

NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS

Wildlife Damage Management Committee

Lovelock Community Center
820 6th Street
Lovelock, Nevada 89419

June 26, 2009
8:30 a.m.

MINUTES

Those Committee members in attendance were:

Scott Raine – Committee Chairman
Michael McBeath – Commissioner
Pete Mori – Commissioner
Grant Wallace – Commissioner
Mike Laughlin – Member
Kevin C. Lansford – NDOW, Staff to Committee

Also in attendance were:

Mark Atkinson – NDOW	Rodney Johnson – NDOW
Mike Bodenchuck – Wildlife Services, Texas	Kim Jolly – NDOW
Tom Cavin – Commissioner	Gerald Lent – Chairman, Commissioner
Kelly Clark – NDOW	Ron Lurie - Commissioner
Trudy Davis – NDOW	Ken Mayer – Director, NDOW
Paul Dixon – Clark CABMW	David McNinch - Commissioner
Maryanna Enochson – NDOW	Don Molde – Self
Rex Flowers – Washoe CABMW	David Newton – Attorney General
Larry Gilbertson – NDOW	Jack Spencer – Wildlife Services
Rich Haskins – NDOW	Ken Wellington – Elko CABMW
Mark Jensen – Wildlife Services	Gil Yanuk – Carson City CABMW

Agenda Items #1 & #2 – Call to Order & Introductions – Chairman (Raine)

Chairman Raine called the meeting to order and introduced the members of the committee who were in attendance.

Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Minutes from the March 27th, 2008 Meeting – Chairman – ACTION

Chairman Raine asked if everyone had reviewed the amended version of the minutes. It was moved and seconded that the amended minutes from the March 27, 2009 meeting be approved. The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Agenda Item #4 – Commission Member Items – Chairman

The Chairman asked for any items from Committee members.

Commissioner McBeath stated that he found some information in the Las Vegas Sun which was an item showing a graph and some tabulated information regarding Fins, Fur and Feathers Nevada Hunting and Fishing Combination Licenses. This information was printed without a corresponding article and it shows statistical information on license sales. One particular table lists resident licenses sold by county from 2007. Commissioner McBeath is concerned about where we stand as a group with regard to the public, such as the low number of clients who purchased these combination licenses. Commissioner McBeath stated that he is very concerned that the direction this commission is going is like “kicking a sleeping dog”. Commissioner McBeath further stated that he has fears on two legal fronts; one is that we base all of our predator projects on biological science. A Commission meeting should have a historical presentation on the bobcat lawsuit in 1985. The Defenders of Wildlife (actually the Nevada Humane Society and the Nevada Outdoor Recreation Assc., Inc.) sued the Department to end bobcat trapping, and the Department won that case. The reason the case ended in our favor is because the Department had the biological data to backup what management practices were being used. The second is the potential for a referendum to be placed on our state ballots that could include to the banning of mountain lion hunting or banning the use of dogs to hunt lions. It only takes three counties to develop a referendum and have it placed on the ballots for our statewide election. If this type of referendum is placed on a ballot and the people vote to approve it we could lose the ability to hunt mountain lions, thereby affecting many, if not all, current and future predator projects.

Agenda Item #5 – Public Comment (*Please limit comments to 3 minutes*)

Chairman Raine asked for public comment on items on the agenda.

Commissioner McNinch stated he is speaking as a concerned citizen as well as a Commissioner of the public. Commissioner McNinch wanted to express his concerns with a potential conflict of interest with certain agenda items, and he strongly encourages any committee member who has family or quasi-family relations to properly disclose those, as well as, excuse themselves from all discussions action or otherwise.

Dr. Molde stated he was the one who brought the lawsuit forward against trapping bobcats, and we don't have correct information, so he can provide this information to the Committee during a break in the meeting.

Chairman Raine stated that the agenda item Commissioner McNinch was referring to is number nine and it involves Heritage projects. One of the committee members (Mike Laughlin) is a family relation to the head of the organization submitting a project proposal. Commissioner Raine stated that there is no

marital or family relationship that would affect or change a decision regarding the proposed heritage projects. Commissioner McBeath asked Chairman Raine if there was a relationship between his mother and Mr. Laughlin. Chairman Raine stated there was no legal relationship that he was aware of. Mike Laughlin stated this felt like an “inquisition” and asked if Commissioner McBeath wanted his life history. Commissioner McBeath stated that he thinks it is important that there be disclosure with respect to relationships. Chairman Raine stated he would bring his mother to a committee meeting and they can ask her directly about any past or present relationships, but he would not comment any further about her. Commissioner McBeath asked Chairman Raine, “There is no legal relationship between Mr. Laughlin and your mother?” Mr. Laughlin asked Commissioner McNinch if he was asking about his relationship with Scott’s mother. Commissioner McNinch stated his comments are on the record and it simply suggests full disclosure made and when that is done then the Committee can move on.

