

CABMW RECOMMENDATIONS for the March 2011 Wildlife Commission Meeting
(Month/year)

Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting results

Submitted by Chairman: Dr. Paul R. Dixon

To the Wildlife Commission, c/o Executive Assistant to Director Suzanne Scourby, sscourby@ndow.org

CABMW Members Present: Paul Dixon, Mike Reese, Jacky Holt, Paul Harris, Brian Patterson, and Tracy Truman

CABMW Members Absent: John Sullivan,

Commissioners Present: Michael McBeath, Hal Shrum and Charlie Howell

NDOW Present: none

Members of the public: 3

Commission Action Item #9B: Wildlife Damage Management Fiscal Year 2011 Plan – Commissioner Vogler. The Commission will discuss and provide guidance to the Department concerning development and information provided in the 2011 and future Wildlife Damage Management plans.

Recommendation

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ See comment below X

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

Below is a repeat of the Clark recommendations from the February CABMW meeting since there was no new backup describing what different was going to be discussed this month at the Wildlife Commission meeting. Thus, no action was taken on this agenda.

Clark CABMW unanimously supports all the projects in the Predation Management Plan for FY11 with the exception of Projects 6A and Project 21 where we have the following recommendations:

Project 6A: The plan should include a mid-year evaluation regarding the need to maintain a full time Wildlife Specialist based on proven results.

Project 21: The Clark CABMW felt the \$2000 for the WMA at Overton to protect turkeys was too low. To protect turkeys, the raccoon, skunk and coyote populations at Overton WMA also need to be controlled. This project needs additional NDOW and wildlife services input.

Commission Action Item #10: Additional Application Hunt System Report Format – Chief of Operations Bob Haughian – Action. The Commission may endorse or deny a request made previously at the December 2010 Commission meeting from Commissioner Cavin to introduce an additional report format to publicly display a list of successful tag applicants by hunt unit on the huntnevada.com website.

Recommendation

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ See comment below X

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

Action was not taken on this agenda item due to the fact that there was no backup describing what the Commission was going to take action on related to this item. Inputs from SCI on costs are needed to inform the public and formulate a position.

Commission Action Item #11B: Legislative Committee Report and Actions - Commissioner

Capurro – Action. The Commission may take action to support, not support, or take no action on bills reviewed at the Legislative Committee meeting.

Recommendation

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ See comments below X

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

The Clark CABMW discussed and unanimously supported the following legislation:

- 1) **AB 167 Aquatic Invasive Species**
- 2) **ACR3 Sage Grouse Resolution**
- 3) **SB102 Shed Antlers (We discussed that this is needed but only support with removal of non-commercial collection wording and requirement that a hunting license is required to collect sheds.)**
- 4) **SB108 Boat Fees (Makes our fees competitive with surrounding Western states.)**
- 5) **SJR5 Resolution on Wild Horses (The Clark CABMW felt that with respect to wildlife impacts that this legislation will help NDOW and the State force BLM to do responsible wild horse management in NV.)**

Commission Action Item #12: Consideration of Disbanding *de facto* Committee to meet with

Governor Sandoval - Chairman Raine – Action. At a prior meeting the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners voted to send a two-member delegation to meet with Governor Sandoval concerning regulation changes being brought before the Board. Counsel advised that it is possible the previous vote technically created a *de facto* public body subject to the Nevada’s Open Meeting Law. The Board will consider taking action to disband the delegation.

Recommendation

In Support X In Opposition _____ Tabled _____

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

Action was not taken on this agenda item due to the fact that there was no backup describing what the Commission was going to take action on related to this item.

Commission Action Item #13: Administrative Procedures, Regulations and Policy (APRC)

Committee Report and Recommendations – Vice Chairman Lent – Action. The Commission will hear a report from the APRC and be asked to take action to approve or modify for reading APRC Committee’s recommendations to change or create new policies

Recommendation 14A:

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ See comments below X

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

The Clark CABMW had the following recommendations:

- 1) **The Clark CABMW unanimously did not support the proposed wording changes to Commission Policy Number 10. We believe that the proposed wording change violates the NRS. A tag premium would reduce total dollars to the Heritage account which is the primary reason for the Heritage tags sales.**
- 2) **The Clark CABMW unanimously support the transparency policy concept but would suggest the following wording change to the draft policy:**

PROCEDURE

- 1. The Department will post on their website ~~all~~ survey data ~~without modifications~~ from each biologist for their specific units.
- 2. ~~All~~ adjustments/modifications made to the data by biologists will also be noted.
- 3. ~~All~~ carrying capacity data biologists have gathered will also be noted on the website.
- 4. ~~All~~ population models used by the biologists to determine ungulate populations and quotas, including explanations of ~~all~~ variables and inputs used will also be posted on the website.

- 3) **The Clark CABMW unanimously support the wolf policy concept but would suggest the following wording change to the draft policy:**

PURPOSE

- 5. The heritage, culture, and custom of the people of Nevada have significantly developed as a result of the absence of the wolf from the State, ~~and the development of recreation, hunting, and ranching have benefited from the absence of wolves.~~
- 6. Scientific data shows gray wolf predation is a primary cause of mortality in ungulate populations ~~and domestic ranching operations.~~
- 7. There are no data to suggest that historically there ever was a resident wolf population in the State, along with none or very limited wolf habitat in the State.
- 8. It is the policy of the Commission to oppose a permanent population of wolves in Nevada and since in 1974 the gray wolf was listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and protected as an endangered species, it is the objective and intent of the Commission to pursue all legal options to restore full state authority and control over the management of wolves in Nevada by listing them as ~~a an-unprotected-species~~ game animal so they can be managed.

In addition the Clark CABMW felt that the Commission needs to develop with NDOW a plan to manage stray wolves that may enter the state. This plan needs support and approval by the US Fish and Wildlife service. Getting the state exempt from wolves being introduced or allowed to get established is paramount.

Commission Action Item #15A: Management Bull Elk: Definition – Chairman Raine – Action. The Commission may give guidance, and provide guidelines to NDOW concerning, development of language for regulation establishing a management bull elk season.

Recommendation

In Support X In Opposition _____ See comments below X

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

The Clark CABMW unanimously supports a management bull elk hunt but feel that they would only support a 4 point or less management hunt.

Comments on informational items:

Informational Agenda Item #16: Wayne E. Kirch Wildlife Conservation Award Judging Committee Report and Recommendations – Commissioner Howell – Informational. The Commission will hear a report from the Wayne E. Kirch Wildlife Conservation Award Judging Committee on changes to Commission Policy #51, Wayne E. Kirch Nevada Wildlife Conservation Award, and the Commission will hear a second reading of those changes.

Recommendation

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ See comments below X

Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:

Since this item was only listed as information on the revised Commission agenda, the Clark CABMW believes no action will be taken on this item at the March Commission meeting. Commissioner Howell indicated this was a mistake at the meeting. With no backup supplied as to what exact actions the Commission would be taking, we did not comment on this item.