

MARCH 11, 1971

PRESENT: Ronzone, Dreyer, Olsen, May, Fry, Homer and Smith

ABSENT: None

OTHERS: Assemblymen Frazzini and Hafen, Glen Griffith and Frank Groves of the Nevada Department of Fish and Game. Martha O'Callaghan and Roger Teglia both private citizens.

Chairman Ronzone called the meeting to order at 10:40 A.M. for the purpose of discussing A.B. 383, A.B. 451, A.B. 521, A.B. 104 and A.B. 603.

Discussion began on A.B. 383 which had previously received a "do kill" motion from the committee but was brought back for discussion at the request of its sponsor, Mrs. Frazzini. Her first comment was to bring attention to a drafting error. She had intended the bill to read "wild cats" not "wildcats". She went on to say that disappearing wildlife had first come to her attention from her family who does a good deal of fishing, camping and hunting. They had always encountered many species of wildlife on these outings but in the past ten years, they have not seen many at all. Is our wildlife disappearing? She cited some cases involving this topic. One survey of the animal population said these species were not becoming rare...but, there had been no population count. Another survey concluded that only about 500 big cats remain in California. She said she didn't insist that these animals actually be declared endangered species but something must be done. If no counts are being taken, how can it be justified that these species are not becoming rare?

Mr. Griffith stated that the Department feels the population of these species is holding its own.

Chairman Ronzone questioned how predator control works. Mr. Groves said he was extremely concerned with the trend. If they went to total protection, the species will increase. Ranchers have been complaining about these predators. If the food supply is limited, then just as deer, there has to be some control measure. If this law went through, this would nulify our right to step in. We want management, we don't want extermination. Ranchers are not going to stand by and see their live-stock killed by predators. There has to be control.

Chairman Ronzone asked whether there are regulations of what the control methods are.

Mr. Griffith informed the committee that there are regulations in some states. Especially in the Eastern states on private property.

Chairman Ronzone then questioned if it is legal to hunt coyote from airplanes. Mr. Groves said it was. He cited an example of the shepherders in the high mountains. The airplane is the only method that can be used to successfully protect in this type of situation.

Chairman Ronzone asked if any states had refused or decided not to avail themselves to government assistance in predator control. Mr. Groves said that some of them did. He said some states used a bounty system.

Mrs. Frazzini asked just what was the Fish and Game Department doing to manage this.

March 11, 1971

Mr. Groves informed her that the trend was to completely eliminate the coyote and bobcat but during the past five years we (the Fish and Game Department) have changed that trend.

Mrs. Frazzini added that this bill does not take out the part that says a permit can be obtained to hold these animals under control.

At that point, Mrs. Martha O' Callaghan, a private citizen representing herself, spoke in opposition to this bill. She commented that she sees the damage caused by these animals. There is a game preserve in Washoe Valley and the coyotes have already began to take it over.

Mr. Griffith said that if these animals do become endangered, the Fish and Game Department will be the first to step in. Dr. Homer added that he was instrumental in getting the Endangered Species Act passed. He said that knowing how these people feel, until word is received from them, it is really doubtful that a species is endangered. He didn't think there is really anything endangered without their knowing about it.

A.B. 451 "Changes regulation of zoos in certain counties from state to county."

Mr. Hafen explained this bill. He said it changes the statutes so that a commercial organization would be able to open a zoo. He questioned why or why not a zoo shouldn't be allowed. Perhaps there are abuses, he said, but he said he was unaware of them and he felt zoos are really an attraction. He added the this zoo would be set up on the old Pahrump Ranch. He commented that a man named Bob Owens has a zoo down there and each fall there are at least ten full bus loads of school children coming to visit this zoo.

Mr. May commented that this bill does not carry any regulatory statement. Mr. Hafen said he thought it would depend on the situation. If regulations were needed, he thought there would be some. Mr. May continued by saying his main concern is the misuse of the animals. Mr. Olsen spoke about some zoos in the past which were gimmicks. He said this is not what is intended. He thought the bill should be amended to provide that the County Commissioners will set up an ordinance regulating the manner in which the animals are treated.

Mr. Griffith added that there have been some pretty unwholesome things that have happened and people would complain as to why the Department lets this type of thing go on. He went on to say that zoos are expensive. They need funds and when they are in trouble, the Department is in trouble.

Mr. Roger Teglia then spoke saying he was all for zoos but with some very good regulations. He said animals that are not from that part of the country are brought in which could be a threat to the animals and the area.

Mr. Olsen asked Mr. Griffith if there currently were any regulations for zoos. There are none. Mr. Hafen commented that if it would make the bill more palatable, it could be made to read that the county commissioners set the regulations. Mr. May then commented on page 1, line 7, of the bill that it takes the power away from Fish and Game. He felt control should be left with the Department. Mr. Groves said he would like to see joint agreement of location by commissioners and leave the authority to set up regulations with the Fish and Game Department. Mr. Hafen asked Mr. Groves if he was given a powerful set of regulations for a zoo, would the

Department be in favor of a zoo. He replied that it would.

