent are traditionalist, who believe wildlife should be used and managed for human benefit. 19 percent are pluralists, who might hold either view depending on the context. I will ask you to consider what a pluralist, perhaps yourself or someone you know, would determine when consider wildlife coyote killing contests. We know that wildlife management professionals and Commission in other states including Arizona, Colorado, and Washington have determined these killing contests cross the line. I hope this Commission recognizes it too and will initial rulemaking today. Thank you.

Kayleigh Dearstyne, private citizen: Hi, my name is Kayleigh Dearstyne. I work as a naturalist educator, teaching environments and modules to kids at one of the tier one schools in Reno. I am grateful for your consideration of rules to ban wildlife killing contests in Nevada and I urge you to support such a rule. As a lover of wildlife and an avid hiker of the state, it disappoints that wildlife killing contests take place and are legal in Nevada. I cannot understand why this blood sport is allowed to continue or why anyone would want to participate in one. Wildlife in Nevada is managed for the benefit of all Nevadans because under

the Public Trust Doctrine under which is North American law was based, wildlife belongs to all Nevadans including my students. I hate think of a child being socialized in the culture that does not have evidence for wildlife. I can't see any ethical defense for it and I know some of your counterparts in other states have agreed. I will share some quote from a couple of them. In 2017, a year prior to Vermont banning contests, the Vermont Fish and Wildlife said, "coyote hunting contests are not only ineffective at controlling coyote populations, but these kinds of competitive coyote hunts are also raising concerns on the parts of the public and could possible jeopardize and effect access to public lands for all hunters". They continue, "although these activities follow laws and regulations, we do not believe such short-term hunts will have any measurable impact on regulating coyote populations, nor will the bolster populations of deer or other game species". When New Mexico Land Commissioner, Stephanie Garcia Richard banned contest on 9 million acres of public land trust, in 2018, she said, "These are not hunting contests, they're animal cruelty context. It is an inexcusable practice." Massachusetts Division of fishing and wildlife outlawed contests in 2019, saying it was doing so after reviewing the best available science and consulting with wildlife agency professionals from other states. Instead of a killing contest ban that they do not reduce opportunity for hunting coyotes or other furbearers to fill the Massachusetts wildlife support foundation functions to develop hunting, fishing, and other trapping opportunities. They further said that the ban would address public concern that certain hunts have contributed to the waste of animals, recognize and address the public controversy over the issue as a potential to threaten predator hunting, discourage the waste of wildlife and reinforce an expectation of all animals during the regulated season to the greatest extent as possible, a boost in hunter education and coyotes and other furbearers are managed as a valuable natural resource. Finally, please consider this quote from the late Jim Posewitz author of *Beyond Fair Chase, the Ethic and Tradition of Hunting*, he said, "competitive killing seems lack of appreciation of and respect of wildlife fundamentals to any current definition of an ethical hunter." Hunters and non-hunters agree that we should respect wildlife and the habitats. Wildlife killing contests are barbaric and a stain on our state. As more and more western state prohibits these events, I feel Nevada will become a haven for contest participants. For these reasons, I urge you to ban wildlife killing contests.

Patrick Donnelly, representing the Center for Biological Diversity: I am the Nevada State Director with the Center for Biological Diversity. The center has been fighting for wildlife and public lands in Nevada for almost 30 years. We have conducted a nationwide campaign against wildlife killing contests. The center is not an anti-hunting organization, many of our members and staff are hunters and anglers. Coyote killing contets are not legitimate hunting, they are blood sport. Each year hundreds of coyotes are killed in gruesome contests across Nevada, where cash or prizes, like assault rifles are awarded to participants who killed the most or the largest animals. Not only are these contests unsporting and wasteful, but they're also ecologically harmful and deeply at odds with principles of the North American Wildlife Conservation model, which requires that wildlife only be killed for a legitimate purpose. We may have our own objections to that particular model but if it is the credo that legitimate hunters wrap themselves in. It is clear that this is not a legitimate hunting activity. Most animals killed in these contests are not used for meat or fur but rather are dumped and discarded. So, we heard earlier that there is no evidence of population level impacts, that's what NDOW was saying and that may be true, but there are definitely localized impacts from systematic killing of coyotes, which will affect family structures and may result in increased conflicts with livestock, pets and people. That's at a micro level but ultimately this is not primarily a question of coyote management, there are much broader questions about our relationship with and management of predators in Nevada. Valid critiques have been raised in the past about the way the state and USDA wildlife services managed predators, but that's not what this is. This is a question of whether, as a society, we will move forward from a barbaric and an anachronistic practice which many states have banned. Coyote killing contests have no place here and most Nevadans find them repellent. Not all decisions made by this Commission are 100 percent based strictly on scientific evidence, you make choices about the ethics of hunting and the ethics of our relationship with wildlife all the time, this is a moral issue. Also, you now have a chance to be proactive and I think Commissioner McNinch expressed this quite well, you can deal with this issue right now, or we can continue to fight over this for

years and years and years. We can take out build more than Las Vegas Strip with piles of dead coyotes, you know, this issue was already black eye hunting community. I heard you got 600 emails, but we can make it 600,000 if you want. This is issue is only gonna get worse the longer it continues to fester. Again, this isn't anti-hunting its ant-wildlife killing contests and you can take proactive action on an issue that already has incredibly widespread consensus among all the tiny fraction of the populous. We urge you to move..... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Dakota Neuffer, private citizen: My name is Dakota Neuffer. I will make this brief; I am here to encourage you to listen to what has been said today. I believe these killing contests need to be banned. These events go against any kind of ethical hunting practices. Thank you and I encourage you to take action on this agenda item.

Michelle Lute, representing Project Coyote: Thank you, Chair East and Commissioners. My name is Michelle Lute and I'm the National Carnivore Conservation Manager for Project Coyote. I am speaking to you on behalf of over 800 Nevada members who support science based modern wildlife management, including and especially a prohibition on wildlife killing contests. As a PhD wildlife scientist and former state biologist in New Mexico, were killing contests were banned, without negative repercussions, I say confidently wildlife killing contests offer no management benefits whatsoever. They began chaos across the landscape with unregulated killing of predators that do not need such control. Predators self-regulate and have done so based on compensatory mechanisms, competitors in native prey availability for a millennium. The draft 2016 Commission policy from the board agreed with this by explaining the wildlife management profession does not generally recognize the use of contests as a tool with substantial wildlife management affect. As both a wildlife scientist and daughter of three generations of farmers, I can also state confidently, killing contests do nothing to address conflict because they do not target the offending predator, site where depredation occurred, or time when it occurred. If anything, the serve to increase conflict with disruption of social structures and foraging ecology. The number of surviving pups that must be fed by Alpha parents and transient individuals may increase. Contest's takeout adults before they teach their young to properly hunt, if you are not taught how to get healthy food you end up in the easiest fast-food joint, eating a burger. Native carnivores take few livestock, less than half a percent according to the Department of Ag. The best available science points to non-lethal methods to prevent conflict, they're effective, targeted, and address the root causes of conflicts. Additionally, no credible evidence exists to support the notion that indiscriminate killing of predators affectively helps manage their prey species. Coyote diets are omnivorous and rely on rodents and rabbits. more than deer. Rodent control is just one of the many ecosystem benefits of predators. Let me be clear, we are not anti-hunting, you may hear concerns about the slippery slope. It is actually a logical fallacy where a course of action is rejected because with little or no evidence one insists that it will lead to a chain reaction resulting in an undesirable end. I invite you to look at the evidence and my body of work is published and available online. Project Woyote's work is on our website, you will not find anti-hunting rhetoric or action, you will find evidence of why killing contests are unjustified. The only slippery slope that ending killing contests leads us to is further refined policies supported by scientific and value-based justifications upon which the majority of Nevadans agree. I would venture we all agree that that's a desirable end. Modern conservation understands that biodiversity and ecosystem health and function is ba.... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Chris Garnett, private citizen: Thank you Commissioners. I would like to start off by saying, I would like the Commissioners to recognize name change wildlife or coyote calling or hunting contests. The use of the name "wildlife killing contests" only leads to bias feelings and pushes one agenda. It does not allow the Commission to remain neutral in its decision making. Having the word "killing" in the title implies animals are standing around for slaughter which is just not the reality. Coyotes must be hunted before they can be taken. It takes extreme skill by the hunter to accomplish this. The word "killing" or "blood sport" is being used and selected specifically to trigger an emotional response in others. We refer to big game hunts as just that, hunts. We don't hear big game killing season. This proves the word "killing" in

