

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT OF MINUTES

Thursday ~ May 7, 2009 ~ 6:30 p.m.

Nevada Department of Wildlife

Conference Room B

1100 Valley Road, Reno, Nevada

MEMBERS

Rick Smith, Chair
Glen Copeland, Vice-chair
Daryl Harwell, Secretary
Rex Flowers
Thomas Wilson

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE *

Vice-chair Copeland led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL *

Vice-chair Copeland called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. A quorum was established.

PRESENT: Glen Copeland, Daryl Harwell, Rex Flowers and Tom Wilson. Rick Smith joined the meeting at 6:33 p.m.

ABSENT: None.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS *

There were no public comments.

5. COMMITTEE, MEMBER AND LIAISON UPDATES * – Limited to items not appearing elsewhere on this agenda – discussion is limited to questions for clarification only.

5-1). Correspondence (including sportsmen's concerns) and Announcements * – None.

5-2). Update on the Sheldon Wildlife Management Plan * – None.

5-3) Overview of the March 27 and 28, 2009, Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting * – None.

5-4). Update and status report on the Washoe County Predator Control Project and the Wildlife Damage Management Subcommittee * – Chris Hampson – Biologist, noted that two female lions had been captured in the Granites and one male that comes in from Unit 015 that appears to have been killed in the trap. Mr. Hampson noted that at the end of February 47 coyotes had been removed from the area.

Chair Rick Smith joined the meeting at 6:33 p.m.

Vice-chair Copeland turned the meeting gavel to Chair Smith.

There was some discussion about the recent Wildlife Damage Subcommittee meeting that had discussed past and future projects.

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 2 of 18

- 6. BOARD MEMBER MEETING ASSIGNMENT** – *A discussion and selection of member(s) to attend the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meetings on: 1) May 15 and 16, 2009, meetings in Reno, Nevada; and 2) June 26 and 27, 2009, meetings in Reno, Nevada.*

Member Copeland will attend the May 15 and 16, 2009, meetings.

Chair Smith stated he could attend one of the June meetings.

Member Flowers commented that he could attend the Commission meeting but would need the draft minutes as he would not be present at the June 18, 2009, Game Board meeting.

Member Wilson noted that agenda item 3 had not yet been acted on

- 3. APPROVAL OF MARCH 19, 2009, AND APRIL 2, 2009, MINUTES** [Taken out of agenda order]

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to approve the March 19 and April 2, 2009, minutes, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

- 7. COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 363 (Permanent)** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to approve, deny or otherwise modify a regulation relating to watercraft; defining motorboat which is used for hire. This revision places “toy share” companies under the same provisions as boat rental companies.*

Member Wilson questioned the purpose of the change in the regulation. Mr. Wilson asked what the issue might be, such as whether those using this type of water craft failed to comply with existing regulations.

An unidentified speaker commented that he believes the intent is to put other motorized vessels used on Lake Mead, Lake Tahoe and other navigable bodies of water within the State of Nevada, under the same regulations as boats.

No specific recommendation was made.

- 8. COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 368 (Temporary)** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to approve, deny or otherwise modify a proposed regulation change that would establish language providing the general public with access to big game draw results 48-hours after the computerized system draw is complete.*

Chair Smith noted that this had been a matter of discussion with the Commission (Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners) for some months now with the contractor indicating that the result can be made available within the 48-hour after completion of the computerized drawing. It does not guarantee a tag, only that the individual has been drawn. The intent is to make four (4) attempts to

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 3 of 18

resolve payment issues with a failure to contact the individuals a tag might not be issued. Therefore, it is crucial that individuals being drawn for a tag should assure that funds are available to cover tag costs.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Commission General Regulation 368, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

- 9. COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 369 (Temporary) –** *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to approve, deny or otherwise modify provisions pertaining to defining edible portion in the case of big game mammal, other game mammals, game birds and game fish.*

Member Wilson commented that Water Fowl is not that specifically defined although only the breast and legs are edible as game birds and that leaving the bird in the field would not apply to Water Fowl.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Commission General Regulation 369, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

- 10. COMMISSION REGULATION 09–07 –** *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to approve, deny or otherwise modify regulations for the numbers of tags to be issued for Mule Deer, Pronghorn Antelope, Elk, Bighorn Sheep and Mountain Goats for 2009–2010.*

PRONGHORN ANTELOPE

Mike Dobel – NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife), noted the previous year's 78-percent success rate and explained that buck and fawn ratios were at or near maintenance levels and that there was a slight increase in resident rifle and other user groups. Mr. Dobel noted that new hunts were added in the Humboldt County to lower or stabilize herd populations that in some instances are having an adverse impact on limited habitat.

