

Committee Members: Commissioner Kiel (Chair),  
Commissioner Barnes, Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner  
Almberg, Jim Rackley, Jeremy Drew, Charlie Clements,  
Josh Vittori, Cory Lytle, Alan Shepherd, Kris Boatner

Staff to the Committee: Mike Scott  
Alan Jenne  
Cody Schroeder

**Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners  
Mule Deer Enhancement Program Oversight Committee**

**Wednesday, June 22, 2022 / 6:00 p.m.**  
Meeting held via [www.Zoom.us](http://www.Zoom.us)

**DRAFT Minutes**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call of Committee Members – Chairman Kiel**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

In attendance:

Commissioner Kiel, Chair  
Commissioner Barnes  
Commissioner Rogers  
Jim Rackley, Nevada Muleys Association  
Charlie Clements, Rangeland Scientist  
Josh Vittori, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited  
Alan Shepherd, Bureau of Land Management  
Kristie Boatner, US Forest Service  
Alan Jenne, Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Mark Freese, Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Mike Scott, Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Cody Schroder, Nevada Department of Wildlife  
Cory Lytle, Meadow Valley Wildlife Unlimited (late)  
Pat Jackson, Nevada Department of Wildlife (late)

Absent:

Commissioner Almberg  
Jeremy Drew, Resource Specialist

**2. Approval of Agenda – For Possible Action**

Committee Member Vittori motioned to approve the agenda.

Committee Member Clements seconded the motion.

The motion passed. Commissioner Almberg, Member Lytle, and Member Drew absent.

**3. \*Approval of Minutes (December 15, 2021) – Chairman Kiel – For Possible Action**

Committee Member Rackley motioned to approve the December 15, 2021, Minutes.

Committee Member Clements seconded the motion.

The motion passed. Commissioner Almberg, Member Lytle, and Member Drew absent.

**4. \*Member Announcements and Correspondence – Chairman Kiel – Informational**

No correspondence was received.

**5. 2021 Approved Project Updates – Game Division Administrator Scott – Informational**

Game Administrator Scott passed the presentation of the agenda item to Habitat Staff Specialist Freese. Mr. Freese presented a spreadsheet and discussed the funding resources sought by the Department to fund or partially fund approved Mule Deer Enhancement Program (MDEP) projects. (Attachment A)

Habitat Staff Specialist Freese stated that a number of the 2021 projects had been moved through the funding process of the Heritage Grant, Restoration Grant, and other funding sources in order to spread the wealth across the board. Water development grant funding was mentioned, as well as National Fish and Wildlife Foundation grants, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) funding, and Fish and Wildlife field funding.

Member Vittori stated he was curious how the Oversight Committee's recommendations were received by the Heritage Committee and if the Oversight Committee's approval of the projects carried weight in the Heritage Committee meetings.

Member Commissioner Barnes responded that the MDEP projects were well received, and the Heritage Committee did not turn down any projects that came from the Department via the Oversight Committee. The Heritage Committee members asked if particular projects had in fact come from the Oversight Committee. Mr. Barnes summarized that MDEP projects that had been approved by the Oversight Committee did indeed pack some weight.

Game Administrator Scott moved the conversation from habitat to investigations and requested Game Staff Specialist Schroeder to speak on this agenda item. Continuing to use the spreadsheet highlighted by Habitat Staff Specialist Freese, Mr. Schroeder explained that the Oversight Committee had approved most of the listed projects at the December 15, 2021, meeting, noting that some projects were taken off the spreadsheet for reasons like funding being tied to another project or a project was put into the federal aid grant application for full funding and got match from various groups.

Game Administrator Scott moved the conversation from investigations to predator project proposals and requested Predator Staff Specialist Jackson to comment on the Wildlife Damage Management Committee's (WDMC) response to the proposed predator projects.

Predator Staff Specialist Jackson responded that the predator projects were discussed at the March 2022 meeting of the WDMC and while the proposed projects were not cancelled or approved, they were paused. Mr. Jackson continued that the WDMC requested the proposed projects have more thoroughness and, at this time, the Game Division was in the process of developing a scoring matrix that followed the WDMC's recommendations.

Chair Commissioner Kiel commented that it seemed like the process was "another step and another step" and asked the Oversight Committee if there was a more efficient way to put forth acceptable project proposals.

Game Administrator Scott stated that the WDMC approves predator projects and that even though the Oversight Committee approved the predator projects, those projects still needed to go through the WDMC process. Mr. Scott stated he was seeking instruction from the Oversight Committee on if predator projects should go directly from the MDEP Subcommittees to the WDMC, or if there was value in the predator projects going through Oversight Committee as a precursor to being submitted to the WDMC. Mr. Scott stated he recognized the situation added another layer of complexity to the overall process but advised the Oversight Committee that vetting the Subcommittee's predator projects also informs the Oversight Committee on what the Subcommittees are requesting. Mr. Scott stated the WDMC is adamant predator projects be based on science and that the WDMC has added scrutiny. Mr. Scott added that Wildlife Services has also commented that predator projects must be scientific based, or the Department will risk being sued. Mr. Scott stated that going forward all predator projects will need to go through a matrix that is being created by Predator Staff Specialist Jackson.

(Chair Commissioner Kiel made several statements, not picked up by the recording.)

Game Administrator Scott stated his plan was to schedule another Oversight Committee meeting in August 2022 for project approval and at this meeting the matrix for the predator projects would also be presented. Mr. Scott recommended that a predator project be approved by Oversight Committee before presenting it to the WDMC.

Member Vittori asked for examples of scientifically based studies or data that would be appropriate and if those studies would be peer reviewed articles or telemetry data or something else entirely.

