

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT OF MINUTES

Thursday ~ September 16, 2010 ~ 6:30 p.m.
Nevada Department of Wildlife
Conference Room B
1100 Valley Road, Reno, Nevada

MEMBERS

Rex Flowers, Chair
Rick Smith, Vice-chair
John Reed, Secretary
Glen Copeland
Daryl Harwell

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE *

Chair Flowers led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL *

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

PRESENT: Glen Copeland, Rex Flowers, Daryl Harwell, John Reed and Rick Smith.

ABSENT: None.

3. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 9, 2010, MINUTES

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to approve the August 9, 2010m minutes, as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS *

Riley Manzonie – Nevada Outfitters, commented that a letter of support for reinstatement of the previous tag policy for non-resident guided hunt had been received from Governor Jim Gibbons and the Elko County representative.

Bob Brunner drew attention to applicable regulations that allow the State of Nevada to sell a predator hunt permit (copy on file).

Joel Blakeslee – Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, commented that there had been four (4) public meetings concerning Sheldon Wildlife Refuge wherein the management was asked to consider allowing a predator hunt, which has to date not been well received. It has been indicated that their mission is to balance predator and prey in a natural habitat. The intent is to seek NDOW's (Nevada Department of Wildlife) support in development a predator hunt.

5. COMMITTEE, MEMBER AND LIAISON UPDATES *

5-1. Correspondence (including sportsmen's concerns) and Announcements – Chair Flowers drew attention to a written opinion (copy on file) rendered by Deputy District Attorney Terry Shea that correspondence related to agenda items should be read at the time the agenda item is heard and that public comment on specific agenda items be taken as the specific agenda item is heard. Comments on items not appearing on the agenda should be heard under the Public Comment agenda item. Chair Flowers encouraged

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 2 of 16

members to individually submit nominations for the Wayne Kirsch award, which closes on November 1, 2010. Chair Flowers outlined correspondence (copy on file) appointing Elmer Bull as the Habitat Division Chief.

5-2). Overview of the August 13 and 14, 2010, Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting – Member Harwell provided an overview of the August 13 and 14, 2010, Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) meeting that included action by the Commission increasing funding for Heritage Project 6a from \$34,000.00 to \$90,000.00. The Commission also suggested that certain funds be returned with the grant rewritten to allow the funds to be used to secure more birds for release.

Chair Flowers noted that the Commission had indicated a desire for two (2) programs, one for monitoring and one to secure additional bird for release, which would require a rewrite of the grant application. Chair Flowers noted that without a program in place to monitor the bird populations that funding to secure additional birds may be unlikely.

Member Reed noted some concern that comments tended to focus on when the birds could be hunted rather than what could be done to reestablish lost native populations.

Chair Flowers explained that there is concern among the Commission Members that the birds could be placed on the Endangered Species list thus causing areas to be closed to all hunting.

Member Harwell commented that it appears that TrailSafe will resubmit the trapping ban petition for the December Commission meeting and that the regulations governing guzzler interference had been continued to address concerns expressed by a rancher on a water feature installed on his property. Additionally, the agenda item dealing with the guided hunt was tabled pending a rewrite of the proposed revision.

Chair Flowers noted that the rewrite will preclude the award of a bonus point until after the draws are completed.

Russell Woolstenhulme – Waterfowl Biologist, commented that some lambs had been observed in the spring (2010). During a previous die-off no lambs were observed for quite some time.

5-3). Update and status report on the Washoe County Predator Control Project and the Wildlife Damage Management Subcommittee – There was not report.

5-4) Member Liaison updates – The members agreed to serve as liaisons as listed: 1) Member Copeland – Wildlife Damage; 2) Member Harwell – Finance and Administrative Procedures; 3) Member Reed – Legislative; Member Smith – Heritage; and 5) Chair Flowers Muledeer Restoration.