During the discussion it was noted that certain Units had reduced tag allocations. It was explained that the estimates had not been developed when the season dates were originally set.

Chris Hampson – NDOW, explained that reductions in tag allocations were the result of 1) buck ratio/management objective in 011 being met; 2) Units 012, 013 and 014 were the hardest hit by drought with poor recruitment; Units 011, 013 and 015 had good moisture in the higher elevations whereas the eastern and southern portions of those Units experienced poor habitat and recruitment conditions. Therefore, the increases/decreases are based on consecutive years data.

Responding to Chair Smith's inquiry about the addition of a Muzzle Loader season in White Pine County, Mike Cox – NDOW, explained the bulk of Muzzle Loader tags came from the Any Legal

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 4 of 18

Weapon and Archery tag allocation using a 50-percent success rate. The intent is to start small and then increase the allocation if needed based on demand.

During the discussion it was noted that the sustainable fawn/doe ratio to maintain population is dependent on species habitat conditions and other factors with a typical fawn/doe ratio of about 28. Other discussion focused on a trap and transplant in 2010 instead of harvest. It was explained that there are no locations to transplant the animals to currently. The season for Muzzle Loader in White Pine County is September 25 to October 4. The 50-percent success rate is nearly the same as archery. It was suggested that a higher success rate be used in the formula. It was noted that an increase in the success rate would make minimal difference in the total number of tags. Currently Pronghorn Antelope in White Pine County includes multiple herds and that the six Unit groups were treated the same in developing the tag allocations. Discussion then turned to the increase from 2 to 4 archer tags that was based on a three year zero success rate average. Other discussion noted that the tag allocation for the Sheldon could be increased somewhat without any significant effect on the population. However, there has been some decline in the recruitment that has an influence on the recommended tag allocations.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend 2151, 2161, 2171, 2181 and 2251 as proposed and Hunt 2261, with the following modifications in Unit 011 increase from three (3) to four (4) tags and Unit 033 change from two (2) to four (4) tags. The motion carried: Members Flowers, Harwell and Wilson assenting; and Member Copeland and Chair Smith dissenting.

Chair Smith noted that, in his opinion, the proposed increase was less than ten (10) percent in the number of overall tags per species.

ELK

Mike Dobel – NDOW, provided an overview of the harvest statistics and provided data on the average age of harvested animal at 6.2 years of age in 2008. Mr. Dobel noted that bull ratio were good in most Units and that the total herd population is $\pm 10,000$ animal with some areas having more Elk than in the 2007 estimates. Mr. Dobel noted that in some areas the herd populations are well in excess of populations identified in Elk Management Plans. Mr. Dobel noted that there were tag decreases in certain Units in White Pine County where calf recruitment and decreases point class.

During the discussion it was noted that the bulk of Elk herds were included in the harvest. It was noted that there are some Elk in Stillwater and the Sheldon but not yet considered a resident herd. Land Management Agencies are being dealt with in Elko (Nevada) and Susanville (California) but have not yet reached a point in which an Elk Plan would be required. Other discussion noted that the depredation hunt provide a somewhat longer season to reduce herd sizes.

It was moved by Member Copland, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunts 4102, 4151, 4156, 4161, 4181, 4176, 4111, 4251, 4256, 4261, as written. The motion carried unanimously.

DESERT BIGHORN

Mike Dobel – NDOW, commented that Desert Sheep continue to do well in the State of Nevada and outlined the demand/success and 187 tag allocation for the season.

During the discussion it was noted that the resident tags had increased by ten (10) percent and what appears to be a nearly 25-percent increase in non-resident tags. Other discussion focused on the balance process used for non-resident hunts to meet the 10-percent total non-resident tag allocations.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunt 3151 by increasing Unit 161 late from four (4) to five (5) tags; Unit 263 increase from seven (7) to eight (8); Hunt 3251 as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

CALIFORNIA BIGHORN SHEEP

Mike Dobel – NDOW, noted a 95-percent hunter success rate with an average age of 7-years. Survey revealed an average to above-average recruitment with 1,800 estimated animals statewide. A quota of 47 tags including one (1) each for Heritage and PIW (Partnership in Wildlife).