Predator Staff Specialist Jackson directed the Oversight Committee to refer to “Predator-Prey Relationships” by Warren Ballard. Mr. Jackson stated that the referenced book reviewed approximately 40 projects that looked at removing predators for the benefit of black tailed deer and there was not much discovered that definitively said that killing predators benefitted the number of mule deer on the landscape. Mr. Jackson offered to share the research book with any member is interested. Mr. Jackson stated that what the WDMC really wanted was some sort of evidence, for example GPS data or fawn survival rates. The WDMC wanted something that is evidence-based demonstrating a stagnate population or one that is in decline.

Member Vittori asked if it would be safe to assume that the matrix that is being drafted will have a scoring component in it much like NEPA projects. Game Administrator Scott confirmed that was the goal of the matrix.

## **6. Discussion of 2022 Timeline and Direction for Mule Deer Enhancement Program Projects – Game Administrator Scott - Informational**

The Oversight Committee discussed the revised timeline for submission and approval of 2022 projects from the Subcommittees. The Oversight Committee discussed requesting a one-page 5-year plan from each Subcommittee. Game Administrator Scott read the suggested timeline that was discussed at the December 2021 meeting:

- January 1 – March 31: Subcommittee meetings to be held.
- January 31: Heritage proposals due to so be submitted internally by Department staff.
- February 15: Federal aid proposals due to be submitted internally by Department staff.
- March 1: Predator projects to be submitted to Staff Specialist Pat Jackson.
- April 15 – June 15: Subcommittee field trips.
- June 15 – July 31: Subcommittees work on ranking and preparing proposals for the Oversight Committee.
- August 1 – Subcommittees submit up to 3 project proposals to Department staff.
- August 1 – August 31: Oversight Committee meets, using scoring matrixes to develop a prioritized list.
- September 1 – September 31: A final Subcommittee meeting to discuss future projects, successes, failures, and ways to improve the process.

Game Administrator Scott stated last year, 2021, he, Habitat Administrator Alan Jenne, and Mule Deer Staff Specialist Cody Schroder evaluated and ranked the submitted projects. Mr. Scotts stated this year, 2022, having had revised the forms for ease of use, he would like the Oversight Committee to rank the projects. Mr. Scott reiterated that it was his goal to have the Oversight Committee rank and prioritize the proposed projects.

Game Administrator Scott introduced support material, “Conservation Actions for the Area 7 Jarbidge to Pequop Deer Migration”, a plan authored by the Elko 6-7-8 Subcommittee. (Attachment B) Mr. Scott stated the document was a 5-year plan of projects and direction that the Subcommittee had declared it is working toward; a document stating where the Subcommittee wanted to go next. Mr. Scott indicated he wanted to ask for a plan from each Subcommittee and that he wanted the Subcommittees to think about the processes involved, such as NEPA approvals, funding, etc. Mr. Scott stated that if a 5-year plan was based on Mule Deer Needs Assessment, it could be a minimum of one page, and he did not feel it would be a consuming task for the Subcommittees. Chair Commissioner Kiel agreed, stating the process would keep Subcommittee members engaged in the process. Member Rackley also agreed with the proposed process. Mr. Scott stated having each Subcommittee create a 5-year plan would provide direction to those involved in the process and that he was looking to make this request of the Subcommittees this fall.

## **7. \*Mule Deer Enhancement Program Habitat Project Proposal Scoring Form – Mule Deer Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder – For Possible Action**

The Oversight Committee reviewed a revised version of the scoring form to be used for scoring project proposals submitted by Subcommittees. Mule Deer Staff Specialist Schroder presented the new forms to be used for project scoring criteria habitat and investigations. (Attachment C) Mr. Schroder stated the Department tried to better marry the MDEP forms to some of the other criteria being using for Heritage projects and using the ranking methods similar to Heritage project rankings.

Game Administrator Scott stated that the Department intends to present the revised forms to the Subcommittees as soon as possible in an effort to be sure the new forms were easy to use, had clarity and made sense to the Subcommittee members. Mr. Scott stated the Department may still need to make revisions based on the feedback from the Subcommittees. Mr. Scott stated the goal was to make the forms fillable so the completed forms can be electronically submitted to the Oversight Committee for scoring. Mr. Scott

concluded stating he hoped the scoring process for the Oversight Committee will be a few minutes per project instead of 20 minutes per project like it was last year.

Chair Commissioner Kiel opened the Habitat Projects portion of the forms for comments from the Oversight Committee.

Member Vittori stated he had concerns that stable and increasing populations seemed to be the focus of the forms over protecting what is already in existence. Mr. Vittori stated he saw only one fuel break project and wanted to know how the Oversight Committee could encourage more projects of that type. Mr. Vittori stated he felt that with fire and cheat grass, protecting what is already in existence as functioning habitat was of utmost importance. Mr. Vittori stated that he was looking for something like that on the form. Mr. Vittori pointed to the category of project scale and implications on page 1 of the Habitat form, stating that the category should be a 15 maximum score because the scale is so huge and that to see noticeable positive impacts for the State's mule deer herds is what the Oversight Committee should be thinking about constantly. Mr. Vittori questioned the likelihood of success, that is, when everything is done right, but mother nature has her own plans. Mr. Vittori stated the term "likelihood of success" is a subjective process, and the Oversight Committee might be optimistic and score something higher.

Member Clements stated that most of what he sees and considers is based on experience.

The Oversight Committee discussed scoring, which categories should have which numbers associated with them, being careful to make the overall maximum score 100 for ease of ranking. Mr. Vittori stated that a challenge for him was how to score the projects, and he was wondering if there might be a probability component. Mr. Vittori stated that something akin to letters of commitment from stakeholders would help him score projects and that the category of cost effectiveness needed some elaboration in order to understand what that meant exactly.

Member Clements stated that it helped when Subcommittees sent the Oversight Committee their thoughts and reasoning on how they got to their findings and eventual proposals.

Chair Commissioner Kiel opened public comment. There was no public comment.

