



Administrative Assistant Ali Medina  
Diversity Division Administrator Jen Newmark  
Staff Specialist Cody McKee  
Management Analyst Megan Manfredi  
Staff Game Warden Jake Kreamer  
Fisheries Division Administrator Chris Crookshanks  
Wildlife Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder  
Administrative Assistant Amanda Perez  
Data and Technology Services Division Administrator Kim Munoz  
Conservation Education Division Administrator Chris Vasey

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott  
Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne  
Conservation Educator Julie Bless  
Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson  
Staff Game Warden Brian Bowles  
Biologist Caleb McAdoo  
Biologist Tom Donham  
Administrative Assistant Cindy Alexander

Public in Attendance:

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW  
Joe Crim, Pershing CABMW  
Steve Robinson, Washoe CABMW  
Coby Rowe, Washoe CABMW  
Gene Green, Carson CABMW  
Tony Gildone, Humboldt CABMW  
Therese Campbell, Clark CABMW  
Bert Gurr, Elko CABMW  
Brian Burriss, self  
Christina Brennan, self  
Don Molde, self  
Clint McGarr, self  
Jana Hofeditz, self  
Ron Stoker, self  
Kristen Kirkpatrick, self  
Larry Staley, self  
Mark Maffey, self  
Mauricia Baca, self  
Thomas Turk, self  
Janette Dean, self  
Tom Green, self  
Bryce Pollock, self  
Patrick Donnelly, self  
Jeff Dixon, self  
William Gardner, self  
Kyle Davis, self  
Cathy Smith, self  
Brian Beffort, self  
Dillon Pollock, self  
Cheyanne Neuffer, self  
Al Morris, self  
Shandon Matheson, self  
Jason Wasden, self  
Bobbie McCullum, self  
David Parsons, self  
Carl Erquiaga, self  
Amy Alonzo, self

Glenn Bunch, Mineral CABMW  
Mitch McVicars, White Pine CABMW  
Matt Malarkey, Washoe CABMW  
Craig Burnside, Douglas CABMW  
Dan Gilbert, Clark CABMW  
John Tibbetts, Lincoln CABMW  
Cory Lytle, Lincoln CABMW  
Mike Reese, self  
Carol Schaye, self  
Christine Saunders, self  
Fred Voltz, self  
Jana Wright, self  
Fauna Tomlinson, self  
Judy Larquier, self  
Larry Ish, self  
Logan Christian, self  
Daniel Davis, self  
Rex Flowers, self  
Chris Garnett, self  
Rich Gonzalez, self  
Karen Boeger, self  
Rebekah Stetson, self  
Camilla Fox, self  
Peter Moo, self  
Rachel Rakaczky, self  
Elaine Carrick, self  
Diego Alaniz, self  
Trish Swain, self  
Shawn Paterson, self  
Gary Kilbourn, self  
William Gardner, self  
Dan Rutherford, self  
David Ricker, self  
Christopher Smith, self  
Joel Blakeslee, self  
Chris Hagan, self

**Friday, November 5, 2021 – 8:00 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**

Chairwoman East called the meeting to order at 8:08am. Commissioner Wise led Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance. NDOW Executive Assistant Missy Stanford called the roll of the Commission. Chairwoman East noted the CABMW members 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 moved agenda item #12, Interim Heritage Project Proposal Review to be heard after agenda item #9, Adjustment to Meeting Intervals for Coordination and Oversight Teams responsible for Overseeing Existing Elk Management Sub-Plan.

No public comment.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA NOTING CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES. MOTION PASSED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS KIEL, ALMBERG AND PIERINI ABSENT.**

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

Commission minutes may be approved from the September 24, 2021 meeting.

Commissioner McNinch noted minor changes.

No public comment.

**COMMISSIONER ROGERS MOVED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 24, 2021 MEETING MINUTES WITH THE NOTED CHANGES. SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR CAVIGLIA. MOTION PASSED 6-0. COMMISSIONERS KIEL, ALMBERG AND PIERINI 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 noted the amount of correspondence she received regarding CGR 503 and the Interim Heritage Project Proposal. She explained that all correspondence had been sent to NDOW.

Secretary Wasley explained that any correspondence received by the Department is forwarded to the Commissioners. He stated that the Department is in the process of developing two letters of gratitude to the Coast Guard for the Silver Life Saving Medal that Warden Sean Flynn received and to several law enforcement entities that assisted with the recent rescue and recovery over the Eastern part of the state, the drowning of kayakers. He stated that the Department has had ongoing correspondence pertaining to the First Come First Serve program. He explained that the Department has seen “suspicious activity”

where individuals are developing strategies and workarounds to gain an unfair advantage to obtain tags and the Department has had communication with individuals to remedy that, so we do not have a few individuals taking away an opportunity for the vast majority. He stated that the Department recently encountered challenges in the new tag deferral regulation. He explained that due to misinterpretation and misapplication of the regulation, several hunters were informed that they were eligible for a tag deferral but upon reinterpretation of the regulation, the Department found them ineligible. He explained that the Department has been working with those affected and the Attorney General's Office to remedy the situation. He stated that the Department is committed to making the situation right within the guise of the law and the intent of the regulation. He explained that he did not fault staff and that training to interpret regulations has been implemented for staff so that this does not happen again.

Commissioner Rogers asked if it would be prudent to simplify the language of the regulation to decrease the possibility for misinterpretation.

Secretary Wasley answered that simplifying the regulation and bringing it back before the Commission is what the Department would like to do. He explained some of the nuances of the current regulation's language are not as clear as it could be.

Commissioner Barnes stated that it was important to try to make the intent of regulations as clear as possible so there is no misinterpretation.

- 5. County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Member Items – Informational**  
CABMW members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Commission. Any item requiring Commission action will be scheduled on a future Commission agenda.

No CABMW items.

**6. Reports - Informational**

*Commissioner Almborg joined the meeting.*

- A. Department Activity Report – Secretary Wasley and Division Administrators**  
A report will be provided on Nevada Department of Wildlife activities.

**DIRECTOR'S OFFICE**

Director Wasley attended the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership (TRCP) Virtual Capital Conservation Awards Dinner which honored Senator Cortez Masto for conservation achievements for her fight to protect Nevada's Ruby Mountains.

The Legislative Commission adopted the Landowner Compensation Tag Regulation (CGR 488), the Shed Antler Regulation (CGR 489), and NAC 501 Simplification (CGR 494) on Friday October 22, 2021.

**GAME DIVISION**

**Mule Deer Enhancement Program:** Field trips and meetings for Mule Deer Enhancement have been completed in most of the areas. A total of 34 project proposals have been received for review by the Oversight Committee. An Oversight Committee meeting was scheduled for October 27<sup>th</sup> to prioritize project proposals submitted by the various subcommittees. Finalizing the Charter and Scoring Matrices were also agenda items for the Mule Deer Oversight Committee meeting on October 27<sup>th</sup>.

**Bighorn Sheep Surveys:** Both California and Desert bighorn surveys have been conducted for many of our sheep herds. Many herds appear to have contracted due to continued drought conditions during 2021. Four water developments have been observed to be dry in two mountain ranges and we are in

discussions about whether to address those projects immediately or to wait to see if these areas will receive any precipitation this week.

**CWD Check Stations:** Game Division personnel have participated in CWD check stations in Ely, Wells, and Alamo. Mulls Meats in Las Vegas is a great source of CWD samples. To date, a total of 90 samples have been collected. We are seeking to create innovative ways to obtain additional samples from successful deer and elk hunters.

**Bighorn Sheep Plan Update:** The Bighorn Sheep Plan Committee has been formed and has begun holding meetings to update the 2001 Bighorn Sheep Plan. The revised plan will include Mountain Goats as well to be more of a mountain ungulate document.

**State Wildlife Action Plan Game Division Species Matrix:** Game Division staff have spent a significant amount of time discussing and revising the matrix for Game species. The criteria for ranking species should be revised but is sufficient to create a meaningful list of species in need of conservation.

**Personnel changes:** The Game Division has hired Josh Kirk for the Eastern & Southern region Landowner Comp Tag biologist position and Cheyenne Acevedo for the Wildlife Tech position in Elko. They will both be starting within the next couple weeks. Also, Samantha Fino has accepted the Eureka game biologist position and will officially start in January.

**Big Game Management Objectives:** Game Division staff are close to completing the updated document, formerly called the Harvest Guidelines. This document provides guiding language for the Game Division to follow for season dates and quota recommendations.

**Commission Policy 24 and 26A:** Game Division staff have been directed to revise these two Commission Policies, which have become outdated. Commission Policy 24 describes Hunting Opportunities Among Weapons and Hunter Groups and Commission Policy 26A describes Game Division Transparency for Big Game Data.

## **HABITAT DIVISION**

**Wildlife Management Areas (WMA):** Waterfowl season is now open in all 3 zones with October 16th being the 1<sup>st</sup> day of the season at many of NDOW's WMA's. Mason Valley reported 47 hunters averaging 2.62 birds, Carson Lake had 56 hunters averaging 1.64 birds per hunter. Kirch WMA was the most popular with 118 hunters and an average of 2.53 birds per hunter.

**WMA Reservations:** Reservation draws to guarantee access on the opening day of waterfowl season at Key Pittman WMA (Oct. 16) and the first two waterfowl hunt days at Overton WMA (Oct. 30 and Nov. 2) were conducted with assistance from DATS staff. The success rate of receiving a reservation for one of the 39 available hunting blinds at Overton was 75 on opening day and increased to 95 percent for the second hunt day, 75 percent of the applicants were successful for Key Pittman which is limited to 55 hunters on opening day. A slight decrease in applications were received this year with a total of 124 for all three hunt days as compared to 136 received in 2020.

**Lander County Commission:** Habitat Staff recently attended the Lander County Commission meeting to present a requested PowerPoint on Smart-From-The-Start renewable energy planning. Also, at this time NDOW presented and requested County support for a property acquisition opportunity north of Battle Mountain. The current owner of the Licking Ranch approached NDOW to see if we would be interested in purchasing the property with intent to maintain the wildlife conservation values of the property.

**Technical Review:** Currently staff are reviewing the following note-worthy public land projects: Goldrush draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); Diamond APD oil & gas exploration Environmental

Assessment (EA); South Railroad Mine EIS; Mountain Home AFB Optimization EIS; Greenlink West transmission project EIS; Cross-Tie transmission project EIS; Gibellini Mine EIS; and the White Pine Pumped Storage geotechnical study project as well as numerous others.

**Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team:** The Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team is currently reviewing and finalizing four Credit Project Management Plans, which when completed will establish approximately 6,500 saleable credits. There are two new potential credit projects working with the SETT to determine program eligibility for enrollment within the Conservation Credit System. Two credit transactions have occurred recently, with several more in the negotiation stage.

**Restoration and Rehabilitation:** Wildfire restoration projects are well under way with approximately 26,158 acres of herbicide treatments nearly and approximately 27,123 acres of seeding treatments in the hopper to be seeded this fall.

### **CONSERVATION EDUCATION DIVISION**

**Classroom Programming:** Our conservation educators have been busy actively engaging classrooms through our various programs. Most of these programs are still being facilitated virtually with in-person experiences being limited to outdoor programming.

Two pilot classroom programs will be launching in the Spring with teacher's being trained and recruited late fall. The first pilot is called 'Wildlife Badges' and is aligned to standards for all grades. To earn the 'badges', the program lessons will be hosted on a Google site so that teachers can facilitate in their classrooms. So far, we have had A LOT of interest from teachers in piloting this program.

