

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
CHAIRWOMAN AND COMMISSIONER TIFFANY EAST
COMMISSIONER DAVID MCNINCH
COMMISSIONER MARIO WALTHER
PUBLIC REP. PAUL YOUNG

STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE:
ALEJANDRA MEDINA
PROGRAM OFFICER I
amedina@ndow.org, 775-688-1514

MINUTES
NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 5:30 PM

ZOOM:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87485026362?pwd=ZkxFSnhTVDJHV09XRW9SWDk4SnVCZz09>

MEETING ID: 874 8502 6362

Public Comment will be taken on every action item after discussion but before action on each item and is limited to three minutes per person. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers. Persons are invited to submit written comments to Committee Staff or attend and make comment during the meeting which will become part of the official record. **Persons wishing to comment virtually are invited to raise their hands in the Zoom virtual meeting forum during the appropriate time; each person offering public comment during this period will be limited to not more than three minutes.** All persons attending are asked to complete the sign-in sheet for attendance, whether speaking or not. To ensure the public has notice of all matters the Committee will consider, Committee members may choose not to respond to public comments to avoid deliberation on topics not listed for action on the agenda.

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

1. Call To Order, Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call of Committee Members – Committee Chairwoman Tiffany East

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. All committee members were present.

2. Approval of Agenda – Committee Chairwoman East – For Possible Action

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

There were no questions or changes to the agenda.

Public Comment: None

COMMISSIONER WALTHER MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE PAUL YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

The Committee may approve the draft minutes from the January 27, 2023, Committee meeting.

There were no questions or changes to the minutes.

Public Comment: None

CHAIRWOMAN EAST MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER WALTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. ***Review of Bill/Bill Draft Request (BDR) Tracking List – Program Officer Alejandra Medina – For Possible Action**

The Committee will review the Nevada Department of Wildlife (Department) bill/BDR tracking list and may take action to add or emphasize bills/BDRs to be recommended to the Commission. The Committee may discuss positions on certain bills/bill draft requests to be brought to the Commission.

Program Office Alejandra Medina reviewed the legislative committee tracking list item by item, going over bill language.

Language had not been released for BDR 30, BDR 32, BDR 93, BDR 168, BDR 208, BDR 246, BDR 338, BDR 678, BDR 743, BDR 744, BDR 816, BDR 861 or BDR 48.

BDR 54-206, now AB87, was removed from the committee tracking list.

BDR S-347, now AB71, was removed from the committee tracking list.

BDR 20-460, now AB143, was removed from the committee tracking list.

BDR 628, now AB204 was removed from the committee tracking list.

BDR 48-79, now SB176 was marked as Watch with no further discussion.

BDR 912, establishing the Nevada Fish and Wildlife Conservation Foundation was added to the committee tracking list.

BDR 1013, revising the membership of the Board of Wildlife Commissioners was added to the committee tracking list.

AB94, prohibiting certain governmental entities from using personnel or financial resources to enforce or administer certain federal laws was added to the committee tracking list.

SJR2, which urges Congress to require the United States Board on Geographic Names to consider renaming the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge as the E. R. Sans National Wildlife Refuge was added to the committee tracking list.

All added legislation was marked as Watch.

Chairwoman East inquired if committee members had further information on SJR2, which urges Congress to require the United States Board on Geographic Names to consider renaming the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge as the E. R. Sans National Wildlife Refuge.

Commissioner Walther considered if the suggested renaming aligned with Federal Legislation renaming place names of certain eras.

Commissioner McNinch offered that Deputy Attorney General, Craig Burkett, may have more information.

BDR 339, now AB221, seeks to allow management of terrestrial invertebrates by the Department as designated by the species of greatest conservation need (SGCN), in the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP). An amendment to remove terrestrial throughout the bill would soon be submitted to be inclusive of terrestrial or aquatic invertebrates, as designated.

Commissioner McNinch expressed his comfort with the amendment as it made AB221 inclusive.

Director Jenne added that the modifier should be SGCN under the SWAP.

