State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee
Meeting Notice & Agenda
Monday, February 2, 2026, 1:00 P.M

Meeting location: **Nevada Department of Agriculture**
405 S 21st Street
Sparks, NV 89431

Online:

Join:
https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/24371940846376?p=ljo6n9LqVLVca7Ldoa
Meeting ID: 243 719 408 463 76
Passcode: jc9TN3Ju

Dial in by phone
+1 775-321-6111,,574571135# United States, Reno

Phone conference ID: 574 571 135#

Video conference: Nevada Department of Agriculture
2300 E. St. Louis Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89104
702-668-4590

Nevada Department of Agriculture
4780 E Idaho Street
Elko, NV 89801
775-753-1360

Public Notice

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. ***Action may be taken on items preceded by an asterisk (*).*** *Denotes possible closed session (**). Items on the agenda may be taken out of the posted order, items may be combined for consideration; and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time at the discretion of the Chairperson. Unless noted as an action item, discussion of any item raised during a report or public comment is limited to that necessary for clarification or necessary to decide whether to place the item on a future agenda. Public comment may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the chairperson.*

Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodation for assistance at the meeting. Please call 775-353-3755.

State Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee
Meeting Notice & Agenda
Monday, February 2, 2026, 1:00 P.M

Nevada Department of Agriculture

Notice of this meeting was posted on or before 9:00 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting at the following locations: Nevada Department of Agriculture, 405 S. 21st Street, Sparks, NV 89431, Nevada Department of Agriculture, 2150 Frazer Ave., Sparks, NV 89431, Nevada Department of Agriculture, 4780 E. Idaho Street, Elko, NV 89801, Nevada Department of Agriculture, 2300 St. Louis Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89104.

Copies of the agenda, supporting documentation and meeting minutes are available, at no charge, at the Department of Agriculture website at www.agri.nv.gov or www.notice.nv.gov or by visiting Nevada Department of Agriculture, 405 S. 21st St., Sparks, NV 89431, attention Executive Assistant.

AGENDA

1. **Open meeting-call meeting to order by Chair Cody Krenka**
   a. Pledge of Allegiance
   b. Roll call

2. **Public Comment**

3. **Minutes**
   a. *Approval of February 26, 2025, committee meeting minutes ***(for possible action)***

4. **Committee Business**
   a. *Committee selection of new Chair for 2026, per NRS 567.040 ***(for possible action)***
   b. *Committee selection of new Vice Chair for 2026, per NRS 567.040 ***(for possible action)***
   c. *Nevada Department of Wildlife FY2027 Predator Control Plan presentation and coordination of submission of comments – Joe Bennett, Nevada Department of Wildlife ***(for possible action)***
   d. NDA program update – ***(for information)***
   e. Progress update on Predatory Animal and Rodent Committee and USDA Wildlife Services programs – Mark Ono, State Director, Nevada USDA-APHIS-WS ***(for information)***
   f. Meeting schedule 2027 discussion ***(for information)***

5. **Public Comment**

6. **Adjournment**

Predatory Animal & Rodent Control Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 26, 2025, 11:00 A.M.
Division of Animal Industry

Nevada Department of Agriculture

Meeting location: Microsoft TEAMS Meeting

Join the meeting now
Meeting ID: 218 372 096 543
Passcode: YP7Cq95d

Dial in by phone
+1 775-321-6111,,997069989# United States, Reno

Phone conference ID: 997 069 989#

Video conference: Nevada Department of Agriculture
2300 E. St. Louis Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89104
702-668-4590

Nevada Department of Agriculture
4780 E Idaho Street
Elko, NV 89801
775-753-1360

Public Notice

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. **Action may be taken on items preceded by an asterisk (*).** Denotes possible closed session (**). Items on the agenda may be taken out of the posted order**,** items may be combined for consideration; and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time at the discretion of the Chairperson. Unless noted as an action item, discussion of any item raised during a report or public comment is limited to that necessary for clarification or necessary to decide whether to place the item on a future agenda. Public comment may be limited to three minutes per person at the discretion of the chairperson.

Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodation for assistance at the meeting. Please call 775-353-3755.

Notice of this meeting was posted on or before 9:00 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting at the following locations: Nevada Department of Agriculture, 405 S. 21st Street, Sparks, NV 89431, Nevada Department of Agriculture, 2150 Frazer Ave., Sparks, NV 89431, Nevada Department of Agriculture, 4780 E. Idaho Street, Elko, NV 89801, Nevada Department of Agriculture, 2300 St. Louis Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89104.

Copies of the agenda, supporting documentation and meeting minutes are available, at no charge, at the Department of Agriculture website at www.agri.nv.gov or www.notice.nv.gov or by visiting Nevada Department of Agriculture, 405 S. 21st St., Sparks, NV 89431, attention Executive Assistant.