The second pilot is called 'Bird Trunk' and is aligned to standards for grades 6-8. The trunk contains everything a classroom will need to go birding: binoculars, bird feeders, field guides, bird skulls and an associated curriculum. Teachers will be trained on Bird ID and how to submit their classroom's observations to eBird.

**Events:** The conservation education staff in the Western Region has partnered with Renown's Sterling Silver Club to help create events to help better connect people to nature. The first event was held in October as a guided nature walk at the Oxbow Nature Study Area. The event was well received by the club members and more similar events have been added to the calendar.

**Urban Wildlife:** Work is being done to have an Urban Wildlife pilot program ready to launch next Fall and the program is aligned to high school standards.

**Outreach:** In late September, Conservation Education staff sent multiple emails promoting the youth chukar hunt which fell on National/Nevada Hunting and Fishing Day. One email went to hunter education graduates and the other went to lapsed license holders. The Nevada Department of Wildlife also celebrated National/Nevada Hunting and Fishing Day on social media with multiple posts, including the Governor's recent proclamation naming Nevada Hunting and Fishing Day in recognition of hunters' contributions to conservation.

In October, Conservation Education staff sent a mass email to 93,000 hunters promoting the waterfowl hunting seasons and a reminder to purchase a federal duck stamp. An email was also sent to all hunting license holders informing them on that state's regulations surrounding Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) prevention, CWD check stations and other sampling efforts that help the department prevent the spread of CWD into Nevada. Staff also posted multiple social media posts and recorded a podcast informing the public about CWD and the department's check stations.

Conservation Education staff worked on multiple press releases which included the announcement of Director Tony Wasley being named president of the Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies (AFWA), Nevada becoming the 39<sup>th</sup> state to create a multi-agency cooperative research institute, an interagency press release on bears entering hyperphagia before denning for the winter, and an invitation to the Department of Wildlife's Ducks and Donuts event.

Staff also submitted multiple articles that were recently published as part of Edible Reno-Tahoe's Fall publication which was primarily focused on hunting and wild food. This is exciting news because Edible Reno-Tahoe distributes approximately 20,000 publications per quarterly issue to 13 different counties. Our staff's stories focused on teaching our youth to hunt responsibly and what the steps are to start hunting.

**Media Highlight:** In October, the department had a print audience of 6,154,870, a radio audience of 120,434 and a National TV audience of 97,133. Stories included bear activity interviews with Public Information Officers on KOLO 8 News, the Las Vegas Sun, News 4 in Reno, KNPR, and Carson Now, a story on coyote sightings in Henderson by Fox 5 News in Las Vegas, and a story on how to properly dispose of pumpkins so they don't impact local wildlife on KOLO 8 News. The department was also featured in multiple segments on PBS' Outdoor Nevada throughout the month.

### **WILDLIFE DIVERSITY DIVISION**

**Fall Shorebird Surveys:** Three fall shorebird surveys were conducted in the Lahontan Valley by NDOW, Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge and Lahontan Audubon volunteers between August 10 and September 3. The August 10 Lahontan Valley survey observed the highest visitation by total shorebirds, with 12,195 birds observed. The majority of these birds (10,798) were documented at Carson Lake Wildlife Management Area.

**Dark Kangaroo Mouse:** The dark kangaroo mouse is a state species of conservation priority and a sensitive species for our federal partners, most notably the Bureau of Land Management. This species is presumed to be rare, existing in more specialized habitat types and in small, fragmented populations throughout the state. Diversity biologists recently conducted nocturnal small mammal trapping in low-elevation sagebrush and salt desert scrub at seven sites in northwest Nevada. We captured dark kangaroo mouse in four locations, increasing our knowledge of habitat preferences and distribution across the region in preparation for additional trapping efforts in 2022.

**Valley of Fire BioBlitz:** Diversity biologists helped conduct a BioBlitz at the Valley of Fire State Park on Sept 19<sup>th</sup>. NDOW led multiple hiking groups and provided training on how to survey for, capture, and handle reptiles. Roughly 175 people were educated on training techniques as well as snake and Gila monster ecology. With this success, we have already scheduled another bio-blitz for the spring. Data collected by these volunteer efforts will assist us in both species and habitat modeling.

**American Pika:** Diversity biologists surveyed multiple talus patches at the summit of Mount Siegel in the Pine Nut Range and confirmed that pikas currently occupy the highest elevations of this mountain range. This is our first confirmed sightings of pika being present in the Pine Nuts. This information aids our understanding of pika occupancy and persistence in isolated mountain ranges in our state.

**Bats at Lake Tahoe:** Ultrasonic bat detectors were deployed in multiple locations in Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park in 2021 to learn more about bat species richness and activity levels under two unique sets of circumstances. Detectors were deployed in summer to study the effects of tree removal on forest-associated bat species, and detectors were deployed in fall to study the change in species composition and activity during fall migration. Data analysis is pending.

**Spotted Owls:** More than 36,000 acres of high-quality habitat were surveyed throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin and surrounding Carson Range in 2021. A total of three spotted owls were found during surveys, including a mated pair within Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park. This pair was observed using areas of the park where they had not been seen in previous years, which helped expand our knowledge of habitats that need to be managed for spotted owls. That pair was also observed both inside and outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, which highlights the need for cross-jurisdictional conservation measures since the Lake Tahoe Basin boundary separates two National Forests (LTBMU and Humboldt-Toiyabe) and two U.S. Forest Service Regions (Region 5 and 4). NDOW has already met with Nevada Division of Forestry foresters to discuss fuel reduction projects in the state park where spotted owl activity has been occurring, which will help protect crucial habitat from wildfire while attempting to retain forest characteristics that spotted owls need.

## **FISHERIES DIVISION**

The Fisheries Division has been busy with field biologists transitioning from wrapping up 2021 field season survey activities to office time conducting data analysis and writing annual reports. The Fisheries division has been busy filling several vacancies statewide. We are proud to announce that C. J. Ellingwood recently accepted the position of Eastern Region Fisheries Biologist in charge of Columbia River Drainage streams (Bull Trout, Redband Trout, Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout) while Kim Tisdale recently promoted to our Staff Fisheries Biologist in charge of Sportfish for Nevada. Both individuals bring a wealth of knowledge, strong work ethics, and great attitudes to their respective positions. We are certain they both will excel in their new roles.

**Fish Hatcheries:** All hatcheries have been extremely busy fulfilling needs for annual fall stocking. Some trout allocations were adjusted due to low water levels caused by the ongoing drought. Gallagher Hatchery will soon be gearing up for annual spawning activities in December.

**Aquatic Invasive Species Program:** Southern Nevada AIS stations are still fully operational as the boating season continues. The AIS station at Topaz Lake also remain operational due to a positive hit for a veliger in samples collected from Walker Lake. Because quagga mussels cannot survive in the alkaline waters of the lake, it is assumed the veliger was washed down from somewhere upstream. Additional samples are being collected from all upstream rivers and reservoirs. NDOW AIS personnel assisted the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe during an extremely busy October first fishing season opener at Pyramid Lake.

**Water Conditions:** Fisheries statewide have received a much-needed break as daytime temperatures have cooled with the beginning of autumn. Although some localized fish kills were documented, many waters have weathered ongoing drought conditions surprisingly well. Because many of the state's most popular fisheries currently sit all all-time lows, much needed wintertime precipitation will be crucial to sustain many fisheries next year. We are all thinking, wishing, hoping, and praying for rain and snow.

**Eastern Region Fisheries:** Eastern Region personnel have been busy wrapping up stream, lake, and reservoir survey work before the snow flies. Fall reservoir electrofishing and gill net surveys have been conducted to assess how many of northeastern fisheries have weathered ongoing drought conditions. NDOW personnel assisted Great Basin Nation Park employees with the installation of alternative beaver dam analogs in streams containing Bonneville Cutthroat Trout in White Pine County subsequent to recent wildfires. Our WP County biologist is currently assisting the local Ely Rotary Club in planning effort for their annual ice fishing derby. The derby helps fund local scholarships and has been cancelled the previous two winters.

**Southern Region Fisheries:** As many Fisheries field activities are concluding in the northern part of the state, fall marks the heart of the field season at many southern Nevada waters. Las Vegas Fisheries personnel are still busy with survey and monitoring activities for a host of native aquatic species down

south. Similarly, as hot summertime temperatures begin to drop, fishing activity at many Southern Region waters has picked up considerably. A number of bass tournaments have recently been held at Lake Mead.

**Western Region Fisheries:** Granite Construction recently completed a new bottomless culvert at the spawning station at Marlette Lake. The new culvert will facilitate upstream movement of Rainbow Trout and Lahontan Cutthroat Trout during the springtime spawning period. Relative to ongoing drought conditions, recent eDNA survey work in Humboldt County showed persistence of LCT populations in a number of streams where it was thought they had possibly blinked out. Western Region and Reno HQ Fisheries personnel are reviewing the EPA Proposed Plan for the Carson River OU2 Superfund Site (that portion of the Carson River from Mound House to its terminus in the Lahontan Valley including Lahontan Reservoir, Stillwater NWR and Carson Lake). The EPA recommendations affecting NDOW include recommendations to discontinue permitting the commercial harvest of Sacramento blackfish for human consumption, and to discontinue stocking of game fish in the Carson River and Lahontan Reservoir. NDOW Staff will be attending coordination meeting and providing comments in November.

### **DATA AND TECHNOLOGY SERVICES DIVISION**

**Hunts & Licensing:** The Hunts & Licensing staff completely transition to a new call center phone system called Bright Pattern and have been assisting the Habitat Division with taking the Overton WMA duck blind reservations. Staff completed the draft of the 2022 Big Game Application dates for the CR that will be presented to the Commission in January. They also have been working on the business requirements for Kalkomey to add functionality into the system that would allow Master Guides to log in and see which of their clients have applied during the Non-resident Guided Hunt application period, as well as view their results through the system. This feature would only allow a guide to see their own clients and not clients signed up under another Master Guide.

In conjunction with the Law Enforcement Division, staff worked on identifying the necessary regulation changes that would have to occur to implement e-Tags in 2023. Our hope is to have this CGR to the January Commission for consideration.

In conjunction with the Game Division, staff have worked to update Commission Policy 24, as well as the specialty tag unit closures procedure for big horn sheep. Both were presented to the TAACH Committee early this week.

In conjunction with the ConEd Division, staff worked to finalize the 2022 Vessel Registration postcards that will go out to boat owners on December 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Geographic Information System:** The Geographic Information System staff created a new automated tool and dashboard for viewing harvest survey results and harvest check-in data. They also created a tool to allow Fisheries staff to automatically update the fishable waters map.

They updated the Overton WMA Blind Reservation spreadsheet and trained the call center staff on how to use it and they helped with quality control on the raptor nest observation data.

Lastly, they started the process of gathering the business requirements for building a new urban wildlife log.

**Information Technology:** Finally, the Information Technology staff finished the upgrade to the internet for the Ely office, as well as giving that building full wireless capabilities. They also got the Lake Mead Fish Hatchery onto the state network. Lastly, they assisted Habitat staff with setting up a new sound database and assisted the Las Vegas ConEd staff with setting up all new shooting range training rooms.

### **LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION**

**Wildlife Investigations:** Game wardens, the OGT program and reserve game wardens teamed up to conduct unit watches and saturation patrols over three separate weekend periods in each Area 10, Area 07, and Area 26.

