

CHAIRMAN TOMMY CAVIGLIA
COMMISSIONER EDDIE BOOTH
COMMISSIONER SHANE ROGERS
COMMISSIONER PAUL YOUNG
CABMW REP. RYAN BROWNE
CABMW REP. JOE CRIM
PUBLIC REP. MEGHAN BROWN

STAFF TO THE COMMITTEE:
KIM MUNOZ, DATS DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR
kim.munoz@ndow.org, 775-688-1565
MEGAN MANFREDI, MANAGEMENT ANALYST
mmanfredi@ndow.org, 775-688-1881

DRAFT MINUTES
NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS
TAG ALLOCATION AND APPLICATION HUNT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2024 @ 4:00 PM

Please click this URL to join.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85871120939?pwd=bVRtaTR6ZWMwczE0YyRGJJRnFlcmhvdz09>

Passcode: 480493

Committee Members in attendance: Chairman Tommy Caviglia, Commissioner Eddie Booth, Commissioner Paul Young, CABMW Representative Ryan Browne, Public Representative Meghan Brown

Nevada Department of Wildlife personnel in attendance: Data and Technology Services (DATS) Division Administrator Kim Munoz, Management Analyst Megan Manfredi, Game Division Administrator Shawn Espinosa, Deputy Director Mike Scott, Director Alan Jenne, Executive Assistant Lynda Barr, Management Analyst Kailey Musso, Law Enforcement Chief Kristy Knight, Wildlife Staff Specialist Joe Bennett, Deputy Director Jordan Goshert, Deputy Director Caleb McAdoo, Conservation Educator Bobby Jones

County advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABMW) Members and public in attendance: Jim Cooney, Mel Belding, Brandon Etchemendy, Carl Erquiaga, Evan McQuirk, Jacob Frisch, Jeremiah Waltman, Lydia Teel, Marcie, Mitch McVicars, Tiffany East, Matt Melarkey, Tom Cassinelli, Jessie Lattin, Robert Cowan, Mitch Bailey, David Gough

1. Call to Order, Pledge and Roll Call – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia

Chairman Caviglia called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM. Members and public present said the pledge. Chairman Tommy Caviglia, Commissioner Eddie Booth, Commissioner Paul Young, CABMW Representative Ryan Browne, Public Representative Meghan Brown and Commissioner Shane Rogers were present. CABMW Representative Joe Crim was absent.

2. Public Comment Period

Mel Belding stated that he had many discussions with the Senator and proposer of the initial bill. The intentions of that initial bill are not being met with the proposed language of the Committee. He requested the intent of the initial bill be considered as it moves forward in the regulation making process.

3. Approval of Agenda – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – 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.

No public comment.

COMMISSIONER ROGERS MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE BROWN. MOTION PASSED 6-0 WITH CABMW REPRESENTATIVE CRIM ABSENT.

- 4.* Approval of Minutes – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action
The Committee may take action to approve Committee minutes from the January 25, 2024, meeting.

No public comment.

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE BROWN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA. MOTION PASSED 6-0 WITH CABMW REPRESENTATIVE CRIM ABSENT.

- 5.* Junior Tag Transfer – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – For Possible Action
The Committee will review the proposed language that would establish a junior tag transfer program. The Committee will make any necessary changes which will be presented and heard at a future Commission meeting.

Management Analyst Megan Manfredi opened the agenda item by summarizing the changes made by the Committee during the last meeting which included the exclusion of a junior mule deer tag specific to the junior mule deer program from participation in the transfer program and the definition of accompaniment in the field. That definition was a combination of a similar definition used by Utah along with assistance from the Law Enforcement division on a reasonable distance away from the youth in the field while still having the ability to provide verbal assistance to the youth in the field. The language has been sent to the Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) for official drafting. She noted that any changes made by the Committee during the meeting will be relayed to the Commission as this item will be heard by the Board of Wildlife Commission later in the week.

Public comment:

Mitch McVicars stated his disagreement with subsection nine of the language where it states a tag holder may only transfer a tag once in their lifetime and would prefer that item stricken from the proposed language.

