

**MINUTES OF THE CHURCHILL COUNTY  
ADVISORY BOARD TO MANAGE WILDLIFE**

**155 N. Taylor St., Fallon, NV 89406  
June 24, 2020**

**Call to Order:**

The regular meeting of the Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife was called to order at 7:05 PM on June 24, 2020, which was conducted electronically via Zoom meeting.

|          |                            |
|----------|----------------------------|
| PRESENT: | Member Jim Curran          |
|          | Member Peggy A. Hughes     |
|          | Member Jason Sibley        |
|          | Member Gary Cordes         |
|          | Deputy Clerk Renae Paholke |
| ABSENT:  | Member Timothy Gubler      |

**Pledge of Allegiance:**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by the board and public.

**Public Comment:**

Chair Hughes asked if there was any public comment but there was none.

**Verification of the Posting of the Agenda:**

It was verified by Renae Paholke that that the Agenda for this meeting was posted on the 16th day of June, 2020, between the hours of 2:30 and 4:30 PM at all of the locations listed on the Agenda, in accordance with NRS 241.

**Consideration and possible action re: Approval of Agenda as submitted or revised:**

**Member Jim Curran made a motion to approve the Agenda as submitted. Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**Consideration and possible action re: Approval of Minutes of the meeting held on:**

**A- January 22, 2020.**

The Minutes of the meeting held on January 22, 2020 are submitted for the board's

consideration and approval.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

**Member Gary Cordes made a motion to approve the Minutes of the meeting held on January 22, 2020 as presented. Member Jason Sibley seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**Appointments:**

**A- Consideration and possible action re: Approval of previously submitted 2021 Travel Budget to the Nevada Department of Wildlife.**

The 2021 Travel Budget was previously submitted to the Nevada Department of Wildlife and needs to be considered and approved by the Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife.

FISCAL IMPACT: As presented.

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: As presented.

FUNDING SOURCE: As presented.

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

Member Peggy A. Hughes said the budget was due the first of May and we did not have any meetings around that time, so I went ahead and submitted the budget requests which totaled \$2,383.96. I bring it before you now for consideration.

**Member Jim Curran made a motion to approve the previously submitted 2021 Travel Budget to NDOW as presented. Member Jason Sibley seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**B- Consideration and possible action re: Commission General Regulation 490 - Party Bonus Points and First Come First Serve.**

This regulation will allow children under 12 to purchase a bonus point if they turn 12 before the first day of the last season for that species. The regulation also addresses bonus points for sportsmen who apply as a party, as well as, restores bonus points to active military unable to apply for hunts in two consecutive years due to being deployed during the application periods. Lastly, the regulation would allow a first-come-first-serve opportunity for returned tags that miss the 14-day deadline.

The Department is recommending the Commission review the language for the regulation and discuss business rules for the Department to move the regulation forward for an adoption at the

August 2020 Commission Meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

Member Jim Curran said I did not receive a hard copy in the mail, and I don't think anybody did. I didn't print it because it was over 100 pages. I did read it a couple of weeks ago and, at that time, I had no problem with the recommended changes.

**Member Jim Curran made a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 490 as presented. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**C- Consideration and possible action re: Commission General Regulation 491 - Notification of Draw Results.**

This regulation clarifies the authority of the Department to notify hunt applicants of their draw results by any means the Department chooses while keeping 48-hours post draw requirement. This change will allow the Department the ability to use current technology as a notification delivery method.

The Department is recommending the Commission review the language for the regulation and discuss business rules for the Department to move the regulation forward for an adoption at the August 2020 Commission Meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

Member Jason Sibley said I don't think that there is any malice involved, but it sounds very broad. I am just curious what that means. I think they should clarify that.

**Member Jason Sibley made a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 491 as presented but with the request of an example of what "by any means" means. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**D- Consideration and possible action re: Commission General Regulation 492 - Thermal Imaging Optics.**

The first section of this regulation addresses an addition to NAC Chapter 503 concerning what equipment or devices may be used or possessed while locating, hunting, or taking any game bird or game mammal. This section also addresses exceptions for certain sights attached to a firearm, bow or crossbow. The second section addresses amending NAC 503.1485-3 to clean up

language and regulate usage of devices that have a time lapse recording function.

NDOW is recommending that the Commission adopt the language as is. These additions and changes to Chapter 503 and NAC 503.1485 address potential ethical concerns of fair chase related to constantly evolving technology.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

Member Gary Cordes said I think there was some discussion that game cameras might be used to better secure traps so you can place one at the bottom of a canyon. If there was a bobcat in your trap and your trap is gone, you might have a good idea of who might have taken it out.