An Eastern Region game warden and a Western Region game warden each assisted in the investigation of a big game animal that was reported as diseased and unfit for human consumption. One was near Battle Mountain, and one was harvested in Area 07 but transported to Reno.

Western Region game wardens have responded to and assisted with many nuisance bear calls, and multiple injured or urban deer calls near Reno, Carson City and Tahoe. Multiple feeding big game incidents are being investigated near Minden. An injured eagle was recovered near Fallon and sent to a rehabilitation facility.

Eastern Region game wardens responded to a reported sick deer where samples were collected because the deer had died near the Ruby Marsh.

Eastern Region game wardens conducted a decoy operation with a deer on Harrison Pass. No persons attempted to unlawfully take the deer.

Eastern Region game wardens investigated five separate cases (two elk, one antelope and two deer) following an individual self-reporting incidents for improper sex or physical characteristics for the animal harvested versus what was allowed on their hunting tag.

Eastern Region game wardens are investigating a waste of game case regarding waterfowl left in a pick-up truck for multiple days in Elko, two shot and left antelope near Battle Mountain, multiple big game animals reported to be harvested on private property, a shot and left doe in Area 06, a shot and left bull elk in Area 06, a dead bull elk in Area 11, a report of an individual killing deer on the Ruby Lake NWR, a shot and left deer near Eureka and a reported waste of game case near Battle Mountain.

Eastern Region game wardens responded to a report of a subject actively shooting at antelope on the road, multiple trespass issues, and one Warden contacted an individual who had just harvested an antelope in the wrong unit.

Western Region game wardens investigated the possible unlawful killing of a black bear near Reno, a residency fraud case, multiple trespass issues, a possible poached deer which appears to show signs of disease, and two separate dead bear calls.

Four Western Region game wardens contacted 270 hunters over one weekend during the sage grouse hunt.

Southern Region game warden are investigating the unlawful harvest of a mule deer, addressed trespass issues, dealt with multiple urban wildlife issues near Panaca, assisted in a livestock depredation issue near Alamo, investigating a deceased ram, and responded to a self-report physical characteristics violation harvest near Tonopah.

Game wardens received a conviction in the Higbee case in White Pine County. This case resulted from multiple electronic warrants, surveillance, and a warrant at the subject's residence in Fallon. The results were:

1. A felony conviction on a bull elk, resulting in 90 days in county jail (Higbee was taken into custody in the court room), a \$1000 fine, a \$10,000 civil penalty, and 12-36 months' probation following his jail time.

2. A gross misdemeanor on an antelope, resulting in a \$1000 fine and \$1000 civil penalty with nine months' probation.

A game warden received a conviction in a poaching case, following an in-field arrest from this past Memorial Day in Lincoln County. Bairley was convicted of felony poaching which includes a \$4,000 fine and 56 days in jail.

**Boating Safety Patrol:** A Southern Region game warden arrested a subject for operating under the influence on Lake Mead.

A Southern Region game warden investigated multiple different watercraft collisions.

A Southern Region game warden rescued two individuals who were stranded with their paddle craft due to high winds at Katherines Landing.

A Southern Region game warden assisted in rescuing a sinking vessel on Lake Mead. Upon getting the vessel safely to the launch ramp the operator realized that the drain plug was not installed.

**Public Safety:** A Southern Region game warden assisted Clark County Parks Police and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department with a search for a potentially suicidal subject in the Las Vegas Wetlands.

An Eastern Region game warden assisted local agencies with following up on a sighting of a nationally wanted suspect near the Bruneau River area. The report was unfounded.

A Southern Region game warden responded to a motor vehicle collision with Nye County Sheriff's Office. One subject was deceased on scene and the other was airlifted to Reno.

A Southern Region game warden assisted Lincoln County Sheriff's Office with locating a stolen vehicle.

A Southern Region game warden participated in Law Enforcement Night Out in Mesquite.

Two Eastern Region game wardens were in the area of a wildland fire and assisted in directing County and Bureau of Land Management units to the fire.

A Western Region Game warden found and revived an unconscious man near our Carson City NDOW yard. The man was taken by EMS to the hospital.

Two Southern Region game wardens were the first on scene to a vehicle fire in the Spring Mountains and assisted with the efforts.

Western Region game wardens assisted in two separate investigations surrounding threats made to persons over wildlife concerns.

**Headquarters:** Three game wardens continued their training as instructors in Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training (ALERRT) to be able to teach active shooter response to the Game wardens of Nevada in the environments they work.

A game warden captain and our Law Enforcement Public Information Officer attended the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators (NASBLA) Conference in Pittsburgh. Game warden captain Brian Bowles, the State of Nevada Boating Law Administrator, was appointed to the NASBLA Executive Board.

Two game wardens have become instructors and have started training game wardens in de-escalation tactics as a new effort in law enforcement protocols and procedures for handling calls with the public.

The Chief Game Warden and game warden captains held meetings with all field personnel and game warden Lieutenants in each NDOW Region.

A game warden captain and Western Region game warden Lieutenant held a regional meeting with law enforcement partners on the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe regarding this boating season and future plans for training and response to incidents.

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

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

Senior Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Burkett gave a report on the Departments litigation. *A copy of the report can be found on the NDOW website.* He stated that there is an update the litigation report explaining that since submitting the report the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed a dismissal from the District Court of the challenge to Nevada’s predator management program, specifically the statute dealing with the 80 percent mandate for reform of predators. He stated that Tony Walsh is going to take over handling of all the Department of Wildlife’s water law cases, filling Tori Sundheim’s position.

**C. Wayne E. Kirch 2018 Award Presentation – Chairwoman East**

Chairwoman East will present the 2021 Wayne E. Kirch Award that acknowledges a deserving individual, nonprofit organization, outdoor sports club, or business who have achieved significant results toward the conservation, management, or enhancement of wildlife in the State of Nevada during the last calendar year.

Chairwoman East noted a change to the agenda item, the dates should be 2020.

Secretary Wasley gave a background on Wayne E. Kirch and the Kirch award.

Chairwoman East presented the Wayne E. Kirch award to Len Warren.

**D. Predation Management Fiscal Year 2021 Report – Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson**

The Game Division will present the 2021 Predation Management Report Per Commission Policy 23, the Department shall prepare an annual Predation Management Status Report (Status Report) detailing results of the previous fiscal year’s projects. This status report shall be presented at the last Commission meeting of each calendar year.

Wildlife Staff Specialist Pat Jackson presented the Predation Management Fiscal Year 2021 Report. *The Predation Management Fiscal Year 2021 Report can be found on the NDOW Website.*

Dr. Peter Mahoney gave a presentation on Project 42 of the Predation Management Report *A copy of the Project 42 presentation can be found on the NDOW website.*

Dr. David Stoner and Dr. Kate Schoenecker gave a presentation on Project 44 of the Predation Management Report. *A copy of the Project 44 presentation can be found on the NDOW website.*

Dr. Sean Sultaire gave a presentation on Project 46 of the Predation Management Report. *A copy of the Project 46 presentation can be found on the NDOW website.*

Commissioner Pierini joined the meeting.

Break 10:38 – 10:55

**E. Tag Allocation and Application Hunt Committee (TAAHC) Report – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia**

A report will be provided on the recent TAAHC meeting. *Committee webpage:*  
[http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Committees/Tag\\_Allocation\\_and\\_Application\\_Hunt/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Committees/Tag_Allocation_and_Application_Hunt/)

Committee Chairman Caviglia gave a report on the November 3, 2021 TAAHC Committee meeting.

**F. Mule Deer Enhancement Oversight Committee – Chairman Kiel and Game Division Administrator Mike Scott**

A report will be provided on the recent Mule Deer Enhancement Oversight Committee meeting. *Committee webpage:*  
[http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Committees/Mule\\_Deer\\_Enhancement\\_Oversight\\_Committee/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Committees/Mule_Deer_Enhancement_Oversight_Committee/)

Game Division Administrator Mike Scott gave a report on the October 27, 2021 Mule Deer Enhancement Oversight Committee.

**7. Administrative Procedures, Regulations and Policy (APRP) Committee Report – Chairman McNinch**

A report will be provided on the recent APRP Committee meeting. *Committee webpage:*  
[http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Committees/Administrative\\_Procedures\\_Regulations\\_and\\_Policy/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Committees/Administrative_Procedures_Regulations_and_Policy/)

Committee Chairman McNinch gave a report on the November 4, 2021 APRP Committee meeting.

**A. \*Commission Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission – First Reading – APRP Committee Chairman David McNinch – For Possible Action**

The Commission will have a first reading of Commission Policy 1, General Guidelines for the Commission, and may take action to repeal or revise the policy. The Commission may advance the policy to a second reading for possible adoption at a future meeting.

Management Analyst Kailey Musso explained that Commission Policy 1 was amended and updated to reflect changes to the Wildlife Trust Fund made in the 2021 Legislative Session. She explained that NDOW's bill provided a provision to allow an exemption for the Department to accept money in the Wildlife Trust Fund; the Department can accept only \$250,000 per emergency event and there were circumstances in the provision. She added that the Department must submit an annual report containing; (a) the unanticipated emergency event for which the gift, donation, bequest, or devise was received, (b) the amount of the gift, donation, bequest, or devise, (c) the amount of the gift, donation, bequest, or devise that was expended for the unanticipated emergency event and (d) the private source from which the gift, donation, bequest, or devise was received.

No public comment.

**NO VOTE TAKEN.**

**B. \*Commission Policy 10, Heritage Tags and Vendors – First Reading – APRP Committee Chairman David McNinch – For Possible Action**

The Commission will have a first reading of Commission Policy 10, Heritage Tags and Vendors, and may take action to repeal or revise the policy. The commission may advance the policy to a second reading for possible adoption at a future meeting.

Committee Chairman McNinch and Management Analyst Musso reviewed Commission Policy 10. [Management Analyst Musso shared her screen, the support material on the website was unclear when converted to PDF]. She explained the update to 1, to read “the first scheduled February Commission meeting of the calendar year,” added (g) An explanation of if or how the auction will take place online or via phone and removed number 6.

No public comment.

#### **NO VOTE TAKEN.**

#### **8. Modernization of the Statewide Elk Species Management Plan – Staff Specialist Cody McKee – For Possible Action**

The Nevada Elk Species Management Plan (ESMP) was approved in 1997. Over the last 25 years, the Department has adopted various techniques, technologies, and harvest guidance designed to improve elk management in Nevada and some of these practices are not specifically described within the ESMP. Further, certain portions of the ESMP may be outdated and may require revision. The Department requests the Commission’s approval to begin the evaluation and review process of the ESMP.

Staff Specialist McKee reviewed the Nevada Elk Species Plan and requested the Commission’s permission to begin an evaluation and review process. He explained that the request to do so is stipulated within the statewide plan.

Chairwoman East asked about the process and timeline.

Staff Specialist McKee answered that it would be a 12–18-month process as the plan has not been updated in a long time. He stated that he plans on contacting the prospective steering committee members and begin to hold meetings, identifying the areas of the plan that they would like to review or update and then begin the full revision process. He expects that there will be several committee meetings to revise and update the plan before presenting the final plan to the Commission for approval.

Vice Chair Caviglia asked if the steering committee will be comprised of more than Department staff.