During the discussion it was noted that the numbers are phenomenal for Desert and California Bighorn Sheep. It was explained that the survey indicated 29 rams out of 103 sheep counted and that age class counted is not more than what is being proposed as the tag allocation. Other discussion noted that there is a single non-resident tag in Unit 012 and Unit 066 and that the tag allocation for non-resident is staying at 4 with additional tag allocations to residents if not detrimental to populations. Other discussion suggested that biologists be allowed more frequent surveys to better manage the resources with additional hunt opportunities provided to resident hunters where possible. Discussion then turned to the loss of habitat with an increase in resident herds. It was explained that the shift of vegetative components were evident after the wildfires and the ability of certain animal species to adapt to the different food sources being found. It was noted that Muledeer are not doing as well as other species. Discussion then turned to the crested wheat grass seeding. Elk have adapted to cheat grass and some native bunch grasses in the above Wells (Nevada). It was noted that the habitat destroyed by wildfires totaled about 2-percent of the State of Nevada. Other discussion noted that perhaps as much as 50-percent of the habitat for Muledeer had been destroyed and that wild horses are also devastating habitant as they do not migrate as do other herds.

Discussion then focused on the potential effects of additional tag increase on herd sizes over the long term. It was noted that recruitments were only slightly higher than herd maintenance levels.

May 7, 2009

Page 6 of 18

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunt 8151 as written with an increase from eight (8) to nine (9) tags in Unit 012; and Hunt 8251 as written. The motion carried unanimously.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN BIGHORN

Mr. Dobel outlined the 2009 population estimate of about 10-percent increase over the previous year. There are some concerns about interaction of Rocky and California Bighorn sheep with domestic sheep herds. Mr. Dobel noted that the State of Nevada has more Bighorn Sheep than any other state.

During the discussion it was noted that the removal of the non-resident tag had not been replaced with a resident tag in Unit 101. Other discussion noted other modifications in the tag allocations. It was suggested that residents should not be forced to take a 50-percent reduction to accommodate non-residents. As the discussion continued, it was noted that there are an insufficient number of rams in the Unit to accommodate a third tag. Other discussion noted that the previous recommendation had been to remove a non-resident tag and replace it with a resident tag in Unit 074. It was pointed out the there is a relatively small herd in Unit 074 and that the requirement for non-resident tags required two (2) tags in a Unit that may have as few as two (2) five year old rams.

Chair Smith moved to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunt 9151 with the addition of one (1) resident tag and eliminate Hunt 9251 non-resident by removing the non resident tag.

Mike Cox recalled the previous legal challenge and potential for a challenge about false advertising for non-resident tags.

Chair Smith amended the motion to increase the tag allotment to eleven (11) in Hunt 9151 and increase Unit 102 by one (1) tag and approve Hunt 9251 in Unit 070. The motion died due to lack of a second.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunt 9151 with Unit 101 increased from four (4) to five (5) tags and Hunt 9251 as written. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flower and Harwell assenting; and Member Wilson and Chair Smith dissenting.

Mr. Cox commented that it is exciting to have the herds and that not all rams can be seen during surveys.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GOAT

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 7 of 18

Mike Dobel – NDOW, noted that there continues to be a slight increase in populations by about 4-percent with a slight increase in tag allocations. The continuing concern is interaction with domestic sheep.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunt 7151 and 7251 as written. The motion carried unanimously.

MULEDEER

Mike Dobel – NDOW, provided an overview of the herd populations and harvest results. The split seasons provides some slight increase in tags for the early season that may be reduced from nine (9) to twelve (12) days. Mr. Dobel recalled the fawn ratios in the early to mid-1980's and the decline over time to the current ratio, which are some of the lowest. It is estimated that there are $\pm 106,000$ a 2-percent decline from the previous year and 5-percent from the five year average. The current ratio is barely meeting required maintenance levels. Hunt 1107 (Youth) has some differences due to demand/success with 22-percent of the allowable buck harvest being allocated to Hunt 1107. The result of that allocation has been a reduction in other hunts. Therefore the Youth Hunt and others were reduced.

Chair Smith commented that, in his opinion, based on the discussion with former Chair Bentley that the Youth Hunt tags were not to be reduced. It is his understanding that other weapons classes should be set with 2,800 tags being allocated for the Youth Hunt.

Mike Cox – NDOW, commented that the harvest needed to be considered regardless of the hunt (youth, archery or any legal weapon). The intent of the recommendation is to account for all classifications and hunt groups.