Game Administrator Scott stated the Department would work in Member Vittori's comments to improve the forms as per the discussion. Habitat Administrator Jenne discussed scoring methodology, stating last year's forms did not give any narrative to create the separation to score the projects. Mr. Jenne continued, stating this year's detail box would allow the narrative to create the separation. The Oversight Committee discussed how to score, how to evaluate, how to accommodate for bias and perspective, and the best way to score a project. Mr. Scott mentioned that taking the average is helpful to minimize bias, and perhaps a sliding scale would address some of the concerns presented by Member Vittori and Member Clements. Mr. Jenne stated reviewing the quality of the question itself might be in order if the numbers are somewhat skewed and that if the range of the rankings were off then that would indicate that the questions needed refinement. Mr. Jenne stated that when the range is off, one needs to ask if it is because of bias or if the question itself is unclear. Mr. Scott stated he would improve the form to provide additional clarity and to take in Member Vittori's suggestions. Mr. Scott stated the Department would use this form this year and make any big changes for next year, looking to improve it for the following year, 2023. Mr. Scott stated he put Member Vittori's comments in red and would inform the Subcommittees that the part in red are the thoughts of the Oversight Committee in an effort to see if the Subcommittees agree or give comment on it. Mr. Scott reiterated that Subcommittee feedback was crucial since they are the ones completing the forms.

**Member Clements made a motion to approve the Habitat Project Proposal Scoring Form as presented with changes from Member Vittori;**

**Commissioner Barnes seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed. Commissioner Almberg and Member Drew absent.**

#### **8. \*Mule Deer Enhancement Program Investigation Project Proposal Scoring Form – Mule Deer Staff Specialist Cody Schroeder – For Possible Action**

The Oversight Committee reviewed a revised form to be used for scoring proposed investigation projects received from Subcommittees. Staff Specialist Schroeder introduced the revised Investigations Project Proposal Scoring Form worksheet, commenting that the worksheets had been standardized to make them compatible and comparable with the worksheet used to evaluate Heritage projects. Mr. Schroeder commented

that Member Vittori's earlier suggestions for the Habitat Proposal Scoring Form could also be incorporated into the Investigations Project Proposal Scoring Form worksheet.

Member Clements commented that the previous forms had non-habitat and predator plan project sections and that this revised form had nothing about predator. Staff Specialist Schroeder replied that the predator section had indeed been separated out. Habitat Administrator Jenne stated that a predator form would be a third form, which was still in the making.

Member Clements cautioned the Oversight Committee on relying too heavily on asking the Subcommittees to support their projects solely on scientific literature; relating that there is equal harm in only relying on science. Mr. Clements continued that he could easily find science to support what he wants to say, no matter which side. Mr. Clements stated that the Department, as a management agency, needed to use a multi-prong approach and that predator-prey relationships would need to be a part of the larger view, whether it was a research project or a management project.

Member Vittori stated the worksheets represented smart goals and that he appreciated realistic, measurable, achievable, and clearly defined methods. Mr. Vittori stated he commended the Department for that specific language. Mr. Vittori asked if the Department could provide examples of successful outcomes of investigations so that he could learn more about the process.

Staff Specialist Schroeder stated that there had been successes in the past few years with radio collars in that the Department discovered a migration corridor it did not know previously existed. The Oversight Committed discussed likelihood of success as a limiting factor and what that would look like and how to measure and rank such a category. Staff Specialist Schroeder stated that the improved forms being discussed at the meeting allowed for the provision of details and clearly defined measureables. Mr. Schroeder stated that it would be obvious, in his opinion, that if there are no details provided for in the completed form, a low likelihood of success could be expected and that the questions themselves will make Subcommittee members want to think the process out.

Game Administrator Scott stated it was his goal to impress upon the Subcommittees that it is crucial they contemplate where they hope a project goes; ask what does the project lead to, perhaps ask themselves if a project is moving the needle, and what benefit does the project produce. Mr. Scott continued that discoveries of migration routes, habitats, and mortality rates at the end of the day might not increase mule deer on the landscape, which is the ultimate goal of this program. Mr. Scott stated that he wanted Subcommittee members to be able to say what their project is leading to and what they hope to achieve with it. Mr. Scott stated that the process also allows the Department's relatively new biologists to learn about their resource and he wants the game biologists to be the most informed people on the Subcommittee they represent. Mr. Scott reiterated to the Oversight Committee that he wanted the projects to be based on science. Mr. Scott continued that the Oversight Committee should be asking the Subcommittees what they intend to do, while incorporating the reality that any project will be expensive. Mr. Scott stated that he wanted to encourage the Subcommittees to discuss and decide, for example, if it is better to spend \$100,000 on a collaring project or a habitat project.

Habitat Staff Specialist Freese commented that the new forms were meant to be easy to use, simple to understand, and capture major themes, but not add complexity. Mr. Freese stated that the Heritage forms are more generic than the MDEP forms because Heritage forms are used for projects across other programs, such as Fisheries, Diversity, and Habitat. Mr. Freese stated that the 3 forms being discussed today for the MDEP offer opportunity for the Subcommittees to be more specific. Mr. Freese stated the forms ask questions such as, is the project necessary? Does the project add value? And if so, will adding value make things more complex? Habitat Administrator Jenne stated that the previous forms failed to make projects discernable, and the new forms presented here and the new way of scoring presented here make the proposed projects discernable. Mr. Jenne stated that if a project was not discernable, it was not scorable. Mr. Freese stated that the Heritage leadership team provide their scores and different answers, but after averaging, the final score was pretty accurate.

Member Rackley stated he agreed with Member Vittori that scoring likelihood of success and completion is completely subjected. Mr. Rackley wanted the Department to be sure the score added up to 100. Staff Specialist Schroeder agreed, and the Oversight Committee discussed how to change the numbering so it totaled 100.

Member Lytle stated that the points being made by Members Vittori and Clements were spot on and the added detail and boxes will prove valuable. Mr. Lytle also agreed that bias is just part of the process.