Staff Specialist McKee answered that the majority of the steering committee members are comprised of outside folks from different entities including NGOs, the Cattlemen’s Association, land management agencies, and the Department will comprise a small portion of the steering committee.

*No public comment.*

#### **COMMISSIONER ALMBERG MOVED TO APPROVE AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR CAVIGLIA. MOTION PASSES 8-0, COMMISSIONER KIEL ABSENT.**

#### **9. Adjustments to Meeting Intervals for Coordination and Oversight Teams responsible for Overseeing Existing Elk Management Sub-Plan – Staff Specialist Cody McKee – For Possible Action**

Language in several local elk management sub-plans stipulate the Coordination Oversight Team (COT) hold annual meetings to discuss various aspects of elk management within the planning area. Achieving a voting quorum during these meetings has been difficult in recent years. The

Department requests the Commission's approval to hold COT meetings with requested by team members of to address emerging management needs rather than on an annual basis.

Staff Specialist McKee requested the Commission's permission to hold COT meetings as needed to address emerging management needs rather than on an annual basis. He explained the difficulties of getting the committee together over the last couple of years and has found that in recent years, the need to hold more meeting is becoming more of a requirement of the sub-plans.

Commissioner McNinch asked if the Department has reached out to the landowners.

Staff Specialist McKee stated that he had not reached out to the landowners that may be affected by this protentional change. He stated that from his perspective, this is an accelerated way for landowners to provide their input. He stated that if the change is approved, letters can be sent out to the coordination team members and other affected entities to inform them of the new process, should the need arise.

*No public comment.*

Commissioner Barnes stated that he likes the idea of having meetings as needed rather than an annual basis to be able to address things before they become major issues.

**COMMISSIONER ROGERS MOVED TO APPROVE AS PROPOSED. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCNINCH. MOTION PASSES 8-0, COMMISSIONER KIEL ABSENT.**

**12. Interim Heritage Project Proposal Review – Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne – For Possible Action**

The Commission will hear an interim heritage project proposal from the Department. The Department has an opportunity to purchase the 1,550 acre Licking Ranch north of Battle Mountain in Lander County to provide match for Pittman Robertson funds.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan Jenne gave a presentation on the Interim Heritage Project Proposal for the 1,550 acre Licking Ranch north of Battle Mountain in Lander County to provide match for Pittman Robertson funds. *A copy of the presentation can be found on the NDOW website.*

Commissioner Almberg asked if leasing grazing right generated sufficient revenue to cover the taxes of that property.

Habitat Division Administrator Alan answered that the Department has the Pittman Robertson grant for management areas and the Habitat Division gets a substantial portion of the budget to sustain and manage and staff those properties.

Commissioner Pierini stated that he likes the purchase of the Licking Ranch. He stated that he knows that it will be a lot of work but is worth it and knows the public will enjoy its use.

Vice Chair Caviglia asked about the timeline to get the Licking Ranch designated as a Wildlife Management Area. He asked about the condition of the property and if there were anticipated costs to the Department.

Habitat Administrator Jenne explained that there are two old dilapidated mobile homes on the property that will need to be removed and the Department has asked Land Acquisition to include in the purchase agreement that those are off the property. He stated that there is a shop on the property that is currently being used and the Department would continue to use that building. He stated that there would be small costs, including management of the weeds on the property. He explained that once that acquisition is

completed, the Department would modify Commission Policy 65 to include the property as a Wildlife Management Area as designated by the Commission and include it in the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC). He stated that the intent is to get the acquisition finalized in early 2022 and he anticipated that it would be designated by the end of 2022.

Commissioner Barnes stated that the livestock industry has major concerns with private property being sold to government entities but also believes it's not their business to tell the owner what to do. He explained that they like that the Department want to leave the agriculture, but they would like to see it in writing and as part of the management plan, so it stays that way. He expressed the ability to have properties open and available to the public but cautioned about having too many, so the wildlife does not get pushed out. He asked Habitat Division Administrator Jenne if this will have to go through the Heritage Committee for discussion and approval.

Habitat Administrator Jenne explained that management plans have a ten-year minimum lifespan, so anything included in the management plan for this property will be in place for at least ten years. He stated he wanted to bring this in front of the Commission to determine how to handle this. He explained that the Department will go to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) on December 9th to request authority and approval and was unsure if it had to go through the Heritage Committee but will proceed as the Commission would like.

Deputy Director Robb stated that the Department planned on moving forward with the purchase and that this agenda item can be approved by the Commission today. He explained why the Heritage funds were the best to use for this property.

Habitat Division Administrator Jenne added that he felt that the Commission would want to be part of, and he thinks that this is a legacy project.

Mitch McVicars, White Pine CABMW, stated that his board is in support of the project and property. He stated that properties that have been purchased by the Department, like the Black Rock Station need money put into them as well. He explained that he would like to see the old stone house fenced and that he has been asking for the last couple of years. He stated that if we are going to purchase property and fund more projects, he hopes that we would take care of the properties we already have.

Bryce Pollock, self, stated that the Argenta Marsh is a 46 square mile recreational paradise, and it was channeled in the 1950s in an effort to direct water to the Rye Patch Reservoir. He stated that the Licking Ranch is a once in a lifetime rare opportunity in terms of habitat because it is one of the portions that was never channeled, and it is a sportsman's paradise in terms of fish, big game, and waterfowl. He explained that it is adjacent to a property that is held in public hands and would create one large open public area. He urged the Commission to jump on the opportunity to open more areas to the public.

Tom Turk, self, stated that as a sportsman and conservationist and knows the area along the Humboldt area fairly well. He stated that he supported Commissioner Barnes' concerns and comments about beneficial use and maintaining it in a productive manner, whether it be an active ranch or farming, those interest need to be kept alive. He stated he supported the purchase of the Licking Ranch and that it was a great opportunity.

**CHAIRWOMAN EAST MOVED TO APPROVE THE INTERIM HERITAGE PROJECT REVIEW FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE LICKING RANCH IN BATTLE MOUNTAIN. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PIERINI. MOTION APPROVED 7-1, OPPOSED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES, COMMISSIONER KIEL ABSENT.**

*Lunch break 12:22 – 1:15*

## 10. Commission General Regulations – Adoption/Public Comment Allowed

*Commissioner Kiel joined the meeting.*

### A.\* **Commission General Regulation 499, Bonus Point Only Application Period – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – For Possible Action**

The Commission will review language amending NAC 502 chapters that would decouple the hunt application periods from bonus point purchase periods, remove the requirement for a 7-day bonus point only purchase period, and allows for the creation of a separate period for bonus point purchases to facilitate a more timely draw process and potentially provide increased opportunity for customers to obtain a bonus points in the future. The change also outlines the definitions for “awarded” or “successful” relative to obtaining a big game tag.

Management Analyst Megan Manfredi reviewed the support material sent in advance to the Commissioners, County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife Chairmen and posted on the Nevada Department of Wildlife website for the public for Bonus Point Only Application Period.

Management Analyst Manfredi asked the Commission to consider removing “...which must follow the posting of the results of all drawings of big game tags for that season”.

Commissioner Barnes noted that there had been confusion around the proposed regulation

Deputy Director Robb noted it would be a large change which would be communicated thoroughly through emails, the regulation guide, social media, hunting forums, application services and more.

Vice Chairman Caviglia wanted clarification on the ability to continue applying for bonus points during the regular application period. He concluded by noting that applicants could now apply for bonus points during the regular application period, and should they have missed the regular application period, they now would have another bonus point application only period to apply for bonus points.

Commissioner Rogers was curious if there were any detriments for potential applicants.

Management Analyst Manfredi responded that removing the seven-day bonus point/withdraw period following the close of the regular application period could be perceived as a loss. Regardless of the perceived loss this regulation would now allow the Department to offer a bonus point application period only for all species in the second draw.

Paul Dixon, representing the Clark CABMW, provided the following statement: With any change there will be confusion, but everything should be done to over communicate the change and possibly a twenty-four-hour hotline for assistance. People are worried that this regulation will be harder not easier.

Mike Reese public, representing the Clark CABMW, provided the following statement: If I want to put in for sheep but miss the application period, I can now apply for a sheep bonus point in the second draw even if there are not sheep tags being offered?

**COMMISSIONER ROGERS MOVED TO APPROVE CGR 499, BONUS POINT ONLY APPLICATION PERIOD AS PRESENTED WITH THE NOTED CHANGE TO SECTION 2(9) OMITTING “..., WHICH MUST FOLLOW THE POSTING OF THE RESULTS OF ALL DRAWINGS OF BIG GAME TAGS FOR THAT SEASON”. COMMISSIONER WISE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 9-0.**

## 11. Commission General Regulations – Workshop/Public Comment Allowed

### A.\* **Commission General Regulation 503, LCB File No. RXXX-XX, Predator and Fur-bearing Contests – Commissioner McNinch – For Possible Action**

The Commission will hold a workshop to discuss potential language on predator and fur-bearing contests proposed by Commissioner McNinch.

Commissioner McNinch reviewed the support material sent in advance to the Commissioners, County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife Chairmen and posted on the Nevada Department of Wildlife website for the public for Predator and Fur-bearing Contests adding his desire to add an enforcement provision.

Secretary Wasley acknowledged the predator and fur-bearing contests was an incredibly difficult issue that put the Department, Commission, and himself, in a difficult position. The contests are not a simple issue with a simple solution, it is hard, complicated, emotional, and therefore messy. He knew that what he was about to share would undoubtedly offend individuals on all sides of the issue. His intention was not to be an equal opportunity offender but to offer thought and perspective acquired from his opportunity to serve as the Director for now approaching 9 years. He added his thoughts were not judgement on the thoughts and ideas of others but simply his thoughts and ideas surrounding the topic. Secretary Wasley started by recognizing the broad statutory charge of the Department in respect to all animals, all citizens, in addition to the public safety charge of law enforcement officers on ground and water ways. He explained the Commission provided broad policy guidance to the Department, how the Department and the Commission reconciled the broad statutory charge for all eight hundred ninety-five species with a relatively narrow funding model was at the core of many of the challenging issues. His job as Director was to oversee the fulfillment of the agency's statutory charge. For him that meant taking care of all the species for all the citizens and one of the most important and key ways that was done was by ensuring the future of hunting and fishing, as they remained the primary funding mechanisms for conservation and the primary funding mechanism for the Nevada Department of Wildlife. Before going any further Secretary Wasley shared what drove him. He is a hunter-conservationist. Just last month he was on a successful mule deer hunt with a friend in Elko, last weekend he was scouting bighorn sheep in Nye County with a lucky friend, he was going bird hunting this weekend, and he would be pursuing elk for himself and desert sheep for a friend beginning later this month. He emphasized that because he holds a political position and sat before all in a coat and tie did not mean he didn't understand the passion and dedication of Nevada's sportsmen and women, he is one. His family homesteaded the Nelson Ranch north of Valmy in 1860. Very little of that ranch remains today. It was sold to Ellison ranching in 1911. However, there remained, a Nelson pasture, Nelson creek, and USGS Nelson Gauging station on the Humboldt River. The issue of coyote contests remained divisive and emotionally charged. Sides were chosen, and perspectives were challenged. Emotions around the issue had left little space for people to consider the merits of the issue, absent the perspectives of their adversaries. Everyone was convinced they were right, surrounding themselves with like-minded perspectives validating views and again affording little if any room for evaluation of bigger picture consequences. The Department had remained mostly on the sideline during the debates. Opinions even within the Department ran the gamut from participants to those vehemently opposed. The Department had shared their professional opinions regarding what contests are and are not, Contests were not threatening coyote populations, nor were they saving mule deer or other game populations. Contests did not replace the need for strategic predator control for the benefit of other species nor did they save the agency any appreciable amount of money. He added that coyotes are a very successful predator and there are many situations in which their numbers require control. The Department would continue to remove coyotes in strategic and targeted efforts wherever and whenever necessary for the protection of other animals. The regulation proposed no limit on coyote hunting. It posed no threat to the numbers of coyotes taken. It proposed no change in the status of the species as unprotected and it proposed no change to an individual's right and ability to gather, call, and kill coyotes. The regulation as proposed would prohibit three things, collection of an entry fee, promotion of the event, and awarding of prizes or rewards. When he focused on the issue of animal contests there