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 3 of 16

6. **BOARD MEMBER MEETING ASSIGNMENT** – *A discussion and selection of member(s) to attend the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meetings on: 1) September 24 and 25, 2010, meetings in Las Vegas, Nevada; and 2). December 3 and 4, 1020, Reno, Nevada.*

Chair Flowers or Member Reed will attend the September 24 and 25, 2010, meetings in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Members Reed and Smith will attend the December 3 and December 4, 2010, meetings in Reno, Nevada, respectively with Member Harwell serving as an alternate.

7. **ADDITION OF SCRIPPS WILDLIFE REFUGE** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife to begin the process to add the Scripps Wildlife Management Area to the list of options available in the State of Nevada for Swan seasons.*

Russell Woolstenhulme – Waterfowl Biologist, provided a handout (copy on file) of information on the Swan Hunt noting that while the estimate of Tundra Swan is down 27-percent from the previous season that the survey has shown a modest increase of 2-percent over the past decade. Mr. Woolstenhulme explained the process to expand the federal framework that includes a minimum three (3) year survey of areas to determine Swan distribution and number; additional hunt areas should be designed to minimize the take of Trumpeter Swans as well as a reopening of the EA (Environmental Assessment) process. Limiting factors include the lack of funding or staff to facilitate the mandatory surveys along with the cost and potential ramifications of a reopened EA process that could result in a loss of Swan hunts in other areas. It was noted that the reopened process would need to include other areas within the State of Nevada such as Humboldt, Lincoln, Nye and perhaps other counties.

During the discussion it was suggested that there may be other opportunities to secure funding for the mandated surveys and reopened EA process. The intent of the three (3) year long survey is to assure that the population estimates are not an anomaly (either high or low). Additionally, the NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act) process could take two (2) years to complete. It was also noted that other states in the Pacific Flyway may have an interest in expansion of their areas. Discussion then noted that an average of 400 of the 650 allocated tags are sold with about 200 sold initially and others sold over-the-counter. Other discussion focused on the current regulations which allow the taking of only one (1) Swan per day. Individuals holding a second permit cannot use the permit until the next day.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 4 of 16

It was moved by Member Reed, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners direct staff to begin the survey process to expand the Swan Hunt.

There was some discussion about the motion. It was suggested that rather than seeking specific direction from the Commission that staff be asked to provide a cost estimate to begin the survey process. It was explained that the intent of the motion is to begin the dialogue and research into the processes, costs and other issues associated with a request to expand Swan hunt areas.

Member Reed withdrew the motion. Member Harwell withdrew the second.

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Harwell to ask that Russell Woolstenhulme – Waterfowl Biologist, provide more detailed information on the cost of the survey process before making a formal request to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners. The motion carried unanimously.

- 8. TRI-COUNTY WILDLIFE GROUP REPORT *** – *An informational update on the recommendations and discussion from the August 11, 2010, meeting of the Tri-County Wildlife Group.*

Chair Flowers commented that the Tri-County Muledeer group had met and was currently at an impasse due to unanswered questions with the fuel reduction process. Currently, NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) is conducting surveys using transmitters to develop additional scientific data to support future recommendations.

- 9. UNIT 015 *** – *An informational update on current conditions concerning Mule Deer including habitat conditions, populations, predators and wild horses.*

Mike Dobel – Supervising Biologist, noted that Biologist Chris Hampson was in the midst of conducting Antelope and Sheep surveys in northern Washoe County. Mr. Dobel recalled that Unit 015 in the mid-1980's (1985) had a significantly larger population. However, the loss of habitat in the 1950's and again in the mid-1980's to wildfire has devastated Muledeer habitat. Additionally, severe winter conditions also contributed to decrease in Muledeer populations with the spring survey showing a population of ± 400 animals. The bulk of the area is federally managed land.

Mel Belding noted that Unit 015 is administered by the Surprise Valley District with the Coyote, Burt and Poodle allotments administered from Winnemucca (Nevada). Mr. Belding questioned the impact to wildlife with the removal of $\pm 2,500$ wild horses from the area.