Chair Commissioner Kiel opened the item to public comment. No public comment was received.

**Chari Commissioner Kiel motioned to approve the Investigation Project Scoring forms.**

**Member Vittori seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed. Commissioner Almberg and Member Drew absent.**

#### **9. Mule Deer Enhancement Program Improvements – Chairman Kiel - Informational**

The Oversight Committee discussed improvements to the MDEP process for future years. Chair Commissioner Kiel stated that there should be more scrutinizing of proposed projects. Game Administrator Scott mentioned Member Clement's comment on the Program protecting what is already in existence and stated that if the Oversight Committee wanted Subcommittees to consider such items, those items could be addressed in the forms for 2023. Mr. Scott stated he is always open to making the program as successful as possible and looking for feedback on if there are things that are being missed. Mr. Scott reiterated that the Program does not have funding and, while that is a challenge, the biggest challenge the Department has is capacity to carry out the projects. Mr. Scott stated he was looking for suggestions how to do address the capacity issue.

The Oversight Committee discussed the importance of fuel breaks and if fuel breaks are being taken into consideration by the Subcommittees. Habitat Staff Specialist Freese stated that the BLM is doing a lot on this and has money, so the Subcommittees are not really looking at those issues since they are already covered by BLM.

Member Vittori stated that for the overall plan, would they omit that piece of the overall management because perhaps it was being addressed through other measures taken by the Department. Game Administrator Scott agreed, stating there were a lot of things happening that were not captured with the new forms. The Department can provide additional information, but when Habitat builds a guzzler, it is likely to benefit mule deer as well as the target species. The Department is not going to include those projects in this capacity because the mule deer focus would be lost.

Member Lytle stated the 5-year plan was a simplistic approach and a good idea. Mr. Lytle stated there were lots of ideas getting thrown out and lots of good conversation and he appreciated that Department Staff had to weed through the whole thing. Mr. Lytle stated some sort of guiding document would be a good thing and that it should probably be renewed on an annual basis.

#### **10. Public Comment**

Public comment was received from Larry Johnson, representing the Washoe Management Area 1-2 MDEP Subcommittee. Mr. Johnson commented on the process for the MDEP, stating that the Washoe's first project was a predator project, which was ultimately rejected by the WDMC. Mr. Johnson stated that he found it frustrating the levels of approvals a predator project had to go through compared to other types of projects. Mr. Johnson stated the criteria given to the Subcommittees for approvable predator projects was not made available and one and a half years into the process that information is still not available. Mr. Johnson felt a lot of work and time had been expended for naught.

Meeting adjourned 7:43 pm.

4/20/2022

**Investigation Proposals**

| MDEP Committee Rank | Division Responsible | Team              | Unit Group           | Project Description             | Type        | Cost              | Match        | Source               | Purpose                      | Limiting |      | Total |          |   |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------|------|-------|----------|---|
|                     |                      |                   |                      |                                 |             |                   |              |                      |                              | Factor   | 1    | Sum   | Possible | % |
| 1                   | Ewanyk               | Washoe            | 012, 015, 033        | GPS Mule Deer Collaring         | Non-Habitat | \$60,000          | \$ 39,600.00 | Heritage, NBU, MDF   | Data Gathering               | 4.3      | 72.3 | 105   | 68.9%    |   |
| 2                   | Glenn                | Elko Area 6       | 061, 062, 064, 066-0 | MA 6 Remote Sensing Modeling    | Non-Habitat | \$65,000          | \$ -         | Various; not secured | Data Gathering               | 4.9      | 68.9 | 105   | 65.6%    |   |
| 3                   | Jeffress             | Elko Area 6 - 065 | 065                  | Mule Deer Collaring             | Non-Habitat | \$30,000          | \$ -         | Heritage, IDF        | Data Gathering               | 5        | 68   | 105   | 64.8%    |   |
| 4                   | Lackey               | CC-Douglas-Storey | 192                  | Public Messaging                | Non-Habitat | \$15,000          | \$ -         | Not secured          | Installation of signage in w | 3.2      | 61.2 | 105   | 58.3%    |   |
| 5                   | Huebner              | Elko 7-8-9        | 081                  | GPS Mule Deer Collaring         | Non-Habitat | \$49,000          | \$ 20,000.00 | Elko NBU (\$20k)     | Habitat Use Assessment       | 4.8      | 58.8 | 105   | 56.0%    |   |
| 6                   | Huebner              | Elko 7-8-9        | 081                  | Tooth Collection                | Non-Habitat | \$0               | \$ 1,500.00  | Elko NBU (\$1,500)   | Age Analysis                 | 2.6      | 56.6 | 105   | 53.9%    |   |
| 7                   | Burkett              | Nye-Esmeralda     | 161-164              | Morey Bench Mule Deer Collaring | Non-Habitat | \$50,000          | \$ -         | Not secured          | Data Gathering               | 4.4      | 54.4 | 105   | 51.8%    |   |
| 8                   | Neil                 | Pershing          | 041, 042             | GPS Mule Deer Collaring         | Non-Habitat | \$59,000          | \$ -         | Not secured          | Data Gathering               | 4        | 49   | 105   | 46.7%    |   |
|                     |                      |                   |                      |                                 |             | Match Total       |              |                      |                              |          |      |       |          |   |
|                     |                      |                   |                      |                                 |             | Non Habitat Total | \$ 328,000   | \$ 61,100.00         |                              |          |      |       |          |   |