this topic is being used to push the agenda. Also, there is no proof that indiscriminate shooting or stray bolts are happening. Clearly, anyone making these comments have little knowledge of coyote hunting. There is no proof or evidence has been presented a public endangerment, yet these statements are being made in hopes to persuade others to agree with them. The Nevada state biologists has made laws require no license and no limit, with the season lasting all year. A suggested change in this management with no qualifying justification is saying that the biologist for the state of Nevada, there data is less valuable than emotions of a few. I would like to ask the Commission to rely on the biologist that have appointed and let's go with their data. Also, the US government kills more predators in Nevada than any contest ever does. Simply by paying your taxes, you fund predator killing. According to APHIS, the Department of Agriculture kills over 27,000 coyotes per year that equates to approximately 64 coyotes per day, yet I hear no complaints being made about this. This is generally done with poisoning and trapping, but mostly from helicopter shooting and nothing about public complaints are being talked about that. Also, I would like to note that the wildlife Commission I would like to see another send a letter back to the Clark County Commission to remind them of their duty of urban planning and let the wildlife management be done by those who are elected. In fact, the Clark County CABMW does not suggest the commission take any further action regarding these contests and also the Clark County CABMW has also considered suggesting to the Wildlife Commission to pay a bounty to hunt coyotes, similar to Utah. I'd just like all those facts stated and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Colton Cole, private citizen: Yes, Madam Chair. I thank you and members of the Commission for taking time to listen to this issue today. As we sat and listened to prior comments, I think we can agree with this is a passionate issue for both sides. The base arguments in support of this bill have been based solely on emotion, you know, we're not hearing any scientific data that the backs this, it comes down to personal opinion. I think we, as a people in the great state and country, often forget one of the keys that make it so great and its diversity. I understand that a lot of the corners of this agenda do not feel that it's right, they talk ethics. We each grew up in, you know, rural cities, different backgrounds, different beliefs, and I'm a person that lives kind of living let live. So, you know I just ask the Commission as they really ponder this issue that they support the sportsman that put the time in, put the dollars in, put the effort in to sustain the land. I would love some of the antis to come out and help us build guzzler projects and help us rehabilitate fire lands and actually do something that benefits wildlife. So, I ask you guys please support the sportsman here and protecting our right. Thank you very much.

Janice Medema, private citizen: My name is Janice Medema and I'm a resident in Henderson, NV. As a wildlife advocate, I've been following killing contests for many years. I supported the group in Arizona, who was instrumental in curtailing these events. I believe that the only reason that there's not more public outrage around these events, is that people do not even realize there happening Over the years, I have followed some of these events on social media and seeing the horrific posts that these people post publicly. I would encourage all of you to check that out. Several of the people at this meeting have said they've gotten one or two coyotes, that's not what people are posting on social media. There are pictures of piles and piles of dead animals, laying either in the bed of truck or just out on the dirt. It's grotesque. Some people post pictures with their children after they've done this. I would encourage you to see what kind of people are coming into our state and participating in these events and coming to conclusion is this the kind of activity that we want to attract into our beautiful state? I also would just like to address that someone said that coyote are these vicious animals, that will attack you. I lived for many years in California, where this illegal and I used to run at night and train for marathons and I would come across coyotes all the time in my adventures and hiking, I never once felt threatened by one of them and they can care less about me. I understand we have to protect our small animals, that's our job as pet owners, to protect our animals from wildlife that live around us, but I do believe that coexistence should be the norm. I would encourage you to end these wildlife contests for good. Thank you.

Rex Flowers, private citizen: Good afternoon, Commissioners. For the record, I've been listening to this and this really is a matter of people's ethics and their moral standing on things, this has no biological

basis. I understand Commissioner McNinch, you have an issue with it, and you're entitled to your viewpoint on that, and I commend you for coming forward. I would like to say though that, why do we continue, I mean this is, these predator contests are like-minded people gathering to do something that they enjoy. I don't participate in these things; I would not get any enjoyment out of them, but I don't think it's up to me to pass judgment on the next individual for doing it. I believe a lot of the people out there who made comments today, they are making their comments based on the fact that it's a coyote. Yesterday people based their comments on the fact it was a bear. I think we need to visualize, as small children we were raised with teddy bears and through life we grow up with cats and dogs, as being our family pets, being our brothers and sisters and being our children, that's why we associate so well with coyotes, bobcats, and with the black bears. We don't ever hear anything about the fishing, we don't hear anything about the birds, how is it any different? I mean, think of the cruelty when you have a fishing contest and a fish hits that line and you rip the lips right off the face of the that fish, is that not as intense? You see where I'm trying to get to? I think we need to justify, is there biological reason for it or is it because these animals have furs and paws and that's the end of the conversation? Thank you and I hope you'll give consideration to that.

Break 2:43 – 2:55

Ron Stoker, private citizen: Thank you, Commissioners for listening to me today. It was brought up earlier in the meeting by a Commissioner that we are the crazy uncle in the room and it's time for us to sit down and be quiet, I don't feel like that is fair. As a conservationist and a sportsman that has never participated in a coyote contest, I will not refer to them as "killing contests", that is not a fair statement, I still believe as a sportsman that you should maintain the right to hunt in a matter which is fit and which you enjoy. It the right to assemble. It's the right where family of friends get together and go out and remove a prey species that negatively affects the herds in Nevada. Now, we've heard several things about it not being biologically sound. and that may be true, but it is beneficial to those communities in which it happens. It might not benefit the whole state, but it does benefit those communities. Along with that, with regards to wanton waste our coyote slaughters, which it has been referred to, there is more waste done by predator management programs than there is ever done by coyote contests. A lot of these sportsman do take and use these animals; they will tie on the pelts and they'll bring them in and do things like that. Also, they say coyotes aren't dangerous in public areas, I know that there has been, recently in the last six months, two coyote incidents which people enjoying nature have got bit while they're sleeping. So, there are certain coyote escalations that will happen if the coyotes aren't manage. I just, I'd really hope that the Commissioners will take into effect that this a way of sportsman and we don't remove these coyotes contests and that we don't call the "coyote killing contests" or else we're going to have to call them deer killings contests, bass fishing killing contest and several other things. I appreciate your time and thank you so much for listening to me.

