

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

MINUTES DRAFT

Monday ~ August 10, 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
Rex Flowers, Secretary
Daryl Harwell
Thomas Wilson

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE *

Chair Smith lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL *

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A quorum was established.

Chair Smith reordered the agenda to hear Agenda Item 17 after Agenda Item 6.

PRESENT: Glen Copeland, Rex Smith, Rick Smith and Tom Wilson.

ABSENT: Daryl Harwell.

Chair Smith noted that Member Harwell was excused.

3. APPROVAL OF JUNE 22, 2009, MINUTES

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Flowers, to approve the June 22, 2009, minutes, as submitted. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting and Member Harwell absent.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS *

Don Molde recalled his previous discussion with Kevin Lansford at the June 22, 2009, meeting and provided a handout (copy on file) explaining that his analysis shows there is no correlation between season length and management statistically.

5. COMMITTEE, MEMBER AND LIAISON UPDATES *

5-1). *Correspondence (including sportsmen's concerns) and Announcements* – There was no correspondence.

5-2). *Update on the Sheldon Wildlife Management Plan* – There was no update on the Sheldon Wildlife Management Plan.

5-3) *Overview of the June 26 and 27, 2009, Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting* – Member Flowers noted that there had been significant discussion at the Friday (June 26, 2009) meeting with Commissioner Raines asking for documentation of the

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 2 of 15

Director and staff travel expenses due to the current budget constraints. The discussion of language in the Wildlife Damage Committee meeting carried over to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) meeting seeking additional oversight. In general the program appears to be working well. Other discussion included the Winecup Ranch, which will be addressed later in tonight's (August 10, 2009) agenda. Member Flowers noted that HR-1018 may allow the placement of wild horses on lands where horses were not originally found. Additionally, a workshop will be scheduled to address the visual disability issues for muzzle loaders due to the potential loss of federal funding if the issue is not adequately addressed.

Chair Smith commented that Chair Lent had expressed his disapproval of the Heritage Tag Committee's recommendation to allot three (3) tags to Nevada Bighorns Unlimited. However, the Commission ultimately approved the Subcommittee recommendations.

5-4). *Update and status report on the Washoe County Predator Control Project and the Wildlife Damage Management Subcommittee* – Chair Smith commented that he did not have an update at this time.

- 6. BOARD MEMBER MEETING ASSIGNMENT** – *A discussion and selection of member(s) to attend the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meetings on: 1) August 14 and 15, 2009, meetings in Elko, Nevada; and 2) September 25 and 26, 2009, meetings in Las Vegas, Nevada.*

Chair Smith will attend the August 14 and 15, 2009, meetings in Elko, Nevada.

Member Flowers will attend the September 25 and 26, 2009, meetings in Las Vegas, Nevada.

- 17. RECOMMENDATION ON THE SLATE OF OFFICERS FOR THE NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners on candidates for the positions of Chair, Vice-chair and Secretary of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners.*

Chair Smith noted that he had received requests to consider recommendations for the slate of officers for the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission).

Chair Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Dennis Wilson – Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, read a letter to the Commission into the record (copy on file) from Nevada Bighorn Unlimited Chair Michael J. Bertoldi.

Tom Smith – Coalition for Nevada Wildlife, read a letter to the Commission into the record (copy on file) outlining their concerns about Chair Gerald Lent pursuing his own agenda in

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife –DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 3 of 15

direct opposition to the interests of sportsmen. Of particular concern is the need to do what is best for all sportsmen, conservationists and the public even if the action is in direct conflict with Chair Lent's own personal beliefs.

Ira Hansen commented that in his opinion, what is being heard is a personal vendetta against Chair Lent. Mr. Hansen pointed out that Chair Lent has been active in promoting predator fees, the tag draw system currently in place and other wildlife related issues. Mr. Hansen noted that, in his opinion, the Director of the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) works for and is directed by the Commission and asked how the election of officers came to be on the Washoe County CAB (County Advisory Board) agenda.

Chair Smith stated that he had directed that the election of Officers be placed on the agenda for discussion and possible recommendation.

Joel Blakeslee noted that he had been involved with predator management for some time and that the issue with predator management is the nearly weekly articles on the issues in local newsprint. Mr. Blakeslee pointed out that continued negative press will be detrimental to the programs and sportsmen and emphasized the need to refocus on biology issues rather than personalities.