AGENDA

1. **Open meeting-call meeting to order by Chair Darrell Pursel**
    a. Pledge of Allegiance
    b. Roll call

Committee members: Dr. Ihsan Azzam, Cody Krenka, Darrell Pursel, Pete Paris, Casey Kiel
Sparks staff: Doug Farris, Julia Ketcham, Will Dawson, Dr. J.J. Goicoechea, Chad Sestanovich, Liz Smith
Guests: Joe Bennett (NDOW), Shawn Espinosa (NDOW), Richard Yien (DAG), Mark Ono (USDA), Jennifer Mowbray (USDA), Eric Covington (USDA), Jack Spencer (USDA), Margaret Welch

2. **Public Comment**
None.

3. **Minutes**
    a. * Approval of February 12, 2024 committee meeting minutes ***(for possible action)***

Cody Krenka moved to approve the February 12, 2024 meeting minutes, Casey Kiel seconded this motion. The motion passed.

4. **Committee Business**

    a. *Committee selection of new Chair for 2025, per NRS 567.040 ***(for possible action)***

Pete Paris motioned to have Cody Krenka take Chair position. Darrell Pursel seconded this motion. The motion passed. Darrell Pursel asked that Cody Krenka run remainder of meeting.

    b. *Committee selection of new Vice Chair for 2025, per NRS 567.040 ***(for possible action)***

Pete Paris nominated Darrell Pursel as Vice Chair. Casey Kiel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

    c. *Nevada Department of Wildlife FY2026 Predator Control Plan presentation and coordination of submission of comments – Joe Bennett, Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) ***(for possible action)***

Key change to AB 70 is that anyone who applies for a big game tag application, to

include turkey applications, under NRS 502.253 is that they have the chance to choose if they want their $3 funding, from processing the application, to go into development, developing and implementing an annual program for the lethal removal of predatory wildlife, or to go into habitat research and management beneficial for non-predatory game species. During 2024's game tag application period, 64% of people chose implementation on legal removal and 36% chose habitat research and management side.

Cody Krenka noted that the predator control plan has been working in specific areas. Questioned if there are any areas that may be neglected because it may not be a "specified" area.

Dr. Goicoechea asked if there was any funding built in for the surveillance and maintenance for the areas that have been successful in predator work.

Shawn Espinosa responded to the questions presented that a decision had been made to move some of the funding from the Raven Control Project and supplement with the Upland Game stamp funds.

Casey Kiel made a motion to accept the plan as written and to be forwarded to Wildlife Commission. Darrell Pursel seconded the motion. The motion passed.

d. *NDA Program Update: Chad Sestanovich, Administrator, Division of Animal Industry

Update of progress for recruitment of PARC staff in the Eureka, Ely area. Abatement update completed with allocated funds in December of Northern dairies that were indirectly or directly affected by the Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A (H5N1) outbreak.

Dr. Goicoechea commented that Wildlife Service is obviously playing a critical role in NDA response not only to High Path but to all predator nuisance in general. Employees that work for Nevada Department of Agriculture will continue to work for Nevada Department of Agriculture as they are not under contract but are State Employee's. and are safe employees as Director Goicoechea, Deputy Director Farris and Administrator Sestanovich will not allow the PARC program to wither away.

No additional comments or questions.

e. *Progress update on Predatory Animal and Rodent Control program by USDA Wildlife Services, Mark Ono. ***(for information)***

Grazing boards have provided $102,100 to the Wildlife Services Program, which is a significant contribution to the aviation program that averages about $550,000.

Focus in Central Nevada, Humboldt County, Elko County and White Pine County projects 37 and 47 mountain lion removal is underway as is mule deer enhancement projects. Project 38 still has secured fixed wing and helicopter contract and plan to fly Northwest Nevada as more of a collaborative effort with NDOW.

Thanked Director Goicoechea for funding approximately $20,000 towards the DRC 1339 procurement. Have deployed staff to conduct wildlife disease sampling and are waiting for results from the lab.

Feral swine eradication through national feral swine program. If any swine spotted across Lincoln County calls can be placed to 775-289-7902.

No additional comments or questions.

f. *Meeting schedule discussion ***(for information)***

Committee discussed holding 2026 meeting as soon as possible after the NDOW Board meeting being held January 2026 – dates for this meeting have not been announced yet. Pete Paris requested it not be later into Springtime.

5. Public Comment

Pete Paris – Nevada Woolgrowers have a self head tax on every sheep in the State of Nevada for predator control and Nevada Woolgrowers would like to see as much predator that benefits everyone in the state. Rather, its wildlife that is very very important to predator control.

No additional comments.

6. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:53 am

Nevada Department of Wildlife

Predator Management Plan

DRAFT

Fiscal Year 2027
July 1, 2026 – June 30, 2027

State of Nevada

Joe Lombardo, Governor

Department of Wildlife

Alan Jenne, Director

Game Division

Shawn Espinosa, Administrator

Board of Wildlife Commissioners

Shane Rogers, Chairman	Las Vegas
Paul Young, Vice Chairman	Reno
Wyatt Mesna	Elko
Eddie Booth	Winnemucca
Shane Boren	Lund
Tommy Caviglia	Henderson
Casey D. Kiel	Lovelock
Liz Munn	Reno
Mario Walther	Yerington

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) maintains a philosophy that predator management is a tool to be applied strategically with specific objectives in mind. For the purposes of this plan, predator management includes lethal removal of mammalian predators and corvids. Pursuant to changes made to NRS 502.253 (1) (b) during the 82nd session of the Nevada State Legislature through Assembly Bill 70 (AB-70), a "non-lethal" apportionment of funds identified annually by big game and turkey tag applicants will be made available for habitat, research, and management (HRM) to benefit non-predatory game species. These funds will be distributed and reported on through a process similar to, and concurrent with, the Wildlife Heritage Account annually and are not reflected in this plan.

