

CABMW RECOMMENDATIONS for the August 2009 Wildlife Commission Meeting

Eureka County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife meeting results

Submitted by Chairman Chris Torres

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

Board members present: Chris Torres, Chad Bliss, Jim Evans, and Dale Hornickle.

Absent member: Mike Taylor

Others Present: Scott Raine, Mike Podborny, Floyd Rathbun, Kathy Porter, and Jake Tibbitts

1. **Action Item No: 1 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

The Eureka CAB voted unanimously to send to the Wildlife Commissioners the following letter:

August 11, 2009

To whom it may concern:

The Eureka County Wildlife Advisory Board recommends for the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Board) to elect a chairman and vice chairman who are not driven by personal agendas. We believe that it is imperative to have a chairman and vice chairman who will conduct themselves with dignity, respect, and in a professional manner towards the Nevada Department of Wildlife, the 17 County Advisory Boards to Manage Wildlife (CABs), the public, and fellow Wildlife Commissioners.

Further, we ask for a chairman and vice chairman that will not stifle the voice of the 17 CABs. CABs are critical in ensuring a democratic process and in giving a voice to the public from various counties. The Board is better informed and can make better decisions from the input and recommendations from the CABs. We feel that the sportsmen and wildlife of Nevada have much to gain from our efforts to work together, and much to lose otherwise.

We do not want a chairman that will not express opinions—only a chairman who would conduct the business of the Board while overlooking personal objectives. Disagreements and debate are a necessary component of the democratic process that has been put in place to focus on the goal of improving and maintaining Nevada's wildlife and hunting opportunities. Therefore, constructive dialogue should be kept open, encouraged and a strong working relationship maintained among all stakeholders to ensure this process works to its full potential. We need a chairman who will stay open minded and listen to views that may be dissenting from his own personal views.

We thank you for considering our opinion on this matter.

Respectfully,



Chris Torres, Chairman
Eureka County Wildlife Advisory Board

2. **Action Item No: 7 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 HR 1018 may allow such a conversion to occur.

Recommendation

In Support _____ In Opposition _____ **See Below**
(place an X in the appropriate recommendation)

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

Eureka CAB took no action on this item. The board agreed that while private property rights must be honored, concern about public grazing lands intermingled with private land and how unanticipated consequences of horses on these lands could affect wildlife was unanimous. This was of particular concern given the checkerboard nature of some of the land ownership in this area.

3. **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 _____
(place an X in the appropriate recommendation)

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

The Eureka CAB voted 3-1 to support Option #6. Dale Hornickle did not feel applicants should be given opportunity to make changes after submittal.

4. **Action Item No 12: 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 _____
(place an X in the appropriate recommendation)

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

The Eureka CAB voted unanimously to supported the proposed bobcat pelt sealing dates.

5. **Action Item No. 13: 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 _____
(place an X in the appropriate recommendation)

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

The Eureka CAB unanimously voted to support recommended dates and bag limits of waterfowl, common snipe, coots and moorhens, and a special youth waterfowl hunt and falconry season dates and bag limits for migratory game birds.

6. **Action Item No.14: 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 regulation which makes revisions to NAC502.42259, 502.42263, 502.42266, and 504.350.

Recommendation

In Support X In Opposition _____
(place an X in the appropriate recommendation)

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

The Eureka CAB voted unanimously to support the proposed changes.

7. **Action Item No. 15: Commission Policy#1, Second Reading- Commissioner Scott Raine-Action:** In accordance with Commission Policy #1, the Commission will have second reading of proposed updates for the Commission Policy #1, “General Guidelines for the Commission.” The Commission will be asked to adopt the proposed changes to Commission Policy #1 and deciding 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”

Recommendation

In Support X In Opposition _____
(place an X in the appropriate recommendation)

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

Eureka CAB voted 3-1 to support proposed updates to Commission Policy. Chad Bliss opposed the use of some of the language in Policy #4 that he felt omitted the opportunity for County CAB's to give recommendations and voice concerns and that the statement "This is a lengthy process" appeared to be an effort to dissuade any petitioner from going forward with a petition process. Mr. Bliss also questioned Policy #1 and wondered why the guidance over monies received by NDOW was necessary without explanation of specific examples where Commission guidance was needed; in other words, why create more policy and regulation if the current system was already working well.