Greg Smith commented that he was berated at the meeting in Lovelock, Nevada and was quite "shocked" by the words used by someone that is supposed to represent the Commission in a professional manner. Mr. Smith recommended that someone that is able to lead the Commission in a professional manner be chosen and pointed out that, in his opinion, Chair Lent is not that person.

Judi Caron explained that she had always felt safe, and welcome at past Commission meetings while a member of the Washoe County CAB. However, she no longer has that feeling and recommended that the Commission consider the following traits in the Chair honesty, integrity, knowledgeable of issues, competent and flexible team player as well as exhibiting respect for others including differing view points along with a willingness to both seek and take advice and support among others (copy on file).

Bob Brunner requested that the Commission choose a new person to serve as Chair noting that Chair Lent has had a year to try his formula that has resulted in a divided Commission and alienated sportsmen's groups that donate significant sums of money to the Department (copy of Mr. Brunner's written statement on file).

Don Molde commented that as a member of the public he too would like to see a Chair and Commission that is responsive to the concerns of the general public. Mr. Molde explained that he admires Chair Lent's dedication whether he agrees with his style or not. Mr. Molde recalled that he and Chair Lent had at one time equally disliked although at opposite ends of the spectrum. Mr. Molde suggested that the Chair let the Director of the department manage the department and noted he had discussed that issue with Chair Lent directly.

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 4 of 15

Chair closed the public hearing.

Member Flowers explained that he was disappointed to see the direction the Commission seems to be taking with a focus on deer herds at any cost thus cutting funding for other worthwhile programs. Mr. Flowers pointed out that the current trend appears to be “whack ‘em and stack ‘em” when it comes to predator control, which is not the same as predator management. Additionally, Member Flowers has noted a resistance to listening to the opinions of others and that the conduct at the Lovelock (Nevada) meeting was unprofessional and detrimental to sportsmen in general as the behavior reinforces a “caveman” mentality of sportsmen to anti-hunt and animal rights activists. Member Flowers emphasized that the Commission needs to appoint a leader that will bring the various groups together and achieve the cohesive approach to issues that was enjoyed in the past.

Chair Smith read his personal letter to the Commission into the record (copy on file) and explained that he concurs with Mr. Hansen’s comments about the work Chair Lent has done in the past. However, the unacceptable bashing of department personnel and failure to listen to the CAB’s is unacceptable from the leader of the Commission. Mr. Smith encouraged the Commission to bring continuity back to the process by providing proper leadership.

Member Wilson commented that he is aware of Chair Lent’s role in advocating on behalf of wildlife and noted that he and Chair Lent were seldom on the same side of a contested issue. Mr. Wilson then drew attention to the regulations governing NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) and pointed out that as a department of the State of Nevada that the Executive Director works for the Governor (Jim Gibbons) with the Commission providing guidance on wildlife related issues. Member Wilson pointed out that the Commission should not micro-manage the department or its operations but be cognizant of the concerns of Washoe County citizens, the CAB and sportsmen’s groups. Member Wilson noted that it is the function of the county CAB’s to represent their County.

Member Copeland commented that while he has concurred with Chair Lent’s position on non-resident hunts, a review of the last meeting’s minutes indicates that it appears that it was not helpful for wildlife and was sad that the Commission was moving in that direction.

Member Wilson suggested a motion that would encourage the Commission Chair to take the CAB and other County recommendations into consideration/

Chair Smith noted that what is being sought in a new Chair is good leadership that listens to the public, sportsmen and the CAB’s. Mr. Smith acknowledged that Chair Lent has done good things for wildlife but in his opinion, does not provide the leadership needed although his intentions may be good.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners make a change in their leadership. The

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife –DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 5 of 15

motion failed: Member Copeland and Chair Smith assenting; Members Flowers and Wilson dissenting; and Member Harwell absent.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners as a whole look to appoint leadership that will work with the County Advisory Boards and the public for the betterment of all sportsmen and wildlife.

The recording secretary read the motion back resulting in Member Flowers restating the motion as follows.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners as a whole look to appoint leadership that will work with the County Advisory Boards and the public for the betterment of all sportsmen and wildlife in a professional and ethical manner.