NDOW intends to use predator management actions thoughtfully, with clear goals and management actions based on objective scientific principle and analysis of resulting data. To be effective, predator management should be applied with proper intensity and at a focused scale. Recognizing the variability in nature, projects should be monitored to the extent practicable to determine whether desired results are achieved. This approach is supported by the scientific literature on predation management. NDOW is committed to using all available tools and all relevant science, including strategic use of predator management, to preserve our wildlife heritage for the long-term.

NDOW is a state agency that must balance the biological needs of wildlife and statutory mandates. As mentioned above, but more specifically, AB-70 amended NRS 502.253 to read:

1) a fee of $3 must be charged for processing each application for a game tag, the revenue from which must be accounted for separately, deposited with the State Treasurer for credit to the Wildlife Account in the State General Fund and used by the Department, at the direction of the applicant, for costs related to:
    a. Developing and implementing an annual program for the lethal removal of predatory wildlife; or
    b. Developing and implementing an annual program for the improvement of wildlife habitat and research or management activities beneficial to non-predatory game species.

The $3 game tag application fee from the 2025 game application period totaled $1,138,260. During that process, approximately 63 percent was identified for lethal removal of predatory wildlife ($722,529) while 37 percent ($415,731) was identified for HRM projects.

Budget Summary

Proposed predator projects for fiscal year 2027 include $614,000 for lethal work. Revenues from 2026 game tag applications are estimated to be similar to 2025 at approximately $722,529. Taking this estimate into consideration, an anticipated carryforward of approximately $486,000 in reserve is expected. The purpose of the reserve account is to account for volatility from AB 70 in how people select where their 3-dollar fee will be allocated. For instance, the 2025 game application period had 63% of applications electing for lethal removal and 37% choosing HRM. These percentages are expected to fluctuate from year to year to some extent. Our goal is to establish a

balance in excess of $700,000 by the end of Fiscal Year 2028 so cash flow is adequate to fund approved projects adequately.

TYPES OF PROJECTS

With the passage of AB 70, all projects within the FY 2027 predation management plan fall within the Implementation criteria which is a deviation from previous plans. All experimental management and experiments will now fall under the HRM (Habitat, Research and Management).

1. **Implementation**: The primary objective is to implement management of predators through lethal or non-lethal means. NDOW will collaborate with USDA Wildlife Services and private contractors to conduct lethal and non-lethal management of predators. Identifying and monitoring a response variable is not a primary objective for implementation.
2. **Experimental Management**: The primary objectives are management of predators through lethal or non-lethal means and to learn the effects of a novel management technique. NDOW will collaborate with USDA Wildlife Services, private contractors, and other wildlife professionals to conduct lethal or non-lethal management of predators and will put forethought into project design. Response variables will be identified, and data will be collected to determine project effectiveness. Expected outcomes will include project effectiveness, agency reports, and possible peer-reviewed publications.
3. **Experimentation**: The primary objective is for increasing knowledge of predators in Nevada. NDOW may collaborate with other wildlife professionals to study and learn about predators of Nevada. Expected outcomes will include agency reports, peer-reviewed publications, and information on how to better manage Nevada's predators.

Project 21: Greater Sage-Grouse Protection (Common Raven Removal)

Justification	This project proposes to lethally remove Common Ravens (*Corvus corax*, hereafter "ravens") from known Greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*, hereafter "sage-grouse") habitat. Raven predation on sage-grouse nests and broods can limit population growth. Ravens will be removed around known sage-grouse leks because most nest sites are located within 5 km of lek sites. In addition, ravens will be removed in core winter use areas. Ravens will be removed in areas of known greater abundance to benefit sensitive populations of sage-grouse.
Project Manager	Joe Bennett, Predator Management Staff Specialist, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Project Type	Implementation
Potentially Affected Species	Common raven, Greater sage-grouse
Span More Than One Fiscal Year	Yes
Project Area	Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Washoe, and White Pine counties.
Limiting Factor Statement	Though predation is a naturally occurring phenomenon for sage-grouse, their populations can be suppressed by abiotic factors such as dry climate and loss of or reduction in habitat quality. Increases in predator numbers can also cause decreases in sage-grouse populations; raven abundance has increased throughout their native ranges, with increases as much as 1,500% in some areas (Boarman 1993, Coates et al. 2007, 2014, Sauer et al. 2011, O'Neil et al. 2018). Under these circumstances, raven predation can have a negative influence on sage-grouse nesting success, recruitment, and population trend (Coates and Delehanty 2010).
Response Variable	Common raven point counts may be conducted before, during, and after removal to detect changes in common raven densities.
Project Goals	1. Reduce raven populations in high abundance areas that overlap sensitive sage-grouse populations identified by NDOW and USDA Wildlife Services wildlife biologists with assistance from USGS raven abundance modeling and cost-benefit tools. 2. Increase populations of sage-grouse in specific areas where deemed feasible.