Agenda Item #6 – Review of Current Projects – INFORMATIONAL

Kevin briefly reviewed each of the current projects.

- Project 6A – The Delamars – Another augmentation of 100+ sheep took place in the Delamars this year and shortly after we had a few mortality signals from the GPS collars. Initial investigations on the carcasses showed that coyotes were causing the mortalities. In the last three years coyote, lion, and bobcats have depredated on this sheep herd. Two years ago coyotes and bobcats were added to the list of species to be potentially managed in the area on a case by case basis with information received from the collared animals. This listing gave us the added ability to do aerial hunting or send in some ground trappers to target bobcats and coyotes. This amendment allowed Wildlife Services to remove several predators in the area over the past two years.
- Project 14 – Wilson Creek/White Rock – In the 2009 plan we extended this project for one more year. We have done the statistical analysis of the project and we were close to showing a significant response to the control work being done, but the analysis did not indicate this. The age analysis of the coyote teeth showed that the age structure was reduced, which is a critical element of this project.
- Project 15 – Area 222 – Information is the same as Project 14 as they are adjacent to each other. We are proposing the continue work in the area in Project 22, as the local area biologist thinks it will be beneficial to continue but on a reduced level.
- Project 17 – Elko County – The analysis has been done on this project and local area biologist thinks that did not receive the response we wanted after five years, so other areas were selected. This project will be concluded.
- Project 18 – Washoe County – Continuing to remove lions, coyote numbers are down to an occasional need for aerial hunting and some trapping. The deer population numbers are now being analyzed by several staff biologists to complete an in-depth analysis of this project. This project is slated for one more year.

●Project 19 – Winter Creek/Marble Canyon Emergency Wildfire, Elko County – This project is to reduce the effects of predation the animals that live on islands of habitat that remain after a wildfire. Some raven removal was conducted on sage grouse leks. The aspect of the project we want to continue is the aerial hunting of critical winter and fawning ranges within Areas 6 and 7, and the raven removal.

●Project 20 – Virginia Mountain Bighorn Sheep – Wildlife Services has removed lions in the area for the augmented sheep herd. More sheep were also augmented this past winter.

●Projects 21A & 21B – Lincoln and Elko Counties – The local area biologist suggested these sites for raven control to enhance sage grouse populations. Wildlife Services had treated 14 leks in Lincoln and six in Elko for the past two years. The projects will most likely be expanded to include additional sites.

21B Overton WMA – Previously raven removal had been done on the area to benefit wild turkey, upland game and waterfowl production enhancement. This project was discontinued in 2004 with the project objective being reached. In 2008 showed little waterfowl and turkey production, so raven removal started again. Initial response to the treatment was the local biologist saw increased turkey poults appearing in the area.

Agenda Item #7 – Review ongoing projects, and potential new projects for 2010 INFORMATIONAL/ACTION

Chairman Raine stated that we go through the projects we have just been briefed on and any 2009 projects that have not been continued to 2010.

Mike Laughlin stated that Project 17 was originally set up as a control area (no predator removal), but now Wildlife Services personnel was working in the area and there is a trapper working all of the time. Mr. Laughlin asked how we can determine that our project was not flawed by the interference. Kevin stated that we knew “there was a lot of noise in the area”, and perhaps rather than stating it didn’t work, say there was not significant impact. Chairman Raine asked the technician who performed the work to give his thoughts on the control area vs. the treated area. Mark Jensen stated that when you have an area that is going to be treated and another that is called control significant work is completed on the control site. Mark also stated it is difficult to do an analysis when the action that you are evaluating is going on in both places.

Commissioner Raine stated that he has looked at the history of these two sites and they were poor areas to use for control and treatment comparisons, and he does not see a scientific value of control areas as a measurement tool because of the noise factor. This decision to conclude this project is appropriate because there is “too much noise” in the area for the analysis to mean anything. Commissioner Raine also stated that this was just a poorly designed project. Kevin disagreed stating that if there is no baseline to compare to, what measure are we going to use for success?