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 5 of 16

During the discussion it was noted that during the winter 1987-1988 surveys identified a significant number of deceased animals due to the loss of habitat and severe winter weather.

The meeting recessed at 7:42 p.m. and reconvened at 7:55 p.m.

- 10. MULE DEER RESTORATION COMMITTEE** – *An ongoing review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Mule Deer Restoration Committee with background information and possible methods and procedures to achieve the goal of increased Mule Deer populations throughout the State of Nevada.*

Chair Flowers commented that he had been unable to attend the meeting today (September 16, 2010).

There was no opposition to the tabling of the agenda item until the November 29, 2010, meeting.

- 11. COMMISSION GENERAL REGULATION NUMBER 389, LCB (Legislative Counsel Bureau) File No. R083-10** – *A review discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify a regulation relating to wildlife; prohibiting a person from interfering with the use of a guzzler or other water development; providing an exception.*

Chair Flowers provided an overview of the agenda item and explained that the item had been continued by the Commission (Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioner) to seek a revision to the language so as not to prohibit individuals with private water used by wildlife from maintaining the water feature.

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve the modifications to Commission General Regulation 389, Legislative Counsel Bureau File R083-10, as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

- 12. LETTER IN SUPPORT OF ELKO COUNTY MULTIPLE USE EFFORTS** – *A review discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify language supporting a resolution to support Elko County in its efforts to ensure multiple uses on the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest and on all public lands in Elko County and the State of Nevada.*

Chair Flowers provided a summary of the agenda item that would support Elko County's desire ensure multiple uses of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest and other public lands in Elko County.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 6 of 16

Hearing no public comment Chair Flowers returned the matter to the board for discussion and/or motion.

Member Smith outlined concerns about going total prohibition to no regulation on the use of off-road vehicles on public lands. Member Smith explained that while he believes that aging hunters should be allowed the use of their quad or other vehicle to secure their harvest, those types of vehicles “blow” animals out of the area.

Mel Belding noted that the BLM (Bureau of Land Management) has specific regulations on the use of off-road vehicles, which allows the use of existing roads and prohibits the making of a track. However, care should be taken in allowing Elko to expand uses, especially when livestock grazing may be involved on some public lands.

Chair Flowers stated that he does not support the use of off road vehicles for game retrieval or the closure of existing roads for access and travel. Chair Flowers noted that there are far more roads in the State of Nevada, than existed five (5) years ago. While recreational opportunities should be maintained, he cannot support the Elko County correspondence in its entirety.

Member Smith explained that he supports open roads, which he believes should remain open to public use. However, he does have some disagreement on the allowance of a quad or other vehicles to retrieve large game. Member Smith noted that the State of Arizona allow off-road use to retrieve large game provided the same path is used to secure the animal and return.

Member Harwell questioned whether this was in response to a proposal to close one (1) of two (2) access roads in various locations.

Member Copeland outlined his concerns with the use of quads and other off-road vehicles that results in the creation of another track. Member Copeland recalled that new maps were being developed and asked if the updated materials had been provided to the County Game Board(s).

Chair Flowers commented that it was unclear whether the mapping process had been completed.

Member Reed commented that a quad may provide the needed access to persons with physical limitations. However, there should not be a “willy-nilly” approach to the issue of allowing off-road vehicles on public lands.

Member Smith suggested that the board recommend that the letter be remanded to Elko County to seek a compromise position on multiple uses on public lands.

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 7 of 16

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Copeland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners remand the letter back to Elko County to seek a compromise positions and revision.

Chair Flowers opened the meeting to public comment on the motion.

Eric Dalen noted that one can witness the development of additional tracks in a single season and that he has seen areas in which a number of motor homes and other recreational vehicles were parked. Mr. Dalen believes that those individuals with mobility issues may need to consider securing assistance in retrieving game or obtain a horse rather than continue to cut in new tracks.

Chair Flowers closed the public comments.

The motion carried unanimously.