Habitat Conditions	Areas of raven removal will be either on winter range valleys or near sage-grouse leks, nesting habitat, and brood-rearing habitat. Persistent drought throughout Nevada has reduced herbaceous cover, along with nesting and brood rearing habitat; these effects are exacerbated by wildfire and the invasion of cheatgrass. Transmission lines, substations, and nearby agriculture production often attract ravens which may threaten nearby sage-grouse populations.
Comments from FY 2025 Predator Report	Raven management, including lethal removal, is imperative to maintain and improve certain sage-grouse vital rates and the ecosystems they depend on. NDOW recommends continuing Project 21 while common ravens are believed to be a limiting factor for sage-grouse.
Methods	*Lethal Removal* Chicken eggs treated with corvicide (DRC-1339) will be deployed to remove ravens (Coates et al. 2007). To reduce non-target species exposure, no eggs will be left in the environment for over 168 hours. No leftover eggs will be used on subsequent treatments. All remaining eggs and any dead common ravens found will be collected and disposed of properly as per DRC-1339 protocol. DRC-1339 is effective only on corvids and most mammals and other birds are not susceptible to the specific effects from this agent.
Anticipated Result	The removal of common ravens is intended to result in long-term protection for Greater Sage-grouse populations through increases in nest success, brood survival, and recruitment. This project will continue until evidence demonstrating Greater sage-grouse nest success and recruitment are not limiting population growth due to common raven predation or common raven populations are in decline from non-lethal measures. The Departments USFWS raven depredation permit increased from 2,500 to 12,500.
Staff Comment	Project 21 will be informed through the SMaRT tool that was generated from USGS from data collected through project 41 and now the HRM approved project. It is the Department's desire to ultimately use Project 21 to create temporary voids of ravens for sage-grouse during sensitive times and to reverse the raven population growth curve.
Project Direction	Fund Project 21.

Proposed Budget

$3 Predator Fee	Pittman-Robertson	Total
$40,000	N/A	$40,000

Previous Budgets and Expenditures

Year	Budget Proposed	Expenditures
2008	$12,000	$12,000
2009	$17,475	$17,475
2010	$15,000	$14,298
2011	$16,261	$0
2012	$16,261	$9,842
2013	$60,000	$0
2014	$60,000	$0
2015	$60,000	$63,297
2016	$128,000	$72,710
2017	$103,000	$69,674
2018	$125,000	$55,846
2019	$125,000	$113,938
2020	$200,000	$25,518
2021	$175,000	$57,094
2022	$175,000	$36,517
2023	$175,000	$150,465
2024	$175,000	$221,216
2025	$175,000	$143,022
Average:	$100,722	$63,050
Total:	$1,812,997	$1,062,912

Expenditures were combined with Project 21 and previously funded 21-02. Heritage and upland gamebird stamps expenditures were not included.

Project 37: Big Game Protection-Mountain Lions

Justification	Predation issues frequently arise in a very short timeframe. By the time a project can be drafted, approved, and implemented, it may be too late to prevent or mitigate the predation issue. Removing mountain lions that prey on sensitive game populations quickly is a required tool to manage big game populations statewide.
Project Manager	Joe Bennett, Predator Management Staff Specialist, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Project Type	Implementation
Potentially Affected Species	Mountain lion, mule deer, bighorn sheep, antelope
Span More Than One Fiscal Year	Yes
Project Area	Statewide
Limiting Factor Statement	Mountain lions are known predators of bighorn sheep, mule deer and other big game species (Rominger et al. 2004). Though predation is a naturally occurring phenomenon for bighorn sheep and other big game, their populations can be lowered or suppressed by abiotic factors such as dry climate and loss of quality habitat. Mitigating abiotic factors by removing predators is imperative for some bighorn sheep populations to stabilize (Rominger 2007).
Response Variable	Measuring response variables are not a primary objective of this project. Response variables may include reduction of prey taken by mountain lions, removal of a mountain lion that was documented consuming the concerned big game species, or a reduction in mountain lion sign. Because of the quick nature of the project, there may be times when no response variable will be measured.
Project Goal	Remove specific, problematic mountain lions to benefit game species.
Habitat Conditions	Persistent drought, frequency and size of wildfires, extremely high numbers of wild and feral equids and human developments throughout Nevada have reduced herbaceous cover, lambing, and browsing habitat. These effects have reduced mule deer and other big game populations below population potential (Ballard et al. 2001).
Comments from FY 2025 Predator Report	NDOW supports continuing Project 37 for the protection of bighorn sheep, mule deer and pronghorn. NDOW supports the ability to remove mountain lions as deemed necessary with efficiency and expediency.
Methods	NDOW will specify locations of mountain lions that may be influencing local declines of sensitive game populations. Locations will be determined with GPS collar points, trail cameras, and discovered mountain lion kill sites. Removal

