

**CABMW RECOMMENDATIONS for the August 2009 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](mailto:sscourby@ndow.org)

1. **Action Item No. 6: Potential Conversion of the Wine Cup Ranch to a Wild Horse Refuge – Ken Wellington, Elko County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife – Action:** The Commission will be asked to take possible action on responding to renewed interest in the development of portions of the Wine Cup Ranch in Elko County into a wild horse refuge. Changes proposed in HR1018 may allow such a conversion to occur

**Recommendation**

In Support \_\_\_\_\_ In Opposition \_\_\_\_\_ **See Below**

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

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported taking the following action: Educate and mobilize our state senators (Reid and Ensign) to fight for the rejection of HR1018 and any efforts to convert the Wine Cup Ranch to a wild horse refuge.**

2. **Action Item No. 8: Election of Officers – Chairman Lent – Action:** In accordance with Commission Policy #1 the Commission will elect a chairman and vice chairman for fiscal year 2010.

**Recommendation**

In Support \_\_\_\_\_ In Opposition \_\_\_\_\_ **See Below**

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

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported the reading into the record and sending to the Wildlife Commissioners the following statement.**

**August 4, 2009**

**Clark County Wildlife Advisory Board Position on the Commission Chairman**

To whom it may concern:

As chairman of the Clark County Advisory Board (CCAB), I represent the public, sportsmen and sportswomen of Clark County. After hearing numerous verbal complaints and concerns about the behavior of the current chairman of the Nevada Wildlife Commission, Chairman Lent, the CCAB met and discussed our concerns about Chairman Lent's behavior, and his ability or inability to carry out his duties as they relate to the Commission. We also discussed his attitude toward NDOW, and the complaint that has been voiced by many individuals that he may not be able to work with NDOW to achieve the purposes of the Commission. On behalf of all CCAB members, and members of public who voiced these concerns to me, I request the following be read into the public record.

The County Advisory Boards of Nevada were formed to get local participation and input from the sporting public on how to manage wildlife in their respective counties. The information presented to the Advisory Boards is shared with the Wildlife Commission to better inform the Commission in making their decisions. For nine years, Wildlife Commission members (and their respective Chairman), have respected and encouraged input from the 17 County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife. In contrast to this long history of working for the benefit of Nevada's wildlife, many who have attended the current Commission meetings in Reno and Lovelock have noted that Chairman Lent often belittles and shows open hostility toward opinions that are contrary to his own. While disagreement and debate have always been present at Commission meetings, those discussions have focused on the goal of improving and maintaining Nevada's wildlife, not furthering a personal agenda.

Chairman Lent has indicated he doesn't see value in the County Advisory Boards, apparently because they are an impediment to him achieving his personal objectives. This disturbing statement is born out and evident in the latest revisions of Commission Policy Number 1. Chairman Lent and Commissioner Raines have written new language into these policies to further restrict CAB input. In Policy #1, although the Chairman approves the agenda four weeks in advance of a commission meeting, the decision is to wait until the last legal date to release the agenda, so as to restrict formal CAB and public comment prior to the Commission meeting. This behavior is wrong and needs to stop. It appears that Chairman Lent is using his current position to rewrite the Commission policies to justify doing whatever he wants.

It is not only the CAB's that Chairman Lent wants to control. Several Wildlife Commission committee chairs have learned the hard way in a public forum that if their recommendations don't match Chairman Lent's personal agenda, they will be publically chastised in an attempt to override their recommendations. This public "dress down" of a Commission committee chair makes all those in public attendance at the Commission meeting very uncomfortable. Several CAB members have stated that say this type of bullying makes them reluctant to speak up or address the Commission on any issue that might be controversial to Chairman Lent.

Finally, I have attended the last two Wildlife Commission meetings (Reno and Lovelock), and have been appalled and embarrassed by the actions of Chairman Lent. Chairmen Lent has made numerous all out, personal and vicious attacks on NDOW director Ken Mayer and his staff. I personally was embarrassed by these attacks. Their content was inappropriate for discussion in a public forum. While we can all disagree on the method or means used to enhance Nevada's wildlife, the common goal among the CABs, NDOW and the Commission must always be that wildlife benefits from a thorough, democratic, organized process used to manage wildlife. Chairman Lent has manifested a contrary goal – his personal agenda is to destroy the democratic process inherent in the CAB system; he seeks to neutralize NDOW's vital role of being the administrative arm to carry out the Commission's directives. The Wildlife Commission's role is to provide direction and leadership – Chairman Lent instead has done little, other than to interfere and impede the decision-making process of the Commission and the CABs. It is because of this behavior, that the CCAB voted unanimously to recommend that Chairman Lent step down and be replaced by a Chairman who will work within the legal framework currently in place that respects (but can still disagree with) NDOW Director Mayer and his staff, his fellow Commissioners, the CAB's and the public.

Respectively,  
Paul R. Dixon  
Chairman Clark County Advisory Board

3. **Action Item No. 9: Wildlife Damage Management Committee – Commissioner Scott Raine – Action:** The Commission will hear a report from its Wildlife Damage Management Committee and be asked to take action on the committee’s draft plan recommendations that identify predator management proposals for the Predator Management Plan for 2010.