Mel Belding stated he knows what the intentions of the bill very well. He did not understand why the program was limited to only mule deer transfers while the intent was for transfers to allow any type of tag transferred to youth. He agreed with the previous comment where the once in a lifetime language should be removed. He stated subsection three should also be removed because a person is not a tag holder at the time a person applies for the tag but after the draw is conducted. There should be no redesignation about wanting to transfer the tag at a later time. Subsection ten preventing a tag holder from returning the tag for the restoration of bonus points is conflicting with an already established regulation and should also be removed. He stated his disagreement with both the original tag holder and the transferee losing their bonus points because the tag is transferred. He asked what the reasoning was behind the definition in subsection 13 A as there are very few people who would want a person going with them while stocking an animal in the field. It is not needed on upland game hunts or within

the junior mule deer program and the proximity should not be included within this regulation. He suggested the regulation go back to the Department for further revisions.

Matt Melarkey stated his understanding that the regulation was written to prevent those from taking advantage of the program, but he agreed with the previous comment that the lifetime limit poses a problem for people with more than one child.

Chairman Caviglia stated that section three was difficult for him to designate the transferee at the time the application is submitted due to not knowing which one of the kids will draw a tag where the tag holder would want to change their designation to another kid. The Committee had a substantial amount of discussion on this item to get the Committee to the point of limiting the program to mule deer only as there is potential for this program to be gamed.

CABMW Representative Browne confirmed that naming an individual at the time they submitted their application was a way to avoid the system being gamed. The once in a lifetime transfer was a way to limit that as well although he stated his understanding of the previous comments on families with multiple children.

Public Representative Brown agreed with the comments on how many times a transfer would be allowed. If the limit was transfers to family only, the burden would be on the Department to research family ties with step kids and biological ties which would become a burden to the Department. She added her appreciation to the Department for being able to encompass the previous discussions of the Committee. Related to the mule deer limit, it was decided by the Committee to try it with the limit and see how it goes as the program flushes out its hiccups. It can then be used as a framework to expand to more species moving forward knowing that there will be attempts to game the system.

Chairman Caviglia added that regarding item number 13A and to limit the gaming, the Committee decided that having the original tag holder in the field. The language is also very similar to what Utah does in their regulation to add some background since there are additional public in attendance today.

Commissioner Booth stated that during the last meeting, Judi Caron made some interesting comments about accompanying the minor into the field and it might be a good idea to allow the youth's parents to take responsibility on the hunt and to not have the necessity of the original tag holder to accompany the youth. If a hunter prefers to hunt alone, the proposed guidelines seem inappropriate as who is going to measure the ten-yard limitation and enforce it. He was in favor of allowing the parents of the child to take responsibility of the mentoring in the field.

Commissioner Young added that many of the items drafted in the regulation were put in to address the concerns related to people gaming the system. He would not be opposed to looking further into the limit to one transfer in a lifetime based on families having multiple children. Addressing the intended transferees at the time of application would also be another item to look further into.

Public Representative Brown asked for clarification of the Department since the regulation mentions a plural in section three, would there be an option to list multiple individuals to receive a tag at the time the application is submitted. If there was an option to list multiple, she believed that would ease some of the public's concerns. She did not want to see the item removed as the point is to bring intent to what the transfer program is trying to establish which is increased opportunities for youth in the field and a good hunting experience. She stated her openness to trying the program as written and at the time feedback is gathered, the program can be expanded upon.

Commissioner Rogers echoed many things that have already been previously said. There has been a tone of discussion on the intent of what is being done with the program and in a perfect world the program would not need to be so strict as it is currently written. History has shown us is that some people take

the original intent and stretch the limit. He added his support for how the regulation is written but agreed that he would be open to discussion on section three.

Division Administrator Kim Munoz reminded that the section three item was added to the program to remove the black market for the tags after the draw has been conducted. By designating a youth intended to receive the transfer removes any ability for an individual to offer the sale of the tag after they become aware that they were awarded. The Department saw people adding to social media forums requests to purchase a tag for their child as the bill was being heard at the Nevada Legislature. She agreed that the program is more restrictive than the original intent of the bill, but it was important to the Department to not create a black market for tags and allow people the opportunity to pass money behind the scenes for a transfer through this program.

