

**STATE OF NEVADA  
BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS  
LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS--NRS 233B.066  
Informational Statement**

**LCB File No. – R045-14  
Commission General Regulation Number – 445**

Informational statement relating to Commission General Regulation No. 445  
(LCB File No. R045-14) - as required by Chapter 233B.066.

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

The current regulation refers to two specific “name brand” black powder substitutes for big game hunts restricted to muzzleloaders. There are over 100 “name brand” black powder substitutes. Having only two specific “name brands” within the language is confusing to sportsmen because it implies all others are potentially illegal. Removing “name brand” black powder substitutes will reduce confusion on which type of powders are allowed during muzzleloader only big game hunts.

**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.**

A petition was received by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (NBWC) to allow the use of additional black powder substitutes. Public comment was taken at the NBWC meeting in December 2013 in Reno, February 2014 in Las Vegas and May 2014 in Reno. The vast majority of comments received were in favor of allowing all brands of black powder substitute. At the May 2014 NBWC meeting, one County Advisory Board voiced opposition to the regulation on the grounds that it allowed for the continued “technological creep” of muzzleloader related equipment.

A video recording of all public comments from NBWC workshops and meetings is available at [http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Commission/Archive/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Archive/).

**3. The number of persons who:**

- (a) Attended each hearing: 26 Workshop 32 Hearing
- (b) Testified at each hearing: 4 Workshop 1 Hearing
- (c) Submitted written comments: 0 Public Comment 5 Total

**4. For each person identified in paragraphs (b) and (c) of number 3 above, the following information if provided to the agency conducting the hearing:**

- (a) Name; Brad Johnston
- (b) Telephone number; 18 Jacob Road, Yerington, NV 89447
- (c) Business address;
- (d) Business telephone number; (775) 316-1157
- (e) Electronic mail address; and
- (f) Name of entity or organization represented. Lyon County Advisory Board Chairman

- (a) Name; Kevin Strozzi
- (b) Telephone number; (775) 482-9185
- (c) Business address; PO Box 226, Tonopah, Nevada 89049
- (d) Business telephone number;
- (e) Electronic mail address; and kstrozzi@hotmail.com
- (f) Name of entity or organization represented. Nye County Advisory Board Chairman

- (a) Name; Gil Yanuck
- (b) Telephone number; (775) 841-3675
- (c) Business address; 4100 Lakeview Road, Carson City, Nevada 89703
- (d) Business telephone number;
- (e) Electronic mail address; and
- (f) Name of entity or organization represented - Self

- (a) Name; Rex Flowers
- (b) Telephone number; (775)-972-6250
- (c) Business address; 3280 Sun Cloud Court, Reno, Nevada 89506
- (d) Business telephone number;
- (e) Electronic mail address; and randbflowers@yahoo.com
- (f) Name of entity or organization represented. - Self

- (a) Name; Furn Winder
- (b) Telephone number;
- (c) Business address; 385 Buffside Court, Spring Creek, Nevada 89815
- (d) Business telephone number; (775) 299-1231
- (e) Electronic mail address; and furn7r@msn.com
- (f) Name of entity or organization represented. Self

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

Public comment, including comment from businesses potentially affected by the proposed regulation, was taken at the NBWC meeting in December 2013 in Reno, February 2014 in Las Vegas and May 2014 in Reno. During the lengthy and in depth NBWC meetings, there were no concerns voiced from any businesses. A video recording of all public comments from NBWC workshops and meetings is available at [http://www.ndow.org/Public\\_Meetings/Commission/Archive/](http://www.ndow.org/Public_Meetings/Commission/Archive/).

**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.**

The regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation because no public comment or testimony was received by the NBWC recommending modification of the regulation as proposed.

7. **The estimated economic effect of the regulation on the business which it is to regulate and on the public.**
- (a) **Estimated economic effect on the businesses which they are to regulate.**  
There is no adverse or beneficial economic effect anticipated on businesses as this regulation does not regulate business.
- (b) **Estimated economic effect on the public which they are to regulate.**  
There is no adverse or beneficial economic effect anticipated on the public. The regulation is simply removing specific black powder substitutes listed as examples within the current language.
8. **The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the proposed regulation:**  
There is not an anticipated increase or decrease of costs associated with the Department of Wildlife for enforcement, because there is only a removal or specific “name brand” black powder substitutes from the current regulation.
9. **A description of any regulations of other State or governmental agencies which the regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlap is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.**  
The regulation does not overlap or duplicate any other State or governmental agency regulation.
10. **If the regulation includes provisions that are more stringent than a federal regulation that regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.**  
This regulation is not more stringent than a federal regulation and federal regulation does not regulate the same activity.
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.**  
This regulation does not establish a new fee or does it increase an existing fee.