Chair Smith commented that it appears the Youth Hunt is taking a 10-percent to 15-percent reduction.

Mr. Cox noted that there are lost opportunities when Youth Hunt tags are not sold. The number of tags sold in 2008 was $\pm 2,600$, which was the basis for this year's allotment. Mr. Cox noted that the board could make a different recommendation of 21,600 compared to the staff recommendation that all weapons classes have a slight reduction.

Chair Smith commented he would rather have greater opportunities for youth. Of some concern is the reduction in the number of tags could result in 260 youth being denied an opportunity to hunt, which he believes is inappropriate.

There was some discussion about the number of youths entering the Hunter Safety Course. It was suggested that the number of youth tags be increased to 2,800. Discussion then suggested that the Youth Hunt be left at the previous year's tag allocation due to potential changes in regulations and policies. Other discussion noted that AB-246 would add 12-year old hunters, which may increase

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 8 of 18

the number of youth hunters. As the discussion continued, focused on the Muledeer populations over the past several years. It was explained that the carrying capacity has been reduced from former levels for a variety of reasons. A research project will be conducted to identify reasons and reduction in carrying capacity. Other discussion pointed out that wild horses are having significant detrimental impacts on Muledeer, specifically pregnant females. Therefore, it is crucial that collars be added to as many animals as possible along with predator control and habitat studies and restoration projects. Other discussion noted the need for a proactive approach in dealing with wild horse issues.

Chair Smith stated that there is no one Washoe County recommendation for Muledeer or any habitat improvements in Washoe County and that it is the fault of the Washoe County Game Board, public and NDOW staff. Mr. Smith noted that not one cent of the more than \$700,000.00 in project is in Washoe County.

Mr. Dobel recalled that there is a significant project within Washoe County and that there has and continues to be projects funded in Washoe County including Pronghorn in Unit 011, Sage Grouse and currently the Granite project that expends hundreds of thousands of dollars in Washoe County annually that is not Heritage funds.

Ira Hansen suggested that wild horse issues be clarified given the herd increase in other species while blaming wild horse for the decline in Muledeer populations.

Mel Belding noted that there is one project in Washoe County in the Sheldon that was a Heritage Project. Therefore it is crucial that the recommendations for the Sheldon need to be made known.

Don Molde concurred with Mr. Hansen's comments about whether Muledeer were now exceed carrying capacity of the habitat and suggested that funds used for predator control might be better spent on bone marrow and body fat studies to determine the health of the harvested animals. Therefore, if the carrying capacity is not depleted then there may be other issues at play. Mr. Molde noted that multiple births were common when habitat conditions were at their best and diminished significant if the nutritional values were not present.

Mr. Dobel noted that hundreds of deer had been studied in Unit 015 causing some condemnation of harvested animals in the late 1980's. Typically fetal rates are 1.7 per doe with a 1.5 rate during the time of the study.

There was additional discussion about Muledeer and the carrying capacity of the habitat.

Chris Hampson – Game Biologist, noted that the Sheldon has a SnoTel site and that seven of ten years have been well below average for snow accumulations. Mr. Hampson noted that this past winter the temperature on the Sheldon reached 60 degrees every month during the current winter season. Mr. Hampson noted that many of the plants used as feedstock for Muledeer are also in poor shape having less nutritional value to the animal to build fat reserves.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 9 of 18

There was discussion about the lack of success in Unit 015. It was explained that Unit 015 and Unit 014 are not comparable and that warm dry winters allow deer to remain in the State of California. The State of California success rate is 48-percent for this particular area. There are fewer deer migrating to the State of Nevada due to the warmer dry winters. Unit 015 has never enjoyed a high level of hunter success over the long term. The long term hunter success rate in Unit 014 is in the 70 to 80-percent range. This year one tag was reduced in Unit 015 due to the lack of deer. Other discussion noted the different in grazing in the two units. The fawn ratio was 42 in Unit 014 per 100 adult.

Chair Smith suggested that the Youth Hunt be done first.

It was moved Chair Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners increase the number of tags to 2,600 in Hunt 1107 with Nevada Department of Wildlife Staff allocating the tags among the weapons classes. The motion carried unanimously.

Responding to Member Flowers' inquiry about a reduction in the other weapons classes to offset the increase in tags for the Youth Hunt, Chair Smith stated that he did not believe that adjustment was mandatory.