Mr. Teglia again spoke that he would like to see in the bill that the Fish and Game Department should approve all species of animal brought in and should have the power to ask for a bond in order to see that it was operated properly. Mr. Olsen asked him what the bond would cover. Mr. Teglia said it would provide that if the operators leave, the animals will be taken care of. Dr. Homer wondered if it could be written that the county commissioners "may" require a bond. It was decided that this was already provided for in the bill on page 1, line 17.

Dr. Homer moved that Mr. Hafen get together with the Fish and Game Department to properly amend the bill. Mr. Dreyer seconded. Motion carried.

A.B. 521 "Affirms state ownership of beds of navigable rivers and lakes, and abrogates common law doctrine of reliction." Dr. Homer explained this bill. Mr. Griffith said he had some people who wanted to speak on this bill. They are more familiar with water law. It was decided to wait until Tuesday, March 16, to hear these people to further discuss this bill. Mr. Smith added that he thought this bill dealt with more than water law. He said deeds and land laws were also involved. Mr. Fry said he would check into it. Mr. May asked to have Mr. McDonald in to testify on this. Mr. Fry is planning to bring in an attorney who is knowledgeable in this field.

A.B. 104 "Provides free hunting and fishing licenses for certain disabled veterans." Mr. May moved indefinite postponement of this bill. Mr. Dreyer seconded. Motion carried.

A.B. 603 "Specifies compensation of fish and game license agents." Mr. Groves commented that this costs the department approximately \$20,000 to \$32,000. Many agents say 10¢ is not enough. Others say that they will issue licenses free of charge. If it goes to 25¢, it will cost the Department \$54,000. Many states handle it by charging 25¢ above the cost of the license. If agents in Nevada charged a fee on top of the license fee, it certainly would help the Department. Mr. May asked if there was any problem getting license agents. Mr. Groves said there was not except perhaps in the more remote areas. Dr. Homer moved to indefinitely postpone this bill. Mr. May seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Ronzone asked the Committee if it wished to let A.B. 383 remain in "do kill" status. It was so decided.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 A.M.

jb



MIKE O'CALLAGHAN  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF NEVADA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

1100 VALLEY ROAD, RENO, NEVADA • TELEPHONE 784-6214

MAIL: P.O. BOX 10678, RENO, NEVADA 89510



FRANK W. GROVES  
DIRECTOR

IN REPLY REFER TO:

March 9, 1971

Assemblyman Dick Ronzone  
Chairman, Fish and Game Committee  
New Legislative Building  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Dear Dick:

This letter is to express the Commission's and Department's concern over A. B. 603 which specifies compensation of fish and game license agents.

Within the framework of the present law the Commission has established a fee of 10¢ per license as the agent's commission. This agent commission applies to all license and tags, whether free or for a price, and all stamps and boat registrations, when issued by a license agent. The agent commission, under this structure, have amounted to the following amounts over the past 3 years: 1968 = \$21,016.20; 1969 = \$21,780.20; and 1970 = \$21,247.50. If A. B. 603 becomes law it will cause a 150% increase in the commissions retained by the license agents. This would result in an additional \$32,000, on the average, being retained by the agents which would total approximately \$54,000 per year at the present level of sales.

As you know the Commission approves the budget of the Department which is based upon license revenue coupled with Federal Aid money, and the license money is from the previous years sales. There has been a very slow rate of increase in license sales as you will note from the attached table and we do not anticipate any significant increase this year over last. In essence we are saying that we are faced with a more or less fixed income and decreasing purchasing power of the dollar. This is further compounded by the fact that if several bills pending in the Legislature come to pass; such as salary increases, retirement benefits increase, per diem increase and insurance contributions increase, coupled with the estimated \$32,000 increase in commissions to agents we will have approximately \$116,000 increase in the cost of doing business within this fixed income causing a proportionment curtailment of the program for hunters and fishermen.

Assemblyman Dick Ronzone

-2-

March 9, 1971

We would have to comment that those who are license agents have asked to handle the items as an enhancement to their business and conversely it is only fair that they be justly compensated as they are providing a service to the public. However, if your committee finds it necessary to amend 502.040 we would like to recommend that another approach be taken with A. B. 603. We would suggest that paragraph 4 be amended to read as follows: "The license agent may charge and retain up to 25 cents for each license issued and such charge to be in addition to the price established for each license authorized by Title 45 and Chapter 488 of NRS." This would further cause paragraph 6 to be amended in part as follows: "Except as provided in sub-section 4, all moneys collected by a license agent shall be deemed to be public moneys....." The intent of this amendment would be to make it permissive for the agent to charge an agents fee of any amount up to the maximum of 25 cents. An additional benefit of this approach would be a simplification of the agents reports saving both the agent and this Department time in bookkeeping, as the only funds the agent would be responsible to the Department for would be the fee as established by law.

Your favorable consideration of this suggestion would be beneficial to the agents and the Department alike and therefore a benefit to the hunting and fishing public.