Commissioner Raine asked the committee for any thoughts on how to measure success. Mike Laughlin stated if we are trying to increase deer numbers that control areas don’t work, but rather fall and spring flights to determine fawn/100 does to get baseline information. Mike also stated that in reference to Unit

155 (that is being proposed as a control area) that we will be right back into the same type of problems encountered with Project #17. Mike stated that the sheep producers in this area have been removing coyotes for years, and to use that as a control area will not work. Why are we conducting these projects with control areas unless it is just science for science's sake? Kevin stated that he wants to know if the project is working so if predator control was being performed in both areas previously, but one area had a significant increase in predator control, then a difference in response could be measured. Mike said how can a comparison be made if we design projects in areas that already have control being done? Kevin stated in the late 1980's and early 1990's, the deer crashed in Unit 155 after 75 years of coyote control being done by Wildlife Services and landowners, what that says for predator control Commissioner is it doesn't work every time or everywhere. Raine stated that after speaking with lots of people the only reasonable way to measure success in a project like this is to do a survey before and after treatment. Then the differences are analyzed and count the total number of deer to see if it is up or down. Commissioner Raine asked Wildlife Services if there is a better methodology in their experience.

Mike Bodenchuck stated he works for Wildlife Services in the State of Texas, and tomorrow when he gives his presentation before the full Commission he will give examples of failed snapshots and better scientific design. Quite frankly and best analysis is to identify pre and post trend control in one unit rather than trying to compare two separate units. Mike will also show 18 different variables that affect predation, and they all work in concert with each other. Trying to find two units that are side by side that have the same variables, and the other thing be done is removing predators, it is almost impossible to do with wildlife. Commissioner McBeath asked if there are ever any instances in where a control and treatment unit approach would work. Mr. Bodenchuck stated measuring trend in each unit but you would not be able to compare the two. Some discussion ensued, but the major presentation will be presented before the Commission at their meeting tomorrow.

Commissioner Raine asked for projects slated for continuation.

Project 6A – Delamars

Project 18 – The Granite Range

Project 20 – Virginia Mountains

Project 23 – Including 14, 15, and 17. Continued aerial hunting on critical summer and winter ranges.

Project 6A – Budget of \$15,000 – Mike asked how the sheep are doing in the Delamar. Kevin stated that it seems to be a well placed project with a lot of investment with the largest augmentation of sheep ever done anywhere. Mike also asked if we have included coyotes, bobcats and lions in the project, and if aerial work is used as well. Kevin indicated yes to both questions. Commissioner Raine stated he doesn't think we need to list each species of predator to be controlled and let it be determined by the personnel working the area. Kevin disagreed. Chairman Raine wanted to make sure the language was flexible enough to allow for any species that might be identified. Kevin stated every time we have identified a predator we have targeted it for removal with these collars.

Project 18 – Budget of \$107,895 – Washoe County Deer – Project to continue with a tentative budget until the end of the fiscal year. Mike asked about the road being listed as boundary between 014 and 015. Kevin stated we have done away with the boundaries and this information is shown on the maps

provided. Commissioner Raine stated that perhaps we need a little more flexibility in the language in the project description and he asked Wildlife Services if they had a suggestion, Mark Jensen asked Jack Spencer stated that they follow the description given in the project. Commissioner Raine suggested adding language to include area adjacent to the described project area. Commissioner Raine asked Kevin to come up with some verbiage to this affect. Kevin asked for clarification as he was not aware there was an issue of this until now, and he needs to know how far we want to expand these boundaries. Commissioner Raine suggested, “pursue the animals that are determined by the personnel performing the control work, that are affecting the herd”. Mike Laughlin is in agreement and stated we need to give the people on the ground to flexibility to pursue the predator outside of the project boundary if necessary. Commissioner Wallace asked how often this occurs. Jack Spencer stated there have been several instances during the past year where lions have been tracked back and forth between 014 and 015. Commissioner Raine stated for the next meeting we will come up with verbiage for all projects that state the animal that is depreddating on the herd can be pursued outside of the project area if necessary.

