

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES  
AND THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AGRICULTURE,  
AND MINING**

**Seventy-Eighth Session  
March 5, 2015**

The joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Don Gustavson at 1:24 p.m. on Thursday, March 5, 2015, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Don Gustavson, Chair  
Senator Pete Goicoechea, Vice Chair  
Senator James A. Settelmeyer  
Senator Mark A. Manendo  
Senator David R. Parks

**ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Chair  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo  
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo  
Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling  
Assemblyman Chris Edwards  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblyman David M. Gardner  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblyman James Oscarson  
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank

Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining  
March 5, 2015  
Page 2

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Debbie Smith (Excused)  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton (Excused)

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst  
Susan Scholley, Policy Analyst  
Lynn Berry, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Tony Wasley, Director, Department of Wildlife  
Patrick Cates, Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife  
Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife  
Bob Brunner, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife  
Daryl Capurro  
Gerald Lent  
Andrew Zaninovich, Nevada Conservation League  
Elaine Carrick

**Chair Gustavson:**

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 130.

**SENATE BILL 130:** Converts the Department of Wildlife into the Division of Wildlife of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.  
(BDR 45-613)

**Senator Pete Goicoechea (Senatorial District No. 19):**

Senate Bill 130 reverses the actions taken in A.B. No. 41 of the 72nd Session, which made the Division of Wildlife, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources into the Department of Wildlife (NDOW). There are concerns regarding the lack of budget oversight within NDOW. I sit on the money committees, and at each Interim Finance Committee (IFC) meeting, there are at least ten work programs requesting monies to be shifted within the NDOW accounts. If the NDOW was a division, there would be more oversight as to where the money is being transferred.

One concern is how the \$3 fee charged for each big game tag application is handled. Many of my constituents are sportsmen and feel there is no accountability as to where this money is being spent. It was anticipated that the fee would be used for lethal predator control. A lot of the money is being funneled into research and science projects with very little being committed to on-the-ground projects. I do not think NDOW is reaching their objectives.

Other issues are tag setting, season dates and how the quotas are reached. Every county has a County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (CABMW). Unfortunately, over time, input from the CABMWs has become diluted and they feel they are being ignored. If nothing else happens with this bill, I would like to incorporate language giving the CABMWs more weight in the process, especially when it comes to tag setting, quotas, season lengths and where the animals are heading. The CABMWs understand what is occurring in their areas regarding wildlife. There seems to be a disconnect between what is actually happening on-the-ground as opposed to the numbers provided by the NDOW reports.

Sage grouse is another issue. We are talking about listing them as an endangered species but yet we are actively hunting them.

Is predator control achieving what we need? We go round and round about the trapping issue, but if we do not control the predators we cannot maintain our wildlife.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

The predator program is not being addressed properly. Could you give the history of when NDOW was made a department?

**Senator Goicoechea:**

It seems to change every decade. The change from division to department is not the critical piece of this bill. Our constituents deserve to know why we are here, where we are at and why our wildlife numbers, especially mule deer, are rapidly declining. We are talking about listing the sage grouse, but we have more sage grouse in eastern Nevada than mule deer.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

You stated that every 10 years we make a switch. Should we not make a choice and stick with it? Have the programs changed?

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I am not saying this is the solution. We need answers as to why we are where we are today versus 11 years ago. In 2003, we thought it was the right thing to do by giving the NDOW the flexibility to administer some new programs. Unfortunately, they have not come to fruition. My main concern is the protection of our wildlife resources.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

I agree. We should look at the shifts that have happened over the decades. We might be able to identify what did or did not work to get us on the correct path.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

Section 11 of S.B. 130 takes the Governor out of the equation. What is the reason for the language change?

**Senator Goicoechea:**

The Governor appoints the director of a department. The department director will appoint an administrator of a division. When the NDOW becomes a division, it will serve under the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

Since 1947, the agency name has changed several times. In 1979, the name changed from the Department of Fish and Game to the Department of Wildlife. In 1993, the NDOW became a division under the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and in 2003 reverted to a stand-alone department. The problem is the lack of accountability.