Sincerely yours,

Frank W. Groves  
Director

cc  
Enclosure

## NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Possible Increased Cost of Doing  
Business as per 1971 Legislative Action

License agent commissions if AB 603 is enacted:

	<u>Commissions paid</u>		<u>150% increase</u>	=	<u>Total under AB 603</u>
1968	\$21,016.20	plus	\$31,518.30	=	\$52,534.50
1969	\$21,780.20	"	\$32,670.30	=	\$54,450.50
1970	\$21,247.50	"	\$31,871.25	=	\$53,118.75

Other increases in cost of doing business:

Salaries possible 5% increase (\$1,226,182)	\$61,309.10
Retirement due to 5% (6% of 61,309)	3,678.54
Retirement up 2% (\$73,212) to strengthen fund	1,464.25
Insurance 100% contribution by state	10,248.00
Travel instate increase from \$20 to \$25	<u>8,250.00</u>
	84,949.89
Agent commission increase	<u>32,000.00</u>
	\$116,949.89

There are several other proposals not included here that could further increase the above figure.

**A. B. 603**

---

**ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 603—MESSRS. SWALLOW, PRINCE,  
POGGIONE AND SCHOFIELD**

**MARCH 3, 1971**

Referred to Committee on Fish and Game

**SUMMARY—**Specifies compensation of fish and game license agents.  
Fiscal Note: No. (BDR 45-982)



**EXPLANATION—**Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [ ] is material to be omitted.

---

AN ACT relating to fish and game license agents; specifying the amount of compensation which may be retained by such agents for sale of licenses.

*The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:*

- 1 SECTION 1. NRS 502.040 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 2 502.040 1. The commission shall provide rules and regulations
- 3 regarding the number of license agents to be designated in any locality,
- 4 the standards to be met by license agents, the manner of remitting funds
- 5 to the department, and the manner of accounting for licenses received,
- 6 issued, sold or returned.
- 7 2. A license agent designated by the department shall be responsible
- 8 for the correct issuance of all licenses entrusted to him, and, so far as he
- 9 is able to determine, that no licenses shall be issued upon the false state-
- 10 ment of an applicant. Prior to issuing any license the license agent shall
- 11 satisfy himself of the identity of the applicant and the place of his resi-
- 12 dence, and shall require of all applicants exhibition to him of proof of
- 13 their identity and residence.
- 14 3. License agents shall be required to furnish bond to the department
- 15 for the proper performance of their duties in such amounts as may be
- 16 determined by the commission. Premiums for such bonds shall be paid
- 17 by the license agent, except in remote areas where the agency is established
- 18 for the convenience of the commission, in which case the premium shall
- 19 be paid from the fish and game fund.
- 20 4. The license agent may charge and retain up to
- 21 25 cents for each license issued and such charge to
- 22 be in addition to the price established for each
- 23 license authorized by Title 45 and Chapter 488 of
- 24 NRS.

1 5. A license agent is responsible to the department for the collection  
2 of the correct and required fee, for the safeguarding of the moneys col-  
3 lected by him, and for the prompt remission to the department for deposit  
4 in accordance with 501.356. The department shall furnish  
5 to the license agent receipts for licenses or moneys returned to the depart-  
6 ment, and shall require of the license agent that he deliver the depart-  
7 ment's receipt for any license received.

8  
9 6. Except as provided in sub-section 4, all moneys  
10 collected by a license agent shall be deemed to be  
11 public moneys of the State of Nevada and the state  
12 shall have a prior claim for the amount of license  
13 moneys due it upon all assets of the agent over all  
creditors, assignees or other claimants. The use  
of these moneys for private or business transactions  
shall be deemed to be a misuse of public funds and  
punishable under the laws provided



February 1971

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

NUMBER OF LICENSES AND DEER TAGS SOLD OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS WITH HIGHEST  
YEAR OF SALES NOTED FOR EACH TYPE AND A TREND IN TOTAL DOCUMENTS SOLD

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>HUNTING</u>	<u>COMBINATION</u>	<u>FISHING</u>	<u>5 DAY FISHING</u>	<u>DEER TAGS</u>	<u>NONRESIDENT LICENSE</u>	<u>TOTAL DOCUMENTS</u>
1960-61	32,215	2,220	24,054	20,811	30,492	7,699	117,491
1961-62	32,869	2,762	23,095	19,441	31,739	8,334	118,240
1962-63	35,056	3,711	28,390	22,347	34,892	▶ 8,738	133,134
1963-64	38,341	4,337	31,729	23,138	▶ 37,390	8,394	143,329
1964-65	▶ 38,916	4,872	33,251	19,341	37,245	7,732	141,357
1965-66	35,763	5,608	38,413	24,233	36,913	6,758	147,688
1966-67	29,605	7,264	35,099	23,579	30,609	4,953	131,109
1967-68	30,067	8,280	39,927	26,374	35,106	5,650	145,404
1968-69	30,584	9,563	39,728	▶ 28,279	35,628	5,092	148,874
1969-70	32,122	▶ 10,787	▶ 40,211	26,973	▶ 35,471	3,857	▶ 149,421