Commissioner Walther questioned if the Department anticipated opposition to AB221, with the changes presented.

Director Jenne replied he was not aware of any opposition. He informed the committee that the Department had submitted a fiscal note on AB221. Currently the Department would not have the capacity to implement the change without a position being added.

Public Comment: None

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO SUPPORT AB221 WITH THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE OF REMOVING TERRESTRIAL. COMMISSIONER WALTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

BDR 294, now SB141, seeks to eliminate the requirement that a holder of a license or permit to hunt, fish or trap has the license or permit in his or her possession while hunting, fishing or trapping.

Chairwoman East requested the Department's stance, in respect to Law Enforcement. She inquired the intent of SB141.

Public Representative Paul Young asked where the responsibility would lie to confirm an individual was licensed.

Director Jenne believed the intent was to remove the client's burden of proof to having purchased a hunt, fish or trap license or permit. Responsibility would lie on the Department, causing issues in areas of no service.

Public Comment:

John Hiatt, private citizen, stated the bill as written was bad. This would be equivalent to removing the need to have a driver's license in one's possession while driving a car. He would support proof of an electronic license, but not total removal of proof, that would not be productive.

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trappers Association, stated he has recreated in areas of no service. By having received a digital copy of his licenses his grandson was able to take a screenshot, saving the digital copy of his license to the phone's images.

Mel Belding, Washoe CABMW, stated that when the Department moved to the Kalkomey system the option to carry an electronic license, not a physical license, was made available. He questioned why it was now an issue.

Chairwoman East and Commissioner Walther believed the language as written intended to eliminate all means of license possession. They sought to have an amendment submitted. Commissioner Walther would work with the Department to draft the amendment.

COMMISSIONER WALTHER MOVED TO TAKE NO POSITION ON SB141, WHILE GATHERING INFORMATION AND WORKING ON AMENDED LANGUAGE. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE PAUL YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

BDR 19-560, now SB90, seeks to designate the wild mustang as the official state horse of the State of Nevada.

Commissioner Walther acknowledged public comment provided by Karen Boeger, expressing concerns over habitat and the health of wild mustangs. He thought the need to testify should be considered. Wild mustangs are over the appropriate management level (AML) symbolizing wild horses would carry implications for other wildlife species.

Commissioner McNinch added that he appreciated wild horses but recognized that placing a focus on them would complicate the ability to bring their numbers to AML and effect change.

Commissioner Walther asked, with the current health conditions of wild horses and their overpopulation, should that be celebrated as a symbol?

Public Comment:

Karen Boeger, Back County Hunters and Anglers stated it was inhumane for horses to live in crowded conditions. She applauded the fourth-grade class who brought forward the legislation for learning civics and attempting to participate in the democratic process for the good of Nevada. With horse populations currently vastly over AML, other emblematic state symbols and threatened species continue to be negatively impacted,

inclusive of bighorn sheep, rice grass, sagebrush, sage grouse, Lahontan Cutthroat Trout, and desert tortoise.

Tina Nappe, private citizen, stated horses were devastating Washoe Lake state park. To her knowledge they had destroyed the Scripps Wildlife Management Area, there was an overpopulation on Deadman's Creek and she did not see a way for them to be removed. While magnificent, wild horses are devastating to the ecosystem, and she hoped the committee would make comments to that effect.

Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated wildlife managers were in agreement across the western states that wild horses, in their overpopulated state, are the second greatest impact to healthy wildlife populations. He believed the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission (NBWC) and committee should stand in opposition. The resolution would add fuel to the fire.

John Hiatt, private citizen, stated the legislation could pass, in which case there should be amended language providing money to the Department of Agriculture to manage horses in the Virginia Range. This would pass the bill to a fiscal committee which would impact whether it passed.

Judi Caron, private citizen, stated questions that came to her mind were, if it became a state horse who oversees management? If someone gets hurt is there a fiscal responsibility to the state? Under the section of promoting tourism and job creation she thought of the Reno-Sparks Industrial area in Storey County, adding that a county ordinance, rather than state law should be used to elevate this to the state horse. There would be ramifications from this, and fiscal discussion should occur, she did not support the bill.