Member Wilson clarified that the Washoe County CAB is not advocating in favor of, or in opposition to the current Chair, which he does not believe is part of the role of the CAB.

Chair Smith explained that, in his opinion, it is the role of the County CAB's to make recommendations to the Commission and pointed out that the Election of Officers will affect the direction of the Commission over the next year.

Member Flowers commented that he believes it is better to allow the Commission to choose the leadership while knowing the stance of the CAB.

The motion failed: Members Flowers and Wilson assenting; Member Copeland and Chair Smith dissenting; and Member Harwell absent.

Member Flowers suggested that it may be better to simply carry forward the letters (copies on file) to the Commission without a specific motion.

Member Wilson commented that it appears that the general consensus among and between the Washoe County CAB is similar to a vote of "no confidence" in the current leadership.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) read the letters presented to the Commission by the public and sportsmen's groups about what is being sought in leadership skills. Mr. Smith stated that those skills include listening to input from the public the County Advisory Boards, sportsmen's groups and all groups involved in the process with a Chair that will be honest, ethical and treat all persons with dignity and pro professionalism throughout their term. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

7. **COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 364 LCB (Legislative Counsel Bureau) FILE NO. R206-08 - GAME** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify proposed changes to Commission General Regulation 364 LCB File No. R206-08 that proposes changes to Elk Damage and Elk Incentive tag regulations which make revisions to NAC (Nevada Administrative Code) 502.42259, 502.42261, 502.42263, 502.42266, and 504.350.*

Hearing no public comment on the matter Chair Smith closed the public hearing and asked for a motion or board discussion.

Member Wilson noted that the language proposes a mandate to refuse a land owner tag in the event the land owner refuses or otherwise prohibits access to public property across private property to a hunter.

Chair Smith explained that he believes that was the original intent of the Landowner Tag and provide the “clean-up” needed to enforce the regulation, which he can support.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve the proposed changes to Commission General Regulation 364 Legislative Counsel Bureau File No. R206-08, as written. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flower, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

8. **COMMISSION POLICY NO. 1, FIRST READING** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify Commission Policy No. 1, which proposes changes to “General Guidelines for the Commission.” Additionally, modifications are being proposed to divide Commission Policy No. 1 and dividing Commission Policy No. 1 into three separate policies: A. Commission Policy No. 1, “General Guidelines for the Commission”; B. Commission Policy No. 3, “Appeals Policy”; and C. Commission Policy No. 4, “Petition Process and Adoption of Regulation Policy”.*

Chair Smith provided an overview of the agenda item and noted that each subsection would be handled individually. Chair Smith opened the meeting to public comment

Policy No. 1, “General Guidelines for the Commission”

Judi Caron suggested that the board have their discussion first so that the public can hear their thought before making comments.

Member Wilson commented that he foresees issues on Policy 1 as the language apparently gives the Commission (Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners) guidance funding that is granted or otherwise gifted to the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW). Mr. Wilson

explained that the Commission under NRS (Nevada Revised Statutes) does not have any authority over funds that are not directly granted or given to the Commission. Typically, such funds to NDOW are earmarked for specific project and must be returned if the monies cannot be expended on that specific project.

Ms. Caron concurred with Member Wilson and noted that “if it is not broken why fix it?”

Chair Smith noted that to his knowledge there had been no opinion rendered by the Nevada Attorney General on the matter.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny the proposed modifications to Policy 1, “General Guidelines for the Commission”. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flower, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

Commission Policy No. 3, “Appeals Policy”

Chair Smith expressed his support for the modification noting that it had been somewhat of “a gray area”. This particular proposed clearly defines the Appeals Policy and what the County Advisory Boards (CAB) can and cannot do.

Member Wilson concurred and cautioned that the policy also requires that the Member of the Commission cannot discuss the matter among themselves or with others until the appeal is heard by the Commission as a whole. The intent is to preclude any perception or potential for a preconceived outcome of a judicial discussion and decision.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve the modification to Commission Policy 3 “Appeals Policy” as presented. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flower, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

Commission Policy No. 4, “Petition Process and Adoption of Regulation Policy”

Chair Smith outlined his concerns with the language that would limit public and/or CAB input on all matters pertaining to wildlife, specifically special regulations or change request to modify existing Commission policies.