- 13. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO RESCIND 2011 AND 2012 HERITAGE TAGS AND/OR PARTNERSHIP IN WILDLIFE (PIW) TAGS –** *A review discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify language to authorize the refund of 2010, 2011, and 2012 donations and fees to successful Heritage and PIW (Partners in Wildlife) donors pending outcome of potential court Injunction and lawsuit against Heritage tags and approved Heritage projects that has been filed by Paul Dixon, Chairman, Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife.*

Member Smith noted that the 2012 tags had not yet been issued and suggested that the discussion focus on the refund of the 2010 and 2011 tags. Member Smith suggested that this may be a ploy in response to an approved predator project that was not supported by the County Game Boards. It is Member Smith's belief that the funds should remain in the Heritage account until the pending legal challenge has been resolved.

Member Reed concurred.

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny the request to refund 2010, 2011 and 2012 donations and fees to successful Heritage and Partners in Wildlife (PIW).

During the discussion it was pointed out that the 2010 recipients had already concluded their hunt and that would be inappropriate to refund fees after the fact.

The motion carried unanimously.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 8 of 16

- 14. BIG GAME ANIMAL STATUS FOR MOUNTAIN LIONS** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to approve, deny or otherwise modify the status and method of take for Mountain Lions, including incidentally trapped animals.*

Chair Flowers provided an overview of the agenda item noting that the choices were defined in the support materials (copy on file) and opened the public hearing.

Riley Manzonie - Nevada Outfitters and Sportsmen, commented that the State of Nevada is second only to the State of Texas in its liberal quotas on Mountain Lions. Mr. Manzonie believes that approval of this particular amendment will result in hunters going elsewhere as a trophy harvest could not be entered into the Nevada Record Book. The intent of the Mountain Lion harvest is to assist in the increased population of Muledeer.

Sean Shea stated that he was not in favor of the proposed modification.

Joel Blakeslee concurred with the previous comments and pointed out that the Nevada Trappers Association wishes to maintain their relationship with the guides.

Eric Dalen explained that, in his opinion, approval of the amendment could lead to increased opposition to hunting by anti-hunting groups. Mr. Dalen noted that a male Mountain Lion consumes one Muledeer per week with a female taking one and a half in a week.

Member Reed noted the public's perception of over-hunting that has the potential for harm and could result in a "California frame of mind" that prohibits this type of hunt.

Member Smith concurred and pointed out that it was important to stay "under the radar" and continue to manage the species in a reasonable manner. Additionally, the proposed modification could result in a loss of revenue from Predator fees.

Member Copeland concurred that opening the regulations could lead to a variety of legal challenges.

Member Harwell stated that he could not support the request.

Chair Flowers commented that he too is opposed to the modification and that he foresees several issues should the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners move forward.

It was moved by Member Harwell, seconded by Member Copland, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny the request to change the status and method of take for Mountain Lions, including incidentally trapped animals. The motion carried unanimously.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 9 of 16

- 15. STATUS AND METHOD OF TAKE OF WOLVES** – *A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to approve, deny or otherwise modify existing regulations on the status and method of taking of Wolves.*

Chair Flowers opened the agenda item to public comment.

Joel Blakeslee noted that the federal government and individual states are at odds with the federal mandate and that the State of Idaho announced that as of October 27, 2010, they (Idaho) would no longer enforce Wolf regulations. Mr. Blakeslee commented that the population in the State of Wyoming was to have been about 150 pairs of breeding Wolves has increased to several thousand. Mr. Blakeslee explained that he sees no need to change the classification from its current status.

Mel Belding stated that, in his opinion, the State of Nevada should take a stance against federal intervention and stand their ground as this is, in his opinion, a State's Rights issue.

Chair Flowers noted that Wolves are a game animal in the State of Nevada and that the insinuation of the modification appears to make Wolves a non-game animal such that it can be managed in a variety of ways.

Member Copeland concurred that the State of Nevada should take a strong stance for State's Rights.