Chairwoman East believed the management of state horses would stay with the Department of Agriculture.

Director Jenne agreed.

Commissioner McNinch shared concern that supporting SB90 would cause a missed opportunity to make a point on the status of horses and reduce their numbers to AML.

COMMISSIONER MCNINCH MOVED TO OPPOSE SB90 AS PRESENTED. COMMISSIONER WALTHER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

BDR 35-340, now AB112 seeks to require the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the Department of Wildlife to develop and publish an inventory and list of certain projects relating to wildlife crossings. The objective would be to 1. identify locations where key wildlife habitat, wildlife migration corridors and highways intersect; 2. Identify and implement strategies to avoid, minimize and mitigate wildlife-vehicle collisions; and 3. Prioritize areas to implement projects for wildlife crossings or other related highway features to improve permeability for wildlife while maintaining highway user safety.

Commissioner Walther stated he had previously worked with conservation organizations. He believed it was a great bill and wanted to ensure that the Department was confident with the language as presented.

Public Representative Paul Young thought AB112 was a good bill. Connecting the migration corridors was great work that was bipartisan. He was supportive of AB112.

Director Jenne was comfortable with the current language. It would create an account for funding. He added that the Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration had substantial funding for these projects with infrastructure programs.

Chairwoman East asked if the Department was comfortable with the March date presented in AB112.

Director Jenne responded currently there would soon be no staff in the geographic information system (GIS) division, causing implications to work. The referenced date in AB112 was for inventory not a plan which led him to believe it could be achieved.

Public Comment.

Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated that the Coalition had submitted letters to the Governor, legislators, and the Senate and Assembly Natural Resource committees in support of AB112. They recommended the Governor include \$15 million in his budget for this purpose. Federal grants were 80% matching, which would allow \$60 million in federal funds to be received. He urged support, Nevada is the leader in western states in wildlife crossings. There is a need, and they are effective.

Karen Boeger, Back County Hunters and Anglers, stated her support for AB112 and emphasized that due to action from the Department and Commission Nevada led the western states in supplying wildlife crossings that are essential to wildlife viability. She believed there was an obligation to continue to hold that leadership and the timing was right because there were matching funds available in the infrastructure and jobs bill.

Fauna Tomlinson, private citizen, stated that wildlife crossings were important and she was happy to see this going state by state. She thanked Larry Johnson for advocating for the bill.

Commissioner Walther was in support of allocated funds but asked the Department if the bill would allow to begin expending funds or would an amendment to allow expenditure of those funds for projects.

Director Jenne clarified that AB112 did not come funded, it did however provide the capacity for the Department to do the work.

COMMISSIONER WALTHER MOVED TO SUPPORT AB112 AS PRESENTED AND WITH THE ADDITION OF 15 MILLION DOLLARS ALLOCATED. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE PAUL YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

SB88 seeks to conduct a study during the 2023-2024 interim concerning state agencies that regulate natural resources. The study must include without limitation examining the Board of Wildlife Commissioners. If passed it would be effective July 1, 2023.

Chairwoman East disliked SB88 but respected the allotment of time given to conducting the study. She understood that the study would occur in the interim to allow more time for discussion, best practices around the county of other commissions, and how other commissions are composed.

Commissioner Walther stated he needed more information on how the study would be conducted. He questioned, if the Commission opposed SB88 would it lead to concerns or suspicions from the legislature. He asked for thoughts from the committee and public to develop a productive position.

Public Comment:

Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated they did not testify at the hearing. The Coalition was pleased with the makeup of the present Commission and stood ready to defend it.

Tine Nappe, private citizen, stated it never hurts to have outside bodies look in and see if original values still stood. She thought the Commission had done well so far and saw this as an opportunity to exhibit that work.

Commissioner McNinch expressed in the past he had been a staunch defender for the makeup of the Commission. He acknowledged concerns voiced to him about the makeup and was not fearful of future makeup suggestions. Being specifically named on the bill should create pause and it should be from the standpoint of why. He did not believe it should be opposed at this time.