were a few things that shaped his perspective regarding possible actions. First the agency role and charge as it related to public trust responsibilities. Wildlife belongs to the citizens of the state. Hunting and fishing are privileges granted to hunter and anglers by society writ large whether by informed and active support or by apathetic indifference. Because they were privileges, they were subject to loss or erosion based on public perceptions and public support. Actions needed to be sensitive to the fact that preferred recreational past times are subject to some level of public acceptance and support. Second, the Agency was responsible for eight hundred ninety-five species in Nevada. Approximately eight percent of those were recreationally pursued by hunters and anglers. Two reports released the previous week showed the annual contribution of hunters in terms of total expenditures at three hundred and ninety-four million dollars a year and four hundred fourteen million dollars a year respectively which was significant. Despite that level of economic contribution, it remained that hunters were in the extreme minority of citizens in Nevada at 2.35 percent of the citizens. Doubling, tripling, quadrupling, or increasing that percentage ten times, would still leave hunters outnumbered by over three to one. Actions must be with the awareness of hunter broader societal irrelevance. Third, ethics, conservation, and the North American Model of wildlife conservation. What did they say regarding contests? Killing contests are ethically upsetting by virtue for most members of society. Hunting should not be a competition as such behavior ultimately degrades the value of life and undermines respect for the animals being hunted. Aldo Leopold in a Sand County almanac wrote that “a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.” The North American Model that was often propped up as the anchor of modern wildlife management, disapproved of “frivolous” killing. The Wildlife Society (TWS) in a 2019 issue stated their policy was to discourage contests that adversely affect “the public’s appreciation of wildlife resources”. TWS further suggested that “making a contest of it may undermine the public’s view of ethical hunting.” He concluded by fully recognizing that hunting ethics were largely subjective and an individual choice. In his ethics as a hunter, he hoped to defend a deeper and more profound sense of hunting than what he feared coyote contests said to the general public about hunters and their ethics. Hunters needed to be conscious of the public image projected and the way in which the public perceives them. If it’s not good for the image, it’s not good for the future. His personal fear was that an unwillingness to consider what society at-large felt about certain activities would hasten the erosion of privileges that he held near and dear.

Commissioner McNinch stated if hunters were not successful conservation would not be either. He had always been a hunting advocate. He mentioned the North American Model, considered the foundation of conservations along with the two long term societies of the model, The Wildlife Society and the Boone and Crockett Club arose from the need of wildlife conservation, and relevancy for sportsman. He quoted an article from The Wildlife Society, concluding that governance fosters relevance. If sportsmen are not relevant than it endangers and erodes the public support for the Agency, hence loss for conservation opportunities.

Commissioner Almborg stated his agenda was to preserve hunting into the future, with that said wildlife came first and usage of them came secondary. He expressed that proper representation of the Wildlife Conservation Model had not been done. Education played the largest role in conservation. He ended by stating the contests were one of the issues that sent the Department backwards in the court of public opinion, he was supportive of the presented language and wanted to continue the discussion.

Commissioner McNinch read a law enforcement fine provision “a person who violates this section may be fined not more than X nor less than X for a first offence. Upon a second and all subsequent convictions or any conviction while under license suspension related to the requirements, a person who violates this section shall be fined...” that he would want added to the regulation. He clarified he was not interested in demerit points.

Deputy Attorney General Craig Burkett advised that a law enforcement provision needed to be added, without that provision it held no value.

Vice Chairman Caviglia vocalized that the North American Model was subjective. Some believed wildlife may only be killed for legitimate purpose, others believed coyote killing contests were not legitimate. Ethics are subjective, what is acceptable for one may not be for others.

Commissioner Pierini shared that he would like to see the Department sell coyotes licenses, understanding that could not be accomplished by the Commission. With the sale of licenses there would be an understanding of how many coyotes were hunted and killed. He added that he would like to see more information regarding the number of coyotes and the issues they were causing prior to deciding.

Commissioner Barnes felt challenged by the regulation which led him to reflect on his own perspectives and who he was. Via email correspondence he had been called a traditionalist in a negative connotation, but he was proud to be a traditionalist. He understood the social issue and the perception that was placed on the calling contests but questioned what in fact was truly being regulated. No illegal activities were taking place.

Commissioner Rogers found himself regularly listening, he heard comments for and opposed to the regulation and took the time to read every email received. Having communicated with different sources to make an informed dissection, he believed the regulation was brought on as an emotional issue more than it was about a wildlife contest. He added that the CABMWs and Nevada based non-governmental organizations did not support the regulation.

Commissioner Wise acknowledged the regulation was emotionally charged but added that there were those who truly spoke to the facts. She recognized the alarm that banning one contest could lead to the banning of other hunting related activities. She added that contests did not control nor affect populations one way or another therefore becoming an ethical issue. It was clear that most did not want the contest to proceed. Hunting and trapping would not be banned by the elimination of the contest.

Commissioner McNinch was open to eliminating the language “fur-bearer” to see the proposed regulation continue. He reiterated there was no biological issue for him and there was no biological issue for coyotes it came down to how the contests were held and promoted. He supported ranchers and individuals protecting their property, livestock, or family lawfully by lethal means. Relevancy of sportsman equals conservation, irrelevancy equals erosion.

Commissioner Alberg as a traditionalist who lived in rural Nevada his position was based on the future for sportsmen.

Commissioner Caviglia was concerned a vocal minority that was well organized wanted the ban, as well it was an opposite minority that participated in the contests. He added the public did not know nor care about the contest. Was the Commission conceding to that vocal minority?

Commissioner McNinch spoke to comments made previously that non-governmental organizations were falling on both sides of the issue. He focused back to the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation which provided recommendations to address issues such as these in the need of maintaining relevancy and the need of sportsman. His beliefs in conservation were tied to the success of sportsmen. He added there might be a greater negative impact should the regulation not be seen through.

Mitch McVicars, representing the White Pine CABMW, provided the following statement: Our CABMW was not in favor of the language proposed or contest bans, thank you.

Matt Melarkey, representing the Washoe CABMW, provided the following statement: three percent of the population that are avid sportsman and you have a vocal majority that is subjugating and involved

minority. The danger is that through Pittman Robertson you the Commission just approved the purchase of a ranch that came from sportsman. You guys need to look at support, where is the support for Nevada coming from. This is the Nevada Wildlife Commission, not the national Wildlife Commission. All the CABMWs have resoundly opposed this language, CABMW see people compelled to continue this conversation when the people who are trying to do good and help their communities and lookout for wildlife are saying Commission, please take this off the table or at least listen to the people who are trying to advise you in this regard. CABMW represent thousands of sportsmen in Nevada and looking at the opposition a lot of it is nationally funded animal rights organizations that are providing talking points, its virtue signaling at its finest. I encourage this Commission to truly listen to the people who are active in this discussion from a CABMW perspective and then Nevadans speaking to you because I think that that's your job as the Nevada Wildlife Commission. Lastly contest may be pushed underground should this pass I don't know if that's the case, but it might be something for you to think about, with that I appreciate your time thank you very much.

Paul Dixon, representing the Clark CABMW, provided the following statement: The Clark County CABMW spent one hour on the entire agenda that you have and spent the remainder of our time, right up to the end, on this topic. There were thirteen members of the public in attendance. The meeting was also offered virtually so all members of the public could participate. We had a lively discussion; our vote spoke to the fact that we should wait and determine whether there truly is a need for this. I do environmental justice at my job, compensating minorities and people of color for the way that they had been impacted by the Department of Energy over the years. I am not sure if it is wildlife justice but what are we really trying to fix? One of the discussions at the CABMW was the language is already compromised language. Because of the definition of contest with multiple "ands" if and event was organized, promoted, sponsored, solicited and no cash prize was offered, and no fee was charged that would be legal under this regulation as presented. This regulation only eliminates a cash prize for hunting coyotes in a large group. What have we really succeeded at with this regulation? If we are worried about the North American Model is just paying for something for getting a cash prize, make it valid or not valid for the North American Model. I think there are a lot of people that will still organize without cash prizes and there are people who probably won't because of cash prizes. Thank you for the time.

Tony Gildone, representing the Humboldt CABMW, provided the following statement: I appreciate the Commission's heartfelt expressions about struggling with this issue. Things can get emotional and unfortunately that results in personal attacks, you guys are in a tough position. I appreciate the time that you guys spend dedicated to the wildlife of Nevada. When it comes to the coyote calling contest the Humboldt CABMW unanimously voted in opposition to any restrictions to coyote calling contest, we feel it is a slippery slope and erosion of the sportsmen culture. It is this today, what is it going to be tomorrow? We feel it's a small loud minority of people that are driving this topic. Lastly, Commissioners admitted in conversation that there is no scientific data or evidence that supports any restriction on the taking of coyotes, thank you.

Therese Campbell representing the Clark CABMW, provided the following statement: A lot of different viewpoints were expressed. I voted to proceed with the wildlife killing contest workshop to discuss potential language, I was the dissenting vote. No one is trying to stop hunting, no one is trying to keep people from getting together with their friends. This is about when a competition is promoted by who can get the most animals at one time, it looks bad. People are starting to be more informed in and making choices for themselves about what is acceptable and what id too extreme. I think the killing contests could be called extreme. The NBWC would be well served to consider the public's opinion. Public views are this change could show that hunters are in favor of ethical hunting. The demographic in Nevada is changing, there are a lot more people aware of these issues than there used to be, thank you.

Dan Gilbert, representing the Clark CABMW, provided the following statement: First and foremost, we are to manage the wildlife in the most scientifically based manner, we are at or nearing a crisis with the

mule deer population is the state of Nevada, coyotes and other predators are substantially responsible for taking high numbers of mule deer. The price of fur trapping, poisoning and everything else these other control measures are not utilized anymore, were essentially down to an active removal process. Like it or not contest allow people that share, teach and mentor the skills to perform these necessary active removals of predators. As a sportsman and a conservationist, I believe that all tools need to be available for what we're going through right now. I appreciate your time, thank you.

Bert Gurr, representing the Elko CABMW, provided the following statement: This is a tough subject, you've been fighting it for years. I don't know if there's a good solution, I hate to say this, but the coyote contest participants shot themselves in foot a long time ago and made this prevalent today. Mr. Melarkey and Mr. Dixon's comments reflect the Elko CABMW stance. Elko has rejected this type of proposal for years. I believe the Elko public has little confidence in the CABMW and none in the Commission to be relevant to wildlife therefore we get minimal attendance and input. I believe this is due to not following the advice of the CABMW. I appreciate your time, good luck.