	efforts will be implemented when indices levels are reached, these include low annual adult survival rates, poor fall young:female ratios, spring young:female ratios, and low adult female annual survival rates (table 3). Staff and biologists will identify species of interest, species to be removed, measures and metrics, and metric thresholds. This information will be recorded on the Local Predator Removal Progress Form and included in the annual predator report. Project 37 will be used to decrease mountain lion densities immediately before a bighorn sheep translocation and be used to keep mountain lion densities decreased after new translocations or augmentations.
Anticipated Results	1. Lethal removal of individual, problematic mountain lions will provide a precise tool, protecting reintroduced and sensitive big game populations. 2. Implementation will occur in association with game populations that are sensitive (e.g., small in size, limited in distribution, in decline) and will benefit from rapid intervention from specific predation scenarios.
Staff Comment	Proactive mountain lion removal to assist struggling bighorn sheep populations is well documented within the scientific literature.
Project Direction	Fund Project 37.

Table 3. Indices used to initiate predator removal.

Species	Annual Adult Survival Rates	Fall Young: Female Ratios	Spring Young: Female Ratios	Adult Female Annual Survival Rates
California Bighorn Sheep	< 90%	< 40:100	--	--
Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep	< 90%	< 40:100	--	--
Desert Bighorn Sheep	< 90%	< 30:100	--	--
Mule Deer	--	--	< 35:100	< 80%
Pronghorn	< 90%	< 40:100	--	--

Budget

$3 Predator Fee	Pittman-Robertson	Total
$250,000	N/A	$250,000

Previous Budgets and Expenditures

Year	Budget Proposed	Expenditures
2016	$90,000	$26,670
2017	$125,000	$192,427
2018	$175,000	$175,217
2019	$50,000	$67,233
2020	$75,000	$71,465
2021	$75,000	$60,357
2022	$100,000	$52,764
2023	$100,000	$160,735
2024	150,000	$211,842
2025	$150,000	$224,603
Average:	$109,000	$119,054
Total:	$1,090,000	1,243,313

Project 38: Big Game Protection - Coyotes

Justification	Predation issues frequently arise in a very short timeframe. These occurrences often occur within a fiscal year, therefore by the time a project can be drafted, approved, and implemented, to prevent or mitigate the predation issue, it may be too late. Removing problematic coyotes quickly is a required tool to manage big game populations statewide.
Project Manager	Joe Bennett, Predator Management Staff Specialist, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Project Type	Implementation
Potentially Affected Species	Coyote, mule deer, antelope, Greater Sage-grouse
Span More Than One Fiscal Year	Yes
Project Area	Statewide
Limiting Factor Statement	Though predation is a naturally occurring phenomenon for mule deer and other big game, their populations can be lowered or suppressed by abiotic factors such as dry climate and loss of quality habitat. Predation from coyotes may further suppress these populations (Ballard et al. 2001).
Response Variable	Response variables may include reduction of prey taken by coyotes, removal of a coyote that was documented consuming the concerned big game species, or a reduction in coyote sign. Because of the quick nature of the project, there may be times when no response variable will be measured.
Project Goal	Conduct focused coyote removal to protect game species.
Habitat Conditions	Persistent drought combined with fires and human disturbances throughout Nevada have reduced herbaceous cover, lambing, and browsing habitat. These effects may have reduced mule deer and other big game populations below population potential. These effects may also be suppressing mule deer or big game populations below population potential (Ballard et al. 2001).
Comments from FY 2025 Predator Report	NDOW supports continuing Project 38.
Methods	USDA Wildlife Services and private contractors, working under direction of NDOW, will use foothold traps, snares, fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters for aerial gunning, calling and gunning from the ground to remove coyotes in sensitive areas during certain times of the year. Work will be implemented when

	indices levels are reached, these include low annual adult survival rates, poor fall young:female ratios, poor spring young:female ratios, and low adult female annual survival rates (table 3). Depending on the indices identified, standard to intermediate levels of monitoring will be implemented to determine the need for or effect of predator removal. These additional monitoring efforts may be conducted by NDOW employees, USDA Wildlife Services, or private contractors.
Anticipated Results	1. Removal of coyotes in winter range and fawning and lambing areas in certain situations will provide a valuable tool for managers. 2. Implementation will occur during times and locations where sensitive game species are adversely affected (e.g., local decline, reduced recruitment) based on the best available biological information.
Staff Comment	Proactive coyote removal to assist struggling pronghorn populations is well documented within the scientific literature.
Project Direction	Fund Project 38.

Table 3. Indices used to initiate predator removal.