COMMISSIONER WALTHER MOVED TO TAKE NO POSITION ON SB88. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

BDR 45-342, now AB70 seeks to remove the usage of the \$3.00 predator fee for habitat protection of nonpredatory game animals and sensitive wildlife species. The \$3.00 predator fee would be limited to nonpredatory big game only as written. The bill additionally seeks to remove the 80% fund requirement that goes towards lethal management and control of predatory wildlife.

Chairwoman East commented that removing the 80% mandate created opportunities for the Department in using the money, for example applying funds towards habitat to obtain grants for matching funds from federal and private sector sources.

Public Comment:

Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated the predator fee originally passed the legislature with the promise to sportsman that it would be used for predator control, over the years that has eroded. In 2015 the 80% mandate was introduced. There is a significant predator issue in Nevada. He referenced the declining Washoe County deer herds; the California bighorn sheep transplant augmentation made in area 014 where over half the animals were taken by predators. The Mule Deer Enhancement subcommittee for Washoe County lobbied heavily for predator control projects. In area 014 the deer herd once numbered in the thousands and now estimated at 250. Area 022 had more mountain lions than anytime in reported history. He did not believe this was the time to reduce efforts of predator management. He urged the committee to oppose the bill.

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trappers Association, stated big game hunters pay the fee, he was not against using the money for habitat but being that this was the predator management fee it needed to be used for predator management, if not, the fee should be returned.

Tina Nappe, private citizen, stated she opposed the legislation when introduced. As she read the changes it didn't prevent using funds for predator management. Her reading was that at times the Department had difficulties finding a use for the funds that would provided the desired input or output. She acknowledged that there was also the possibility to get rid of the program all together.

Mel Belding, Washoe CABMW, stated he believed Commission Policy 23 stated before, during, and after a transplant was carried out, predator management would be conducted. This policy has been overlooked by other Commissions. He added that area 014 in fact had two transplants that ended with the same result. Nevada has a vast abundance of mountain lions and there is a need for predator management. He did not believe the 80% mandate should be removed and he opposed the bill.

Rex Flowers, private citizen, stated he opposed the bill. The intent was for predator control, Wildlife Services could not keep up with the demand. There was more than enough work and he thought the 80% should be increased to 90%. He ended by stating sportsman's money needed to get back on the ground for what it was intended.

Commissioner Walther asked the Department if there were any concerns with the funds as they currently exist.

Director Jenne replied that the Department tried to develop projects to meet the 80% mandate. This year there were projects totaling above the 80%. Previously there has been performance issues. Implementation depended on whether contractors could be obtained and other issues.

Commissioner McNinch understood why the bill was being presented. Currently the money could not be matched, therefore lost opportunities existed. Raven numbers were increasing and have been, there have been situations where if proper habitat improvements losses may have been mitigated for sage grouse and possibly desert tortoise. As the bill was written he worried about the Departments ability to manage ravens. He would see no issue with suggesting for Wildlife Services to have their budget increased as well to assist with proper management on predators. He addressed public comment and inquired if the \$3.00 fee could become a check off box where the sportsman decided to contribute to habitat or predators. He would like to see a more proactive approach to habitat, where funds could be matched 3 to 1.

Commissioner Walther was interested in discussing habitat ideas for 3 to 1 match. If there are larger funds available would the Department have the capacity to get on the ground and complete projects in the short windows that exist?

Commissioner McNinch did not believe there was reason to oppose AB70 and would not support the motion. He was open to no action or neutral.

COMMISSIONER WALTHER AMENDED HIS MOTION AND MOVED TO OPPOSE AB 70 AND CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS AS A COMMITTEE AND COMMISSION. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE PAUL YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED 3-1. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH DISSENTED.

Recess at 7:25 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 7:30 p.m.

BDR 128, now AB102 seeks to prohibit organizing, sponsoring, promoting, conducting or participating in contests, tournaments, derbies or other in which animals are taken for prize or other inducement. The animals listed include beaver, bobcat, coyote, fox, mink, muskrat, otter, rabbit, skunk or weasel.