Project 20 – Budget \$5,000 – Virginia Mountains – Reasonable success has been achieved in this area. Mike Laughlin asked where is the depreddation occurring and is it near housing? Kevin stated there is some development going on currently. Commissioner Raine asked if there were any human/lion conflicts in the area. Kevin stated we have not received any calls but Wildlife Services may have.

Commissioner Raine asked about the next projects 21A and 21B. Kevin stated he is going to propose those two as standalone projects, so they will remain with those numbers. Previously these projects were funded through the \$20,000 emergency money we set aside. Two years ago we started the fund and half way through that year we had some requests from area biologists in Elko and Lincoln Counties asking for some sage grouse projects. Some money was then taken from the fund to begin raven control projects in those areas identified by the local biologists. Kevin stated the budget is approximately \$14,000 between the two projects. Commissioner Raine stated we will have another meeting where we can establish the final budget.

Mike Laughlin asked if there approximately 800 leks in Elko County that we have mapped and how many were treated? Kevin stated 22 leks were treated. Mike further asked why those 22 and what are the criteria used. Kevin stated the leks were selected by the local biologists. Joe Bennett from Wildlife Services stated they are currently working on six sage grouse leks that were selected by NDOW biologists in Elko County. The biologists observed ravens and productivity on these particular areas. Director Mayer stated that he could have Shawn Espinosa attend a meeting to describe how areas are chosen and what criteria used. Commissioner Raine stated that would be good as he does not feel that what we have in place now is a sufficient response for sage grouse. Commissioner McBeath wanted to disclose that in 21A, Cave Valley, the Gardner Ranch lek, this lek is on our private deeded land, and the Patterson Pass lek is on our BLM allotment, therefore, Commissioner McBeath with not vote on these particular projects.

Commission Raine asked for a motion on 6A, 18, and 20. Commissioner Mc Beath motioned to approve the continuation of Projects 6A, the Delamar Mountains, Project 18, Washoe County, and Project 20, the Virginia Mountains with the addition of language that through interactions between the Department of Wildlife and Wildlife Services, if it is determined there is a predator impacting the resource in these

particular projects that Wildlife Services be allowed to pursue that individual into whatever area adjacent areas are necessary within the State of Nevada. Commissioner Raine will work with Kevin and other interested parties to draft new language and bring it forward to the next meeting. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

Commissioner Raine asked for any further public comment on these projects, there was none.

Commissioner Raine stated that we are not doing enough in Project 21A, and other committee members agreed with this, but how much more and do we have enough funding. Kevin stated that we have had some new proposed sites by local biologists for additional treatments and we will work with Wildlife Services to find out what their permit restrictions are to make sure we can expand the program.

Mike Laughin asked Director Mayer what was the status of the lawsuit with Western Watershed as the Elko County Commissioners intervened. Director Mayer stated there were actually two suits, the first one was Western Watersheds and the Center for Biological Diversity as the second. A stipulated agreement was entered into by all six of the people involved. The agreement stipulated that a decision will be made by February 26, 2010, as a complete volume of conservation assessments are still being gathered. A range-wide determination, distinct population segment (DPS) and one level below that, they are looking pretty hard at one or more DPS's. One other item is that the preliminary finding on the website is now null and void, and it seems they are looking hard to list something somewhere. Mike asked what will determine what populations will be listed. Director Mayer is a piece by piece process that includes population trends over time, threats, and conservation projects that have positive and negative effects. Director Mayer does not think that they will cause listing to be range-wide as there are areas where the birds are doing well, and conservation programs are continuing.

Commissioner Raine would like to see 21A expanded or maybe a new project be written including other/additional areas

The following motion was made to approve project 21A and 21B as presented by the Department with the option of expansion at a later date. The motion was seconded, Chairman Raine asked for any further comment, there being none, the committee voted with four in favor and one abstention. Motion passed.

Commissioner McBeath asked why we are not approving Projects 14 and 15 if they are to be continued. Kevin said we are planning a continuation but not at the same level as previously. We are proposing some aerial hunting on identified critical winter and summer fawning range. This was previously a 5-year project and last year it was extended for one more year, and after speaking with the local area biologist he would like some continued surgical aerial hunting, very specific fawning ground with some winter range. Commissioner McBeath asked if this will now be a new project. Kevin stated that yes it will be a new proposed project. Commissioner Raine stated that in 2009 the budget for #14 was \$85,501 and #15 was \$32,469 plus some tooth analysis on both, and he asked Kevin to describe these two projects in their new format.