The Board of Wildlife Commissioners is comprised mostly of sportsmen. Governor Jim Gibbons appointed members who had worked hard on the predator control issue, which became controversial. The Governor also had the authority to appoint the director of the NDOW without any input from the Wildlife Commission.

Sage grouse became an issue when the Ruby Pipeline route was approved across northern Nevada. A contingency fund was specifically earmarked for sage grouse habitat but, again, there was no oversight of these funds. Former NDOW Director Ken Mayer and Amy Lueders, Nevada State Office Director of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) bought a \$5 million piece of

property in central Washoe County that no one knew about. The NDOW director and the BLM director were buying property, transferring it into state ownership with no oversight. That is an example of why there is a need for stronger fiscal and budgetary constraints. Senate Bill 130 has merit and will address these significant budgetary concerns.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

The majority of questions will be directed at NDOW. Could we have NDOW come to the table first?

**Chair Gustavson:**

That was my intention.

**Tony Wasley (Director, Department of Wildlife):**

There have been changes in the nomenclature since the 1870s. In the early 1900s, the disagreements were about the control of wildlife; whether it was county or State. In 1995, the Department was realigned as a Division of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources as shown in my presentation ([Exhibit C](#)). In 2003, we were converted back into a Department. There has only been one shift from department to division and back again. This has not hampered our ability to be consistent with our statutory responsibilities.

**Patrick Cates (Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife):**

I will begin with the Ruby Pipeline funds. We have a habitat enhancement account that is a nonexecutive account. This account receives money that has been negotiated between the federal government and the State for development of projects benefitting wildlife. It is funding to help mitigate damage to wildlife habitat by the introduction of the commercial projects such as mines or laying the pipeline. The funds are administered jointly with the State and the federal government. This nonexecutive account has oversight by the Executive Branch. Executive and nonexecutive accounts are established by the Budget Division, Department of Administration. They are reviewed by the Governor's Office. When we entered into the Ruby Pipeline agreement with the federal government, the State Board of Examiners approved it. The Governor was able to review and approve that agreement.

We work with the Division of State Lands regarding land acquisitions. Any acquired land is submitted to the State Board of Examiners for approval. There

is extensive oversight to the use of these funds. These accounts have been highlighted in our budget presentations and we have also provided supplemental reports to the Legislature regarding how these funds have been used.

Our executive budgets are reviewed and approved by the Legislature. We typically have 10 to 12 work programs at the IFC meetings. That number is not rare. The nature of the work is instrumental in creating the work programs. It can be a one-time, on-the-ground project and money needs to be transferred to these projects, as funding is not in our base budget. Some of the on-the-ground projects require review and approval by the Wildlife Commissioners and require a work program.

The NDOW received a letter of intent from the Legislature for a budget reorganization plan. The plan was reviewed by IFC and the 2011 Legislature. We implemented the reorganization plan in fiscal year (FY) 2012. The intent was to give greater transparency into our finances. It also increased the number of our budget accounts from four to eight. There are now more details and categories, necessitating work programs.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Could you elaborate on the grants you receive? I sit on the money committee and you do have a lot of budget accounts.

**Mr. Cates:**

Our operating budget is approximately \$35 million per year. Federal funds comprise 48 percent of that figure. There are a variety of grants. There are specific grants for specific projects. Most come from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); others are from the BLM and the U.S. Coast Guard. Occasionally grants become available on an ad hoc basis. We are not able to add them in our budget as we build budgets 2 years in advance and have no idea what grants will be available.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

Are there any reports as to how the funding from the Ruby Pipeline has been spent?

**Mr. Cates:**

Yes, we have detailed reports and would be able to submit them to the Committee.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

I see that \$400,000 was allotted for predator control. How much was spent for on-the-ground work? Why are we still hunting sage grouse if we are thinking of listing them as endangered species? Ravens are the most invasive predators of the sage grouse. When will you request an amendment to the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 regarding the ravens?

**Mr. Wasley:**

We are engaged with the USFWS on a daily basis. I would like to address predation management ([Exhibit D](#)). *Nevada Revised Statute* 502.253 authorizes a \$3 fee for every big game tag application. The purpose is for management and control of injurious predatory wildlife, protection of non-predatory game animals, predator research and public education. There is significant oversight and cooperation.