**Predator Project Proposals**

| MDEP Committee Rank | Team       | Unit Group        | Project Description               | Type             | Cost      | Match      | Source             | Purpose          | Limiting |       | Total |          |   |
|---------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|-------|-------|----------|---|
|                     |            |                   |                                   |                  |           |            |                    |                  | Factor   | 1     | Sum   | Possible | % |
| 1                   | Washoe     | 011-013, 014, 015 | Coyote/Lion Removal               | Predator Removal | \$120,000 | \$5,000??? | NGO, Predator Fund | Predator Removal | 4.3      | 70.8  | 115   | 65.56%   |   |
| 2                   | White Pine | 111-115           | Coyote/Lion Removal               | Predator Removal | \$75,000  |            | Predator Fund      | Predator Removal | 4.14     | 63.14 | 115   | 58.46%   |   |
| 3                   | Lincoln    | 22, 23, 24        | Predator Removal                  | Predator Removal | \$25,000  |            | Predator Fund      | Predator Removal | 4        | 65    | 115   | 60.19%   |   |
| 4                   | White Pine | 121               | Bothwick/Gleason Predator Removal | Predator Removal | \$75,000  |            | Predator Fund      | Predator Removal | 4.1      | 63.1  | 115   | 58.43%   |   |
| 5                   | Pershing   | 043-046           | Coyote/Lion Removal               | Predator Removal | \$30,000  |            | NGO, Predator Fund | Predator Removal | 4        | 77    | 115   | 71.30%   |   |
|                     |            |                   |                                   |                  | Predator  | \$295,000  |                    |                  |          |       |       |          |   |

**Habitat Project Proposals**

| Revised NDOW Project | MDEP Committee Rank | NDOW Project                        | Team       | Unit Group    | Project Description                | Type    | Cost      | Match         | Source                         | Purpose                      | Limiting |        | %   | NEPA  | Water Rights Clarification | Funding               |               |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|--------|-----|-------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
|                      |                     |                                     |            |               |                                    |         |           |               |                                |                              | Factor   | 1      |     |       |                            |                       | Sum           |
| 1                    | 1                   | Hale/WD                             | Lander     | 151-156       | Strawberry Summit Spring Enclosure | Habitat | \$46,000  |               | Water Development Grant        | Protection from Horses       | 5        | 148    | 195 | 75.9% | Nepa completed             | Lower pool accessible | BLM, LCCD and |
| 2                    | 2                   | Cernoch/WD                          | Washoe     | 013, 014, 015 | Spring Protection                  | Habitat | \$75,000  |               | NFWF/BLM/FWSBIL                | Habitat Improvement          | 4.1      | 138.1  | 195 | 70.8% | Private, not required -    | NDOW will             | Through an    |
| 3                    | 3                   | Burkett/Kipke                       | Nye        | 16            | Morey Bench Habitat Enhancement    | Habitat | \$40,000  | \$ 150,000.00 | Heritage                       | PJ Mastication & Overseeding | 5        | 137    | 195 | 70.3% | EA in place                |                       |               |
| 4                    | 4                   | Kolada/Daniel                       | Lincoln    | 22            | Bullwack Habitat Enhancement       | Habitat | \$75,000  | \$ 100,000.00 | Heritage                       | PJ Thinning                  | 4        | 133    | 195 | 68.2% | NEPA completed             |                       |               |
| 5                    | 5                   | Neil/Andrle/BLM Covered?            | Pershing   | 046           | Gregg Fire Seeding                 | Habitat | \$186,000 | BLM?          | W-24 Restoration Grant         | Improve Winter Habitat       | 4        | 132    | 195 | 67.7% | ESR NEPA in place          | BLM will likely have  |               |
| 6                    | 6                   | Kolada/Kody                         | White Pine | 111-115       | Cooper Canyon PJ                   | Habitat | \$150,000 |               | Spring Valley Wind Mitigation  | PJ Thinning                  | 4.57     | 129.57 | 195 | 66.4% | NEPA completed             |                       |               |
| 7                    | 7                   | Trimble/Huebner                     | Elko 7-8-9 | 071-079, 091  | Murdock Mtn Habitat Enhancement    | Habitat | \$100,000 | \$ 165,000.00 | Heritage                       | PJ Removal                   | 3.8      | 126.8  | 195 | 65.0% | Private, not required      |                       | \$125k FWS    |
| 8                    | 8                   | Salisbury/Pirkle/Andrle/BLM Covered | Churchill  | 183           | Draw Fire Reseed                   | Habitat | \$145,000 |               | W-24 Restoration Grant         | Seeding                      | 5        | 123    | 195 | 63.1% | ESR NEPA in place          |                       |               |
| 10                   | 17                  | Glenn                               | Elko 10    | 102-103       | Corta Fire Shrub Planting          | Habitat | \$75,000  |               | Heritage/W24 Restoration Grant | Fire Rehab                   | 3.33     | 112.33 | 195 | 57.6% | Near completion            |                       |               |
|                      |                     |                                     |            |               |                                    |         | Total     | \$892,000     |                                |                              |          |        |     |       |                            |                       |               |