Kevin stated that they would now be included in the new proposed Project #23, which is a statewide deer and multi-species enhancement project. This is basically a pool of funding for mostly aerial hunting by

Wildlife Services on designated specific critical habitats in the state at critical times of the year. Chairman Raine felt this project was too "wide open". Kevin stated that the project is based on Utah's Predator Management Program. The Division of Resources identifies areas based on some criteria for Wildlife Services to perform predator control. Mike Laughlin asked who makes the determination on how the money is spent. Kevin stated we will identify the areas we want Wildlife Services to concentrate in. Wildlife Services will do some aerial hunting in our identified areas, and subsequent to that they will determine in their professional opinion if enough control has been done or if more aerial work is necessary. Mike noted there are eleven units identified in the project, and Kevin stated that each unit has a very specific area where work will be done.

Commissioner Raine stated that approximately \$115,000 from the original projects 14 and 15 will be transferred to this project, which is \$70,000, and asked what will happen to the rest of the money. Kevin stated he would like to see the impact of coyote removal in mule deer in Nevada that Michael Conover from the Berryman Institute spoke about at the last meeting. Mike Laughlin stated that the rest of the money would be used for studies. Kevin stated no, as this project will remove predators, and we will be paying for some monitoring of that work. Chairman Raine said for the monitoring aspect we can potentially use matching funds for various sources, so why are we not applying for matching dollars for a good portion of this project. Kevin stated that Ken can better answer this question. Commissioner Raine asked Director Mayer in regards to project #22 it is his understanding that we can utilize matching funds for the monitoring aspects, and is that being done. Ken stated that the money is already spoken for at this point and all grant proposals are written a year in advance. At this point we would need to write a PR grant proposal, submit it through and process and have the Federal Office approve it. The problem is you cannot use federal money for predator control, but if you turn it into research project that would work. The committee would like to pursue getting matching funds for next year to go forward with this project turning it into a research and monitoring proposal. Ken did state until the grant process begins and we submit it for funding many pre-research things that can be done prior to getting the matching fund monies. The money that is already budgeted for this project could be used to "set the stage"

Mike Laughlin motioned to explore the possibility of obtaining matching funding as previously discussed for Project #22 for the 2010-2111 year; the motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

Commissioner McBeath asked what happens with the \$70,000 that has been allocated for this project for this year. Chairman Raine stated as the next meeting we will finalize the money available for project and the small amount left for emergency projects.

Chairman Raine stated that the committee has not yet voted on the large project #23 and we need to go back to finish decision on that proposal. Kevin restated what project #23 was and that it was loosely patterned after Utah's predator management program. Mike Bodenchuck elaborated further on Utah's plan.

Chairman Raine was interested in the meetings that occur each year between Utah's Wildlife Services personnel and the Division of Wildlife Resources. Mr. Bodenchuck stated that there is one annual meeting between the two agencies, but that there were probably more within the Division to prioritize and determine there was enough data to support the request for a project. Commissioner McBeath stated that

he sees project #23 is designed to allow maximum flexibility to deal with issues as they come up. Mr. Bodenchuck stated that the project is loosely defined now because the priorities have not been established until an analysis is done. Commissioner Raine was interested in establishing possible number criteria, and he feels the committee could be directly involved in setting up this criteria. Kevin stated that he has spoken with local biologists about standardized criteria, and the problem is there are no standard areas in Nevada. Chairman Raine wants the committee to be involved in meetings between NDOW and Wildlife Services, and he wants a basic criteria developed with allowable exceptions.

Motion to approve Project #23 as written with the some additions of year minimums and committee involvement and we will see a new version of his project at the next meeting. Motion was seconded, motion passed unanimously.

Project #24 – Mountain Lion Specialist – Kevin stated as we move forward into the surgical removal, and identifying problems as they exist, that this is a good sound one for the direction this program is going. Wildlife Services is a great resource that have two experienced lion hunters that are not always available for the amount of work that is growing. Kevin feels this is a solid position, and there is the potential for \$15,000 from the Delamars and \$5,000 from the Virginia Range to fold into this position. This position would be targeting specific lion and not population reductions. Commissioner Raine is concerned with the issue of having another agency hire this person. Mark Jensen stated that they are providing a service and not necessarily a person. Mark would also like the flexibility to manage his employees as he sees fit. Mike Laughlin stated his concern is that lion hunters are sometimes difficult to work with, and if two people are asking the hunter to work on a job, “it doesn’t work”. Who is the supervisor? Kevin state he is working for either agency at any one time. Kevin further stated that this position responds to solely wildlife issues. Mike asked “what is the job description?” Kevin stated he is to work the Delamars, the Virginia Range, work in Hays Canyon and he will be working on a preventive status rather than corrective. The Department agrees to one FTP person per year, but Wildlife Services will determine which of the three lion hunters goes where with at least one available for our predator program when necessary.