Larry Staley, private citizen: I appreciate the time I have to talk to you today. I would advise you to oppose this proposed thing from the Clark County Commission. One thing I want to touch on is stop referring to them as "killing contest" it is called a "calling contest" for a reason. My dad used to say it's not called "killing" it's called "hunting". Hunting takes technique, and hones skills, if it was called "killing" there would be more people doing it and that's a fact. The same goes for coyote calling, it takes extreme skill and technique to call in a coyote. Many of the statements made were using the word "killing" to play on the emotions of others. It's not a bass killing tournament, a chukar killing contest, or a big buck killing contest; so, stop referring to it as a killing contest, it's not, it's strictly a calling contest, where you go out and you try to prove that you can call in a coyote. It's not easy. People that think it is easy, they're 100 percent wrong. 100 percent. If they think it is easy, I dare you to go to a sporting store, pick up a hand call and go and try to call a coyote because you won't do it. Fact. Also, hunters on here have been portrayed as just wild savages, going out, shooting bullets all over the place and willy nilly. Well, the type of people that are hunters are people that aren't felons, they're allowed to have their Second Amendment rights. They go out, they participate in the outdoors and they're law-abiding citizens. That's who comes out to

our state, come out and go out and hunt. It doesn't matter if it's coyotes, ducks, fishing doesn't matter its coyote hunting, it doesn't matter if it's a big game hunting, people that come out and hunt are people that are law abiding citizens. That is a fact. One thing I'd like to also consider is how is fair to solely go after one group of like-minded individuals for something that that we like to enjoy. If you're going to ban coyote calling contests, that are an unprotected species in our state, then you'll have to stop the multi-million industry of bass fishing tournaments, where there's multi-million dollars brought in bass are brought in that die in the live well, there's big buck contest held in almost every small town in the state of Nevada, where you bring your biggest buck in and you might win some cash. the same goes for coyote calls contest s. You're also going to have to stop doing the Nevada wildlife record book, you're going to have to stop doing that because there's belt buckles given to the top three species in our state, which is a fact. Don't believe me? Go look up to wildlife record book that gives you the top three animals killed in a state of every species. So, you're going to have to stop doing that. You can have stop the chukar contest, you're going to have to stop these banquets, because these banquets are earning money and these banquets are using that money to go out there and put more animals on there for people to go kill. Why would we do that? So, take this into consideration when you're going to sit there and target one group of individuals that like to go hunt coyotes that tried to do a little bit of predator control in the areas that like go to big game.. ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Randall Massaro, representing the Union Member for the Preservation of Wildlife and Animal Rights: Hello, my name is Randall Massaro, I'm the National President of Union Members for the Preservation of Wildlife and Animal Rights, an Activist organization that's been around since 1970. we advocate and we heard from my myself I'm retired law enforcement work with several law enforcements as well and became an actor in Hollywood and big advocate for animal rights. Obviously, we were involved with the first ever bear hunt and we also sit on Native American boards, where we include Native Americans, animal rights organizations, and concerned citizens. We'd like to ask you to vote no on coyote killing contests and if science doesn't prove it then obviously the ethics of being a hunter should. What most people consider a hunter is the guy that goes out and shoots an animal and eats it. Quite often here in California and in now Arizona and many other states are going along with voting against coyote killing contest, 17 states right now and we're working on others. Out Teamsters union that I represent, is supporting the no-hunt policy, for the fact that the biggest buyer of pelts, hides, and furs is communist China and Russia. While we're pushing for the boycott of states that do support the purchase of furs, we've gotten to our union members in Europe as well as other countries to dissuade people from buying and traveling to many of the states that support the coyote killing contest and hound dog hunting of bears and other animals. In California, we won the fight to ban hounding on bears and bobcats, we banned bobcat trapping, we want protection for the wolves in California and our again, we're an international animal rights organization and we bring in the Native American side of it as well. While Native American's hunt for survival there's a big difference between hunting for fun, sport, and profit. We encourage your board not to vote for hound dog hunting of bears and coyote killing contests. We are, again, actors from Hollywood are watching you. As for myself, I am an actor/retired federal law enforcement officer worked investigations for the state of California, and we use this also as evidence where we bring in the videos and other testimonials from the hunting industry. We'd like to encourage you please look at all the facts and listen to Project Coyote, Humane Society, and many of the other allies and friends out there. I'm going to extend an olive branch and ask you to join to visit the wolf rescue in Lucerne Valley, CA. We would love to have you be our guest and come on out and get a hands-on experience with live wolves and see why we're so adamant about protecting wildlife. We have a wolf rescue with 20 wolves out there. Many of the actors come out in support protection for the wildlife in the state like Sons of Anarchy cast and crew of Twilight. We're in a lawsuit, we joined up with actor Robert Redford in New Mexico. So, would like to invite you to come on out, extend the olive branch of friendship for all of you. Look up Wolf Mountain sanctuary, look union members for the preservation of wildlife. My name is Randall Massaro, feel free to give me a call, I sent you an email. You... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Fred Voltz, private citizen: When the elected representatives of over 70 percent of the state's population unanimously oppose wildlife killing contests (WKC) because of the detrimental impacts on wildlife, plus public health, safety and liability factors, the Wildlife Commission needs to act. Contest participants are killing wildlife; don't sugar coat reality. Some, including six of the appointed Clark CABMW, dismissed the elected County Commission's message as ill-informed and emotional, while twice failing to show up at public meetings and make an alternative case. They failed to track the County Commission's wildlife-related agenda items. . . one of their responsibilities. Mass slaughter of any species for amusement, sport or fundraising cannot be rationally perpetuated regardless of whether the targets are categorized as protected. Fishing contests do not involve the high-volume killing of wildlife or dangers to public health and safety; they deserve exemptions from WKC prohibitions. Fear mongers claiming wildlife pose a threat to be addressed through WKC or unlimited bounty hunting would be well advised to spend their time, money and energy educating people in the actions they can take to diminish unwanted wildlife-human interactions. Such alternatives include adequately protecting their pets or livestock, containing and securing human garbage, removing exterior water and food sources, and arranging television public service announcements, along with social media and HOA dissemination. Nevada needs to ban WKC, much as it needs to ban commercial trapping on public lands as New Mexico enacted yesterday. Thank you.

Brian Cox, private citizen: Hello, I listened to the County Commission meeting and I heard a number of people say, "this isn't anti-hunting, it's anti-killing and cruelty". When I listened to everyone who came before the County Commissioners, the majority of comments were either anti-shooting, anti-hunting and everything about the coyote killing contests were emotion. I've heard several people say this is just cruel, it's a blood sport; well, as young boy growing up in Nevada, I was in the desert and I witnessed two coyotes go after a rabbit, I never seen a rabbit run so fast in my life, so I went to investigate, first thing I found was a pile of the rabbit's entrails, and then this is the way predators go after animals throughout the world, not just here but in Africa as well. the predator immobilizes animal, and they disembowel the animal through the stomach because that's where the skin is the thinnest. Animals die in the wild really only two ways, that's starving to death or being ripped to pieced by another animal. So, when I hear that this is "cruel" and this is "inhumane", well, that's what nature is and to all of those people that believe their support if seeing animals in the wild, well, you can thank a hunter for that. You can thank a hunter for paying, not only themselves, but their fathers and grandfathers for participating in the conservation since Teddy Roosevelt and then FDR enacted it through the Pittman Robertson Act. So, to anyone who wants to say that they are for conservation but used the rhetoric of anti-hunting, I'm sorry but that's very disingenuous and your ignoring history. Anybody that thinks that urban Las Vegas should determine the policy to the entire State, I'm sorry, that's not the way a democracy is set up. I'm hearing way too much anti-hunting rhetoric, and you say its not, but you ae using that rhetoric but you say you're not anti-hunting. Its disingenuous and I'd appreciate it if you'd look at history and appreciate the conservation efforts of hunters, not only today but our fathers and grandfathers that participate in this going back to FDR. Thank you very much for your time.