There have been issues on how the program was conducted and implemented. We realize there is room for improvement. The Wildlife Commission addressed this issue with Commission Policy 23, which outlines a specific annual process and incorporates public and CABMW input. This policy delineates the NDOW's roles and responsibilities.

Our targeted distribution of funds is 75 percent towards predation management action and 25 percent towards administration, habitat improvement, research and education.

**Senator Settlemeyer:**

How much money did you spend for on-the-ground projects? One report stated \$100,000 was spent on studying coyotes. The concept of predator deprivation is to eliminate them, not study them.

**Mr. Wasley:**

Since the inception of this program, \$5.5 million in revenue has been generated. Since FY 2002, \$5 million has been expended through 2014. Seventy-four percent of the total expenditures have been provided to the State Department of Agriculture and the United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Wildlife Services for help in the removal and control of coyotes and/or ravens.

The \$100,000 referenced was an amount that was matched three to one with federal funds. For \$25,000 of the \$3 fee, we were able to triple the amount for study. The USFWS does not allow their grants to be expended for predator control or removal. If it is under the guise of research or study, which is necessary for us to carry out and defend removal activities, it is acceptable.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

How is the wildlife department defined in other states, division or departments?

**Mr. Wasley:**

Presently, only seven states identify themselves as divisions. The remainders are departments or combinations. In the west, Colorado is combined with parks; Wyoming and Idaho are combined with fish and game, and California is combined with fish and wildlife. The majority of the western states are stand-alone departments. However, there is a myriad of structural variations within the departments.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

The sage grouse is a sensitive issue. The Governor implemented a committee to bring different agencies together to function as a team to benefit the State. The NDOW independently released their own assessment, blaming livestock grazing as a problem for sage grouse habitat. How do items like this get by you if you have so much oversight?

**Mr. Wasley:**

Assemblyman Hansen is referring to a comment in a letter submitted to the BLM relative to a draft environmental impact statement (EIS). The BLM was requesting the State provide input into how the State believes habitats should be managed for the improvement of sage grouse. The NDOW submitted a letter independent of review from the State, as we do often. This one had higher visibility. Language in the letter was misinterpreted as not supporting the State's process and plan. If we dissect the letter's contents, we would see that NDOW pointed out BLM's lack of monitoring on the landscape. The specific language that was offensive was that only 41 percent of active grazing allotments had a current evaluation. Of that 41 percent with a current evaluation, only 23 percent met or exceeded rangeland health standards. It was not intended to counter the State's efforts nor not be consistent with the Governor's goal and the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council. I wrote a letter to



articulate the misunderstanding, including an apology to the Governor and the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council. Since that time, there have been no other missteps.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

The predator control program had a person in charge who was adamantly opposed to predator control. How did that happen?

**Mr. Wasley:**

That person is a personal friend of mine. I respect his abilities as a biologist. As you have pointed out, there are times when greater objectivity is necessary, especially in positions requiring political sensitivity. Had anyone else applied for the position, there might have been someone more suitable. That person has since retired and a new individual is in place that we feel his philosophies and experience are consistent with what the Legislature wants. We feel confident we are moving in a positive direction.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

What percentage of your funding went to raven and predator control?

**Mr. Wasley:**

It is contained in the 74 percent of total expenditures. We can provide a breakdown of raven removal versus coyotes. We are saying 74 percent of the \$3 fee has been paid to federal Wildlife Services for on-the-ground predator control.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

You eliminated 2,500 ravens. In the last 2 years, there has been a 600 percent increase in the raven population. The ravens are out of control. You need to spend more funding on raven elimination. I would like a breakdown on the funding for personnel, overhead and operating.

**Mr. Wasley:**

We can provide the breakdown to the Committee. The USFWS has a take permit level of 5,000 ravens per year. We share that amount with Wildlife Services, giving us both 2,500. The logic behind it is the NDOW would be taking ravens for the protection of wildlife; Wildlife Services would be taking ravens for the protection of livestock. We share information and present it to

the USFWS. We realize there has been a significant increase in raven densities. We have asked the USFWS what we could do to increase our take number. Assembly Joint Resolution (A.J.R.) 2 addresses this very issue. The USFWS needs to know this can produce a sustainable population increase. Some of the funds within the 3 percent research category are to document population level increases to demonstrate to the USFWS the value of raven removal with the hope to make a stronger case to increase the level of permitted raven take.

**ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2:** Urges the United States Congress and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to take certain actions to reduce the impact of common ravens on the greater sage grouse population in this State. (BDR R-33)

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I would like a breakdown of expenditures from FY 2002 through 2014 for lethal predator control. I am concerned the grants that are almost 50 percent of your budget come from the same agencies who are saying you cannot spend it for lethal control. Mr. Wasley is the president of Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA). There is no consideration under WAFWA for using grazing as a tool to control fire and/or invasive species. We have to increase our raven take number. My district is the biggest breeding ground for ravens. If we take ravens in the north, they keep coming from my district.

**Chair Gustavson:**

During the interim, we traveled to several control areas to see whether or not it is working.

**Mr. Wasley:**

You are correct. The raven numbers are increasing. There are many pieces to try to fix it. The USFWS says that lethal control cannot be the primary means of control. They would like us to cover landfills and pick up roadkill. Those are the types of hoops we have to jump through to get the allowable take we presently have. Science is demonstrating huge population increases in raven numbers. The approach needs to be broad. We do not have enough time, money or energy to go out short term to reduce the raven populations to a reasonable level. We are actually subsidizing the ravens through the dumps and road kills.

We can maintain healthy habitats to help mitigate the raven problem. Part of the reason there is such a high nest predation is the absence of residual cover. We try to revegetate areas that have burned, but if the area has had high use by wild horses or the like, the cover is not there and the nests become vulnerable.

I agree that we need to engage with the USFWS more effectively. A good start was A.J.R. 2. Some of the non-lethal work we are doing around the State demonstrates to the USFWS that we are not spending a lot of money just killing things; we are trying to comply.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

We are looking for a quick response. If we go to the Apex Landfill in southern Nevada with a truckload of treated eggs, we will control part of the problem. The USFWS needs to understand the seriousness of this.

**Mr. Wasley:**

I would like to answer Senator Settelmeyer's question regarding the hunting of the sage grouse. I have a presentation ([Exhibit E](#)). We survey the sage grouse leks as the primary means to monitor their population. There are 1,865 lek locations around Nevada. The chart on page 3 of [Exhibit E](#) shows the number of leks counted and the average male attendance at the leks. The variations in the chart are mainly due to climatic conditions. During drought conditions the attendance is lower than in wetter years.

In 2012, the USFWS published a proposed rule in the Federal Register stating they had no evidence suggesting that gun and bow sport hunting was a primary cause of range-wide declines of the greater sage grouse. Page 5 shows the bistate sage grouse population. There has not been an open sage grouse hunting season since 1998. The population numbers on the Nevada side are declining or remaining stable at low levels despite the cessation of hunting.

The research findings on pages 6 and 7 show other sources of sage grouse mortality. These include invasive species, infrastructure and wildfires.

Seventeen states belong to WAFWA providing a unified voice to lobby the federal government for states interests. Resources are pooled and science is shared. Guidelines are developed within WAFWA specific to the hunting of sage

grouse and are listed on page 8 of [Exhibit E](#). Page 9 shows the hunt closures since 1997, based on the guidelines.

Wings of sage grouse are collected during the 10-day hunting season and deposited in barrels located around the State. When we analyze the wings, we can determine the sex and the success of nesting and rearing of a brood. This information gives us the population trends and helps defend against potential listings.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Would it impact your grant structure if we stopped hunting the sage grouse?

**Mr. Wasley:**

It would not affect our grant structure. However, if the hunting opportunity was gone, people would not buy tags and licenses, thereby creating some budgetary challenges.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

There are some hard feelings when we close hunting seasons.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

In urban areas, there are strategies to curb some animal populations. One strategy is birth control through food. Could this strategy work on the ravens?

**Mr. Wasley:**

That may control the reproductive capacity, but there would still be the predation issue of the remaining sterile birds. Ravens are incredibly resourceful and fill in quickly even with aggressive lethal removal.

**Assemblywoman Swank:**

Could this be combined with aggressive removal? What is the cost to the State to manage the ravens versus the loss of federal money to eliminate them?