Management Analyst Manfredi added that section three would cause development work through our application system and would have the ability to provide an option to collect multiple names of the intended transferees at the time the application is submitted. She suggested not going higher than five names per application but there is an option to provide that during development of the program while not needing to list the number of names within regulation.

Discussion continued related to items within the written regulation and their purpose to prevent the gaming of the system and which items could be adjusted.

Deputy Director Mike Scott stated that the bonus point section was added to remove the loophole that the Department saw a few years ago related to party hunts where an individual had the option to return their tag for a bonus point return just to use their points for the party the following year. We do not want the same loophole provided to the transfer program to transfer tags year after year.

Chairman Caviglia stated that he thought that if the tag was returned the junior would be the one who received the points back and not the original tag holder.

Management Analyst Manfredi added that it could be written into regulation that the junior who returned the tag would receive their bonus points back but the original tag holder who transferred it would not.

Public Representative Brown asked what would happen to the tag if the junior returned the tag to the Department and requested that the public is aware and understand the trajectory of the tag after a tag is returned from this program.

Management Analyst Manfredi answered that current business processes would be applied, and the returned tag would be offered to the next available alternate or offered for sale in the First Come, First Served program depending on the timeframe of which the tag was returned.

Chairman Caviglia stated that he felt the ten yards in section 13A was restrictive and asked if that option was added by the Law Enforcement division.

Management Analyst Manfredi answered that she did work with Law Enforcement to determine a reasonable distance away to continue verbal assistance to the minor while in the field. The set distance is easier to enforce opposed to a general type of terminology within regulation.

Commissioner Young stated his support of extending the yardage between the tag holder and the original tag holder in the field.

Public Representative Brown was in favor of leaving in regulation the need for an applicant to designate their intended transferees, the program should start with one transfer in a lifetime and can be relaxed once the program has been established and open for a few years. The point of the program is to get

youth in the field and part of the program should contain a mentoring aspect as some kids do not have a hunting family and a tag transferred to the youth could provide a good opportunity for a learning experience. She stated that her goal was that the youth get quality mentorship in the field through this program.

Other members of the Committee stated their agreements with what had been discussed related to the items found within the regulation language.

CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA MOVED TO APPROVE THE JUNIOR TAG TRANSFER REGULATION AS PRESENTED WITH THE OPTION FOR THE DEPARTMENT TO REVIEW SECTION 13A AND AMEND THE 10 YARDS SECTION AND FORWARD TO THE COMMISSION FOR REVIEW, SECONDED BY PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE BROWN. MOTION PASSED 6-0 WITH CABMW REPRESENTATIVE CRIM ABSENT.

6.* Waiting Periods for Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goat – Management Analyst Megan Manfredi – For Possible Action

The Committee will review the proposed language changes that would amend NAC 502.345 and 502.364, adjusting the waiting periods for Nelson (Desert) bighorn sheep, Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, California bighorn sheep, and mountain goat to once in a customer's lifetime. The Committee will make any necessary changes which will be presented and heard at a future Commission meeting.

Management Analyst Manfredi opened the agenda item by providing history of the lifetime waiting periods being discussed at the June 2023 TAAHC meeting. During that meeting, moose was included in the option for a lifetime waiting period and since moose has had its own regulation created that included the waiting periods, this item has been brought back to the Committee for review before being forwarded on to the Commission. The regulation language has been sent to LCB for drafting.

Chairman Caviglia asked the Department to share the numbers that were presented at the June's meeting.

Management Analyst Manfredi answered that in preparation for the June meeting, the Department pulled 18 years' worth of data related to how many customers drew multiple of the same sheep tag within that time. From 2005 through 2023 no people drew a rocky Mountain bighorn ram tag twice, one person drew a California bighorn ram tag twice, and 16 people drew a nelson bighorn ram tag twice.