Jim Cooney, representing Elko County CABMW: Madam Chairman members of the Commission, for the record, Jim Cooney, Elko CABMW. I really appreciate all of you listening to all of these different points of view but it's my responsibility as a CABMW to you let you know exactly where Elko County comes down on this. With regards to the Clark County resolution, I too would like to have everybody consider these the coyote "calling" contests, not "killing". The Elko CABMW does not support the resolution from Clark County. A number of the items that were brought up during our CABMW meeting, have been touched on, I will try to fill in a few of the areas that I haven't heard so far in the discussion. These contests help to maintain a healthy population, to keep the coyotes from getting mange and possible rabies and reducing the conflict with pets and human interaction. In Elko County, these coyote calling contests do have an economic value to the local economy; gas, rooms, restaurants, and the likes do have a considerable economic impact. Elko County CABMW as well as most of the residents of Elko County support the livestock industry and to reduce the predation that happens. The first thought that I had is I

looked at this, if Clark County is putting forth a resolution, why don't they first consider the county commission? One of their primary responsibilities is to develop ordinances, if Clark County would like to have an ordinance that outlaws that, that's fine, but let's not push that off on the other 16 counties. I'd also draw your attention to an email that you should have received from the Elko County Manager's office, that Elko County has come up with a resolution to support the coyote calling contests, as it is right now. A final question that I have, and I thought that it was interesting, and I don't know if Commissioner McNinch addressed this or not, I didn't hear him earlier, why was this brought forward in a form of a resolution? My understand is that the petition is the correct procedure to bring forth one of these questions. So, with that, those are the primary things. Most everything else has been touched on previously so I don't want to prolong this hearing. Thank you.

Fauna Tomlinson, private citizen: So, I had this prepared statement, but almost all my points have already been talked about. I will try to keep this brief and come up with new ones. Not only does killing contest hurt the reputation of hunters, but also Nevada residents. I do not want to be one of the last states standing that allows this. Speaking of, as each western state bans killing contest, we are seeing an uptick in killing contests, there are underground so it's hard to find them. Right now, we have about three dozen, which is up from two dozen the beginning of this year. Contestants are growing in size also. The World Coyote Calling Contest brought in 157 participants. the really bad part about this is the prize money is growing, we've documented \$20,000 in prize money. Now, remind you that none of this none of this goes to NDOW, none of this goes to research, none of this goes to science, there's no data, there's no numbers, this is just calling or killing. You call to kill. Even NDOW shows that there's no science that says this helps. Just like Hubbs said, there's so much misinformation with coyotes. The last person said that this slows mange, no it doesn't, there's no science that shows that, it slows disease, there's no science that shows that, or it slows pet taking and there's no science to show that either. So, I think it's really important that we keep with science and not the feely touchy stuff, because science does not show that killing contests help in any way for livestock, pet protection. Somebody else said that you have to watch to make sure your children aren't snatched, I wanted you to know that's also false, and that in Nevada there's never been any coyote that has been documented to kill a person. As far as being safe, it's hard to think of something in Nevada that has never kill somebody. We have thought long and hard about it, but we can't seem to find anything. The difference between a fishing derby, a deer derby and a chukar derby is easy, there's limits and you eat them. There are no limits in coyote killing contest and I think that's the reason why it gives the ethical hunters a bad name. is just like Hubbs said, bodies on top of bo.... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Daniel Davis, private citizen: Thank you guys for the opportunity to speak here today. I'm calling in as a Clark County resident. Personally, I've had pets while on a leash in Clark County park, have had coyotes come up within 10 feet of me and try taking hi. Walking through my neighborhood, I've watched other people walking their dogs, have packs of coyotes stalking them. So, quite frankly as a taxpayer in Clark County I've love to see the Clark County officials do something about that rather than worry about these contests, which seemed to be more of an emotional based attack than anything. I'm an outdoor enthusiast, I spend a lot of time out hiking, mountain biking; I've come across predator hunters and never once have I had anyone make me feel unsafe. I've never heard of anyone or anyone's pets being injured by anyone in these contests or predator hunting, in general. So, I feel like there's a lot of misinformation that has been spread here in that regard. I've never come across any of them who don't seem to be very respectful and, quite frankly, pretty well-trained and informed on how to handle weapons. Thank you.

Trish Swain, private citizen: Thank you members of the Commission and really thank you, Commissioner McNinch for bringing this forward. We're very grateful, when I say "we", all of us who keep talking about this stuff for years and years. I'm trying to collect some comments real quick here that are not repetitious, because I certainly feel strongly that we do not need, as you call them, coyote killing contests or anything at al. One thing I want to say is I think it is the height of absurdity to say that you hate animal. An animal is an animal, it's doing what it's born to do. So, the coyote has got so much bad press, so much

persecution, so much hatred that it's really shocking, it's really disturbing, and I cannot understand. Well, I understand because it's traditional or whatever, but to blame and animals for being what it is, or being a predator, or eating prey its absurd. I recommend don't a position like that, so that's the first thing I'd like to say. I would also like to say that in our neighborhood there's a lot of folks who just moved in and I like pretty much on the edge skirts of town. You go a quarter mile to where you're out in the hills and that's why I live here. I hike up there with my dogs all of the time. I run into coyotes frequently, never had any problem with me or my dogs. As a matter of a fact, I consider them some of the most wonderful and absolutely magical events that have ever happened in my life. They're amazing animals, you never know exactly what they're going to do. They communicate to you, they're making noise at you and their body language and I'm very grateful that I've had those experiences and they certainly left me with a respect and an affection for coyotes as the beings that they are. Now, in my neighborhood, as I say, a lot of folks have moved in and we have that neighborhood chat, NextDoor, and people are like 'Oh! I saw a coyote! What am I going to do?! Am I able to let my children out? What's going to happen?'. So, I'm contacting NDOW, the urban wildlife division and Jessica Heit come out here and she gave a wonderful presentation to our neighborhood and there is none of the this "Oh! The coyotes are such a danger." She gave us some very solid pointers. Face it, they were here first. It was their territory before we moved here and she gave us some solid pointers about keeping your yard clean, clean up your fruit, don't leave garbage, don't leave pet food out there. ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Carol Garlington, private citizen: Hi, thank you Commissioners, thank you Commissioner McNinch for bringing this up. My prepared statements will be redundant. The letter that I wrote to the Reno Gazette Journal that was published, basically says that Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners has the opportunity to make the proper ethical decision to ban killing contests in Nevada as several other western states have done. That it's my position. I am appalled that we continue to talk about this, especially in a year of COVID when we are all the survivors, to murder other creatures, at this time is unthinkable. Thank you very much for discussing this, I appreciate your time.

Cathryn Smith, private citizen: Good afternoon and thank you for hearing our comments today. I would like to thank Commissioner McNinch for his courage to raise this topic. I happen to agree with this alternative theory of tipping point over the slippery slope. Tipping points are tricky, you don't really know what the cause will be in it can surprise you. As Commissioner Hubbs said yesterday, it is a lack of widespread knowledge by the public regarding the activities this Commission has condoned in the past that protects the status quo. If this Commission retains its course of inaction, I wonder what Nevada's tipping point will be. Thank you.