Chris Garnett, private citizen, provided the following statement: I ask the Commission to open the Nevada small game hunting regulation booklet. The last page is an ad for the 2021 Battle Mountain chukar hunting tournament, it advertises thousands of dollars in raffle prizes. I would hope the Commission can see the overwhelming hypocrisy that exists here. The CABMWs unanimously are not in support of this ban. According to the predator fee report earlier today the state spent \$70,000 on coyote killing for the benefit of antelope and \$109,000 for the benefit of mule deer. Coyotes are killed by trapping and by shooter in helicopter. I fail to see how morally these coyote removal activities by the state are any better than a calling contest which at least allows fair chase, it appears because the killing is done by the state a blind eye is turned. These contests provide no financial benefit for the state, yet the opportunity exists for the Commission to require both resident and nonresident coyote hunters to acquire a hunting license to take coyotes. Utah has passed a hunting and fishing right for its citizens I would like to see the Commission focus on something similar for Nevada. ***\*Public comment reached the three-minute allotment.***

Logan Christian, representing the Mountain Lion Foundation, provided the following statement: good afternoon, Madam Chair East, Director Wasley, and members of the Commission. My name is Logan Christian, and I am a Conservation Advocate with Mountain Lion Foundation. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak today. First, I want to express our appreciation for the ongoing work of Commissioner McNinch to bring the issue of wildlife contests to the table, and for the continued efforts of the Commission to consider this issue despite its polarizing nature. We respect that there are many different perspectives on wildlife contests, and hope that the Commission can reach the best possible agreement. Furthermore, we do not agree with the moral attacks levied against some commissioners, and hope that those individuals who are taking these extreme positions recognize that such language is neither helpful for Nevada's wildlife nor its people. In general, we are in support of the proposed language presented today. Mountain Lion Foundation is opposed to contests that target predator and furbearer species including coyotes, bobcats, and foxes. These contests do not represent standards of fair chase or science-based management of our native wildlife. Research finds that the indiscriminate killing of these species can lead to unintended consequences including disruption of family groups, increased rates of reproduction and increased conflicts with domestic animals. Moreover, we urge the Commission to recognize that there are already several options for agriculture producers to kill individual animals that they believe are threatening their operations, even within the guise of this proposed language. While we would prefer to see language that eliminates the killing of predator and furbearer species, as well as more resources to help producers use non-lethal options for preventing depredations, we want to emphasize, similar to what Director Wasley mentioned earlier, that nothing about this proposed language would end things like depredation permits or predator management plans. This proposal is simply about removing an outdated form of recreation and entertainment that both the science and the majority of the public find concerning. We urge each member of the commission to weigh this proposed language against what the Nevada Legislature would likely pass as an alternative. The Commission has a unique opportunity to weigh in

and provide a stance that will help improve the public's perception of wildlife management in the state of Nevada. Why leave this decision to the legislature when you all have the ability to address an important issue that improves the relevancy of sportsmen and sportswomen? For all of these reasons, we strongly urge the Commission to adopt this language. Thank you for your continued consideration of this issue and for the work that you all do on behalf of Nevada's wildlife.

Tom Turk, private citizen, provided the following statement: I recently decided to get involved because of my son and hunting family. I'm here as a sportsman, hunter, conservationist, a participant ranching and farming, a past hunter education instructor for the Department of Wildlife and a past chair of the Elko chapter of the mule deer foundation. Where and why is there pressure to act on this issue when in the past it has not been an issue. Seeing a lamb or calf taken by a coyote during birth is truly painful. The losses are not compensated. I'm troubled by the outside influences that are rearing up on this issue and the threats to the Commission. Science on coyotes is difficult to pin down, and the population numbers are as well. I believe the calling contest don't have a major impact on the populations of coyotes. I believe they do have an impact in specific geographic regions during the time of contests for a period. Coyotes tend to be wherever there is species for them to prey. The cyclical theory says if there's a lots of jack rabbits there tends to be a lot of coyotes and vice versa. I appreciate the opportunity, again I don't believe this issue is worthy of having this much time spent on it. ***\*Public comment reached the three-minute allotment.***

Tom Green, private citizen, provided the following statement: I respect each of you for putting your hat in the arena, controversial matter such as this are never fun or easy. You should be praised for your service, and we should condemn anyone harassing or threatening anyone on this commission. I would like to acknowledge Mr. Wasley comments, I hung on every word he said. As we heard, there is no science to show that these contests hurt coyote populations. How the removal of coyotes from a contest area impacts mule deer or other game species is not clear. That is important. The US government kills 100,000 coyotes annually and we know there has not been success in curtailing the population, nationwide. I don't participate in these contests, however as Mr. Wasley said, other sportsman activities that are legal today may not be tomorrow. That is why I am here. The antis inundate your email, they stack these meetings with commentors. In other states, we know these antis have been successful in banning many of the activity's sportsmen enjoy in Nevada. We know the demographic in Nevada is changing, and that is why it is important we do not cave to this movement. If this were a carp contest or a rodent contest, no one would be caring. Heck, California even allows ground squirrel contests! How does that fit into the conservation framework? For whatever reason, coyotes invoke a soft spot for people. These people have little or no understanding of how these animals have proliferated since the 1950s and how they have expanded their range by 40% since then. Simply put, we all know that coyotes are well represented in Nevada. And no contest or contests will change that. I understand and respect that the commission is weighing the social backlash. I want the commission to hear me, today's coyote hunt contest ban is tomorrow's bear hunt ban and next year's dove hunt ban. Many of the people in opposition would love to see hunting all together banned! Commissioner Caviglia summed it up well, the general public doesn't care about this issue. The people who care have spoken. And with respect to Commissioner McNinch's comments about needing to essentially acquiesce to these antis, I understand his point however these people will not stop with this. This will energize them, and they will be coming for other sportsman activities we enjoy in Nevada. Again, this isn't about the contests for me, I have never done one nor would I, however I support their choice to do it. Thank you

Christopher Smith, representing Wild Earth Guardians, provided the following statement: I would like to thank Director Wasley for his comments at the outset of this agenda item. I'm here on behalf of Wild Earth Guardians and our nearly one thousand members and supporters across Nevada. I'm also a sportsman, I'm supposed to be an anti I guess but I can't remember the last year that I didn't hold a license in multiple states, and I own livestock. These contests are deeply unpopular, they're not hunting, and they're not wildlife management and note that the North American Model also condemns the commercialization of

wildlife as one of its tenants. Wild Earth Guardians supports the regulation changes written which is narrow and common sense and compromised we urge that Commission to move this forward thank you very much.

Jason Wasden, Clark County private citizen, provided the following statement: I don't personally participate in coyote calling contest, but I do not object to them. I thank you for your role in protecting, conserving, and restoring our wildlife. I hope you would not make this a political decision, determine the need, if there is a need then make the decision that's best. I know that there is a mule deer foundation and they do support coyote calling contests. I again echo the comments that have been made, I am a sportsman, I don't participate in these, but I do support them.

Bryce Pollock, private citizen, stated good afternoon, Chairwoman East, and Wildlife Commissioners. First, I'd like to thank you for the incredible amount of time you have spent regarding this matter. Though it is frustrating to see the amount of the commission and department's resources gone toward a social issue, your consideration is appreciated. The issues around coyote calling competitions are a branding problem. Not an ethics problem. The issue with the competitions at its core stems from the lack of pushback against a false narrative from those opposed to competitions and hunting in general. These competitions are not senseless or frivolous killing. These competitions abide by all regulations in place to manage predators and have very real impact on the rural areas where these competitions are held. The competition in Eureka for example has raised funds to expand and repair several wildlife guzzlers as well as work to remove pinion juniper encroachment. The competition in Ely, NV is a fundraiser for the community's volunteer fire department. A statewide ban will disproportionately affect rural areas where popular opinion favors these competitions. A statewide ban is not a compromise, and that is in large part of why none of the county cabs have supported the language put forth. One compromise would be an addendum for non-profit groups that put monies back into the community and conservation be exempt from a ban. This could be achieved through a license and would allow the department to monitor the competitions to determine the number of animals harvested, the real impact, and make decisions on the competitions going forward based on real data. Another compromise, for example would require the competitions to use the animal's pelts and put on workshops teaching people how to tan and use this renewable resource. This would begin to address the PR and branding issue in a very real way. A ban makes no effort to improve the PR and branding issues around hunting. A ban is a nod to antihunting groups acknowledging hunting has a negative branding issue and that rights will be taken from sportsmen and Nevadans whenever enough pressure is applied. Thank you for your time and for the opportunity to speak on this issue.

Brain Beffort, representing the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club, provided the following statement: On behalf of the more than 7,000 members and 30,000 supporters of the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club of Nevada, we write today in strong support of the proposed prohibition (ban) on wildlife killing contests in Nevada. One of the key missions of the Sierra Club is the preservation and protection of our nation's wildlife resources and nothing is more antithetical to this goal than killing contests that glorify the killing of animals purely for blood sport with the intention of seeing who can kill the most. These contests should be outlawed across the nation, regardless of species (coyote, bobcat, foxes, wolves, prairie dogs etc.), and we support this ban as an important step in the right direction. As commissioners in charge of setting important wildlife management policy for our state, we urge you to support a ban. It is ironic to note that while other blood-sports like dogfighting and cockfighting have been outlawed nationwide, thousands of native carnivores and other species perish every year in killing contests, derbies, and tournaments across the country. Killing contests must be outlawed because they are one, completely unjustified: Contests are motivated by baseless myths, misunderstanding, and fear about animals and their roles in our ecosystems. Scientific studies are repeatedly concluded that eliminating coyotes and other predators does not result in increased numbers of deer or other ungulates. Two, cruel and unsporting: Countless animals are killed, injured, or orphaned as a result of these events, and the use of lures and distress calls to attract target animals is inconsistent with fair chase hunting principles. Companion animals and

endangered wildlife are also at risk. Three, counterproductive to sound wildlife management: Mass killing of native carnivores and other keystone species disregards the critical role these species play in healthy ecosystems and creates chaos in the family structures of targeted species, which may result in increased conflicts with livestock, pets, and people. In the case of some species, such as the coyote, there are also rebound population mechanism where in fact the population then increases. Four, a violation of the Public Trust Doctrine: This doctrine holds that wildlife is a shared public asset that must be protected and maintained for present and future generations. And lastly, a promotion of violence: Contest organizers are increasingly encouraging the participation of children as young as ten years old, which teaches our youth that killing is fun, life is cheap, and wild animals are disposable. These unethical contests are antithetical to modern conservation principles regarding biodiversity conservation and their existence disrupts and harms human and biotic communities. Public lands should be managed for the benefit of all citizens and all wildlife. Those who visit our national forests and wildlife sanctuaries in hopes of finding peace and refuge should be able to do so without the fear and trauma of encountering these barbaric contests. The Toiyabe Chapter promotes the preservation and protection of our public lands and wildlife. We are strongly opposed to the unscientific and unethical practice of killing contests. We urge you to support this proposed ban and help Nevada move in the right direction in terms of wildlife management.

Ron Stoker, representing the Wildlife Habitat Improvement in Nevada, provided the following statement: Members of WHIN and myself get up before the sun comes up and leave as the sun goes down. We pull stuff through marshes, we break our backs building guzzlers, it's all for wildlife. You can debate the science on coyote contest, but I know if you don't have a coyote, you have a fawn and that's what we need in Nevada. As mentioned earlier they have banned it in New Mexico and trapping followed. Looking at the pattern this is just the tip of the iceberg. I hope that the Commissioners think long and hard about who swings the hammers and not who writes the letters. I appreciate your time and I know it's a tough decision, I hope you do the best you can, thank you.

