

CABMW RECOMMENDATIONS for the December 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

The Clark CAB and the general public that participated in our December 1st meeting were very concerned that several of the action items in the late revised commission agenda could not be properly vetted due to lack of information. The Clark CAB recommends that the commission take no action on these items until they were properly vetted through the CAB's with all the backup materials (as required by the NRS). Thus, the Clark CAB will recommend that several actions items (noted below) be deferred from commission action. Thank you for your consideration of delay on these action items.

1. Commission Action Item No. 3: Central Nevada Elk Plan Coordination and Oversight Team – Game Division Chief Mark Atkinson

Mr. Ray H. Williams Lander County Commissioner has been nominated to replace Mrs. Midge Carver on the Coordination Oversight Team (COT). As directed by the Central Nevada Elk Plan, the Commission will be asked to officially appoint Mr. Williams as an official member of the COT.

Recommendation

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ No Action taken _____ **See Below**

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

The Clark CAB had no backup on Mr. Williams' position on elk and/or hunting. Thus, we unanimously decided to take no on this commission item. Clark CAB recommends the commission defer taking a action on this item, unless they do not want CAB input. If the commission wants input on this nomination then more information is needed on his wildlife position.

2. Commission Action Item No. 10: Commission Regulation 07 - 07 Amendment #5 – Chief of Habitat Dave Pulliam

The Commission may adopt amendments to recommended changes to the hunt units available for the Moapa Valley limited entry fall and spring turkey hunts as well as language pertinent to the Overton Wildlife Management area defining public hunting opportunity.

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 proposed amendments to the hunt units listed in Commission Regulation 07-07 Amendment #5.

3. Commission Action Item No. 11: Commission General Regulation 370 – LCB File No. R082-09 – Chief of Fisheries Mark Warren

The Commission may adopt a regulation authorizing a person to take bullfrogs or crayfish without obtaining a license or permit issued by the Department under certain circumstance. Note: See agenda item #4 for support material.

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 regulation wording changes.

4. Commission Action Item No. 12: Commission General Regulation 372 – LCB File No. R115-09 – Chief Game Warden Buonamici

The Commission may adopt new language of defining certain antelope, elk, and deer physical descriptions for hunting. This includes antlered deer, antlered elk, antelope horns longer than ears and shorter than ears. Antler defined. Cleanup of 502.390 Section 1 (validation of tag) to be consistent with other regulations. Section 2 and 3 new language for when a person must validate a tag. Note: See agenda item #5 for support material.

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 proposed regulation wording changes.

5. Commission Action Item No. 13: Commission General Regulation 373 – LCB File No. R110-09 – Chief of Fisheries Mark Warren

The Commission may adopt a regulation relating to wildlife management areas; providing that only vessels without motors may be used during certain periods on the Dacey Reservoir in the Wayne E. Kirch Wildlife Management Area; revising certain other provisions governing the use of the Dacey Reservoir. Note: See agenda item #6 for support material.

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 regulation wording changes.

6. Commission Action Item No. 14: Commission General Regulation 376 – LCB File No. R137-09 – Chief of Fisheries Mark Warren

The Commission may adopt a regulation relating to fishing, expanding the permissible radius of a cast net used in certain waters.

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 regulation wording changes which will make Nevada's laws consistent with the other western states.

7. Commission Action Item No. 15: Commission Policies, Second Reading – Commissioner Kobrin

The Commission will conduct a second reading to review and possibly take action on the recommendations/changes from the Commission's Administrative Procedures, Regulation Committee to **Commission Policy #50**, Duck Stamp Procedure; **Commission Policy #51**, Wayne E. Kirch Nevada Wildlife Conservation Award; and **Commission Policy #22**, Introduction, Transplanting and Exportation of Wildlife. Note: See agenda item #8 for support material.

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 will comment on each policy wording change individually as we did not have unanimous support or opposition for all of them. The Clark Cab felt that the wording added in several of the policies had multiple interpretations and needed to be further discussed in the public forum with more information before a CAB recommendation could be made. The Clark CAB has the following recommendations on the revised language in Policies #50, 51 and 22:

Recommendation Policy #50: In Support

The Clark CAB unanimously supported the proposed policy wording changes.

Recommendation Policy #51: In Support

The Clark CAB was split 3 to 2 in support of these proposed policy wording changes.

Recommendation Policy #22: In Opposition and recommend the Commission take no action

The Clark CAB did not support any of the proposed policy wording changes. The CAB and NDOW biologists present at the meeting felt it was a bad decision to take the decision making process out of the hands of the NDOW biologists. The proposed wording changes will bring the big game release program to its knees and stop or greatly slow any further releases. There needs to be considerably more discussion on these proposed policy changes before the commission votes on them. This has been a hugely successful program and have heard of serious issues that would warrant these proposed changes.

8. Commission Action Item No. 16: Biennial Big Game Release Plan for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 – Big Game Staff Biologist Mike Cox

The Commission will be asked to approve the amended biennial Big Game Release Plan for FY 2010 and 2011.

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 supported the big game release plan as written.

9. Commission Action Item No. 17: Wildlife Damage Management Committee – Commissioner Scott Raine

The Commission will hear a report from its Wildlife Damage Management Committee and recommendation for Commission approval of proposed Heritage Program Predator Projects: 10-23, 10-26, and 10-27.

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

Recommendation Policy #1

In Support ____ In Opposition X

The Clark CAB unanimously decided to take no action on these heritage proposals for the following reasons:

- 1) A member of the public at our meeting raised grave concerns about possible ethic violations concerning Commissioner Raines. Without further information the Clark CAB was unsure of their validity and how to proceed.**
- 2) Although there was general agreement that the proposals look fine, there was concern on how actually the fund would be spent. More details were requested by the Clark CAB to make an informed recommendation.**
- 3) The Clark CAB would also like to backup information on how the 2009 heritage funds were spent and biologic stats on how successful the those programs were before recommending to expand them.**

The Clark CAB did not support any of the proposed Policy #25 changes. These changes were not properly vetted to the CAB's for recommendation.

The Clark Cab recommends the Commission take no action on this important item.