Responding to Ira Hansen’s inquiry about what is meant by “Special Regulation”, Chair Smith explained, that in his opinion a “Special Regulation” is anything outside of the bag limits, seasons and the like. Mr. Smith noted that the Nevada Attorney General has indicated that the CAB’s and public have a right to provide input on such matters to the Commission on any Special Regulation or Commission Policy.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife –DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 8 of 15

Mel Belding suggested that the Muzzle Loader modifications to allow scopes of the visually impaired would be considered a Special Regulation.

Chair Smith drew attention to other language that further precludes public and CAB input as well as the restrictions suggested on the petition for a change in existing Commission Policy.

Joel Blakeslee commented that, in his opinion, the proposal is designed to keep the public and the CAB from proposing other options and is “not right.”

Chair Smith noted that the changes to existing policy had been written over time and had provided a set of guidelines that has worked of the public for a long time. It is unclear why anyone would want to modify those processes now.

Member Copeland concurred.

Member Flowers pointed out the Commission is to review Commission Policies on a periodic basis and that the timeline provision for the refilling of a petition does not appear to make sense as circumstance may change considerably.

Chair Smith concurred and suggested that the revision is poorly written and pointed out that the second reading of the proposal the following day which seems inappropriate.

Member Wilson stated he is opposed to any provision that precludes or prohibits CAB and/or public input in the process.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny Commission Policy No. 4, “Petition Process and Adoption of Regulation Policy” as written. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

9. **MUZZLELOADER VISUAL DISABILITY MODIFICATIONS WORKSHOP** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify a U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service request that the Nevada Department of Wildlife implement a process whereby reasonable modifications to the muzzleloader hunting program are available to accommodate hunters with visual disabilities, as a result of a multi-state disability complaint by the North American Muzzleloader Association.*

Chair Smith outlined the agenda item noting that this proposal is a result of a multi-state disability complaint by the North American Muzzleloader Association. Chair Smith opened the public hearing.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 9 of 15

Member Copeland recalled that the board had previously recommended denial of the request as the scope can be used on a muzzle loaded weapon under the Any Legal Weapon season.

Member Flowers commented that the placing of a scoped muzzle loader into Any Legal Weapon may be discriminatory since it separate from their regular Muzzle Loader draw. It appears that the option to have their hunt within the muzzle loader hunt is based on federal guidelines. While several states have moved forward with some modification of the regulations there are specific medical requirements that have to be met. Mr. Flowers suggested that perhaps one course of action would be to recommend that the Commission hold workshops on the matter to determine how best the issues can be addressed in a manner that retains federal funding.

Member Copeland noted that the muzzle loader class is intended for a primitive weapon and that he has concerns with allowing a device that make the weapon's accuracy comparable to a regular rifle such as the 30-06.

Member Flowers voiced concerns bout public safety with a program that allows the use of a firearm if vision is significantly impaired.

Joel Blakeslee noted that the matter had been heard by the CAB previously and recalled that there had been some discussion about how the use of a scope might alter the hunter success ratio if the technical improvement results in accuracy similar to that of a 30-06 rifle.

Member Wilson noted that while he understands the issues he is opposed to the request and suggested that matter be sent to a workshop for further discussion.

Member Flowers noted that the minutes from the June meeting were not available thus making it difficult to understand the discussion about the issue.

Member Wilson commented that it is difficult to make an informed decision without a specific plan for consideration. Therefore, his preference is to have some input upon which to begin that decision making process.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners leave the muzzle loader regulations as currently written. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; Member Flowers dissenting; and Member Harwell absent.

The meeting recessed at 7:54 p.m. and reconvened at 8:08 p.m.

- 10. POTENTIAL CONVERSION OF THE WINE CUP RANCH TO A WILD HORSE REFUGE** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify the development of*

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 10 of 15

portions of the Wine Cup Ranch in Elko County into a wild horse refuge. Changes proposed in HR-1018 may allow such a conversion to occur.