Mel Belding, private citizen: Thank you for recognizing my hand. There is a couple thing that I'd like to address. Number one is that I've never went to the World Championship Calling Contest, but a brief check of their website; Commissioner McNinch said that they bring in a lie detector test, a polygraph, to see if there's any artis in there to do the hunt. I spoke with a couple of guys here earlier and I'm told that's not case. They're brought in for making sure that the coyotes were taken in the timeframe of the contest. I would really like to know where Commissioner McNinch got that. Also, the WCCC is by invitation only, it's not open to the public. I wouldn't know why they would have to scrutinize someone that's trying to get into the contest when they've already invited them. Rex Flowers used to term "rip the lips and out of fish" and I'm going to take that little further, we have these "fishing derbies", you call them, of course, "wildlife killing contests". I wish this would have been more specific, so that we could have had some conversation at the CABMW. If we are talking about a "coyote killing contest" or "coyote calling contests", lets address it. Here's the question, you guys know who I am, you see me at that podium a lot of time, you want to talk ethics and morals Is this ethical? Is this moral? My biggest thing 8 of the 9 Commissioner at that time voted.. First, I'm going to say that money was being mentioned. Would it be okay if these contests gave the Department of Wildlife money? Would it make it more ethical? More moral? The most unethical that I see done, 8 of the 9 at that time voted for, is it to kill a desert bighorn sheet 365 days a year, point of

sale. Now that's changed a lot. I ask you, Mr. McNinch, Ms. Hubbs, you guys approve this, is it ethical? Is it moral? Let's talk about.... **\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.**

David VonSeggern, representing Sierra Club's Toiyabe Chapter: Commissioners, we're getting late in the day, thank you for sticking with this public here today. I'm speaking on behalf of the nearly 6000 members of the Sierra Club in Nevada, in the Toiyabe chapter. We followed this issue back in 2015-2016, when Commissioner McNinch talked about it. At that time, we pass through resolution in the chapter against coyote killing contests and that's on the record and we presented then. So, I'll try to be a little more brief today, the Sierra Club does oppose hunting events that promote the killing of any animal in an excessive and unmanaged manner, such as in coyote killing contests. Sierra Club understands, however, that some exceptions in formal regulations may be warranted to continue to allow more acceptable public events, fishing derbies, for example. We also recognize that there will be a need for predator control at various times and places but doing contests and summer grants are not the appropriate tool to address these management needs. I'm just going to give you kind of a personal note here, I live in northwest Reno, I go out and hike in the hills a lot and it's not uncommon to see a coyote, them along with deer and rabbits and badgers. That gives me my wildlife experience but particular, the coyote; quick, cunning, alert, adept. They deserve our respect for perseverance as species. When so much has been thrown at them in a quest to eliminate them in the past? I feel we should allow them to live their lives with the minimum amount of interference that's necessary. So, returning now to speaking for the Sierra Club, you have before you a resolution that will start the process for banning coyote killing contests in Nevada. We along with the whole body of Nevada citizens own the wildlife in this state, we ask that you vote in favor of this resolution in order to prevent indiscriminate killing of one ecologically important species from the enjoyment of a few. Now, I heard a lot about science today, and I appreciate the comments by the Director Wasley and others on this, but I think this is an issue that's not going to be decided on science. Why should the sensitivities of a few people limit the activities of others? Well, the sensitivities of a few people are now the sensitivities, I think of the maj.... **\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.**

Mike Reese, representing the Clark County CABMW: Good afternoon Chairwoman East and Commissioners. I'd like to compliment Commissioner Kiel on bringing up this morning the topics we need to discuss. I'm going to talk about a doe's recruitment versus the coyote's recruitment. In a perfect world, a doe will have two fawns; in a perfect world, most coyotes can have 6 to 8. Right there you're probably 4 to 1, more coyotes to everyone fawn that's born. This discussion is leading to how do we put a protection on the coyote and I'm scratching my head going, "at what point are we going to talk about putting protection on our fawns?" so that we can have a higher recruitment rate. I'm going to leave that where that's at. I've heard talks about ethics in this. You have a coyote predator hunter that leaves the house, probably has the same gun, same animal, same vehicle, same calls and he goes coyote calling, takes the exact same equipment and goes to a calling contest. He has dinner with some friends he probably hasn't seen a whole lot and he will break up with the rest of them, go out on the public lands by himself or with his partner if it's a two-man team. What is unethical about any step in that equation? Is it unethical because he decided to go have dinner with some friend he hadn't seen? Because nothing else changes, he is still going hunting for coyotes. Let's talk public lands. There was talk about you got to have a permit, when these coyote call contests go on, they disperse. You can't go into an office and say we are going to have 20 guys go coyote hunting, I don't know where all of these people are going to go, but they won't be around us. They might be 100 miles away, well how do we give you a permit for that? It's ludicrous to think that because, we all know you are going to have a couple thousand deer hunters in our public lands at the same, no permits are required for that. It's a multi-use land and this is being used for multi-use. I will not bore you with anymore of the details, you guys have pretty much heard the stuff. I'm going to ask you guys to deny the resolution as presented. Thank you.

Joe Crawford, representing the Lyon County CABMW commented, thank you Madam Chair. This is Joe Crawford with the Lyon County CABMW. We voted unanimously. I only going to keep it brief because

most of the points that were discussed in the CABMW have already been presented by other speakers. The Lyon CABMW actually voted to not move forward this this proposed regulation change. Everyone felt that it was emotionally charged regulation change and it was unnecessary. On behalf of myself, I feel that the wildlife killing contest, the name alone was meant to trigger some type of emotion. I know that coyote calling contests are in fact that, they're calling contests. I hear the word "blood sport killing", that is also is associated with a negative connotation. I've heard multiple people speak, I've heard a Commissioner state that sportsman take their hunting rights for granted, I've heard a Commissioner say compare us to the embarrassing family member that should just be quiet, and then I've also heard a California actor use my Native American heritage to try to further promote an anti-hunting agenda, which is absolutely disgusting. Do not use my Native American heritage to further your anti-hunting agenda and do not compare me to an embarrassing family member, that is despicable. Thank you.

Jason Graham, private citizen: Thank you Commissioners. I guess I just wanted to touch base on this. I've heard several testimonies and I have to agree with Joe Crawford on some of his thoughts as well. I've got some embarrassing and family members, but I can't get rid of him and I'm not going to. The other thing, I just did a quick Google search and brought up four or five different coyote attacks in 2020, children, strangling a dog that was attacking a child. People say they're not dangerous, they can be, it's not common but they can be. I guess the next thing is, we have taken populations of wolves down from the 16<sup>th</sup>, grizzly bears, several different things, coyotes have been on the hit list from day one. They have expanded their territories, clear back to Maryland. I mean, there was an attack in Chicago. So, coyote contests, coyote trapping, all of it, its not doing anything. We can't manage these animals, they're unstoppable, plain and simple. Man has tried, we can't do it. We spend tons of money every year to try and knock down the population and it doesn't work. Then the term "wildlife killing competitions", we have wildlife competitions, hunting competitions; there's buckles, their certificates across the board. So, the name of this, when you're calling it is just incorrect and that's all I have. Thank you.

