Action Report

CABI	March 25 and 26, 2022
Chur	County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlin
Subm	itted by Chairman:
To the Stanfor	Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners: wildlifecommission@ndow.org , c/o Executive Assistant: Missy d: keturah.stanford@ndow.org and Administrative Assistant III: Ali Medina: amedina@ndow.org
CABM' Others:	W Members Present: Jim Curran, Jason Sibley, Gary Cordes None
Com	mission Agenda Action Items:
1)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Policy 10
	Recommendation
	In Support X In Opposition See comment below
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:
	# of public signed in/testified for this item: 0
2)	Agenda item (description here)
	Commission Policy 31 Recommendation
	In Support X In Opposition See comment below
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:
	Members of the public signed in: 0
3)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Policy 33 Recommendation
	In Support X In Opposition See comment below
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:
	Members of the public signed in: 0

Action Report

	MW recommendations for the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners Meeting on: h 26 and 26, 2022
Chur	chill County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife
Subm	itted by Chairman: Curran
To the 1 Stanford	Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners: wildlifecommission@ndow.org, c/o Executive Assistant: Missy d: keturah.stanford@ndow.org and Administrative Assistant III: Ali Medina: amedina@ndow.org
CABMV Others:	W Members Present:
Com	mission Agenda Action Items:
1)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Policy 40 Recommendation In Support X In Opposition See comment below
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:
	# of public signed in/testified for this item: 0
2)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Policy 63 Recommendation In Support X In Opposition See comment below
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:
	Members of the public signed in: 0
3)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Policy 64 Recommendation
	In Support X In Opposition See comment below
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:
	Members of the public signed in: ()

Action Report

Chur	County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife				
Subm	itted by Chairman:				
To the l Stanfor	Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners: wildlifecommission@ndow.org, c/o Executive Assistant: Missy d: keturah.stanford@ndow.org and Administrative Assistant III: Ali Medina: amedina@ndow.org				
CABMV Others:	BMW Members Present: ers:				
Comi	mission Agenda Action Items:				
1)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Policy 67 Recommendation				
	In Support X In Opposition See comment below				
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:				
	# of public signed in/testified for this item: 0				
2)	Agenda item (description here) Commission Regulation 22-10 Recommendation In Support X In Opposition See comment below				
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:				
	Strongly recommend that changes be done in red or blue in future $\mbox{\it Members of the public signed in: }0$				
3)	Agenda item (description here) MDEP Projects 1-5 Recommendation				
	In Support In Opposition See comment belowSee excerpt of Minutes attach				
	Other comments, including a dissenting viewpoint (different than the majority) or issue brought up during discussion:				
	Members of the public signed in: 0				



Informational Items:

A- Consideration and possible action re: Items listed on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda for March 25 and 26, 2022, which is attached as Exhibit "A", and Final Combined MDEP Project Approval List 2-15-2022, which is attached as Exhibit "B".

B-

Should the board want to discuss Items listed on the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' Agenda for March 25 and 26, 2022, which is attached as Exhibit "A", and the Final Combined MDEP Project List 2-15-2022, which is attached as Exhibit "B", the board may do so.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

EXPLANATION OF IMPACT: N/A

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

ACTION REQUESTED: None; Informational Only

Vice-Chairman Curran said, with regard to the Fiscal Year 2023 Predator Management Plan. which is the second reading, since we met last time, the Department established mule deer subcommittees in different parts of the state. There is one for the north Washoe deer herds, one for the bi-state herd in Carson City, there are several in Lincoln County and in Elko County. These sub-committees are made up of biologists, sportsmen, deer hunters, and mule deer federation representatives. They have been working on ideas and recommendations now for close to a year. They have really spent a lot of time on this. Since we met last time, they have come up with five projects that they are recommending. There is also a master committee that is trying to consolidate all deer management ideas. At least these five projects were approved and rated 1-5. They have some other recommendations in here. If we are looking at strictly predator projects that would be financed with that \$3 predator fee that we pay, I think those are the projects. I think Washoe County is coyote and lion removal, basically, everywhere north of Gerlach. Member Sibley said I think that is good thing to have. Member Curran said, in Area 111-115 in White Pine County, it is coyote and lion removal; Lincoln County has a recommendation by their committee; and White Pine County has another for predator removal. The list that we considered last time, which I believe we stayed neutral on until we received more information, there is only so much money that they have but project 37, which was on that original list for big game protection – mountain lions – it was \$100,000. Big game protection – covotes – it was \$100,000. It was generic. I am irritated that somewhere we do not get a summary of what has happened in this last year to see what they have done. That is a lot of money. The one that really irritates me is increasing the understanding of common raven densities and space use in Nevada. That totals \$300,000. This is about the 4th year that they have had that in there. My recommendation is that the Commission seriously consider funding the CDEP committee ranking of these five projects in lieu of these other things. It just about offsets that \$300,000 under the raven control. I think it would be a real slap in the face to all of these sub-committees that have been meeting weekly and monthly to not have their recommendations considered.

Member Cordes said I cannot agree with your more. I definitely have an issue with the feral horses, as well as what you have just stated. If we could put those two together is some kind of motion. I have very passionate about the feral horses, as there are too many. Member Curran said the Department recognizes that. They even went to the Legislature and got them to pass a

resolution recommending to BLM that they bring horse numbers down to AML. There are quite a few horse gathering projects going on right now. Some of the horse groups tried to stop those in court but the judges denied their injunctions.

Member Curran made a motion to recommend that the Commission seriously consider funding MDEP's committee recommendations for project priority 1-5 and, if additional funding is needed that they discontinue project 41, which is increasing the understanding of common raven densities in Nevada. Member Cordes seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

Member Curran said those 5 projects would have to be funded the predator fee and not matched with Pitman Robinson funding. Right now, that raven is a study and the federal government will finance ³/₄ of a study but they will not finance any control work. That is a \$300,000 project. Looking at the budget down below, there are adequate funds available in that account for predator control. They would save about \$87,000 of predator money by doing away with project 41, the ravens.

Member Curran said there is an elk damage payment that exceeds \$10,000 to the Granite Peek Ranch in White Pine County, which is an action item. Any award over \$10,000 has to be brought back to the Commission for approval. There are adequate funds, as they decided there is \$19,170 worth of damage to the elk out there. Member Cordes said I read that and I have no problems with that. Member Curran said I think that is an automatic approval.

Consider Future Agenda Items:

There were no future Agenda items suggested. However, Deputy Clerk Moore informed the board that the next meeting is scheduled for May 4, 2022.

Public Comment:

Vice-Chairman Curran asked if there was any public comment but there was none.

Adjournment:

-	5.6			1729		(22 E)	ALC: YES
The	meeting	was	ad	ourned	at	7:30	PM.

CHAIRWOMAN PEGGY HUGHES
MEMBER JIM CURRAN