<http://www.privatelandauctions.com/books/winecup/winecup.asp>

Chair Smith provided an outline of the agenda item noting that the only information had been from the web link listed above. However, that link did not provide any significance information as to the changes being proposed other than the past history of the ranch, water rights and number of cattle. Chair Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Tina Nappe commented that while she supports the right of a private land owner to use their land as they see fit, she is opposed to a change in use that would allow wild horses on property that has not historically been home to wild horses.

Joel Blakeslee concurred noting that there are a number of wild horses on the Sheldon Wildlife Refuge.

Mel Belding concurred with Ms. Nappe's comments and concerns that current statistics indicated there are more than 1,000 wild horses on the Sheldon Wildlife Refuge. The plan is to provide vasectomies to some and adopt a significant number of wild horses out. Ms. Belding believes the estimated number of adoptions is somewhat overstated.

Judi Caron noted her concern about the taking of a private parcel of land and making it into a wild horse refuge that will be seeking a portion of the already limited federal funding to maintain the private wild horse refuge.

Mr. Blakeslee noted his concern about having wildlife that is owned by the public housed on private lands.

During the discussion it was noted that HR-1018 had been passed by a majority of the House of Representatives. As the discussion continued, it was explained that it appears that HR-1018 is similar to the Wilkinson Act and noted that the Commission and CAB would only have standing if this is converted to public land. Other discussion noted that HR-1018 is related to wild burros and that the proposed amendment would allow wild horse on to lands that are not historically ranges for that species. It was noted that the wild horse population is not being managed effectively by the BLM (Bureau of Land Management).

Member Wilson stated that he prefers to defer to the Elko CAB for a recommendation on the Winecup Ranch who would have more knowledge and a better understanding of the issues.

Discussion then turned to whether this would remain private land or become federal public land. As the discussion continued, it was emphasized that there is little to no support for using public funds to maintain a private wild horse refuge and the continued trend to make the BLM a welfare agency for wild horses.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny the development of a portion of the Winecup Ranch or any other County in the State of Nevada into a wild horse refuge. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

- 11. WILDLIFE DAMAGE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify recommendations that identify predator management proposals for the Predator Management Plan for 2010.*

Chair Smith summarized the agenda item and opened the meeting to public comment.

Judi Caron asked whether project Heritage Fund project were included in the 2010 Predator project noting that she did not have support materials.

Chair Smith commented that minutes of the previous Predator Control Subcommittee meeting were not available either.

During the discussion it was noted that noted that federal funds cannot be used for predator control project. However, funds can be used for research projects. Other discussion noted that Project 23 is the Mason Valley Pheasant augmentation, which already has an incubator. Project 22 was continued into 2011 for Unit 010 with some funds being transferred to coyote management. There was some discussion about a potential project for Unit 015. During the discussion it was noted that lions can be chased into adjacent units for domestic sheep protection under certain conditions in Project 20. Other discussion focused on Projects 6, 14 15 and 17 with the notation that Unit 015 was not covered in any of those project either. Discussion then pointed out that a lion cannot be pursued across the California State line.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners take no action and table the agenda item until appropriate support and informational materials are made available. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

- 12. ONLINE HUNT APPLICATION CHANGES/AMENDMENTS AFTER APPLICATION SUBMISSION** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify proposed changes or amendments to the Online Hunt Application process after an application has been submitted.*

Chair Smith provided an overview of the agenda item noted that there are six (6) options for consideration. Mr. Smith then provided additional detail on each of the options that provide

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 12 of 15

opportunities to resubmit an application under specific guidelines. Chair Smith explained that in all cases the fees are not refunded and must be paid again. In some instances the \$3.00 predator and \$2.00 convenience paid are not paid a second time. Mr. Smith noted that Option 6 provide the most user friendly scenario, which is the intent of the modification. It is expected that the process will generate additional income of \pm \$28,548.00 annually with a programming charge of about \$12,150.00.

During the discussion it was suggested that a seventh option be suggested that would allow application for a bonus point plus a change in the second draw when tags are left over. In that instance the bonus point would be returned

Member Wilson commented that while he understand the reasoning and additional income that this would generate, he feels that a deadline should be enforced without exception. Mr. Wilson noted that he too had occasionally missed a deadline. Of some concern is that this could lead to the alteration of other deadlines for a variety of issues.