**Projects "on the bench"**

|    |    |                           |                   |                       |  |         |           |           |             |                              |     |       |     |       |                         |                       |      |
|----|----|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------------------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------|
| 11 | 12 | Brittany                  | Elko 7-8-9        | 071-079, 091          | Charleston Fire Rehab                  | Habitat | \$95,000  |           | Not secured | Shrub Seeding                | 4.4 | 114.4 | 195 | 58.7% | NEPA ongoing and likely |                       |      |
| 12 | 13 | WD/Kolada                 | Lincoln           | 22, 23, 24            | Spring Enhancement                     | Habitat | \$100,000 |           | Not secured | Installation of exclusionary | 5   | 129   | 195 | 66.2% | NEPA ongoing and likely | We have also          |      |
| 13 | 14 | WD? Already funded?       | Nye               | 212                   | Palmetto / Montezuma Water Development | Habitat | \$120,000 |           | Not secured | Water Development            | 4.6 | 113.6 | 195 | 58.3% | Pending Water           |                       |      |
| 14 | 15 | NO NEPA                   | White Pine        | 121                   | Steptoe Bench PJ Treatment             | Habitat | \$50,000  |           | Not secured | PJ Removal                   | 4.5 | 113.5 | 195 | 58.2% | NEPA in progress        |                       |      |
| 15 | 16 | NO NEPA                   | Elko 7-8-9        | 071-079, 091          | Meadow Creek Restoration               | Habitat | \$25,000  |           | Not secured | Creating Fuel Break          | 4.4 | 112.4 | 195 | 57.6% | NEPA ongoing and likely |                       |      |
| 16 | 18 | Lackey- More Coordination | CC-Douglas-Storey | 192, 194, 195, 196, 2 | Spring Enhancement                     | Habitat | \$150,000 |           | Not secured | Spring Protection            | 3.2 | 112.2 | 195 | 57.5% | Private, not required   | No permits of         | None |
| 17 | 10 | REMOVE/BLM covered        | Elko 7-8-9        | 081                   | Goose Creek Fire Bitterbrush Plant     | Habitat | \$26,000  |           | Not secured | Plant Bitterbrush in Fire    | 4.4 | 119.4 | 195 | 61.2% | ESR NEPA in place       | No funding right now, |      |
| 18 | 11 | Salisbury-BLM Covered     | Churchill         | 183                   | Water Canyon Reseed                    | Habitat | \$85,000  |           | Not secured | Seeding                      | 5   | 119   | 195 | 61.0% | ESR NEPA in place       |                       |      |
| 9  | 9  | Roberts                   | Elko 10           | 101-109               | South Ruby Mtn Enhancement             | Habitat | \$100,000 |           | Unsure      | PJ Thinning                  | 3.2 | 120.2 | 195 | 61.6% | NEPA completed          |                       |      |
|    |    |                           |                   |                       |  |         | Total     | \$651,000 |             |                              |     |       |     |       |                         |                       |      |

Mule Deer Enhancement Committee Recommendations 04.20.2022

| Team       | Unit Group    | Project Description                | Type    | Cost         | Match            | Source                       | Purpose                    | Limiting Factor |        |          |
|------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---------|--------------|------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------|----------|
|            |               |                                    |         |              |                  |                              |                            | 1               | Sum    | Possible |
| Lander     | 151-156       | Strawberry Summit Spring Exclosure | Habitat | \$46,000     |                  | Water Development Grant      | Protection from Horses     | 5               | 148    | 195      |
| Washoe     | 013, 014, 015 | Spring Protection                  | Habitat | \$75,000     |                  | NFWF/BLM/FWSBIL              | Habitat Improvement        | 4.1             | 138.1  | 195      |
| Nye        | 16            | Morey Bench Habitat Enhancement    | Habitat | \$40,000     | \$ 150,000.00    | Heritage                     | PJ Mastication & Overseedi | 5               | 137    | 195      |
| Lincoln    | 22            | Bullwack Habitat Enhancement       | Habitat | \$75,000     | \$ 100,000.00    | Heritage                     | PJ Thinning                | 4               | 133    | 195      |
| Pershing   | 046           | Gregg Fire Seeding                 | Habitat | \$186,000    | BLM?             | W-24 Restoration Grant       | Improve Winter Habitat     | 4               | 132    | 195      |
| White Pine | 111-115       | Cooper Canyon PJ                   | Habitat | \$150,000    |                  | Spring Valley Wind Mitigatio | PJ Thinning                | 4.57            | 129.57 | 195      |
| Elko 7-8-9 | 071-079, 091  | Murdock Mtn Habitat Enhancement    | Habitat | \$100,000    | \$ 165,000.00    | Heritage                     | PJ Removal                 | 3.8             | 126.8  | 195      |
| Churchill  | 183           | Draw Fire Reseed                   | Habitat | \$145,000    |                  | W-24 Restoration Grant       | Seeding                    | 5               | 123    | 195      |
| Elko 10    | 102-103       | Corta Fire Shrub Planting          | Habitat | \$75,000     |                  | Heritage/W24 Restoration G   | Fire Rehab                 | 3.33            | 112.33 | 195      |
|            |               |                                    |         | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$892,000</b> |                              |                            |                 |        |          |

|                   |                       |  |         |              |                  |             |                              |     |       |     |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--|---------|--------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| Elko 7-8-9        | 071-079, 091          | Charleston Fire Rehab                  | Habitat | \$95,000     |                  | Not secured | Shrub Seeding                | 4.4 | 114.4 | 195 |
| Lincoln           | 22, 23, 24            | Spring Enhancement                     | Habitat | \$100,000    |                  | Not secured | Installation of exclusionary | 5   | 129   | 195 |
| Nye               | 212                   | Palmetto / Montezuma Water Development | Habitat | \$120,000    |                  | Not secured | Water Development            | 4.6 | 113.6 | 195 |
| White Pine        | 121                   | Steptoe Bench PJ Treatment             | Habitat | \$50,000     |                  | Not secured | PJ Removal                   | 4.5 | 113.5 | 195 |
| Elko 7-8-9        | 071-079, 091          | Meadow Creek Restoration               | Habitat | \$25,000     |                  | Not secured | Creating Fuel Break          | 4.4 | 112.4 | 195 |
| CC-Douglas-Storey | 192, 194, 195, 196, 2 | Spring Enhancement                     | Habitat | \$150,000    |                  | Not secured | Spring Protection            | 3.2 | 112.2 | 195 |
| Elko 7-8-9        | 081                   | Goose Creek Fire Bitterbrush Plant     | Habitat | \$26,000     |                  | Not secured | Plant Bitterbrush in Fire    | 4.4 | 119.4 | 195 |
| Churchill         | 183                   | Water Canyon Reseed                    | Habitat | \$85,000     |                  | Not secured | Seeding                      | 5   | 119   | 195 |
| Elko 10           | 101-109               | South Ruby Mtn Enhancement             | Habitat | \$100,000    |                  | Unsure      | PJ Thinning                  | 3.2 | 120.2 | 195 |
|                   |                       |  |         | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$651,000</b> |             |                              |     |       |     |

|         |         |                                |         |           |  |             |                             |     |       |     |
|---------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|-----------|--|-------------|-----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|
| Elko 6  | 067     | Migration Corridor Improvement | Habitat | \$155,000 |  | Not secured | Herbicide & Bitterbrush see | 4.9 | 110.9 | 195 |
| Elko 10 | 101-109 | Migration Corridor Improvement | Habitat | \$50,000  |  | Unsure      | Fence modification          | 2.4 | 110.4 | 195 |

