

**STATE OF NEVADA
BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS
AS REQUIRED BY NRS 233B.066**

**LCB FILE NO. R029-26
Commission General Regulation 517**

The following statement is submitted for adopted amendments to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 503.

1. A clear and concise explanation of the need for the adopted regulation.

The regulation is necessary to maintain ethical hunting practices and uphold the principle of fair chase by limiting the use of advanced electronic systems that provide hunters with an undue advantage. These devices, such as automatically adjusting aiming points using external data, compromise the integrity of wildlife management and create enforcement challenges. By clearly defining permissible and prohibited sight types, the proposed regulation ensures consistency, prevents unsporting practices, and protects Nevada's hunting traditions.

2. Description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response, and an explanation of how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Public comment was solicited during both the regulation workshop of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (NBWC) in March 2026 and the adoption hearing in May 2026. Public comment may also be submitted at any time by email to wildlifecommission@ndow.org.

Meeting minutes from the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' meetings include all public comment and can be found here when posted: <https://nvboardofwildlife.org/#meetings>

Public comments reflected divided views on range-finding scope technology and fair chase ethics. Some speakers argued the technology is simply an extension of tools hunters have used for decades to estimate distance and improve shot accuracy for clean, ethical kills, and therefore should not be restricted. Others expressed concern that advancing technology could reduce the challenge of hunting by allowing hunters to target animals that are difficult to see or otherwise gain unfair advantages. Several commenters also warned that while current capabilities may seem limited, future technological developments could create more significant ethical concerns over time.

3. The number of persons who:

- (a) Attended each hearing: (date and number of attended for workshops and hearings)**
- (b) Testified at each hearing: (date and number of attended for workshops and hearings)**
- (c) Submitted written comments: (date and number of attended for workshops and hearings)**

March 14, 2026, NBWC Meeting

- a. Attended: 49
- b. Testified: 4
- c. Written Comment: 0

May 9, 2026, NBWC Meeting

- a. Attended: 48
- b. Testified: 1
- c. Written Comment: 0

4. For each person identified in number 3 above, the following information if provided to the agency conducting the hearing:

- (a) **Name:** Steve Robinson
- (b) **Telephone number:**
- (c) **Business address:**
- (d) **Business telephone number:**
- (e) **Electronic mail address:**
- (f) **Name of entity or organization represented:** Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

- (a) **Name:** Corbett Fleming
- (b) **Telephone number:**
- (c) **Business address:**
- (d) **Business telephone number:**
- (e) **Electronic mail address:**
- (f) **Name of entity or organization represented:** Carson City County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

- (a) **Name:** Stephanie Myers
- (b) **Telephone number:**
- (c) **Business address:**
- (d) **Business telephone number:**
- (e) **Electronic mail address:**
- (f) **Name of entity or organization represented:**

- (a) **Name:** Matt Melarkey
- (b) **Telephone number:**
- (c) **Business address:**
- (d) **Business telephone number:**
- (e) **Electronic mail address:**
- (f) **Name of entity or organization represented:**

- (a) **Name:** Paul Dixon
- (b) **Telephone number:**
- (c) **Business address:**
- (d) **Business telephone number:**
- (e) **Electronic mail address:**
- (f) **Name of entity or organization represented:** Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

5. **A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their response, and an explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.**

Comment was not solicited from small businesses. This regulation does not affect small businesses as the changes are associated with a program administered by the Nevada Department of Wildlife.

6. **If the regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reasons for adopting the regulation without change.**

Not Applicable

7. **The estimated economic effect of the adopted regulation on the businesses which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and each case must include:**

- (a) **Both adverse and beneficial effects on businesses; and**

There will be no adverse or beneficial effects from the proposed regulation on small business because it does not regulate the operation of any small business.

- (b) **Both immediate and long-term effects on businesses:**

There will be no immediate and long-term effects from the proposed regulation on small business because it does not regulate the operation of any small business.

- (a) **Both adverse and beneficial effects on the public; and**

The regulation is expected to preserve the principles of fair chase and ethical hunting by limiting the use of advanced electronic systems that provide hunters with an undue advantage. By clearly defining permissible and prohibited sight types, the regulation ensures consistency in enforcement and prevents unsporting practices. This will help maintain public confidence in wildlife management, promote equitable hunting opportunities, and protect the integrity of Nevada's hunting traditions

(b) Both immediate and long-term effects on the public:

Hunters who currently use electronic sighting systems may incur costs to replace or modify equipment; however, these impacts are limited to a small subset of individuals.

8. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the adopted regulation.

There are no anticipated direct or indirect costs to the Department for the enforcement of the regulation.

9. A description of any regulations of other state or government agencies which the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlapping is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.

This regulation does not include provisions that duplicate or are more stringent than federal, state, or local standards.

10. If the regulation includes provisions that are more stringent than a federal regulation which regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.

This regulation does not include provisions that duplicate or are more stringent than federal, state, or local standards.

11. If the regulation provides a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.

The regulation does not provide new or increased fees.