Responding to Member Flowers' inquiry about what issues were encountered in other states that had adopted similar regulations, Chair Smith explained that there are 151,000 applications in the State of Nevada compared to 291,000 in the State of Utah that had some 5,000 amended applications. It is anticipated using that formula that Nevada would have about 2,594 amended applications.

Mel Belding expressed his support of the proposal noting that all other licenses can be amended for an additional fee or penalty if there is an error or missed deadline.

Ira Hansen commented that he too supported this proposal.

There was some discussion about the various options. During the discussion a consensus was reached that Option 6 provided the most user friendly option.

It was moved by Member Copeland to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Option 5 as submitted. The motion died due to lack of a second.

It was moved by Member Flowers, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Option 6 as written.

Member Wilson commented that while most are in favor of making the system more user friendly, there comes a point when a missed deadline is missed and nothing can be done.

Chair Smith commented that while he is personally opposed to Option 6 he will support it based on the input from sportsmen who he was chosen to represent.

The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

- 13. BITTERBRUSH AND WILDFIRE** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify a presentation on Bitterbrush and Wildfire and their effects on wildlife habitat.*

Chair Smith summarized the agenda item noting that this was an informational report for the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission).

The recording secretary explained that it was his practice to include informational items from the Commission agenda as action on the board agenda in case the board wished to make a recommendation.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Copeland, to take no action and await support material and information on the matter. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

- 14. COMMISSION REGULATION 07-07 AMENDMENT NO. 4** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve deny or otherwise modify proposed amendment to Commission Regulation 07-07 Amendment, which addresses changes to the Bobcat Pelt Sealing Dates that were approved at the June (2009) Commission meeting in Lovelock (Nevada).*

Chair Smith outlined the agenda item and opened ht meeting to public comment.

Joel Blakeslee commented that the Trappers Association concurred with the modifications as presented.

Chair Smith closed the meeting to public comment and concurred with Mr. Blakeslee's comments.

It was moved by Chair Smith, seconded by Member Wilson, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioner approve Commissioner Regulation 07-07 Amendment No. 4 as written. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

- 15. COMMISSION REGULATION 09-08 - GAME DIVISION** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify Commission Regulation 09-08 season dates and bag limits for migratory Waterfowl, Common Snipe, Coots and Moorhens for 2009-2010. The proposed regulation also recommends dates and bag limits for the*

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 14 of 15

Special Youth Waterfowl Hunt and Falconry season dates and bag limits for migratory game birds.

Chair Smith summarized the agenda item noting that there were some modifications to the original recommendations.

Don Molde questioned whether the local conditions, such as drought could be taken into consideration when setting seasons and limits that are somewhat less than the federal limits.

During the discussion it was noted that the recommendation is for the liberal season and limits and that only 3,500 Duck Stamps had been sold in the previous season. Other discussion suggested that Scaup be identified in the Duck and Merganser classification to avoid confusion.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve Commission Regulation 09-08, as written. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

It was moved by Member Wilson, seconded by Member Flowers, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners include Scaup in the Duck and Merganser portion of Commission Regulation 09-08. The motion carried: Members Copeland, Flowers, Wilson and Chair Smith assenting; and Member Harwell absent.

- 16. COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION 364 LCB FILE NO. R206-08 – GAME – A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify proposed changes to Elk Damage and Elk Incentive Tag regulations which make revisions to NAC (Nevada Administrative Code) 502.42259, 502.42261, 502.42263, 502.42266, and 504.350.**

This is a duplicate agenda item handled under Agenda Item 7.

- 18. 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.**

Chair Smith noted that Animal Ark Wildlife Refuge was hosting an appreciation dinner for former Nevada Wildlife Commissioner David McNinch on Thursday, August 13, 2009. Cost of the cater BBQ is \$17.00 per person with a suggested contribution of \$10.00 to Animal Ark that evening. Mr. Smith noted that flyers were available (copy on file).

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – DRAFT Minutes

August 10, 2009

Page 15 of 15

Member Wilson noted that the Subcommittee was experiencing problems in starting at the agendized time, which is inconvenient for those individuals wishing to provide testimony.

Chair Smith stated he would address the issue with the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

19. FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS * – *Selection of additional agenda item(s) for the September 17, 2009, meeting.*

No new agenda items were identified.

20. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

* denotes NON action item