Member Reed commented that Wolves are a "scourge" in the State of Idaho and that there is little chance of the animal becoming extinct in the State of Nevada.

Member Harwell explained that the management of the species needs to be low key to avoid significant public opposition.

Chair Flowers commented that the State of Montana had done a 180-degree change in regulation based on the predation of the Elk population. Chair Flowers noted that while the federal government may own the land the states presumably own the wildlife. It is Chair Flowers' belief that perhaps the only way to resolve the issue is with a legal challenge as suggested by Mr. Belding.

Mr. Belding noted that Wolves were again on the Endangered Species List and that the State of Nevada Wolf Plan could not be written as the animal is on the Endangered Species List.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 10 of 16

Mr. Blakeslee suggested a dual licensure for Wolves as is done in the State of Alaska, which allows the taking of an unlimited number of animals in some areas with specific bag limits set in others.

It was moved by Member Copeland, seconded by Member Harwell to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners reclassify Wolves as an unprotected species, similar to Coyotes, and remove Wolves as a Game Animal. The motion carried unanimously.

- 16. NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE BIG GAME RELEASE PLAN –** *A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to approve, deny or otherwise modify proposed amendment to the current biennial Big Game Release Plan to accommodate additional Bighorn Sheep releases.*

Carl Lackey – NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife), explained that Lance Gilman – developer of the Reno Tahoe Industrial park had offered 63 square miles of private property as a release site. Mr. Lackey explained that the property owner has agreed to allow access, trapping and other activities on the property in a Cooperative Agreement. The subject site will also serve as a Big Game Animal research and education component for UNR (University of Nevada, Reno) research. The agreement was reviewed by the Nevada Attorney General's office. It is not anticipated that there will be any significant issues based on the aerial and ground surveys. Additionally, the agreement releases the property owner from any liability. Mr. Lackey then summarized the land constraints that will most likely keep the herd within the 63 square miles of land.

Mel Belding noted that NBU (Nevada Bighorns Unlimited) had agreed to construction two (2) guzzlers on the property and that he believes a herd of forty (40) animals is a good start.

Sean Shea commented that he too supported the release and voices some concern about whether there were any domestic sheep in close proximity. Additionally, Mr. Shea believes that a predator control program should be initiated before the transplant.

Erin Dalen expressed his support for the transplant based on the biology and suggested that a Mountain Lion study may be warranted.

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve the current biennial Big Game Release Plan to accommodate additional Bighorn Sheep releases. The motion carried unanimously.

- 17. BLACK BEAR SEASON REGULATION –** *A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to*

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 11 of 16

approve, deny or otherwise modify guidance and instruction to NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) staff to develop a Black Bear Season Regulation, including, but not limited to Hunt Units, Season Dates, Quotas, Method of Take and Use of Hounds.

Chair Flowers provided an overview of the agenda item and read correspondence from Jerry Lowery; Madonna Dunbar – Incline Village GID (General Improvement District); Richard Mason expressing their views on the proposal. A copy of all correspondence is on file.

Carl Lackey – NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife), summarized the proposal to establish a bear season in the State of Nevada. Mr. Lackey noted the fourteen (14) year study of recruitment, survival rate, density and other information by UNR (University of Nevada, Reno) and Wildlife Conservation. Mr. Lackey explained that this is not the regulation but rather the first step in the development of a season, bag limits and weapon types. The intent is to prohibit the taking of sows during spring and summer months. Mr. Lackey noted that the sustainable harvest would be ± 40 animals that staff believes biologically viable. The mandatory reporting will allow the department to secure additional data outside the core populations. Although it is anticipated that up to 45 tags would be issued the limit will be set at 20 as it is anticipated that there will be a 44-percent success ratio. The season will close once a total of six (6) sows are harvested to protect the population.

Eric Dalen commented that while he supports the proposal he believes that the use of hounds should not be prohibited. Additionally, meat should be removed from the field to alleviate the perception that the animal is being hunted solely for its hide. Mr. Dalen also suggested a 24-hour hunt.