**Recommendation**

In Support \_\_\_X\_\_\_ In Opposition\_\_\_\_\_

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

**Based on input from Commissioner McBeath, the Clark CAB unanimously supported the draft Wildlife Damage Management plan.**

4. **Action Item No. 10: Online Hunt Application Changes/Amendments after Application Submission – Chief of Operations Bob Haughian - Action** The CABMWs and the public are requested to review options presented and make recommendation to the Commission. The Commission will be asked to make a selection of one of the proposed options.

**Recommendation**

In Support \_\_\_X\_\_\_ In Opposition\_\_\_\_\_ **See Below**

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

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported the hunt application changes/amendments Option #6 as long as the added week did not alter the draw or draw notification dates.**

5. **Action Item No. 12: Commission Regulations: Commission Regulation 07 - 07 Amendment #4 - Game Division Staff Biologist Kevin Lansford – Action** The proposed amendment to Commission Regulation 07 – 07 Amendment #4 addresses changes to the bobcat pelt sealing dates that were approved at the June Commission meeting in Lovelock.

**Recommendation**

In Support \_\_\_X\_\_\_ In Opposition\_\_\_\_\_

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

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported the proposed bobcat sealing dates.**

6. **Action Item No. 13: Commission Regulations: Commission Regulation 09 - 08 - Game Division Staff Biologist Craig Mortimore– Action** The proposed Commission Regulation 09 –08 recommends season dates and bag limits for migratory waterfowl, common snipe, coots and moorhens for 2009-10. The proposed regulation also recommends dates and bag limits for the special youth waterfowl hunt and falconry season dates and bag limits for migratory game birds.

**Recommendation**

In Support \_\_\_X\_\_\_ In Opposition\_\_\_\_\_

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

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported the Liberal framework package for the Pacific Flyway and Ducks and Mergansers bag limits and seasons. In addition, the Clark CAB**

supported staff recommendations on the “Special Youth Waterfowl Hunt, Coots and Common Moorhens, Common Snipe, Canada and White-Fronted geese, Snow and Ross geese, Falconry seasons for migratory game birds and Swan bag limits and seasons.

7. **Action Item No. 14: Commission Regulations: Commission General Regulation 364 LCB File No. R206-08 - Game Division Chief Mark Atkinson – Action:** Commission General Regulation 364 LCB File No. R206-08 proposes that the Commission accept changes to elk damage and elk incentive tag regulations which make revisions to NAC 502.42259, 502.42261, 502.42263, 502.42266, and 504.350.

**Recommendation**

In Support  In Opposition

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

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported the proposed changes.**

8. **Action Item No. 15: Commission Regulations: Commission Policy #1, Second Reading – Commissioner Scott Raine – Action:** In accordance with Commission Policy #1, the Commission will have a second reading of proposed updates from the Commission’s Administrative Procedures, Regulations and Policy Committee for Commission Policy #1, “General Guidelines for the Commission.” The Commission will be asked to adopt the proposed changes to Commission Policy #1 and dividing Commission Policy #1 into three separate policies:
- A. **Commission Policy #1, “General Guidelines for the Commission”**
  - B. **Commission Policy #3, “Appeals Policy”**
  - C. **Commission Policy #4, “Petition Process and Adoption of Regulation Policy”**

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

**Recommendation Policy #1**

In Support  In Opposition

**The Clark CAB unanimously did not support the proposed changes in section 7 of Policy #1, especially the second new paragraph in section 7 dealing with the predator fee . The Clark CAB felt that this entire new section was an end run around issues that had been rejected by the State legislature and did not have CAB support the last two times that they were placed on the Commission agenda.**

In addition, the Clark CAB recommended that the current language in Policy #1 section 3 should be amended as follows: *A draft agenda will be developed by the Secretary of the Commission and approved by the Chair four weeks prior to the scheduled meetings. Three days after this draft agenda is approved by the Chair it will be distributed to the commissioners, county advisory board members, interested individuals or groups and staff. The final agenda and support materials will be distributed to commissioners, county advisory board members, interested individuals or groups and staff two weeks prior to the meeting. The agenda will be posted according to NRS 241.020.*

**Recommendation Policy #3**

In Support \_\_\_\_\_ In Opposition  X

**The Clark CAB unanimously did not support the proposed changes in Policy 3 because we do not know if these proposed policies and procedures are legal as they may conflict with other state statutes.**

**Recommendation Policy #4**

In Support  X  In Opposition \_\_\_\_\_

**The Clark CAB unanimously supported the proposed changes in Policy 4 in procedure sections 1 and 2. In procedure section 3 of Policy 4 (CABMW's and Public Input) the Clark CAB recommended the following changes to the third to the last paragraph.**

***“CABMW members and the public will have full opportunity to provide input before a vote is taken by the Commission, during the public comment period after the petitioner and staff presentations. Due to the nature of a live hearing, CABWMs will not receive sufficient information before the hearing on the petition to make a recommendation”. If new information is provided at the hearing the Commission will table the recommendation and send to the CABMWs and public before taking any action. This will allow the CABs and the public to provide input to the Commission prior to them taking any action.***