Public comment:

Evan McQuirk with Nevada Bighorns Unlimited Reno stated that their organization was seeking additional intent related to the reasoning this item was being proposed. While collecting the feel of the proposed regulation with board members and members of the organization in addition to the statistics the Department just shared, it seemed to him that the current waiting periods for sheep are already handling the intent of the proposed regulation. Many of the feedback from their organization is that people do not wish for this to move forward so they were looking for additional intent as to why it was being proposed.

Matt Melarkey stated that the statistics to him were unknown until the Department just shared and by math, it is already a once in a lifetime tag as the regulation is currently written. He agreed that the argument for once in a lifetime could be made for mountain goat and potentially rocky bighorn sheep and California bighorn sheep. A broad sweeping once in a lifetime tag based on some people feeling poor due to them yet to draw seems like the Commission would be managing the wrong things. While unfortunate for some, it is not something that he felt should be meddled with.

Mitch McVicars stated his understanding for the California, rocky bighorns and mountain goat tags but he did not see it justifiable for the nelson bighorn sheep. He did not think it was worth the time to discuss the item.

Mel Belding stated for clarification that there have been 16 desert bighorn sheep tags between 2005 and 2023. He personally knows an individual who has drawn three desert bighorn sheep but not within that timeframe. If a tag was drawn in 2005 or later, a person would have used eight bonus points or more to draw the second tag. This might be bigger than what some people may think. He stated that he felt it was unfair to have a waiting period based off just drawing a tag and felt that it should be based on the harvest of the animal. He wanted to know the intent of those already in a waiting period or have accrued bonus points since their last sheep harvest.

Chairman Caviglia stated that the initial discussion included leaving people in their current waiting period and allowing those with bonus points to remain able to apply and draw a tag. A starting point would need to be developed. He was in favor of adding this item for discussion on an agenda. He didn't believe that people knew that the waiting periods are a net zero gain for the most part based on people accruing a waiting period at the same time people are being released from the waiting periods. A once in a lifetime tag would pull applicants out every year and would help the odds down the road. Since he has started on the Commission there are a third more applicants now than there was then.

Public Representative Brown recalled the discussion at the previous Committee meeting that removal of the people who have already drawn a tag would allow for more opportunity to those who have yet to draw.

CABMW Representative Browne added that he thought it would take over 100 years to allow for everyone who has been applying to draw a sheep tag who has not already drawn. It was an item he thought was worth looking at.

Commission Young stated is agreeance on increasing draw odds for individuals. He stated that rocky, mountain goat and California was an easy yes for him because of the statistics and that it is very rare that a person would draw a second in their lifetime. As for the desert sheep, he is in support of increasing draw odds and hopefully the higher bonus point individuals would draw but he is not sure of the need for the lifetime waiting period on that species. He mentioned programs that other states utilize to accommodate and assist with better draw odds.

Management Analyst Manfredi provided additional data from the 2023 main draw. 75,799 applications were submitted for all species of sheep, including ewe hunts for the approximately 250 sheep tags offered for the 2023 season.

Discussion continued related to draw odds, other state's bonus point systems, how the change would affect current applicants, and what would happen to the system if the Committee decided to add the lifetime waiting period for some species but not all the species being discussed.

Commissioner Young clarified that if the regulation passed as written, harvest or no harvest, you only have one chance to draw and hunt a sheep or mountain goat.

Chairman Caviglia confirmed that the previous discussion did cover that item.

CHAIRMAN CAVIGLIA MOVED TO FORWARD THE PROPOSED REGULATION TO COMMISSION AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROGERS. MOTION PASSED 5-1 WITH COMMISSION YOUNG DECENTING AND CABMW REPRESENTATIVE CRIM ABSENT.

7. Future Committee Meeting – Committee Chairman Tommy Caviglia – For Possible Action
The committee will discuss possible future agenda topics and set a date and time for the next committee meeting.

Chairman Caviglia stated that he would work with the Department if any future items come up but currently there are no items needed to be addressed by the Committee.

No public comment.

No action was taken.

8. Public Comment Period

No public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM.

DRAFT