Cheyenne Neuffer, private citizen, provided the following statement: I grew up in rural northern Nevada. I fully support the proposed language regarding wildlife killing contests. I strongly urge the Commission to make the honorable decision and help end wildlife killing contests in the state of Nevada, thank you so much.

Al Morris, private citizen provided the following statement: I am the only four-time world champ with my partner, we hunted the world championship in Nevada since 1997, when I won my first championship. I then won it in '07, '08 and 2016 at 50 years. I cannot imagine my life if it wasn't for the world coyote calling championship, held in Elko Nevada. 394 million to 414 million dollars coming into Nevada from sportsman. These contests are not the problem, it might be perception. Project coyote has a \$24 million budget, why would this Commission let the small percentage of people that oppose these contests influence their decision. I've made a living hunting coyote, I put my girls through college, it used to be a revered tradition. There would not be a wildlife models if it wasn't for the predators that were not controlled and taken out of the system. To quote Aldo Leopold "The last word in ignorance is the man who says of an animal or plant, "What good is it?" You as a Commission need to support contests, I would like to see the Commission go for more hunter rights bills at the state legislative level, thank you for your time.

Diego Alaniz, private citizen, provided the following statement: I strongly oppose the proposed regulation, thank you for your time.

Larry Staley, private citizen, provided the following statement: I oppose this ban on coyote contest, all your CABMW have told you to kill this bill, it is time for you guys to act and end this. Nevadans have spoken, we don't want this. Lastly, when the bill was brought forward it was said there was not impact to small businesses. For you guys to sit there and rule that out there's no small business impact is wrong, I believe it's against NRS for you to say there is not impact, a lot of income is raised in the winter due to these contests. I appreciate your time.

David Parsons, private citizen, provided the following statement: I am a retired career biologist with the US Fish and Wildlife service and an advisor for Project Coyote. I applaud the Commission for proposing a ban on killing predatory animals. There is no critical basis in science that these contests provide any verifiable benefits for wildlife conflict management or wildlife conservation. Ample scientific evidence shows the predatory and furbearing animals can have important benefits on the ecosystems they occupy, resulting in greater biological diversity to season rodent control, improved ecological health, and the resiliency of ecosystems to environmental change. It is important to emphasize with adopting this regulation is not prohibited to hunt any of the animals specified, it simply ends the contest. Eight states have already prohibited wildlife killing contests, social science research and public opinion polls show a significant shift in public attitudes about wildlife, to a more mutualistic view that wild animals possess intrinsic values. I recommend that Nevada join the eight other states to lead the way in setting examples of ethical, science-based wildlife management. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Brian Burris, private citizen, provided the following statement: I've never entered one of these contests, I spend much of my time outside of work helping with conservation of wildlife as a youth programs director for Wildlife Habitat Improvement of Nevada. Many of my hours are in the field, actively improving the environment for our wildlife. I'm also co-host a podcast that actively recruits people to help with conservation projects in Nevada. I find it troubling that we are considering managing wildlife on public opinion and emotion rather than science. The issue I raise is pertaining to the legality of the workshop. Nevada Revised Statutes 233b.0608 requires a small business impact statement which has not been done. There is a financial impact to small businesses and ranchers. Fiscal and statutory responsibilities require you to manage by science, I would encourage you to stop this action, thank you for your time.

Patrick Donnelly, representing the Center for Biological Diversity, provided the following statement: I speak on behalf of our thousands of Nevada members, we're in opposition to coyote killing contests and we support the proposed regulation. The question we need to ask here is does the Board of Wildlife Commissioners represent the two percent of Nevadans who hunt or does the Wildlife Commission represent all Nevada's and our diverse and pluralistic interests in wildlife. I think we've heard "well the opposition is the minority" and that just says people are out of touch with what normal Nevadans think. Most people, when a coyote killing contests is described to them will react with revulsion, they are counter to the common moral sensibilities which guide behavior in our society. So, we can hear "well all the CABMW opposed this regulation" I think that tells you a lot more about who is on the CABMW than the legitimacy of that institution, than it does as a barometer for how Nevadans feel about killing contents. Seeing how many animals can be slaughtered as fast as possible to get prizes is not sporting, it's wrong. Nevadans agreed and I think the time is now to act on this issue, put it to bed and ban these contests, thank you.

Jana Hofeditz, private citizen, provided the following statement: I have lived near Pyramid Lake for about thirty years. I love living remote and I love being surrounded by wildlife. Today we hear from two different sides, please choose to vote for neither one side nor the other but instead for nature, for wildlife. Let's give them a voice. I believe you all have this most respected responsibility, if we cannot coexist with a respectful behavior to nature we are doomed, thank you.

Karen Boeger, private citizen, provided the following statement: I feel compelled to make a statement on this issue. To make my own judgement on this question, I felt it essential to learn about a tradition that falls outside my own experience, despite having grown up rurally and intimately connected to our hunting & fishing traditions, not least of which was to feed our blue-collar immigrant family. My closest connection to a contest experience was my pride at age 12 in inheriting my brother's .22 & allowed to go out into the pasture to shoot pesky ground squirrels, while (regretfully) not even using them for squirrel stew. This journey of finding my way toward a resolution of the question re coyote contests made me deeply empathetic with all of you in decision-making positions within NDOW or on the Commission, many of you

may have had my same mental struggles toward a sound decision. For the following reasons I sincerely urge you to deny this proposed regulatory ban: Simply put, the NAMWM is the firm ground on which to make a just decision that will not set a potentially erosive precedent for NDOW/Wildlife Commission decisions creeping outside that boundary in future. There is a critical reason why wildlife management needs stay within that boundary: to keep politics & divisive cultural battles outside the realm of wildlife management decisions. Wildlife belongs to us all & should not become a victim of divisive elements outside the objectivity of science. I am aware of the reality that the question, if denied, will likely be presented to the NV legislature, but in my opinion, that is where it belongs. I recognize that, because this particular issue has appeared a number of times in the past before the Commission, while giving plenty of public time to air proponents' views, we sportsmen/women have not been stepping up to be proactive toward public education, let alone our own education. Most of what passes as "education" these days are offensive images making the rounds among millions on social media platforms. We are all familiar with the "ugly hunter" ones that do us no favor re broad public sentiment. Every group on all "sides" of this debate (inclusive of animal rights folks) has their own small cadre of "bad apples" who impact opinion via emotion eliciting photos and/or inflammatory, even threatening words. This paradigm sets up a dehumanized "us vs them" scenario leading potentially to decisions lacking empathy for actual persons whose culture, traditions & lives may be affected. On this coyote issue, luckily for me, it became immediately humanized upon learning that a rural conservation-oriented family, for which I have had great respect for decades, has participated in & enjoyed these contests for 3 generations. I learned a lot about what actually takes place, in their experience, and the benefits that accrue to the community, wildlife & habitat. Here are a few take-aways: It is a community & family event — some teams are a parent & child. Coyote calling is a difficult learned skill — this is passed down the generations — typically the numbers of coyotes killed are few. Moneys collected from contestants typically go to non-profit conservation groups, often to fund local wildlife & habitat projects, which in turn are completed by volunteer work of local families. Those projects help NDOW and the wildlife belonging to us all. It arguably has more benefits than the professionals who are paid using conservation dollars. In summation, while I do not personally enjoy the thought of such contests, nor would I wish to attend or participate, I have a deep aversion to having one demographic unit, in this case primarily urban, dictate cultural/social/ "moral" rules to another, primary rural — especially at this time of divisiveness in our great nation in which "ordinary" decisions are unfortunately often made political. I urge you all to resist this divisiveness with a no vote on the proposed ban. Even more importantly, to please keep inviolate the NAMWM decision-making basis that holds our wildlife management within the fortress of science & not subjected to political winds or whims. Thank you for your consideration of these comments that, while difficult to make, I felt important to share with you. Wishing you both wisdom and strength tomorrow. Thank you for your continuing public service contribution to the health of the wildlife we all share & love, Karen Boeger.

Jeff Dixon, representing the Humane Society of the United States, provided the following statement: I represent a national organization, but I identify as a Nevadan, I enjoy the wildlife here, I birdwatch here. The mutualists, advocates don't feel well represented at this meeting and we're trying to get some more representation. I don't think that I could say anything to be as persuasive to this board as the Department Director said speaking as a sportsman himself. If you re-watch that everything he said was valid, common sense and a measured way to look at this. I would urge you to pass this ruling as written. I just hope we can move forward and find a way to support the policy, thank you for your time.

Mike Reese, private citizen, provided the following statement: This is not a petition, this is a resolution from Clark County that the Commission accepted so the public knows. Elko County, on Wednesday had an agenda item to put bounties on coyotes in their county. They are looking at that as another form of control. Regardless of if it's one month out of the year it is a tool. This is leading to control of us socially because what you're trying to do is stop our right to assemble. Progression sportsmen's foundation has stood up for us in the past, they have lobbied at federal and state level. NGO's and CABMW have voted on this, they've said no. I would urge you guys to make a motion at the end of the public comment, make the motion to end this debate right now, let's start concentrating on sensitive species, thank you.

Shandon Matheson, private citizen, provided a statement in opposition of the regulation. *The audio was inaudible.*

David Ricker, private citizen, provided the following statement: Chairwoman East and members of the commission, my name is David Ricker and I'm commenting as an individual. I would like to ditto Mr. Bryce Pollock's eloquent comments in opposition of this proposed regulation, and also, Mr. Reese's sentiment concerning the proposed regulation's infringement on the right to peacefully assemble and freely associate which is surely problematic to some of you on the commission. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Janette Dean, private citizen, provided the following statement: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I am Janette Dean, an alumna of the University of Nevada, Reno where I studied Political Science and Sociology. I currently live and work in Minnesota where I work as a national environmental advocate to help protect the natural environment and wildlife using modern science, traditional ecological knowledge and respect for other beings, and human ethics. I first testified against wildlife-killing contests in Nevada in March 2015, and I am very relieved that a regulation is finally ready for adoption by a majority of you Wildlife Commissioners on the Nevada Board. I am therefore happy to again join those today asking for passage of the long-awaited regulation by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to ethically stop wildlife-killing contests in Nevada to protect predatory animals and fur-bearing animals which will show more respect for wildlife species and for individual animals. I believe that Nevada Revised Statute 501.100 which is the "Legislative declaration regarding wildlife" reveals the fairness of the proposed regulation as well with its strong statement that: 1. Wildlife in this State not domesticated and in its natural habitat is part of the natural resources belonging to the people of the State of Nevada. I wish to emphasize that nowhere does it does mention that hunters only including those who participate in wildlife-killing contests are the main group of people it should apply to. Such contests that cause as many deaths of animals as possible to win prizes and cash are very dishonorable to many people in Nevada and people like me who studied ethical political policy in Nevada and the dangers of regulatory capture by small groups and special interests. Instead, Nevada's natural resources are meant to belong to all people of Nevada as fairly as possible, and I know many who are and would like Nevada to also be among the ethical stewards of wildlife for not just Nevadans, but for all Americans as well as for the animals themselves. Wildlife-killing contests are not stewardship. In addition, the same Nevada Revised Statute 501.100 also says: 2. The preservation, protection, management, and restoration of wildlife within the State contribute immeasurably to the aesthetic, recreational and economic aspects of these natural resources. I therefore wish to emphasize that those words, too, include extremely-wide aesthetic, recreational and economic aspects of the statute which when ethically understood do not prioritize the interests of participants and supporters of wildlife-killing contests vs. everyone else in Nevada. Current and future activities and regulations related to the statute should instead be in keeping with the responsibilities of the statute to as wide an array of people in Nevada as possible. For example, many who enjoy hiking, sightseeing and other recreation of many kinds in Nevada love seeing, spending time in, and simply knowing that natural habitats and the wildlife within them — including important and spectacular predator species and fur-bearing animals — are able to exist as individuals without being unnecessarily killed and disrespected so strongly by a few participating in wildlife-killing contests who are in or who are traveling into the state. I am therefore pleased to join and echo the comments of other members of the public, of environmentally-focused organizations and of other groups plus any ecologists and wildlife conservationists who are here today to share their moral and scientific opposition to wildlife-killing contests as an acceptable public service or recreational activity as well as those who have expressed similar views on many other dates and locations. Thank you, Janette Dean.