Member Sibley said I oppose that whole regulation altogether. I am going to choose not to vote on this at all because I am still very much against this whole trail camera thing. I think it is poorly written and it took away a whole lot more than what we recommended and what it was intended for. As far as the thermal imaging, the only thing I can think of, because you can't hunt big game animals after hours anyway as that is a violation, is maybe someone is locating an animal with night vision before the sun comes up and then hunts the animal. That is the only thing that would make sense in this situation.

Member Jim Curran said I actually don't have any problem with what they are proposing because it does limit it to hunting game mammals; it does not affect pig hunting. That is not a game mammal. That is a very popular way to hunt in the south. We do have a couple problem areas with pigs in our state. I agree with Jason in regard to the part that they aren't really trying to admit it. I know we supported, and the commission argued over and over, about the distance from a body of water and the intent was not to outlaw all trail cameras, it was to outlaw on guzzlers and streams and springs. At the last minute, the commission made it completely generic to cover everything and I am opposed to that section also. I could support strictly approving the blue recommendation for changes. I am really surprised that some county has not submitted a petition to address the whole trail camera subject again. That would be the way to go, is the petition process, which is not hard to do and just that section would come up before the commission.

Member Jason Sibley said my only rebuttal to that is, in section 1, the first note says a person shall not possess the device so, if I go pheasant hunting and then I go deer hunting and I have a rifle in my truck that has that scope on it, then I am in violation. I think it needs to be the active use of it versus of in possession. Member Jim Curran said it does talk about using. Member Jason Sibley said, the very first word says a person shall not possess or use any of the following equipment while hunting. It is saying I cannot even have it if I am out deer hunting, even if it is on a gun rack in my truck. Member Peggy Hughes said but isn't the stuff on your gun not

exempt? Member Jason Sibley said, if I had infrared or some sort of night vision, then I would be in violation because I have a gun in my truck with that. I am okay with that with the way it is written as long as they remove the word possess. Anytime you use the word possess, it makes me nervous because somebody is going to forget it is in their truck and then they get a citation for it.

**Member Jason Sibley made a motion to approve Section 1 of the Commission General Regulation 492 as presented with NFC 503.1 with the stipulation that they remove the word possess. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote. Member Jim Curran made a motion to oppose Section 2 of NAC 503.1485. Member Jason Sibley seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**E- Consideration and possible action re: Fiscal Year 2021 Heritage Project Proposals.**

The objectives of this project are to understand demographic responses to selection of resources by adult and juvenile desert bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis nelsoni*) to: 1) to improve the delineation of high quality lambing habitat for multiple populations, 2) determine demographic parameters (survival and recruitment) of adult and young desert bighorn sheep in response to translocation, and 3) understand movement and dispersal patterns of males. This information will benefit NDOW by providing information on demographic parameters to help direct conservation and restoration towards habitats critical for enhancing population growth of desert bighorn sheep. Results from this project need to be disseminated to provide detailed information on designation and detailed descriptions of habitats that are selected by ewes to enhance lamb survival. This information will provide managers information on population parameters as well as helping them to direct conservation towards habitats critical for enhancing population growth of desert bighorn sheep. A detailed description of the project is outlined in the proposal.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

**Member Jim Curran made a motion to approve the list of projects as presented. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**F- Consideration and possible action re: Duck Stamp Request.**

The Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) donated \$10,000 to Ducks Unlimited (DU) during FY20 to help them implement the migratory bird projects that were developed as a result of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan. The projects primarily consist of wetland restoration, forage establishment and production, and the purchase of conservation easements in the prairie potholes regions of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Band return data show that these two Canadian provinces are the sources of a significant number of waterfowl that pass through

Nevada each year. The prairie potholes region has the highest density of breeding ducks in all of North America. The projects are outlined in the report.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

**Member Jim Curran made a motion to approve the Duck Stamp Requests as presented. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**G- Consideration and possible action re: Commission Regulation 20-12 - Upland Game and Furbearer Seasons and Bag Limits for 2020-2021.**

The Commission will consider and may vote to amend regulations for upland game birds and mammals, as well as furbearers, for the 2020 season. this regulation will also include fall wild turkey seasons for 2020 and spring wild turkey seasons for 2021.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

**Member Jim Curran made a motion to approve Commission Regulation 20-12 as presented. Member Jason Sibley seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**H- Consideration and possible action re: Biennial Upland Game Release Plan for Fiscal Years 2020 and 2021.**

The Commission will review and may take action to approve up to \$264,840 for projects submitted for FY 21 funding from the Upland Game Bird Stamp account. The specific Upland Game Bird Stamp projects that may be approved are listed below:

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Bi-State Sage-grouse Coordinator   | \$ 5,000 |
| Dusky Grouse Ecology and Management in Nevada  | \$22,003 |
| Eastern Complex WMA Weed Control   | \$10,000 |
| Estimating Greater Sage-grouse Vital Rates within Nevada's Novel Habitats                      | \$21,250 |
| Estimating the Effects of Large Ungulate Grazing on Greater Sage-grouse in Northwestern Nevada | \$18,397 |
| Greater Sage-grouse Statewide Monitoring   | \$47,640 |
| Key Pittman WMA Wildlife Food Plots  | \$ 3,900 |
| Monitoring Greater Sage-grouse Response to the Martin Fire                                     | \$12,750 |
| Monitoring the Effects of Landscape Level Treatments on Greater Sage-grouse in                 | \$19,500 |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| the Desatoya Mountains  |          |
| Soil Health Restoration on WMAs   | \$10,000 |
| Upland Game Translocation and Monitoring  | \$12,400 |
| Using Hunter and Population Survey Data to Investigate Drivers of Upland Game bird Populations and Forecast Harvest in Nevada | \$24,600 |
| Genette Creek Conservation Easement   | \$30,000 |
| Toiyabe PMU (Bakes, Hickison, and Wolf Ranch) Pinyon Juniper Thinning   | \$25,000 |
| A Multi-scale Resilience-based Framework for Restoring and Conserving Great Basin Wet Meadows and Riparian Ecosystems         | \$ 2,400 |

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

**Member Jason Sibley made a motion to approve the Biennial Upland Game Release Plan as presented. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**I- Consideration and possible action re: Commission General Regulation 485 - Tag Transfer, Deference and Return Program.**

During the 80th Legislative Session, Assembly Bill 404 was passed which gives the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commission the authority to adopt regulations establishing conditions or events which are extenuating circumstances, a process through which a big game hunter may provide documentation to the Department which shows he or she qualifies for an extenuating circumstance, and a program through which the hunter can transfer his or her tag to another eligible hunter, defer his tag, or return the tag for restoration of bonus points. At the January 2020 Commission Meeting, the Commission directed the Department to bring the regulation forward for adoption. The regulation was resubmitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to incorporate the many changes. The attached regulation came back from LCB and is ready to be adopted.

The Department recommends adopting Commission General Regulation 485, Tag Transfer, Deference and Return Program, LCB File No. R022-19 as written.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

**Member Jason Sibley made a motion to approve Commission General Regulation 485 as**

**presented. Member Gary Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**J- Consideration and possible action re: Changes to Waterfowl Hunt Zones for 2021 - 2025.**

Independent dates may be selected for the regular duck season. A split is a designated break within a waterfowl season that breaks that season into two or more segments. Waterfowl zone and split designations are regulated through federal waterfowl frameworks, and the Department can only recommend changes to those frameworks once every 5 years. The zones and splits are designed to distribute hunting opportunities and harvests according to temporal, geographic, and demographic variability in waterfowl and other migratory game bird populations. Once a zone and split option is selected during an open season, it must remain in place for the following 5 years.

Zone and associated split configurations are as follows:

- 1 zone, season can be split into 2 or 3 segments.
- 2 zones, Season can be split into 2 segments.
- 3 zones, Season can be split into 2 segments.
- 4 zones, no split allowed.

Timeframe:

The deadline for states to submit any proposed changes is July 1, 2020. A state's zone and split choices at that time would be effective from 2021 through 2025 and cannot be changed again for that time period.

Current Zones:

- Northeast Zone: Elko and White Pine Counties.
- Northwest Zone: Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lyon, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, Storey and Washoe Counties.
- South Zone: Lincoln and Clark Counties.

Proposed Zones:

- Northeast Zone: Elko, Eureka, Lander and White Pine Counties.
- Northwest Zone: Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Humboldt, Lyon, Mineral, Pershing, Storey and Washoe Counties.
- South Zone: Clark, Esmeralda, Lincoln and Nye Counties.

The Department recommends that the Commission vote to approve waterfowl hunt zone changes as presented for the 2021 – 2025 waterfowl seasons and direct the department to move forward with necessary actions to request zone changes as required within federal frameworks.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A



ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

Member Jason Sibley said I think we voted on this last time. Member Peggy Hughes said I think we did too so there is no response. Member Jason Sibley said it doesn't look to be affecting our unit so I don't have an opinion on it.