## Conservation Actions for the Area 7 Jarbidge to Pequop Deer Migration February 2022

### Fences – Minimize and/or Modify

- **Railroad ROW – between Holborn and Fenelon** – 3 miles  
1.3 miles private (Monty Pierce and Winecup Gamble Ranch)
- **Railroad ROW – between Moor Exit and Ralph’s Well** – 4 miles  
1.5 miles private (Monty Pierce, Winecup Gamble Ranch, and Weinger Family)
- **Fences located in the Anderson Creek and Hot Creek Allotments on BLM**
- **Meadow Creek** – 1.5 miles removal in migration corridor

### Conservation Easements

- Antelope Peak Ranch – Erik Taylor
- Pequop Conservancy – Winecup Gamble
- Gibbs Ranch – Wyatt Mesma
- Mary’s River Ranch – Preston Wright
- Willomonte Ranch – Monty Pierce

### Habitat Restoration

- **Seedings:**
  - **Deer Fire** – O’Neil PPA EA Restoration Treatment – 15,776 acres BLM  
Bitterbrush and Sagebrush seedling plantings
  - **South Cricket Fire** – O’Neil PPA EA Restoration Treatment – 5349 acres BLM, 6140 private (Pierce) Bitterbrush and Sagebrush seedling plantings
  - **Charleston Fire Shrub Rehabilitation** – Plant sagebrush and bitterbrush seedlings in important stop-over areas that didn’t regenerate after burn.
- **Conifer Removal:**
  - **Payne Basin** – waiting on DNA – 2,200 acres, juniper removal and possible seeding in transition and migration corridor.
  - **Murdock Mountain Mule Deer Habitat Enhancement** – Hand thinning and mechanical mastication of Phase 1 or 2 Juniper in migration corridor and winter range. Partners include USFWS, MDF, and Winecup Gamble Ranch.
  - **Collar and Elbow Basin** – 400 acres of private property owned by Simplot. Phase 1 juniper removal in critical winter range. A Partners for Fish and Wildlife Project
  - **Polygons #16 Deadman, #25 Northeast Pequops** – O’Neil PPA EA  
Phase 1 and 2 conifer removal within 3 miles of sage grouse leks, treatments could include – hand thinning, mastication, broadcast and drill seeding, pile burning, greenwood fire cutting, herbicide, and/or temporary fencing.
- **Fuel Breaks:**

Meadow Creek Restoration – Mow 10 miles of a fuel break to protect critical transition and stop-over areas from burning (O’Neil Basin PPA EA)

## Investigations Projects

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| MDEP Subcommittee:  | Hunt Unit Group:  |  |
| Project Title:  | Project Location:   |  |
| <b>Brief Description of Project:</b> <i>Include any development plans such as capturing, collaring, wildlife health analysis, etc. and include the schedule for obtaining any necessary permits, permission, funding, etc.:</i>   |   | <b>Score</b>   |
| <b>Limiting Factor Score:</b> <i>Use subcommittee cumulative score from Limiting Factor Score Form</i>  | <b>Maximum of 5 points possible</b>   |  |
| <b>Has this mule deer management area or hunt unit group been identified as a statewide priority for research or investigations?</b>  | <i>Yes = 10 pts</i>   | <i>No = 0 pts</i>  |
| <b>Does this project directly address identifying factors limiting healthy mule deer populations? (10 points possible)</b>  | <i>Yes = 10 pts</i>   | <i>No = 0 pts</i>  |
| <i>How will project address limiting factors?</i>   |   |  |
| <b>Does this project occur in a crucial or priority habitat for mule deer? (10 points possible) (Score using the highest ranking criteria)</b>  | <i>High priority (Critical Mule Deer Seasonal Range or Migration Route) = 10 points</i><br><i>Moderate priority (High elev. summer range, PJ encroached shrub community, winter range) = 5 points</i><br><i>Low priority (salt desert shrub or low density mule deer habitats) = 1 pt</i> |  |
| <i>Provide added details:</i>   |   |  |
| <b>Will the research or investigation improve knowledge of habitat and restoration of a long-term or permanent nature? Projects of this nature are known to have long-term benefits with demonstrated history of past successes.</b>  | <i>10+ years = 10 points</i>  | <i>3-10 years = 1 point</i>                                |
| <b>Is the sample size (# of marked animals) and project scale (distribution across an entire hunt unit or region) adequate to gain meaningful inference or statistical power for interpreting the relative impact of this investigation?</b>  | <i>High impact = 10 pts</i>   | <i>Moderate impact = 5 pts</i> <i>Low impact = 1 point</i> |
| <b>Does the project complement an adjacent project or study, previous project, or help inform future habitat projects?</b>  | <i>Yes = 5 points</i>   | <i>No = 0 pts</i>  |
| <i>Describe existing or past projects:</i>  |   |  |
| <b>Needed permitting, authority, and mechanisms are completed or in process and does the project have a high probability of being completed on-time:</b><br>-NEPA analysis for wilderness permits for capture work<br>-Permission from private landowners or other government agencies (such as USFWS or D.O.D.)<br>-Contract mechanisms to support the work are in place or not needed | <i>Timely completion (12 months) = 5 pts</i>  | <i>Extended completion (24 months) = 1 pts</i>             |