Sean Shea commended Mr. Lackey for his report and concurred with Mr. Dalen's comments that meat should be taken out, allow the use of hounds and open the hunt to 24-hours. Mr. Shea believes that perhaps the tag fee should be somewhat higher.

Joel Blakeslee noted concern that the six (6) sows could easily be taken during the archery hunt thus closing the season before the Any Legal Weapon Hunt. Additionally, Mr. Blakeslee concurs with the use of hounds and suggested that perhaps the Archery Hunt should be closed if three (3) sows are taken.

There was some discussion about the limit on sows. It was noted that most hunters would most likely pursue the larger males as females typically weigh about 120-pounds. Other discussion noted that orphaned cubs would be handled as they are now if a sow is taken in error.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 12 of 16

Member Harwell noted his support for the proposed bear hunt and expressed concern that the archery hunt could cause a closure of the season before any legal weapon if the quota of 20 were reached.

Chair Flowers explained that if the bear being pursued were to cross into the State of California a Nevada licensed hunter would need a California license to continue the hunt.

There was some discussion about the season dates. During the discussion it was noted that modifications to the regulation could be made such as closing the Archery Hunt on a lesser number of sows harvested. Other discussion noted some concern about the potential for only wounding a bear in a residential setting. As the discussion continued it was pointed out that pepper spray could be used in the event a wounded bear gave chase to the hunter. It was pointed out that problem bears are taken using a tranquilizer and that [problems bears are not always in higher density residential areas. Other discussion noted that bear harvests must be reported within 72-hours.

It was moved by Chair Flowers, seconded by Member Reed, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners approve the guidance and instruction to NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) staff to develop a Black Bear Season Regulation, including, but not limited to Hunt Units, Season Dates, Quotas, Method of Take and Use of Hounds with the following amendments: 1) Archery and Any Legal Hunt be separate seasons; 2) hours of hunt changed to 24-hours; 3) a bear hunter seminar is mandatory; 4) all edible part must be removed; and 5) harvest validation mandatory within 72-hours.

During a brief discussion it was noted that Guided Hunt fall under the Division of Forestry. As the discussion continued, it was noted that the concerns Guided hunt concerns will be provided during the Washoe County presentation to the Commission for their discussion.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting recessed at 9:46 p.m. and reconvened at 9:55 p.m.

- 18. NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) BIENNIAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2012-2013 – A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify the Finance Committee’s 2012-2013 budget recommendations.**

There was no discussion or action due to the lack of support materials.

- 19. WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES (WAFWA) CONFERENCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT – A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife**

* denotes NON action item

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 13 of 16

Commissioners (Commission) to approve, deny or otherwise modify action in response to correspondence sent to Commission Chairman Raine from NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife).

Chair Flowers provided an overview of the agenda item noting that \$5,254.00 had been expended on the conference but only \$4,000.00 was authorized.

Member Smith stated that, in his opinion, the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) should not authorize any additional funding and that the attendees should determine how the \$4,000.00 allocation should be shared.

Member Harwell concurred with Member Smith's comments.

Chair Flowers agreed noting that he too believes the attendees should determine how to share the \$4,000.00 reimbursement authorized by the Commission.

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny any addition funding and that the sharing of the \$4,000.00 allocated by the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners be shared at the discretion of the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners. The motion carried unanimously.

20. RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT – *A review, discussion and possible recommendations to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to approve, deny or otherwise modify instruction to NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) staff to develop an energy policy/position.*

Mel Belding commented that, in his opinion, that renewable energy should not be constructed in a manner that takes habitat away from wildlife, which should be a top priority for the State of Nevada.

Bob Brunner commented that no additional staffing be approved until and unless there is sufficient monies received from the renewable energy project to fund a staff position.