The committee’s concern is that we are paying for a person that works for someone else. Director Mayer stated that we will evaluate this person/project annually. If we will determine is this is a workable project, and if not we can make a modifications or end the contract. Chairman Raine stated we have threet option; one is to move this forward to the next meet, approve or deny the project now.

Motion to discuss Project #24 at the next meeting. Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Project #25 Mason Valley – Kevin stated that this project was just brought forward to him.. The personnel at Mason Valley WMA have begun a program; they have twp surrogate incubator boxes designed to raise pheasants. Kevin stated they are trying to establish a population in Mason Valley they are losing many birds through predation. This project is to assist in raising a pheasant population on the area. Commissioner Raine stated he felt this would have been a good heritage project. Kevin stated this will not be an expensive project, and we can do some trapping and raven removal. A full time person would not be necessary and there are people on the management area that can assist. Kevin estimated the cost at \$8,500. Commissioner Raine thinks that this is a good idea, but it is not sage grouse. We are talking

about spending only \$12,000 to save sage grouse which is very important especially if it is listed statewide, and almost as much on a species that would be nice but “it’s not sage grouse.” Director Mayer stated he will bring in Shawn into the next to present some information about predation on sage grouse.

Commissioner McBeath stated that since we have already invested in the incubators, and we are trying to augment pheasants on a management area that provides opportunity for our sportsmen, this is the type of project we should be considering to assure the success of this program. It was asked what the length of the project would be. Kevin stated approximately two year, and he wanted to assure the committee that the cost of \$8,500 is very tentative. Commissioner Raine stated that he thinks the funding should come from the upland game bird stamp monies.

Commissioner McBeath made a motion to approve proposed Project #25 for Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area for predation management on our surrogated incubated pheasants.

Mike Laughlin wanted to amend the motion to look at Heritage funding for next year as this cannot be a one year project.

Commissioner Raine would like amend the motion to see some funding from the upland game bird stamp program.

Commissioner McBeath stated he would accept both of those amendments to his motion as long as we agree to do some protection this year, also he would accept and funding source for future years.

Chairman Raine said is has been moved and seconded to approve proposed Project #25 Mason Valley Pheasant Restoration with the addition that NDOW will explore the possibility of performing the project with Upland Game Stamp money and with Heritage funds, and is directed to develop proposals to that effect in the future. Motion passed unanimously,

Kevin stated that two years ago Buster Dufferena approach out local area biologist and some discussions were held about his sheep range, associated leks, and fawning grounds. Buster thought is be a good cooperative program with the livestock industry, as they hired some aerial hunting to conduct some removal. Ed Partee pit together a proposal and thought it would be beneficial, and because we do not have a contract with the company that did the work, we can only do a one year onetime payment. So we agreed to pay for 3.5 hours of aerial hunting in Unit 031 for the protection of sage grouse, antelope a deer for a cost of \$1,960. This could be folded into Project #23 in the future.

Kevin stated the final proposal is to produce a predation management brochure and public outreach. It will have some nuisance information, but will also state the mission and goals of the program to try and education the public. The cost is approximately \$5000 for about 20,000 brochures.

A motion was properly moved and seconded that a predation management brochure/public outreach be approved with the addition that any and all versions of anything to be published presented for approval by the Wildlife Damage Management Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item #8 – Review Projected Budget for 2010-Informational.

Agenda Item #9 – Review process/ procedure for finalizing details of heritage projects 10-23, 10-26, and 10-27 -**Informational**.

Agenda Item #10 – Discuss possible changes to Policy #25 and review amendment crafted by Department of Wildlife to Policy #25. - **ACTION**

Agenda Item #11 - Establish Date, Time and Location of the Next Meeting – Chairman Raine – **ACTION**

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for a July 24th in Elko. Committee members will contact the Chairman with their schedules.

Agenda Item #12- Adjourn.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Dawn Carter