Commissioner Walther did not support the language as presented. He acknowledged that this was a contentious matter, even for sportsman. Those in support of the bill voiced there was no biological reason for the hunt or that it painted the hunting community in a bad light for a small group of participants. Those in opposition wanted things to remain as they had been. He asked if the Commission could take this topic back to the Commission. There existed two polar extremes, he asked both groups to back away from their positions and see if there was an opportunity to contribute to predator management in a productive way. Could there be designated areas where the Department had identified an overabundance of predators and provided opportunity to sportsman's in doing so?

Chairwoman East mentioned that selling licenses to hunt coyotes was discussed but nothing became of it.

Public Comment:

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trappers Association and private citizen stated AB102 fell into his wheelhouse due to all fur bearers being called out. He has spent his life being singled out and saw this bill as cultural bigotry. This is largely a rural pass time and there would be a large outlash from rural counties. This was about allowing gatherings with people of similar interest and have a social event. The Nevada Trappers Association give out a best handled furs award, this bill would make that illegal.

Bryce Pollock, private citizen stated AB102 was based on misconception presented by special interest groups, Project Coyote specifically. They label the events as barbaric, wasteful competitions and display images of coyotes stacked twenty feet high. They selectively choose their narrative. Contests in the state are not savage, barbaric contests, they are families paring up for a day scheduled a year in advance. They are fundraisers, the Ely Volunteer Fire Department uses them as a fundraiser. Tonopah High School Rodeo Club uses them as a fundraiser. Silver State Sportsman's and Eureka uses them as a fundraiser to do habitat work and guzzler repairs. Last year the friends and family competition he participated in consisted of 50 teams, 100 people total, 6 dogs were killed. An outright ban does not consider the spectrum of the competitions, it greatly disproportionally effects rural counties at the will of urban counties. Sportsman needed to tell their story.

Karen Boeger, Nevada Back County Hunters and Anglers stated that Bryce had provided her a great education. Bryce educated her on the monies raised going to Project Habitat and wildlife projects on the ground. Families that participate also go out on the ground to contribute sweat equity towards making improvements, that information failed to get in the public sphere. She appreciated Commissioner Walther's carefully thought-out questions and proposals. In the past the Department had given suggestions where contestants could seek coyotes, targeting groups causing high depredation, going forward that could be advantages. She understood the perspective of this being a cultural war but thought the two extremes led to the dehumanizing of people. She believed this belonged in a stakeholder group with facilitators, not at the legislature.

Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated he had never partaken in contests, but he stopped short of telling sportsman what they could and could not do. This was America the land of the free and is not harming anyone or any resource so it should be protected as a personal freedom. This was a lifestyle. He added that the Department's previous Small Game guide advertised a wildlife contest, the chukar tournament in Battle Mountain. He opposed the bill.

Mel Belding, Washoe CABMW, stated he opposed the bill as it called out the list of furbearers. He mentioned that what the Commission did with the calling contests hit home in a lot of places, specifically with public and Facebook advertisement. He did not believe what occurred was a failure.

Tina Nappe, private citizen, stated the Commission should be addressing the topic not the legislature. She did not like the coyote calling contests, they were disrespectful to coyotes and the processes the Department had set up over the years. She did not like people coming in from out of state and being free to hunt animals. She thought it was

time to have licenses to hunt anything in the state. The agency was largely run on the opportunity to hunt, when there are contests processes that support the agency are being disrespected and dismissed. If the bill passed there would be a missed opportunity, the bill should return to the Commission.

Commissioner McNinch aimed to be succinct. The bill was sent to the legislature the previous session and was brought to the Commission as an opportunity to find a resolution. The Commission failed to appease the legislature, prompting them to take it back. Of his personal conversations only two of the roughly twenty-four sportsmen opposed this bill, the others simply wanted to know if they could continue to hunt coyotes outside of the confines of the competitions. The answer was yes and they expressed they found the competitions offensive. He was not opposed to taking this back to the Commission but to what end. The Commission was in a position where they legislated morality, that was the reason quotas and seasons existed, why rules for guiding and trail cameras existed. Chukar contests and fishing derbies were not included in this bill because they operated under a regulatory framework. This was not a biological issue; it was a social issue. If sportsmen do not adapt, they will lose relevancy. He supported the bill and saw it as an important checkpoint.