Mr. Cox stated he would ask the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to compensate for the increased number of Youth tags from other classifications.

Chair Smith noted that the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife could make a recommendation to not take the additional tags from any other weapons class.

Mr. Cox concurred.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunts 1131, 1181, 1101, and 1331 (Any Legal Weapon) as proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunts 1371 (Muzzle Loader) as proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved Member Harwell, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunt 1341 (resident/non-resident Archery) as proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting recessed for ten minutes.

LANDOWNER TAG ALLOCATIONS

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 10 of 18

Mike Dobel noted that a percentage of the statewide total was allocated for landowner tags. Mr. Dobel explained that there was no shortage of tags.

Mike Cox noted that 265 tags between Muledeer and Pronghorn were sold the previous year. The 1.5 percent recommendation was 284. Mr. Cox noted that 68 landowner tags were issued for Elk the previous year. It was estimated that the landowner received some \$600,000.00 in return for the tags with one recipient using the proceeds to purchase a new vehicle.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Hunts 1115, 1215, 2115 and 2215 (Land Owner Compensation Tags) as presented. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Harwell and Wilson assenting; and Chair Smith dissenting.

11. U. S. FOREST SERVICE NORTHEASTERN NEVADA TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLANS AND STAFF REPORTS – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation on Nevada Department of Wildlife staff reports on U. S. Forest Service Northeastern Nevada Travel Management Plans and suggestions on staff direction to draft a letter to the U. S. Forest Service concerning travel management plans on behalf of the Wildlife Commission.*

Member Harwell commented that the USFS (United States Forest Service) was present at the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) meeting conducting a survey of roads and that some County Game Board have representatives attend meetings to address the process. It appears that roads and maps have been completed in Washoe County with maps available at USFS facilities. Once the roads are closed, signs will be posted stating that the specific road is closed and failure to observe the posted signage will result in a no trespassing fine being levied. Mr. Harwell noted his concern that Washoe County had been completed and that the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife had not be included in the process.

Chair Smith commented that he had read the staff report but is unclear on the recommendation to the Commission.

Chris Hampson – NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife), noted that the maps are posted on the USFS website to ascertain what roads are proposed for closure.

Mel Belding noted that Washoe County is waiting for the Travel Management Plan that may be delayed until beyond the 2010.

Chair Smith noted that Member Harwell had expressed some concern at the Commission meeting that the WCABMW had not been involved in the process.

Member Flowers noted that the roads being closed are those installed at the back of subdivisions by the City of Reno in response to complaints from residents. This particular process was not part of the USFS or BLM (Bureau of Land Management).

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 11 of 18

Ira Hansen recalled the reopening of the Jarbridge road and noted his hesitancy in moving forward with an endorsement without additional information and in coordination with the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and Citizen Advisory Boards.

Member Harwell commented that they are going through the state section by section with Washoe County having been drawn with eastern Nevada being done first.

Chair Smith noted his concern about the closure of road without additional information or public input.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners table this without any specific action until additional information is made available that will allow the County Game Boards to make an informed recommendation to the Commission. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell dissenting.

12. WILDLIFE HERITAGE PROJECTS – A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify the Heritage Committee's recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners for approval of projects submitted for funding in fiscal year 2009-2010.

Chair Smith noted the 43 projects listed totaling more than \$1-million with only \$600,000.00 available in funding. Mr. Smith stated that he believes this information should be available on the website for all interested parties to review due to the expense of printing and distributing materials to interested parties. Chair Smith stated he would like to go thru and determine whether or not each project was supported and then come back with a funding recommendation.

2009-2010 BIG GAME CAPTURE, TRANSPLANT AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Chair Smith provide an overview and aspects of the program submitted by Mike Cox that include tracking of herd migration patterns; post release monitoring of Big Horn Sheep and Muledeer as well as future strategies for managing populations. Total request \$296,271.00; request to Heritage 167,471.00; \$63,000.00 put in by conservation and sportsmen groups; \$10,000.00 for volunteer labor and travel; and \$55,800.00 for NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) for salary. There is an ongoing \$10,000.00 for data management being requested form the Heritage fund on an ongoing basis.

Chair Smith noted that the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife had supported AB-437 and that Mr. Hansen's comments were not fully accurate as there was more information that was provided to the Game Board.