## Investigations Projects

**Project narrative:** *Be specific to the research needs and issues associated with mule deer and/or habitat and your technical approach to addressing the issue. Identify potential benefits to mule deer and other wildlife. Describe if the project would be conducted on BLM, FS, USFWS, or private land and if any private landowner permissions are necessary. Please describe any NEPA permitting requirements (such as permission to capture animals in wilderness) if on public land and when NEPA completion is expected. Also provide a tentative project schedule of major tasks (ie collar orders, capture dates, data collection period, reporting dates, etc). Please list any collaborators or project funding partners.*

Habitat Projects

|  |  |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| MDEP Subcommittee:   | Hunt Unit Group:   |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
| Project Title:   | Project Location:  |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
| Brief Description of Project: <i>Include any development plans such as vegetation removal, planting, seeding, or installation of structures; also include the schedule for obtaining any necessary permits, completing NEPA compliance, etc.:</i>  |  |                                |                              |                   |                          | Score |
| Limiting Factor Score: <i>Use subcommittee cumulative score from Limiting Factor Score Form</i>  | <i>Maximum of 5 points possible</i>  |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
| Unit Group 5-Year Published Deer Population Trend:   | 2017:  | 2018:                          | 2019:                        | 2020:             | 2021:                    |       |
|  | <i>Decreasing = 5 pts</i>  |                                | <i>Stable = 3 pts</i>        |                   | <i>Increasing = 1 pt</i> |       |
| Does this project directly address factors limiting healthy mule deer populations?   | <i>Yes = 10 pts</i>  |                                |                              | <i>No = 0 pts</i> |                          |       |
| <i>How will project address limiting factors?</i>  |  |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
| Does this project protect, maintain or strategically restore statewide priority mule deer habitat, enhance critical habitat or a critical life stage for mule deer? <i>Score using the highest ranking criteria</i>  | <i>High priority (Critical Mule Deer Seasonal Range or Migration Route) = 10 points</i><br><i>Moderate priority (High elev. summer range, PJ encroached shrub community, winter range) = 5 points</i><br><i>Low priority (salt desert shrub or low density mule deer habitats ) = 1 pt</i> |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
| <i>Provide added details:</i>  |  |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |
| Is this mule deer habitat restoration or improvement of a long-term nature? <i>Does the project involve habitat trend and condition through restoration and improvement of a long-term or permanent nature? Projects of this nature are known to have long-term benefits with demonstrated history of past successes</i>   | <i>10+ years = 10 points</i>   |                                | <i>3-10 years = 5 points</i> |                   |                          |       |
| Project Scale and Implications: <i>Is the size or magnitude of the project, relative to the habitat type or Mule Deer distribution, impactful? Does the project convey a large conservation benefit to important or critical habitat for Mule Deer? For instance, does a riparian project have a meaningful impact across multiple reaches within a watershed or would a seeding project address a large extent or important critical habitat?</i> | <i>High impact = 10 pts</i>  | <i>Moderate impact = 5 pts</i> | <i>Low impact = 1 point</i>  |                   |                          |       |
| Does the project build upon existing project work?   | <i>Yes = 5 pts</i>   |                                |                              | <i>No = 0 pts</i> |                          |       |
| <i>Describe existing or past projects:</i>   |  |                                |                              |                   |                          |       |

Habitat Projects

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Timely Completion:</b> <i>Needed permitting, authority, and mechanisms are completed or in process and does the project have a high probability of being completed on-time:</i><br/> <i>-NEPA analysis or other statutory compliance is completed or not needed</i><br/> <i>-Permits are completed or not needed</i><br/> <i>-Contract mechanisms to support the work are in place or not needed</i></p>                             | <p><b>Timely completion (12 months) = 5 pts</b>      <b>Extended completion (24 months) = 1 pt</b></p>                               |  |
| <p><b>Urgency:</b> <i>(Is the project urgent due to a narrow biological window that requires immediate attention and funding to address resource degradation or deterioration?)</i></p>  | <p><b>Yes = 5 pts</b>      <b>No = 0 pts</b></p>   |  |
| <p>Provide added details:</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Likelihood of Success:</b> <i>What is the likelihood of successful completion and successful outcomes? Do the individuals and organizations involved possess the capability, experience, and proven methodology needed for implementation? Is the proposal supported by sound and established scientific or biological principals? Project objectives are realistic, measurable, and achievable with clearly defined methods</i></p> | <p><b>High likelihood= 15 points</b>      <b>Moderate = 10 points</b>      <b>Low = 1 point</b></p>                                  |  |
| <p>Provide added details:</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Partner Funding:</b> <i>Does the project leverage funding or in-kind contributions by external partners and by how much?</i></p>   | <p><b>&gt;3x match = 10 pts</b>      <b>1.5-2.9 match = 7 pts</b>      <b>0.75-1.49 = 3 pts</b>      <b>0.1-.74 = 1 pt</b></p>       |  |
| <p><i>(List amounts and sources if possible)</i></p>   | <p><b>Amount: \$</b>      <b>Source:</b><br/> <b>Amount: \$</b>      <b>Source:</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>Cost Effectiveness:</b> <i>Are the expected results worth the cost of the project?</i></p>   | <p><b>Very cost-effective = 10 pts</b>      <b>Moderately cost-effective = 5 pts</b>      <b>Minimally cost-effective = 1 pt</b></p> |  |
| <p>Provide added details:</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Amount Requested:</b></p>  | <p>\$</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Total Project Score</b>      <b>(100 possible points)</b></p>  | <p>Sum of Scores</p>   |  |

## Habitat Projects

**Project Narrative:** *Be specific to the needs and issues associated with mule deer and/or habitat and your technical approach to addressing the issue. Identify potential benefits to mule deer and other wildlife. Describe if the project is on public or private land and any private landowner permissions. Please describe any NEPA permitting requirements if on public land and when NEPA completion is expected. Also provide a tentative project schedule of major tasks. If your project is associated with water rights (e.g. spring fencing project) please discuss the status of permissions to complete the project with water rights holders.*