Joseph Terry, private citizen: Thanks for hearing me. First, I want to speak about the title of the wildlife killing contests, I know it's been discussed. I don't agree with the title I believe the title; I believe its biased and has an agenda. I personally have hunted coyotes, not in what you guys called coyote killing contests, but I've hunted by myself before. Even though I don't participate in the contests, I do believe someone else should be allowed to. The impacts of coyotes on the landscape are huge. Coyotes have continued to demonstrate their wits, outsmarting hunters by not being called in or by getting comfortable around city limits and moving closer to the population. I've seen multiple coyotes here in Las Vegas, I do report it but that's about all that happens until something bad happens and then the that coyotes gets removed. Commissioner McNinch said there's no money coming in from coyote killings contests, which I agree that NDOW is not making money off the contest, but I believe the most important thing is that the coyote numbers are being or attempted to be controlled. If this is passed, the pressure that is already placed on coyotes would greatly be reduced. Someone mentioned that residents enjoying Nevada outdoors would be at risk if calling contests would go on. When someone hunts coyotes, they don't go to Red Rock, they don't go to Lake Mead, they go in the middle of nowhere, that's the whole point because if you do, then coyotes simply won't come in. Thank you.

Clint McGarr, representing the Elko County CABMW: Like many people have said quit calling it call them "killing contests" it's "calling contest". Just pointed people's emotion. We talk about predator control, who pays for the predator control in the state? As far as I know, there is over a million last year that came from the hunters in Nevada that applied for their big game tags. Three dollars per application. So, over \$1,000,000 comes out of our pockets to pay for predator control but you're saying that we can't help out by doing these calling contests? There's no reason for that. If you're gonna take away us being able to, at least, chip in, I know you're not trying to ban coyote hunting but there's no reason we can't get together and.... if we make some money, we make some money, but we're all getting together and having a good time. We're not putting the public at risk at all. I heard one lady talk about USDA reports, I emailed you guys all my statement, it's a two-page statement the I put out. In a study in 2015 from USDA, coyote

accounted for 40.5 percent of predator caused calf deaths. They also accounted for 54.3 percent of the total predator cause sheep deaths, with 63.7 percent of that being lamb deaths. It goes on to goat and kid deaths, and coyotes accounted for 43.1 percent. We, as hunted, and predator callers are doing our part, whatever we can as a free service to the public. Banning these tournaments is just taking our rights away from us, one step at a time. Thank you for your time and again, vote against this. Thank you.

Preston Acuff, private citizen: I'm a Las Vegas resident. I'd like to start off by just touching base on the comment that I heard a little bit ago, where someone referred to coyote contests as mass slaughter and also made the comment that in fishing derbies, fishing in general, that it doesn't mean unlimited take. It's really frustrating to hear stuff like that, and I do hear a lot of that type of narrative today. Slaughter at these contests it's not a mass slaughter, callers are lucky if they can get even one coyote in, let alone a larger number than that in an evening. In Clark County, in Lake Mead, when you're going to talk about fishing, it doesn't mean unlimited take. In the game book for Lake Mead, it describes that striper bass under 20 inches, there's no limit. So, you can go you can catch fish with no limit. We're talking about an unprotected species when we're talking about coyotes and there unprotected for a reason. I heard a comment from a Commissioner earlier, in regards to chukar or fishing derbies being different because of their interaction and regulation by the State, coyotes unprotected for reason, again. So, when a the NDOW representative earlier stated that it is unlikely that these contests or predator hunting, in general, would alter the populations of coyotes or their prey, in my opinion, it kinda says it right there that this isn't a science backed argument. Really and either way, at least yet I know someone earlier also mentioned that we should give the time for NDOW to come up with scientific states to back this argument one way or another and I definitely agree with that. Right now, it seems this is just a matter of opinion or perspective; however, you want to word it. I also know a lot of people today are saying that other states have set a precedent that we need to follow, and I think this is an opportunity for Nevada to stand up and set a different precedent that we are not just going to be followers, but rather acknowledge there is no scientific basis to banning these contests and will allow sportsman to legally partake in these contests of unprotected species. I really don't see any reason why we put these law and regulations and possible legal consequences in place for hunters and sportsman that are taking place in an event that otherwise..... ***\*Public comment reached its three-minute allotment.***

Callie Lynn, private citizen: Thanks for taking time to discuss to possibly end these wildlife killing or calling contests. I think such contests are giving ethical hunters a bad reputation. The practice not hunting, and the majority of regular hunters agreed killing the most of a certain species for a prize ignored and demoralizes the hunter's creed. Wasting wildlife is a crime and we should stop this practice. Thanks for listening, I'm Callie Lynn from South Reno, NV.

Larry Allen, representing the Humboldt County CABMW: Good afternoon Commissioners. Larry Allen, for the record, Humboldt CABMW. I'll make this pretty short because all of the points that supported the Humboldt County recommendation have already been stated. I would like to address just a couple items that I've heard during testimony, in relation to the statement that money spent while participating in these calling contests doesn't go back to Wildlife or to the Department of Wildlife. I believe, I could be off base, but the Pittman Robertson Act, the tax that we pay when purchasing firearms which these coyote hunters spend a lot of money on firearms and ammunition, that does go back to the state, a portion of it. I would like to counter that that is not a correct statement. Outside of that, all of the other statements brought up about it; the naming of the "wildlife killing contest" is too far reaching, too broad. It is a polarizing thing, in that its an emotional issue that is being brought to the forefront. My fear, if I post a picture of me and my kids with 20 fish on a stringer, how is that any different than somebody with 20 coyotes stacked up? When is it going to stop? Eventually that will be turned around to me. So, with that being said, you have the motion from the Humboldt County Commission, and we oppose this resolution. Thank you.

Elaine Carrick, private citizen: Thank you Commissioners for hearing this. A lot of the comments against the contests, they weren't necessarily anti-hunting. It's just to put it very simply, that the killing of animals

simply for the fun of killing them is not acceptable in today's society. This isn't the 19th century. Whether the animal is unprotected or not, it's simply killing them for the sake of killing and fun. I don't think changing the name of "killing contests" to "calling contests" is going to make it more acceptable to the public. This has been happening for years in Nevada, it's been under the radar and now it's come out in public, and the people do not want their wildlife slaughtered for fun and prizes. I know a lot of the sportsmen are ethical hunters, they respect the animals that they kill, but it's difficult for me to see if there's any respect for people who participate in these contests when they simply kill them for the fun of it, let them pile up, weigh them to see which is the biggest or smallest, they have a few drinks, they get prizes and then they dump the bodies in the desert like trash. I think this is what the public sees and changing names are not going to have any effect. Someone mentioned in the comments that the animals in the wild kill other animals and it's kind of gory. Well, yes, but they killed him for a reason, they killed him for food or protection of their territories. These contests are none of these items. I would please like you to consider banning these contests, it is simply the want and killing of the public's wildlife and it's not acceptable. Thank you very much.