Species	Annual Adult Survival Rates	Fall Young: Female Ratios	Spring Young: Female Ratios	Adult Female Annual Survival Rates
California Bighorn Sheep	< 90%	< 40:100	--	--
Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep	< 90%	< 40:100	--	--
Desert Bighorn Sheep	< 90%	< 30:100	--	--
Mule Deer	--	--	< 35:100	< 80%
Pronghorn	< 90%	< 40:100	--	--

Budget

$3 Predator Fee	Pittman-Robertson	Total
$100,000	N/A	$100,000

Previous Budgets and Expenditures

Year	Budget Proposed	Expenditures
2016	$90,000	$97,794
2017	$125,000	$135,507
2018	$175,000	$133,720
2019	$50,000	$50,569
2020	$75,000	$73,480
2021	$75,000	$60,905
2022	$100,000	$1,270
2023	$100,000	$150,757
2024	$100,000	$93,200
2025	$65,000	$2,145.46
Average:	$95,500	$79,934
Total:	$955,000	$799,347.46

Project 40: Coyote and Mountain Lion Removal to Complement Multi-faceted Management

Justification	The Department is proposing an intensive 4–year coyote control and mountain lion removal project in Management Area 13 to assist with fawn recruitment which has been below the threshold of 35 fawns per adults during the spring for an extended period. The MA13 deer herd has underperformed due to drought and increasing feral horse numbers within the Mokemoke Hills area in Hunt Unit 131.
Project Manager	Joe Bennett, Predator Management Staff Specialist, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Project Type	Implementation
Potentially Affected Species	Coyote, Greater Sage-grouse, mule deer, mountain lion
Span More Than One Fiscal Year	Yes
Project Area	MA 13
Limiting Factor Statement	Though predation is a naturally occurring phenomenon for mule deer and other big game, their populations can be reduced or suppressed by abiotic factors such as dry climate and loss of quality habitat, these populations can be suppressed by predation from coyotes (Ballard et al. 2001).
Response Variable	The response variable will be the fawn to doe ratios in Management Area 13. This ratio will be observed throughout the life of the project. The project will be altered or discontinued after three consecutive years of observed spring fawn:adult ratios averaging 50:100 or higher.
Project Goal	To increase mule deer and Greater Sage-grouse populations by removing coyotes and mountain lions.
Habitat Conditions	Persistent drought combined with fires and human disturbances throughout Nevada have reduced herbaceous cover, fawning, and browsing habitat. These effects may have reduced mule deer below population potential. These effects may also be suppressing mule deer below population potential (Ballard et al. 2001).
Comments from FY 2025 Predator Report	NDOW supports continuing Project 40 until mule deer populations reach levels defined in the annual Predator Plan.
Methods	USDA Wildlife Services and private contractors working under direction of NDOW will use foothold traps, snares, fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters for aerial gunning, and calling and gunning from the ground to remove coyotes and mountain lions in Management Area 13

Anticipated Result	Coyote and mountain lion removal will complement some of the habitat improvement work conducted by the U.S. Forest Service and Nevada Department of Wildlife within the White Pine Range/Mokemoke Hills complex which includes pinyon and juniper removal work and spring improvement/protection projects.
Staff Comment	The Department supports multi-faceted management projects such as Project 40.
Project Direction	Fund Project 40. Evaluate efficacy of Project 40 annually.

Additional Information

Spring fawn ratios in Management Area 13 have, like Management Area 14, averaged 37 fawns per 100 adults from 2023-2025. We recommend experimenting with intensive coyote and mountain lion control in Management Area 13 to benefit fawn recruitment and adult survival. Through project 38, the Department plans on implementing maintenance for Hunt Unit 144 in fiscal year 2027.

Budget

$3 Predator Fee	**Pittman-Robertson**	**Total**
$100,000	N/A	$100,000

Previous Budgets and Expenditures

Year	Budget Proposed	Expenditures
2016	$60,000	$36,402
2017	$100,000	$109,432
2018	$100,000	$110,960
2019	$100,000	$107,461
2020	$100,000	$83,213
2021	$100,000	$100,445
2022	$100,000	$97,251
2023	$150,000	$134,269
2024	$100,000	$76,973
2025	$65,000	$58,360
Average:	$97,500	$91,476
Total:	$975,000	$914,784

Project 43: Meso-predator removal to protect waterfowl and upland gamebirds on Wildlife Management Areas

Justification	Mesopredators including coyotes, striped skunks, and raccoons often consume waterfowl, quail, pheasant, and turkey eggs and broods. Consuming these eggs may limit fowl species population growth and could be causing declines of these populations at Mason Valley, Steptoe and Overton Wildlife Management Areas.
Project Manager	Isaac Metcalf, Adam Henriod and Bennie Vann, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Project Type	Implementation
Potentially Affected Species	Assorted waterfowl, turkey, pheasant, coyote, striped skunk, raccoon
Span More Than One Fiscal Year	Yes
Project Area	Mason Valley, Overton and Steptoe Wildlife Management Areas
Limiting Factor Statement	Though predation is a naturally occurring phenomenon for waterfowl and upland gamebirds, their populations can be lowed or suppressed by abiotic factors such as dry climate and loss of quality habitat.
Response Variable	The response variable for waterfowl, turkeys, quail species and pheasants will be the number of females with clutches, and the number of young per clutch.
Project Goals	To increase clutch size and survival of waterfowl and upland gamebirds (particularly turkey and quail species) on Mason Valley, Overton and Steptoe WMAs.
Habitat Conditions	Persistent drought throughout Nevada has reduced herbaceous cover, nesting, and browsing habitat.
Comments from FY 2025 Predator Report	NDOW recommends continuing project 43.
Methods	USDA Wildlife Services and private contractors working under direction of NDOW, will use foothold traps, snares, calling and gunning from the ground to remove coyotes, striped skunks, and raccoons during waterfowl, turkey, quail and pheasant nesting seasons.
Anticipated Results	1. Increase nest success of female turkeys, waterfowl, quail species and pheasants on Wildlife Management Areas. 2. Increase brood success of female turkeys, waterfowl, quail and pheasants that have clutches within or near Wildlife Management Areas.