Member Harwell asked whether the State of Nevada had any specific policy/procedures on the development of renewable emergency and suggested that at minimum such development should be reviewed by NDOW (Nevada Department of Wildlife) biologist to ascertain what effect a project may have on wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Chair Flowers commented that he does not believe the State of Nevada has any specific polices and that perhaps wildlife is the least of the considerations, which he believes is supported by the approval of the Ruby Pipeline. Chair Flowers believes that the primary focus for NDOW should be the preservation of both wildlife and wildlife habitat. Chair

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 14 of 16

Flowers pointed out that in the absence of support materials it is unclear what the intent may be.

Mike Dobel – Supervising Biologist, commented that he is not aware of any specific guidelines within NDOW although there are a variety of documents related to various types of renewable energy resources in Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA).

It was moved by Member Harwell, seconded by Member Reed, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners take no action on Renewable Energy Resources due to the lack of adequate support materials that define the intent and scope of the recommendation.

Bob Brunner suggested that perhaps 20-percent of the renewable energy tax come to NDOW.

The motion carried unanimously.

21. BIGHORN SHEEP – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Commission) to approve, deny or otherwise modify policies for diseased Bighorn Sheep populations and development of future management techniques.*

There was no specific action or discussion due to a lack of definitive support materials upon which to base a recommendation.

Mel Belding suggested that this may be an opportunity to make it clear that the State of Nevada boasts more sheep than any state other than Alaska. Mr. Belding pointed out that the State of Nevada's transplant program is the envy of other states and one of the most successful.

Chair Flowers asked that Mr. Belding provide his comments to him in writing to be taken to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting.

22. 2011 HERITAGE PROJECT 11-17 – *A review, discussion and possible recommendation to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners to approve, deny or otherwise modify changes being recommended by the 2011 Heritage Project 11-17 vendor.*

Chair Flowers recalled that the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manager Wildlife had not supported Heritage Project 11-17 original and that it is unlikely that the board will support any revision. Chair Flowers emphasized that there was no support material to define the changes being proposed by the project vendor.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 15 of 16

Member Smith concurred and noted that the project is currently the subject of a legal challenge. Member Smith agreed that it was unlikely that this board would support the project modification since it had not supported the original project proposal.

Mel Belding stated that this was not a good project when it was originally presented and that without knowing what modifications are being proposed that proposal should, in his opinion, be rejected.

Bob Brunner concurred that this was not a good project originally and that he does not believe it can be modified in a manner that would make it a better project.

Member Harwell recalled some previous correspondence about Heritage Project 11-17 that apparently allowed a single vendor to handle the predator project.

Member Smith reiterated that Heritage Project 11-17 was and continues to be a bad project in his opinion.

It was moved by Member Smith, seconded by Member Harwell, to recommend that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners deny the modifications being proposed for Heritage project 11-17, which is not proper Heritage Project. The motion carried unanimously.

23. 2011 MEETING CALENDAR – A review, discussion and possible action to set meeting dates for 2011.

Chair Flowers provided an overview of the proposed meeting schedule.

Mike Dobel – Supervising Biologist, commented that with the seventeen (17) Game Board scheduling meetings closer to the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners meeting dates it was becoming more difficult for staff to attend.

Mel Belding commented that, in his opinion, the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife is “smart enough” to make informed decisions based on scientific data before them without support materials.

It was suggested that the March 2011 meeting be held on Tuesday March 8, 2011.

A consensus was reached to accept the proposed 2011 meeting calendar with the March meeting date to be Tuesday, March 8, 2011. It was pointed out that the proposed meeting calendar is subject to change of date and meeting venue.

Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife

DRAFT Minutes

September 16, 2010

Page 16 of 16

- 24. 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.

- 25. FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS *** – *Selection of additional agenda item(s) for the Monday, November 29, 2010, meeting.*

The November 29, 2010, meeting agenda may include, but is not limited to: 1) TrailSafe Trapping Petition; 2) Ruby Pipeline update, detailed map and its effect on wildlife; and 3) Addition of a Swan hunt in Scripps area.

26. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Flowers adjourned the meeting at 10:29 p.m.