Ira Hansen noted that not all County board had made comment on the bill.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 12 of 18

During the discussion it was noted that ±63-percent of the funding would come from the Heritage Fund. Other discussion noted that this type of project is what the Heritage Fund was designed for. It was suggested that a recommendation to increase the funding by 20-percent would be supported. As the discussion continued, it was noted that none of the projects included funding for body and nutritional analysis of the declining Muledeer herd. It was suggested that some funding be targeted towards that goal. As the discussion continued, it was noted that this was but one of more than 200 projects.

Chair Smith reiterated that while there are no specific project recommendations for Washoe County and that when this comes back for 2010-2011 there will be project for Washoe County including surveys and additional data as suggested to research underlying reasons for the continued decline in Muledeer population.

Mr. Dobel noted that NDOW is the managing agency for wildlife rather than research. Collectively NDOW staff does not have time or knowledge to develop a research project envisioned by Mr. Molde.

Chair Smith commented that there are individuals getting degrees that could conduct this type of project.

Mr. Dobel noted that the State of California has a much larger agency.

Member Flowers suggested that while the agency could provide direction, other such as researched from UNR (University of Nevada, Reno) could be used to conduct the research for evaluation by the department.

Mel Belding noted that he has worked with NDOW staff and sad that more biologists cannot be added to do the things that need to be done. Mr. Belding noted that the application for Heritage funding is difficult and not user friendly. Mr. Belding reiterated that there is a need for additional NDOW staff.

Chris Hampson – NDOW, noted that there may be some disconnect in the provision of information on activities and projects within Washoe County that might not be funded through the Heritage fund. Mr. Hampson outlined various activities NDOW is involved with including a Muledeer Project on the Sheldon and Sage Grouse study.

Mr. Cox noted that he had recently completed the Intermountain West Habitat Guidelines. Mr. Cox noted that he knows how to do research but does not have the time to do it all and noted his concern that by reading one report that NDOW staff has their head in the sand.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-01 as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cox noted that he could accept less funding if necessary.

Chair Smith stated that the following projects should not be supported: 1) 10-17 Western Region Fisheries for a fishing boat – not supported as fund should be spent on big game in his opinion; 2) Project 10-23 for Muledeer enhancement due to a lack of supporting information; 3) Project 10-24 for the study of feral horses from BYU (Brigham Young University) – not within regulatory compliance and scope of the fund; 4) Project 10-26 increase fawn to doe ratio and overall Muledeer herd – while it meets regulations there are concerns about predator management; and 5) Project 10-27 Sage Grouse nesting survival – does not meet management suitable.

Project 10-31 removal of predators – \$290,000.00 co-sponsored by UNR (University of Nevada, Reno) and NDOW staff. It was noted that the project could perhaps be done with \$150,000.00 with a multi-year study with subsequent applications for funding. It was noted that climate is the driving factor and that a study is needed to fully understand what, if any, long term benefits are derived from predator control. This would develop the long and short term strategies. It was noted that about half the project costs would be matched but was not yet banked.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny Projects 10-17, 10-23, 10-24, 10-26 and 10-27. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Smith suggested going down the list noting that he believes all have some merit but not sufficient funds to support all.

PROJECT 10-30 WOOD DUCK

During the discussion it was noted that Project 10-30 on Wood Ducks and had received reduced funding in the past year. As the discussion continued, it was suggested that this project may be Ph.D. project that should perhaps not be funded by the Heritage Fund. Other discussion noted that the study is one of the best research projects on Wood Ducks and that there are matching funds including Duck Stamp funds, Nevada Water Fowl, Sacramento NWR Metal Poles, Reno High School and others. \$10,000.00 is being sought from the Heritage fund.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-30, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT 10-29 – DIXIE VALLEY SOLAR PUMP PROJECT

During the discussion it was explained that this project would provide additional water resources for Antelope and exclude cattle in Pershing County. The total project cost is \$21,555.00; \$7,895.00 from the Heritage Fund and cash contributions of \$14,709.00.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners accept Project 10-20. The motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT 10-02 NORTH SPRING VALLEY HABITAT IMPROVEMENT AND HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION PROJECT

The project proposed by Steve Foree of Elko County is seeking \$30,000.00 of the total \$120,000.00 for the project. It was noted that BLM (Bureau of Land Management) was funding the bulk of the project with NDOW assisting BLM in the layout design using the funds for purchase seeds and contract labor to see additional acreage. It is unclear how many acres were included in the project. It was also noted that a listing of matching funds should be included