	This project will be cancelled or altered once there are two consecutive three-year averages where: • The average hen turkey successfully raises 3 poults. • Area biologists and management area supervisors believe that quail and pheasants no longer need predator removal.
Staff Comment	Area managers have noticed a substantial increase in waterfowl nest success and an increase in clutch size since the inception of project 43.
Project Direction	Fund Project 43.

Budget

$3 Predator Fee	**Pittman-Robertson**	**Total**
$30,000	N/A	$30,000

Previous Budgets and Expenditures

Year	Budget Proposed	Expenditures
2017	$50,000	$42,246
2018	$50,000	$28,447
2019	$50,000	$38,038
2020	$50,000	$20,849
2021	$50,000	$17,350
2022	$50,000	$20,933
2023	$50,000	$22,282
2024	$50,000	$36,960
2025	$32,500	$5,805
Average:	$48,055	$25,878
Total:	$432,500	$232,910

Project 47: Mule Deer Enhancement Program Mule Deer Protection and Assessment

Justification	Many of the projects proposed by MDEP subcommittees are for areas of low densities of mule deer or where populations have trended downward and/or have remained suppressed for extended periods of time.
Project Manager	Joe Bennett: Predator Staff Specialist, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Project Type	Implementation
Potentially Affected Species	Mule deer, coyote, mountain lion
Span More Than One Fiscal Year	Yes
Project Area	Statewide
Limiting Factor Statement	Drought, fire, degraded habitat, and competition from feral horses may all be limiting factors. Predation and its interactions with these factors are the primary focus.
Response Variable	Fawn to adult ratios and adult survival in project areas.
Project Goals	1. Increase mule deer population numbers or minimize loss to mule deer populations. 2. Increase understanding of predator removal on mule deer populations.
Habitat Conditions	Persistent drought combined with fires and human disturbances throughout Nevada have reduced herbaceous cover, fawning or lambing, and browsing habitat. These effects may have reduced mule deer and other big game populations below population potential. These effects may also be suppressing mule deer or big game populations below population potential (Ballard et al. 2001).
Comments from FY 2025 Predator Report	NDOW recommends continuing project 47.
Methods	Underperforming mule deer populations will be identified by local mule deer enhancement program committees. NDOW staff, along with the mule deer oversight committee.

	1. Lion and coyote removal will be conducted in these areas that are identified through the Mule Deer Enhancement Process.
Staff Comment	Nevada Mule deer populations have declined overall over the last 20-30 years. Recent precipitation patterns have seen improved fawn recruitment the last three years. However, populations are below levels seen prior to 2019. Removal projects will contribute to higher annual adult survival and recruitment in these areas.
Project Direction	Fund Project 47

Budget

$3 Predator Fee	**Pittman-Robertson**	**Total**
$80,000	N/A	$80,000

Previous Budgets and Expenditures

Year	**Budget Proposed**	**Expenditures**
2025	$75,000	$70,537.35
Total:	$75,000	$70,537.35

Proposed Predator Management Budget for State Fiscal Year 2027

Project	Predator Fee	PR Funds	Total
Department of Agriculture Administrative Support Transfer[a]	$14,000	N/A	$14,000
Project 21: Greater Sage-Grouse Protection (Common Raven Removal)	$40,000	N/A	$40,000
Project 37: Big Game Protection-Mountain Lions	$250,000	N/A	$250,
Project 38: Big Game Protection-Coyotes	$100,000	N/A	$100,000
Project 40: Coyote and Mountain Lion Removal to Complement Multi-faceted Management in White Pine County	$100,000	N/A	$100,000
Project 43: Meso-predator Removal to Protect Waterfowl, Turkeys, and Pheasants on Wildlife Management Areas	$30,000	N/A	$30,000
Project 47: Mule Deer Enhancement Program Mule Deer Protection and Assessment	$80,000	NA	$80,000
Total[b]	**$614,000**	**$0**	**$614,000**

[a] This transfer of $3 game tag application fees for administrative support to the Department of Agriculture partially funds state personnel that conduct work for the benefit of wildlife at the direction of USDA Wildlife Services (e.g., mountain lion removal to benefit wildlife).
[b] The projects that contain lethal removal as a primary aspect, making them ineligible for Federal Aid funding.