**K- Consideration and possible action re: Petition filed by John V. Zenz for big Game Tag Drawing Changes.**

Mr. Zenz has submitted a petition to change the Big Game Tag Drawing to (1) give twenty-five percent of the overall tags to the max point holders; (2) reduce the number of choices to only three; and (3) allow only up to fifty percent of the tags in any unit to be issued to max point holders. The Commission may take action to deny or accept the Petition and initiate rulemaking.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Accept

Member Jason Sibley said I am against this. I am not in a situation that some people might be where they are close to max bonus points, but I think allocating 25% is a big chunk of the max tag owners. I am not a big fan of reducing the number of choices. I am not sure what that would accomplish, mostly because if you look, historically, most of the people that have max bonus points are the people that are putting in for, say, area 16 bull elk where there are only 2 or 3 tags and that is why, because that is the only unit they applied for. There are just unlucky people. I am against allocating 25% max bonus point holders. Member Gary Cordes said if you open this up to a different allocation, then every person has a special interest. They want a little slice of the pie, so then you go from a 25% allocation to a certain tag holder and then another 10% to another certain tag holder. Member Jason Sibley said I also think that if you are looking at a unit that has 4 tags or 8 tags, and then you take away 25% of those tags, I think the department is going to suffer because less people will apply. People who have 1 or 2 bonus points, now that we are giving 25% of those tags to max holders right off of the top, they are just going to start applying for bonus points only. That is the reason I apply every year and I have never applied for bonus points because it is a true lottery. I could have 1 bonus point and draw a sheep tag, or I could have 25 bonus points and never draw a sheep tag.

Member Peggy Hughes said she and Dennis Lee were talking earlier about how some people are maxed out on their bonus points but if they truly want to hunt a certain species, maybe they need to consider different areas because some of those areas are over applied for so the odds of drawing something are against you. Member Jason Sibley one of the things he mentioned in this was the Rocky Mountain Elk tag and big horn sheep and that is tough because there are only 5 tags in the state and you are limited to 3 choices for mountain goat, I think is what it is, so I understand that those tags are tough but the way our system is being random, I like that because I have a chance of 7 bonus points to draw a sheep. Dennis Lee said I would be careful in adopting this, in terms of dividing out max points versus random. You will create a bottleneck

with guys with max and guys that are 2 points behind them. Look at Arizona, Colorado, and Wyoming with 2-point preference systems. I apply in 9 different states and have 15 points in Utah and can't draw because of the bottleneck of bonus points. There are not enough tags given, especially when you talk sheep. Even if you are one point behind in Arizona, it could take you 10 to 20 years to move through the max bonus point holders. I would be very careful to adopt that.

Member Jason Sibley said it might make more sense to make it a once in a lifetime tag if you are worried about bonus point holders. The splitting between 25 and 75 has caused more problems like you said, in terms of, creating another 10% for what Wyoming does, regular and special draw right? Now you are giving out another cut of tags out of that pool to go to a different draw and I think you would see interest groups wanting to go that way creating a different drawing. Yes, it sucks that you have 25 bonus points and can't draw a sheep tag, don't get me wrong, but there are people in Arizona that have 30 points and still can't draw a sheep tag. The way their preference points are set up, they may never draw a sheep tag because they will never get through max bonus point holders. Member Jim Curran said that is partly true here too. Mr. Zenz didn't really provide enough information regarding the number of people that do have the maximum let's say for sheep, it really only affects the sheep species. If you look at the number of unsuccessfuls, I have like 19 for California Big Horn. If this was enacted, I could never get up to the maximum because if there are 50 people with 29 bonus points and there are only 5 tags, then there will be 45 of them that will move up to 30 points and so on. When we changed from one bonus system to another 28 years ago, which was a zoo for 5 or 6 years. People who had 5 unsuccessful postcards went into the first draw, so for 5 years you really didn't have a chance to draw a tag unless you were one of the five that had physically saved your postcard and then you went into the draw. I have grandkids that might have a chance to draw a sheep tag in the next ten years. With the other system, there is no reason for them to even apply. I am against any change to any new system.

**Member Jason Sibley made a motion to oppose the petition. Member Jim Curran seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.**

**Informational Items:**

**A- Consideration and possible action re: Items listed on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda for June 26 and 27, 2020, which is attached as Exhibit "A".**

The board will consider items listed on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda for June 26 and 27, 2020, which is attached as Exhibit "A". The board will take action as deemed appropriate.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: Other

There was no further discussion on items listed on the state's Agenda.

**Consider Future Agenda Items:**

There were no future Agenda items suggested.

**Commissioner and Management Staff Reports:**

This item was listed on the Agenda in error and no report was made.

**Claims and Payroll Transmittals:**

This item was listed on the Agenda in error and no transmittals were made.

**Public Comment:**

Chair Hughes asked if there was any public comment but there was none.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 PM.

---

CHAIRWOMAN PEGGY HUGHES

---

MEMBER JIM CURRAN

---

MEMBER JASON SIBLEY

---

MEMBER TIMOTHY GUBLER

---

MEMBER GARY CORDES

ATTEST:  
Linda Rothery, Clerk/Treasurer

---

Renae Paholke, Deputy Clerk