**Mr. Wasley:**

There is a larger challenge than operating without the federal funds. The ravens are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. There would be federal violations and not only would we not receive the 48 percent of our funding, but Mr. Cates and I would probably go to jail.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

In the past, there was a predator program trying to reduce the raven numbers by picking up roadkill. Was that successful and what was the budget for that project?

**Mr. Wasley:**

I do not know the value of the budget. The project was too dispersed to have any measurable benefit at the local level. Driving around the State in no particular order or area, removing carrion from the roadway did not work. When we attempt to remove a subsidy, it should be highly localized and associated with a particular population around certain lek complexes.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I understand there is a fund exclusively used by the director of NDOW that is privately funded and can contain up to \$75,000. Is that accurate?

**Mr. Wasley:**

There may be some confusion about a legislatively created account. Deputy Director Cates can address this.

**Mr. Cates:**

You may be referring to the Wildlife Trust Fund created by the Legislature in 2011. It is a gift account and is not limited to \$75,000. We receive private donations and use those funds according to the donors' wishes, as long as it is consistent with our mission. That account goes through the budget process. Work programs are created and written reports are given to the Legislature.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

There is concern as some of the gifts come from major organizations or wealthy sportsmen. That can cause friction between the rank-and-file sportsmen as they see NDOW focusing on the needs and wants of certain organizations at the expense of the everyday sportsman.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Is there any natural predator for the raven?

Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining  
March 5, 2015  
Page 14

**Mr. Wasley:**

I do not know of any natural predator that would have any significant effect on the raven levels.

**Assemblyman Edwards:**

Would decoys, such as owls on houses, work?

**Mr. Wasley:**

We are most concerned about nest predation. Sage grouse are very susceptible to noise and disturbance. They tend to nest in desolate and isolated areas. If we could find a decoy that might work, the logistics of placing them would be difficult.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

Are you working with any other states regarding the ravens?

**Mr. Wasley:**

We work with other state wildlife agencies both formally and informally. There are "flyway" councils that deal with a myriad of nuisance species as well as ravens. We look at agricultural problems associated with high goose numbers. Many of these species are covered under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. We coordinate through the flyway regional associations, such as WAFWA, and national associations that involve all 50 states and some Canadian provinces. We share data and science. We all face the same challenges working under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as it relates to raven numbers.

**Chair Titus:**

This is an example of where common sense has gone out the door. Government has been over-burdensome. There used to be a bounty on magpies. Maybe we should institute a bounty on ravens.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

There does not seem to be a concerted effort to address Congress to have the ravens removed from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Do you know how many ravens are in the Apex Landfill?

**Mr. Wasley:**

I do not know how many ravens are in the landfill. I will be meeting with my national counterparts next week and will query them as to what else we can do to address the raven problem.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

The ravens are prolific in the Apex Landfill. You cannot cover it up fast enough to get ahead of the ravens. It is not healthy. If we take 10,000 ravens from central Nevada, the next year the ravens from Apex will backfill in central Nevada. We have to deal with the source.

**Chair Gustavson:**

As we are short on time, we will not be able to hear everyone who wishes to speak on S.B. 130. Please submit any testimony or handouts to the committee secretary. We will look at them in a work session.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I am aware of a proposed amendment that will move some predator funds into another area. It goes along with the intent of S.B. 130.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

The federal predator control program was managed by the USFWS. There was an internal backlash and most of the predator control programs were then shifted to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This Committee might consider realigning duties to other State departments.

**Assemblyman Gardner:**

Why are some states, such as Idaho, allowed to take more ravens than we are?

**Mr. Wasley:**

I do not believe their allowable take is any higher than Nevada's. I will check and provide a specific response.

**Larry Johnson (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):**

We oppose S.B. 130. Sportsmen's groups in both southern and northern Nevada are opposed as well. During the time when the NDOW was a division, no money was saved. We almost lost a significant part of our air operations, which are necessary for big game census and tag quota calculations. The

NDOW has the fiduciary duty to sometimes take unpopular stands, such as migration corridors for deer, overgrazing or the development of key sage grouse habitat. These decisions sometimes affect special interest groups. The NDOW can best fulfill this duty by being an independent department.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

We do have to change the trend of declining wildlife numbers, especially the mule deer.