Commissioner Walther believed it was important for the Commission to take the issue up again. He inquired if the Department could identify areas of opportunity in a regulated manner that would in fact benefit other managed species and avoid a total ban on the activity. Could a fee be explored, could regulations to address wanton waste be explored, could seasons in which coyote pelts are in better shape than others be created. Is there an opportunity to turn this into something better for sportsmen, those in opposition and the Department?

Commissioner McNinch was open to having conversations on predator management with sportsmen but questioned why it is necessary to do that under the premise of a contest. Sportsmen could still go out on the field, if their actions were voluntary why was there concern with the contests?

Chairwoman East was against the contests. These were unmanaged species, there were no regulations around this. She did not believe the Commission would want to explore this further. She leaned towards not taking a position at the moment and opening the conversation to the Commission to make a determination.

Commissioner Walther agreed the issue should be taken to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner McNinch believes the bill should be supported. If not supported, he asked the committee to stand neutral.

Chairwoman East wished to consider the ideas that were addressed in the meeting.

Director Jenne stated conversations could be had with Commissioner Walther to address his questions and ideas.

CHAIRWOMAN EAST AMENDED HER MOTION AND MOVED TO BE NEUTRAL ON AB102 AND CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS AS A COMMITTEE, COMMISSION AND DEPARTMENT. COMMISSIONER MCNINCH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Future Committee Meetings – Committee Chairwoman East – For Possible Action

The Committee will discuss potential agenda items for future committee meetings. The Committee may schedule its next meeting and may choose to recommend a March meeting date or timeframe for the Board of Wildlife Commissioners related to legislative matters if needed.

Chairwoman East provided projected Legislative Committee meeting dates. March 11, 2023, at 8:00 a.m., in conjunction with Commission meeting. A Zoom link will be made available. April 6, 2023, at 5:30 p.m., held virtually. May 5, 2023, at 8:00 a.m., in conjunction with Commission meeting. A Zoom link will be made available. May 16, 2023, held virtually if need.

6. Public Comment Period

Persons wishing to comment are invited to raise their virtual hands in the virtual meeting forum during the appropriate time; each person offering public comment during this period will be limited to not more than 3 minutes. No action can be taken by the Committee at this time; any item requiring Committee action may be scheduled on a future Committee agenda.

David McNinch, private citizen, stated he had been asked to attend meetings at the legislature with legislators. He prefaces each meeting that he is not there as a representative of the Commission, he is representing his personal thoughts. The bills discussed were the calling contest, predator fee and interim study. Largely, he shared his experience with proposing regulatory change through the Commission.

Karen Boeger, Back Country Hunters and Anglers stated she submitted comments on SB87. The bill was not addressed and she questioned if it would be tracked by the committee as it related to Ameri Corps and incentivizing them for filling natural resource openings.

Rex Flowers, private citizen stated Commissioner McNinch mentioned wanting to be respectful of the sportsman's perspective but felt he was caught in the social science, was he speaking on behalf of conservation or on behalf of the general population.

Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, stated Commissioner McNinch questioned the effectiveness of predator control projects and one did not have to go far. The area 014 predator review project that occurred a decade ago caused the deer population to expand 80%. There was a question on diverting predator funds for habitat programs, he pointed out as an example the Washoe County Mule Deer Enhancement

Program subcommittee set their first priority to reseeding a large wildfire area in 014, a guzzler project and last predator management. The dollars spent on habitat outstripped what was spent on predator control.

Mel Belding, Washoe CABMW, stated that Commissioner McNinch mentioned getting to the 80% mandate was difficult, for that reason he believed transparency was needed. He wanted to see the projects that field biologist were asking for, whether they were being denied and why. Transparency was needed, it would allow the public to know if it was in fact difficult to reach the 80% mandate.

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.