PROJECT 10-03 SUZY CREEK WATER SHED

It was noted that BLM, Barrick and Newmont had contributed to the project and that NDOW would assist BLM in the treatment of the subject site. \$120,000.00 project costs with \$90,000.00 provided by partner agencies. It was noted that NDOW proposal 10-01 through 10-17 are NDOW's top priorities.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Projects 10-02 and 10-03. The motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT 10-04 ROBERTS CREEK MOUNTAIN SAGE GROUSE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT

Total request \$20,823.00 to conserve nesting habitat of Sage Grouse along with brood rearing. The project is on public lands administered by the BLM \$20,823.00 is being requested. NDOW has provided funding as have BLM, Department of Interior and others.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-04. The motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT 10-05 HIGHWAY 93 RURAL FENCING REMOVAL

This project includes \$4,000.00 from the Muledeer Foundation with a total project cost of \$8,000.00 to Wells Honor Camp Workers to remove the fence. The project will remove unneeded fencing along a five mile section of an abandoned railroad corridor to make it more wildlife friendly.

It was moved by Copeland, seconded Members Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-05. The motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT 10-06 DISEASE MONITORING FOR CONSERVATION OF TERRESTRIAL BIG GAME SPECIES IN NEVADA

It was explained the project would continue surveillance in big game animals, specifically Big Horn Sheep. Other discussion focused on the type and method of specimen sample collection. The current testing will be entered in collaboration with UNR with storage of materials for future use. The total is \$73,594.50 with NDOW funding \$8,776.00; USDA-APHIS \$13,608.00 and \$10,000.00 from UNR.

It was moved by Member Harwell, seconded Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10.06. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Smith stated that he believes this is one of the highest priorities in his opinion.

PROJECT 10-07 EUREKA FISH CREEK WATER DEVELOPMENT NO. 6

The project is seeking \$8,000.00 in funding from the Heritage Fund with for the \$23,800.00 project. \$8,000.00 will be provided by the BLM with \$4,800.00 in donated equipment and labor. It was noted that the Eureka County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife had sponsored the project to enhance water supplies.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Projects 10-07, 10-08, 10-09, 10-10, 10-11, 10-12, 10-13, 10-14, 10-15 and 10-16.

Chair Smith noted that this particular motion did not rank any proposal and that if the list is approved funding levels will be determined.

The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-01 in the amount of \$120,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-31 in the amount of \$150,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-16 in the amount of \$25,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 16 of 18

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-30 in the amount of \$6,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved Member Flowers, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Projects 10-02 and 10-03 at \$15,000 each for a total of \$30,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-06 in the amount of \$25,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-08 in the amount of \$25,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-29 in the amount of \$5,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-05 in the amount of \$4,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-07 in the amount of \$8,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Harwell, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-04 in the amount of \$20,823.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-09 in the amount of \$14,980.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-12 in the amount of \$40,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-15 in the amount of \$100,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-10 in the amount of \$10,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Harwell, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-13 in the amount of \$15,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-11 in the amount of \$5,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-14 in the amount of \$5,000.00. The motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Project 10-18, 10-19, 10-20 and 10-21 each in the amount of \$5,495.00, The motion carried unanimously.

Member Wilson expressed his appreciation to those present for their participation in the process.

13. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE/RECOMMENDATIONS – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify legislative recommendations.*

There was some discussion about SB-411. It was noted that Member Flowers had attended the hearing and that the Committee appeared to be in support of the proposed legislation. It was explained that NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) had been unaware that the bill had been reintroduced.

SB-42 was heard April 21, 2009.

The following legislation has been heard and recommended on: SB-146; SB-280; and SB-394.

SB-431 is clean-up language to resolve confusion and aid in the public's understanding of the regulation. This legislation was heard on April 29, 2009.

Chair Smith noted that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners would review SB-411 and suggested that a recommendation be made.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

May 7, 2009

Page 18 of 18

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioner support SB-411, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

14. MEMBER COMMENTS * – *Limited to emergent items not addressed elsewhere on the agenda. While the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife may not engage in discussion or take action on any item identified under this topic the matter may be placed on a future agenda for discussion and possible action or recommendation of action to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners.*

There were no member comments.

15. FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS * – *Selection of additional agenda item(s) for the June 18, 2009, meeting.*

Chair Smith suggested that material on Washoe County projects be provided for board discussion and an update on Washoe Lake.

Member Flowers stated he would not be present at the June 18, 2009, meeting.

16. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at