Expected Revenues and Beginning Balance of $3 Game Tag Application Fee for Lethal Removal

	FY 2023 Actual	FY 2024 Actual	FY 2025 Actual	FY 2026 Projected	FY 2027 Estimated
Beginning balance	$930,654	$768,922	$326,650	$398,798	$486,798
Revenues	$944,410	$1,095,252	$1,138,260	$722,529	$722,529
Plan Budget	$1,159,000	$1,059,000	$1,028,500	$634,000	$614,000
Expenditures	$1,106,142	$1,164,413	$650,380	$634,000	$614,000
Ending balance	$768,922	$326,650	$398,798	$486,798	$595,327

Literature Cited

Abadi, F., O. Gimenez, R. Arlettaz, and M. Schaub. 2010. An assessment of integrated population models: bias, accuracy, and violation of the assumption of independence. Ecology 91:7–14.

Anderson, C. R., and F. G. Lindzey. 2005. Experimental evaluation of population trend and harvest composition in a Wyoming cougar population. Wildlife Society Bulletin 33:179–188.

Ballard, W. B., D. Lutz, T. W. Keegan, L. H. Carpenter, and J. C. deVos Jr. 2001. Deer-predator elationships: of recent North American studies with emphasis on mule and black-tailed deer. Wildlife Society Bulletin 29:99–115.

Beckmann, J. P., and J. Berger. 2003. Using black bears to test ideal-free distribution models experimentally. Journal of Mammalogy 84:594–606.

Boarman, W. I. 1993. When a native predator becomes a pest: a case study. Pages 191–206 *in* S. K. Majumdar, E. W. Miller, K. Brown, J. R. Pratt, and R. F. Schmalz, editors. Conservation and Resource Management. Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA.

Chandler, R. B., and J. D. Clark. 2014. Spatially explicit integrated population models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 5:1351–1360.

Coates, P. S., and D. J. Delehanty. 2010. Nest predation of Greater Sage-Grouse in relation to microhabitat factors and predators. Journal of Wildlife Management 74:240–248.

Coates, P. S., K. B. Howe, M. L. Casazza, and D. J. Delehanty. 2014. Common raven occurrence in relation to energy transmission line corridors transiting human-altered sagebrush steppe. Journal of Arid Environments 111:68–78.

Coates, P. S., J. O. Spencer Jr, and D. J. Delehanty. 2007. Efficacy of CPTH-treated egg baits for removing ravens. Human-Wildlife Conflicts 1:224–234.

Fieberg, J. R., K. W. Shertzer, P. B. Conn, K. V. Noyce, and D. L. Garshelis. 2010. Integrated opulation modeling of black bears in Minnesota: implications for monitoring and management. W. M. Getz, editor. PLoS ONE 5:e12114.

Grayson, D. K. 1993. The desert's past: a natural prehistory of the Great Basin. Thesis. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.,USA.

Kristan, W. B., and W. I. Boarman. 2003. Spatial pattern of risk of common raven predation on desert tortoises. Ecology 84:2432–2443.

Lackey, C. W., J. P. Beckmann, and J. Sedinger. 2013. Bear historical ranges revisited: Documenting the increase of a once-extirpated population in Nevada. Journal of Wildlife Management 77:812–820.

Luginbuhl, J. M., J. M. Marzluff, J. E. Bradley, M. G. Raphael, and D. E. Varland. 2001. Corvid survey techniques and the relationship between corvid relative abundance and nest predation. Journal of Field Ornithology 72:556–572.

Malaney, J. L., C. W. Lackey, J. P. Beckmann, and M. D. Matocq. 2017. Natural rewilding of the Great Basin: Genetic consequences of recolonization by black bears (*Ursus americanus*). Diversity and Distributions.

Morris, W. F., and D. F. Doak. 2002. Quantitative Conservation Biology. Sinaur Associates Inc.

O'Neil, S. T., P. S. Coates, B. E. Brussee, P. J. Jackson, K. B. Howe, A. M. Moser, L. J. Foster, and D. J. Delehanty. 2018. Broad-scale occurrence of a subsidized avian predator: reducing impacts of ravens on sage-grouse and other sensitive prey. Journal of Applied Ecology. <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1365-2664.13249>. Accessed 13 Aug 2018.

Ralph, C. J., S. Droege, and J. R. Sauer. 1995. Managing and monitoring birds using point counts: standards and applications. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station 161–168.

Rominger, E. M. 2007. Culling mountain lions to protect ungulate populations—some lives are more sacred than others. Page 186 *in*. Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. Volume 72. Wildlife Management Institute.

Rominger, E. M., H. A. Whitlaw, D. L. Weybright, W. C. Dunn, and W. B. Ballard. 2004. The influence of mountain lion predation on bighorn sheep translocations. Journal of Wildlife Management 68:993–999.

Sauer, J. R., J. E. Hines, J. Fallon, K. L. Pardieck, D. J. Ziolkowski Jr, and W. A. Link. 2011. The North American breeding bird survey, results and analysis 1966-2009. Version 3.23.2011 USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland, USA.