Don Molde, private citizen: Madam Chairman and Commissioners, thanks. I was part of the original petition in 2015 and my views have not changed. I have coyotes coming through my yard and have for 40 years without any trouble. I want to give you three bits of information that you haven't heard today about coyotes, there's been a lot of misinformation; first of all, the only credible estimate of the coyote population in Nevada was done by Wildlife Services recently, a couple years ago, as part of their NEPA documentation to justify their activities. Their estimate, which I think is reasonable, has one coyote per square mile in Nevada. Nevada has 10,000 square miles so Wildlife Services estimates a population of coyotes, from some around 55,200 and 10,000 for the state and I think that's reasonable. Nobody else has come up with a credible population estimate that I've ever seen. With respect to what happens when coyotes are intensely killed, the Department has a paper, Project 14 and 15, which it produced, you can get it from Director Wasley, it was a five-year Wildlife Service project down by Caliente and Pioche. Killing coyote to benefit deer, over five years, they killed about 1200 coyotes, in the fifth year of the project, wildlife service killed three times as many coyotes in the last year as they did in the first year. A little size tripled in the area at about the third year. The average year of coyotes killed by the fifth year dropped by half and there was a male predominance. Basically, what happened was Wildlife Services in five years, got more coyotes than they started with and they were juveniles with a male predominance, just what you don't want. With respect to your own predator fee information, the Commission has spent over 4.4 million dollars since 2000 killing coyotes and you've killed over 10,300 coyotes. Deer numbers in the same time declined from 133,000 in 2000 to the present level on 93,000. You've lost about 35,000 deer while spending over three million dollars to kill over 10,000 coyotes. I think those numbers, at some point, should ring a bell and suggest that we need a management plan for coyotes in Nevada that doesn't include the crazy stuff that's been going on for the last twenty years. You have all of this information in your hands. If the Department won't send it to you, I'll be happy to send it to you. Thank you.

John Tarantino, private citizen: I am a native Nevada resident; I support a ban of coyote killing contest. There has been a lot of opinions today, but I encourage you to do your own unbiased research on the impacts of mass killing of any native species to any area. Coyotes are not a varmint; coyotes are an important part of Nevada's ecosystem. They should not be killed in mass for prize money and the entertainment of those who participate. Nevada needs to be progressive, just as the other western states have banned these coyote killing contest, five of which are within the last two years. I hope that you guys will ban coyote killing contest. Thank you.

Jonathan Lesperance, private citizen: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Commission. I would just like to applaud Joe Crawford for standing up and speaking out on his personal comments. I've appreciated the conversation today. We can and should talk about culture, but we have to do that without cultural appropriation and quite frankly in 2021, if that's not offensive, then nothing is including wildlife killing contests. So, thank you.

Seeing no more public comment Chairwoman brought it back to the Commission for further conversations. Indicated that we had public comment from 43 people and did not know how many were in favor or not in favor of banning coyote calling contests. Opened the conversation.

Commissioner McNinch indicated he wasn't worried about who was in favor or not and suspected sportsmen would come up on the short end of that. Indicated it was not his intent to offend anyone by calling them "killing contests" rather than "calling contests" and stated he would refrain from using the term "killing contests" but will using the term "wildlife contest" rather than "calling contest". Answered Jim Cooney of Elko CABMW's question from public comment in regard to resolution vs. petition to initiate rulemaking and Commissioner McNinch indicated that was his intent here today, to ensure a member of the public did not have to submit a petition in order to initiate rulemaking. Discussed and clarified the Pittman Robertson money. Clarified his statements on the polygraph tests at the World Coyote Calling Contests. Talked about statements from Commissioners from other states, offered his fellow Commissioners to speak with those Commissioners. Addressed the unprotected species concept. Would support a survey for sportsmen to gauge the views of sportsmen on the contests. Wildlife in the State of Nevada belongs to the residents of the state, these contests are frowned upon. *A Hunter's Heart*, an essay called *Failure of the Spirit*, asked the Department to post it and encouraged everyone to read it. Talked about the traditional Christmas hunts in the 1800's and numbers were counted, now referred to as the Christmas bird count, in regard to adaptability to change.

Chairwoman East thanked Commissioner McNinch for bringing this forward. Acknowledged the time and comments on this matter. Indicated she stated that it was important to look at all aspects and went through the comment and noted that there was a split in the comments and believed sportsmen felt as strongly as the public about the matter. Agreed with Commissioner Kiel's comments about wishing to be able to spend time on the habitat and other species in Nevada. Thinks we need to look at the impacts to NDOW and Law Enforcement if we decide to ban these contests and suggest we move forward with something. Asked Commissioner McNinch if we can readdress this issue during summer months as the May Commission meeting was full of quotas. Referred to the Clark County Commission's resolution indicated she has a problem with a sentence included in the letter. Went out for further conversation.

Commissioner Hubbs stated she'd be brief because she knew the makeup of the Commission and that she knew who would make the decisions today. Apologized for saying anything that may have upset anyone. Acknowledged that it wasn't easy for Commissioner McNinch to bring this forward to the Commission. Considers hunters conservationists, at heart. Stated the pictures online are horrid. Stated that the decisions made today will affect everything in the future.

Commissioner Rogers talked about all of the members on the Commission were there for the betterment of Wildlife for all of Nevada's citizens. Enjoyed hearing both sides of this polarizing topic. Asked about the standing of the CABMWs and other County Commissioner in Nevada.

Commissioner AlMBERG discussed imposing morals on people. Agreed to continuing the discussions.

Commissioner Caviglia stated he was willing to bet that more coyotes are killed outside of these contests, but clarified his statement was not based on data. Agreed to further discussions.

Vice Chair Barnes agreed to further discussions.

Commissioner Kiel indicated that he believes other things that we should be focused on and does not support moving on with these discussions.

Commissioner Pierini talked about ranches. Stated he'd think about the topic more before making a decision.

Commissioner McNinch apologized if he hurt anyone by the things he said. Suggested that we put this on an agenda to process and evaluate with things for possible the June meeting. Vice Chair Barnes indicated that he may not change his mind from today if this topic is heard on a future agenda.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MADE A MOTION TO BRING BACK DRAFT LANGUAGE RELATIVE TO THE WILDLIFE CONTEST'S WITH THE SPECIFIC GOAL OF EVALUATING THOSE THAT ARE INVOLVING COYOTES AND OTHER UNPROTECTED OR FURBEARING MAMMALS. SECONDED BY CHAIRWOMAN EAST. MOTION CARRIED 5-4. COMMISSIONER KIEL, VICE CHAIR BARNES, COMMISSIONER ROGERS, COMMISSIONER PIERINI OPPOSED.**

**18. Future Commission Meetings and Commission Committee Assignments – Secretary Wasley and Chairwoman East – For Possible Action**

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for May 7 and 8, 2021, in Reno and the Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The location of the meeting is subject to change due to direction of the Governor during the COVID-19 pandemic. Review and approve the schedule for the 2022-2023 Commission meetings. The Commission may change the time and meeting location at this time. The chairwoman may designate and adjust committee assignments and add or dissolve committees, as necessary at this time. Any anticipated committee meetings that may occur prior to the next Commission meeting may be discussed.

Secretary Wasley discussed the future items on the May meeting that will contest the Final Draft of the Predation Management Plan, Approve the Big Game Status Report, Wildlife Heritage Committee and Report. Protentional future items include: The Sagebrush Biome Status and efforts presentation, wildlife health issues, hearing more about the Wildlife Management Area program and Carson Lake and Pasture.

Chairwoman East indicated she'd like to hear about Living with Wildlife.

Review and discussion of the 2022 – 2023 proposed Commission schedule.

Commissioner McNinch ask that we move the March meetings up a week.

Deputy Director Robb noted his concern with moving those meeting and stated we'd talk about it.