**Mr. Johnson:**

We have more antelope and elk than in any time in recorded history. We have more bighorn sheep than any other state except Alaska. Black bears are spreading across the State for the first time in a century. We have tremendous wildlife successes. Unfortunately, the sagebrush obligate species are declining, such as sage grouse and mule deer. You cannot burn the entire winter range areas of mule deer and expect them to survive.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

You are speaking about the wildfires that decimated a lot of the wildlife population. We know that good grazing would stop some of the fires. Where do you find a balance?

**Mr. Johnson:**

We are staunch supporters of the multiple use of public lands. Grazing can be used as a management tool, but it has to be managed effectively. We are only doing a fair job when the BLM's survey concludes that only 23 grazing areas meet the grazing standards out of the 41 percent surveyed. Wild horses are oftentimes 100 percent over appropriate management levels. They can be managed. There is no control. Grazing can be an important tool but uncontrolled grazing is bad.

**Bob Brunner (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):**

I oppose S.B. 130.

**Daryl Capurro:**

Dr. Gerald Lent and I have looked at predator control and have prepared a proposed amendment ([Exhibit F](#)). We propose transferring 85 percent of the



\$3 predator fee to the USDA Wildlife Services Program for on-the-ground predator development.

We also have a conceptual amendment regarding the CABWMs. Usually only 7 of the 17 CABWMs are represented at our meetings and some areas have no members at all. We propose to consolidate the CABWMs into three regions ([Exhibit G](#)). This would allow a larger pool of applicants and perhaps generate more interest.

**Gerald Lent:**

I have served two terms on the Washoe County Advisory Board, was Wildlife Commissioner for 3 years and Chairman of the Wildlife Commission for 2 years. I was one of the original sponsors of A.B. No. 291 of the 71st Session establishing the \$3 predator fee. I have submitted a letter from Assemblyman Claborn ([Exhibit H](#)) which stated the intent of A.B. No. 291 of the 71st Session was to do on-the-ground projects for removal of predators in order to enhance deer numbers. The intent of this legislation is not being followed. They are doing research and studies. This amendment to give 85 percent of the \$3 fee to the USDA Wildlife Services Program will benefit wildlife by doing on-the-ground projects.

The chart ([Exhibit I](#)) shows amounts generated annually. The average amount of revenue for those 3 years is \$477,331. The Governor's Executive Budget page Wildlife-37 ([Exhibit J](#)) shows that \$400,000 was allocated to the NDOW for predator management. I did not see any plan earmarked for the \$400,000 in the NDOW's predator plan. Even taking the 85 percent, it still leaves approximately \$200,000 with the three to one match for the department to perform studies.

I agree with the CABMW restructuring. We could add language that one or more members from each county could be appointed by the respective board of commissioners. Mandatory training would be provided by the NDOW. That would stimulate attendance. Qualifications could include no personal agendas and unexcused absences would be subject for removal. If the Wildlife Commission disagrees with the CABMWs recommendations, a written response should be prepared stating why they did not agree.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining  
March 5, 2015  
Page 18

**Senator Goicoechea:**

I would like to meet with other members of this body again to have additional discussion.

**Andrew Zaninovich (Nevada Conservation League):**

We oppose S.B. 130.

**Elaine Carrick:**

I have prepared testimony to submit for the record ([Exhibit K](#)).

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining  
March 5, 2015  
Page 19

**Chair Gustavson:**

I will close the hearing on S.B. 130. There being no further business, the Senate Committee on Natural Resources is adjourned at 2:56 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lynn Berry,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Don Gustavson, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>		<b>Witness or Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
S.B. 130	C	5	Tony Wasley	Presentation
S.B. 130	D	6	Tony Wasley	Predation Management
S.B. 130	E	13	Tony Wasley	Sage Grouse Management
S.B. 130	F	1	Daryl Capurro	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 130	G	1	Daryl Capurro	Drawing
S.B. 130	H	1	Gerald Lent	Letter from Assemblyman Claborn
S.B. 130	I	1	Gerald Lent	Chart of revenue
S.B. 130	J	1	Gerald Lent	Executive Budget page
S.B. 130	K	3	Elaine Carrick	Written Testimony