Break 3:43pm – 3:53pm due to technical issues.

Fred Voltz, private citizen, provided the following statement: Many comments were offered at this week's Clark CAB meeting attempting to support wildlife killing contests by people fearful of change or who are not interested in truly protecting wildlife, only increasing wildlife killing opportunities. They make such a pitch regardless of the negative consequences and black mark such contests give to this Commission and NDOW. Of course, CABs, when they meet, are dominated by hunting enthusiasts. Wildlife is not a play thing for people to do with as they choose. The already-implemented regulation in neighboring Arizona, a model for the Nevada proposal, has not threatened mom, apple pie and the American way of life, despite dire predictions of Armageddon should this Commission choose to do something favorable for wildlife that avoids wanton waste. Perhaps the most outlandish claim is that the people you are to represent, that would be all Nevadans, regardless of the slot you fill on the Commission, don't favor the abolition of wildlife killing contests. A broad coalition of informed and engaged advocacy groups sent this Commission their position paper to you yesterday. In that paper, a Nevada-specific, statistically vetted poll demonstrated widespread opposition to wildlife killing contests. The results are no different than in other states. For example, similar 2019 polls of both Oregon and Kansas residents using sound polling practices found that over 60% were opposed to pointless and destructive wildlife killing contests. The compelling arguments against these wasteful and dangerous-to-public-safety contests have already been made multiple times. One or two days a year of killing contest participants in a given rural town will not make a material difference between a business' or community's economic survival or failure. If the Commission chooses not to take further action on a wildlife killing contest ban, this issue will not suddenly evaporate, but take a materially different tack.

Joel Blakeslee, private citizen, provided the following statement: The motivation to stop the contests are motivated by fear of the legislature. More than eighty percent of the legislature must face reelection before the next session so who knows what the political composition will be? There are two strong sportsmen's Coalitions that represent a voting block numbering in the hundreds of thousands. Those coalitions have had tremendous success in previous legislatures.

Rex Flowers, private citizen, provided the following statement: I am a hunter, I am neither irrelevant nor am I not a normal Nevadan. I am not in favor of this regulation. We talk about the irrelevancy of hunters because they're only two percent of the population, when I attend any type of meeting, I see the same people, it's a very small group of people. They speak as they are representing the general public and they're only representing their own personal views, these people are going to be at the legislature, they are always there. If you accept to go forward with this regulation it gives them one less thing on their plate when they get to the legislature, it does not mean they won't be there. I asked you not to pass the regulations, thank you.

Gary Kilbourn, private citizen, provided the following statement: I am a northern Nevada resident for over three decades, I was brought up in a very rural cattle ranch, I am from a hunting family. As the Commission noted this sport is not about ethical hunting specifically, but it does bestow on the state of Nevada and all its sportsman of that reputation. Science is undeniable and the public pools are undeniable, regardless of comments made here on the issue the contests do nothing but harm from multiple perspectives. I approve the proposed language, thank you very much.

Clint McGarr, private citizen, provided the following statement: think we should table this for a while and do a study, use some of our predator fees that us as sportsman pay every year do a five- or ten-year study. Let's figure out the number of tournaments that are put on, the number of coyotes that are taken, and then go to the places that are putting them on and find out what kind of income would be lost at the bare minimum. I challenge people to go out calling and seeing what it is, learn what it takes to call in a coyote. We don't just go out there and slaughter by the thousands like everybody perceives. I asked you to vote against this, thank you for your time.

Fauna Tomlinson, private citizen, provided the following statement: Thank you Commissioners, I appreciate all the time you've taken on this issue. I'm Fauna Tomlinson, a Reno resident. I hold a Nevada hunting and fishing license. I volunteer for Project Coyote & other conservation orgs. I urge you to adopt the language to end Wildlife Contests. There's a lot at stake for sportsmen. Tony said it eloquently and I agree, irrelevancy can erode privileges. Thanks for your careful consideration.

Rich Gonzales, private citizen, provided the following statement: I don't agree with the ban, I participate in these calling contest, it's not a killing contest, it's a calling contest about who can call the most in. If we're not organized out there as a group, planning a dinner after our hunt we're still going to go out and do that as you guys say that the language won't affect that. It's an attack on a good group of folks, sure we're the three or two percent but we are the true conservationists. The people funding Project Coyote don't do anything for sportsmen, they don't do anything for wildlife. This is another notch on their belt and it's not going to end. I hope you guys end this. Mr. Garnett mentioned there's going to be a contest with chukar sponsored by NDOW, what is the difference, why are we any different? Thank you and have a good evening.

Chairwoman East thanked everyone for their patience, adding that she respected everyone's position.

Commissioner McNinch addressed comments made during public comment. This does not preclude individuals from gathering and taking coyotes, it eliminates the prizes, incentives, and numerated take. Other contests, big buck, chukar, and fishing derbies are harvested consistently with ordinary and generally accepted hunting practices. Calling contests, are not.

Vice Chairman Caviglia pointed out that coyote hunting is legal, hunters are within the limits of Nevada law. This is a social issue, not a fair chase issue.

Commissioner McNinch replied it was the method of harvest that were inconsistent with accepted hunting practices. If it is not illegal there are more acceptable ways to hunt coyotes that fall into social norms. He stressed once more that this was not a biological issue.

Commissioner Almborg commented that the language had been reviewed word for word. The language does not affect the right to assemble or perform predator control. He feared that the those in support of this regulations would double down and cause the erosion of hunters.

Commissioner Kiel noted there were no biological consequence, the Commission needed to listen to the CABMWs. If it was assumed that the methods being used were not accepted that was the definition of a slippery slope.

Commissioner McNinch clarified that this focused on the perception and acceptability from society on the contests. He read "The development of human dimensions of wildlife as a discipline has moved us closer to realizing Leopold's ideal. The integration of biological and social sciences is necessary to meet the conservation challenges of the twenty first century." This made it clear that conservation needed to occur for the continuation of hunting and acceptance from the public.

Commissioner Barnes respectfully disagreed with Commissioner McNinch. He disagreed that the Commission did not listen to the CABMWs, he was hearing them.

**COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE PROHIBITING WILDLIFE CALLING CONTESTS ALONG WITH ADDING AN ENFORCEMENT PROVISION, ALLOWING CITIATIONS FOR VIOLATIONS. COMMISSIONER WISE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION FAILED 4-5. VICE CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA, COMMISSIONER ROGERS, COMMISSIONER PIERINI, COMMISSIONER BARNES AND COMMISSIONER KIEL DISSENTED.**

12. *Heard before Agenda Item 10.*

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

The next Commission meeting is scheduled for January 28 and 29, 2022. The Commission will review and discuss potential agenda items for that meeting. The Commission may change Commission meeting dates, times, and locations at this time. The chairman may designate and adjust committee assignments and add or dissolve committees, as necessary. Any anticipated committee meetings that may occur prior to the next Commission meeting may be discussed.

Chairwoman East reviewed the proposed 2022-2023 Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting schedule.

**COMMISSIONER ROGERS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2022-2023 COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE, MOVING THE MARCH 17<sup>TH</sup> AND 18<sup>TH</sup> MEETING TO MARCH 25<sup>TH</sup> AND 26<sup>TH</sup>. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER PIERINI. MOTION PASSED 8-0, COMMISSIONER BARNES ABSENT.**

*A copy of the 2022-2023 Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting schedule can be found on the NDOW website.*

Chairwoman East stated she would like to remove Commissioner Rogers from the Legislative Committee and add Fauna Tomlinson to the Wildlife Damage Management Committee as the public representative.

Secretary Wasley listed potential future agenda items:

Next Meeting: January 28 & 29<sup>th</sup> in Reno

- APRP Committee
- TAAHC Committee
- CGR 504 – E-tag workshop
- NAC 504 Simplification, CGR 497
- NAC 503 Simplification, CGR 496
- Draft Predation Management Plan
- Big Game Seasons and Regulations (set in odd-numbered years, amend in even-numbered years)
- Black Bear Seasons (set annually)
- Mountain Lion Limits and Quotas (set annually – season is set in NRS)
- Heritage Tag Seasons and Quotas (set annually a year in advance)
- Dream Tag, Partnership in Wildlife, and Silver State Tag Seasons and Quotas (set annually)
- Big Game application Deadline and Big Game Tag Eligibility (set annually)
- WAFWA mid-winter Conference Report
- Wildlife Heritage Account Report

**14. 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.

Paul Dixon, Clark CABMW, stated that he would look forward to a hybrid meeting in January and explained that he was able to get the hybrid system to work at the Clark County Chambers on the third try. He explained that hybrid meetings allowed greater participation and give greater relevancy to people.

Fred Voltz, self, stated that while NDOW seems to have finally solved the lack of consistent Zoom meeting capabilities for general Commission meetings, there is another continuing trend that's more than a little concerning and in need of simple solutions by the next Commission meeting. At today's meeting and others in 2021, support materials, namely Power Point presentations given during agenda items, have not been posted before the meeting begins; they follow days later on the NDOW web site, or must be individually requested of support staff. Even for information items, it is important for the public and Commissioners to see what's presented in advance and given the opportunity to reflect on it and comment on it at some point during the meeting. That opportunity has been denied, even though the materials were likely finalized days before the actual Commission meeting for agenda items #6D and 12. Of even greater concern, the listed agenda item for 6D mentions Mr. Jackson's recurring presentation on the annual predator killing program results but makes no mention that there would three other presentations from Messrs. Mahoney, Stoner and Sultaire. These presentations should have been listed in the agenda but were omitted. The meeting agenda needs to clearly state what will be presented and discussed, otherwise there is potential for an open meeting law violation.

Brian Burris, self, stated that he wanted to take this opportunity to commend Director Wasley for the game warden hired in Overton. The warden has been a great addition to the community. He continued explaining that the warden is personable, he patrols the area regularly and takes responsibility for what he does. He commended the Commission for the work they do and explained that game guides and regulations need to be clear and relevant. He explained that there were issues with marking big game tags. He continued and explained that last year there was an issue with the small game and upland game tag manual where it appears that there was a legal weapon hunt presented for the raven hunt which is federally illegal and illegal in the state of Nevada, which caused confusion. He asked that regulations and guides be rereviewed to make sure they are clear and do not cause issues for the sportsmen and game wardens.

Adjourned 4:47pm.

\*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).