**Public Comment**

Joseph Terry, private citizen: Thank you. I know Jack Robb with NDOW mentioned that they're wanting to keep Reno and Las Vegas dates the same and locations, I'm still going to request that the Big Game Seasons and Regulation be held in Las Vegas one of those years. The last three years, it's been the same, and I'm from Vegas and it's hard to drive all the way out there, so I had to watch it online. I know they have staff there and I know they have some issues I just wanted to voice my opinion. Thank you.

Paul Dixon, representing the Clark County CABMW: I just wanted to quickly ask if in future agendas, if we could go back to the way that it used to be after agenda item you have CABMW comment and then you had public comment, so it's not confusion with the public when you see somebody talking more than three minutes or you kind of understand. We only have seven CABMWs and generally we don't go over 3 minutes schedule, because we give you an action report but if there was a need to under discussion, I'd like you to have that option. Just a thought. Thank you.

Rex Flowers, private citizen: I have a suggestion that again, Chairwoman East has twice for asked for elk management plans to come forward and as has former Chairman Brad Johnston, as have many of

the sportsman ask that there been openness elk management plans and when we can start the process to review population levels. It seems that that is brought up, I know it was brought up at the last meeting, as a future agenda item and it's still not being recognized and coming forward. After all, we are supposed to be discussing the management of wildlife, at some point on the Commission's part, so I ask that we get that going. I appreciate it, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVED THE 2022-2023 NBWC MEETING SCHEDULES AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY CHAIRWOMAN EAST. MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

**19. Public Comment Period**

Public comment will be limited to three minutes. No action can be taken by the Commission at this time; any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. \*Persons wishing to comment are invited to raise their hands in the virtual meeting forum and will be individually called upon until all wishing to comment have had the chance to do so.

Caron Tayloe, private citizen: This is Caron Tayloe, a Washoe County resident and a non-hunting Pittman Robertson contributor. I wanted to thank Chairwoman East for your amazing work this weekend, you didn't excellent job and I can't even imagine what you how you keep it all together, but you did, and I appreciate it, thank you. I'm also really thrilled that so many people, including sportsmen, are concerned about other Nevada species besides the mule deer that we hear about every single meeting. I would love to see a bobcat enhancement program, because I keep telling everybody the bobcat is in trouble and I would love to see a bobcat enhancement program go along with the mule deer enhancement program. I wanted to say thank you to Commissioner McNinch, you're one of the bravest people I know and a special shout out to Cathie Smith. Doctor Cathie Smith, I wanted to publicly do this, all the work that you do for wildlife in Nevada is absolutely amazing, the wildlife work that you do internationally is fantastic and I'm so proud to know you and thank you for your petition, that's all.

David Ricker, representing the Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers: Hello, my name is David Ricker. I'm the Policy Chair of the Nevada Chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. We are responsible for a SB299, the roadkill salvage bill. I'd like to urge this Commission to potentially reconsider its opposition to a SB299. The freedom to salvage accidentally killed wildlife is afforded to the citizens of every single surrounding states, including California. The public health and safety concerns mentioned yesterday by the Commission haven't materialized in these other States. In any case, this particular bill waives all liability to the state and the Department of Wildlife. Those who would utilize the system already know what they're doing, they butcher their own meat, and they understand what's tainted and what isn't. While there's been no PR campaign to fill your inboxes of letter support on this, this bill is in fact broadly supported by sportsmen's groups, especially with the included provision which requires a salvage permit holder to surrender the trophy to an NDOW office. This provision also provides an opportunity for increased testing, not only for CWD but also other wildlife diseases dangerous to the State od Nevada. Additionally, there are other provisions in the bills to reduce administrative overhead through an electronic criminating system and the ability of other law enforcement agencies to issue these tags. I'll leave you with this, the wasting of thousands of pounds of meat along the roadway should be the criminal act, not utilizing it to feed your family. I would implore you all, please take a closer look at the particulars of this bill and thank you for your consideration of my comment.

Rex Flowers, private citizen: Commissioners, over the past year, I've noticed on every meeting, we've gone through this regulation simplification, we've updated all of our NACs, we've spent over 50 percent of this weekend trying to figure out whether or not to further regulate hounding for bears and whether or not coyote contests are proper. It seems to me that we are on a mission to continue to try to manage the people who recreate and not manage the wildlife for the state. I was sure it was the duty of the Commission to give broad oversight to the Department and there's a duty of the Department to manage wildlife, not recreationist. I'm asking, how about we spend as much time trying to grow critters as we are

trying to manipulate the way people recreate on our public lands? All you have to do is look at the facts. We have deer herds that are down throughout the state, antelope hers are diminished in some areas. We augmented a sheep herd on the granites. Ask the Department, where are those sheep now, because I've been told, we've lost them to predation. We lost the hunt in 041, out in Commissioner Kiel's area. We've lost that sheep hunt, why? Predation. What are we doing about this to correct it and move forward? Thank you for listening to me.

Fred Voltz, private citizen: Worth noting is the addition of a Zoom connection for public participation in this weekend's Commission meeting. Thank you for adding this capability. For years NDOW has struggled with video conferencing, never arriving at a permanent solution. Zoom, plus still-needed telephone call-in capacity, bridge the distance gap cost effectively for everyone. Even when the Commission reverts to in-person meetings at some point, continuing to offer this capability, regardless of the meeting location, becomes important so that interested people do not need to spend money out of their own pockets to travel to distant and remote meeting locations. Ensuring the completeness of a petition cannot be equated with acting as judge and jury, only that all the elements necessary for successful submission are present. Thank you.

Jonathan Lesperance, private citizen: Good afternoon Madam Chair and members of the Commission. I just wanted to say that I was quite sorry to not be able to be present yesterday for the petition. I had a work obligation that I couldn't get out of. I went back and listened to the two and half hours of discourse this morning and I was really impressed with the quality of the conservation, in particular, Commissioner's McNinch and Hubbs on their thoughtful comments, I appreciate that. Even the petition, Ms. Smith, she's always challenged me to think about my own biases and convictions, I appreciate the level of thought that went into it. I would like to just briefly speak about some of the other public comments and the repetition of barbaric practice and remind this Commission that about three years ago, I brought forward some of the threats made against me and my family when we talk about bear cubs being orphaned, I would just like to... that with comments that called for my death so that my children can see what it's like to be an orphan. Let's keep those things in context when we talk about "barbarianism" and again, a standing offer to anyone on the Commission to join me on a hunt so you can see for yourself what goes into a hound hunt and decide for yourself whether its barbaric or not. I appreciate the discourse and thank you for this comment.

Chairwoman East concluded the public comment period. Thanked everyone for great dialogue and stated the Commission accomplished some good stuff this weekend.

Adjourned, 5:13pm.

\*Support material provided and posted to the NDOW website, and updates to support material will be posted at [http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Com/Agenda/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Com/Agenda/). Support material for this meeting may be requested from the Recording Secretary at (775) 688-1599 or [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org). In accordance with NRS 241.020 this agenda closes three days prior to the meeting date and has been posted on the NDOW website at [http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Com/Agenda/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Com/Agenda/).

Notice to the Public: Nevada Department of Wildlife receives Federal Aid in Fish and/or Wildlife Restoration. The U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, gender, or disability. Individuals with hearing impairment may contact the Department at 775-688-1500 via a text telephone (TTY) telecommunications device by first calling the State of Nevada Relay Operator at 1-800-326-6868. Disabled individuals in need of special services should contact the Department prior to the meeting at (775) 688-1599 or [wildlifecommission@ndow.org](mailto:wildlifecommission@ndow.org).