



STATE OF NEVADA  
**SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEM COUNCIL**  
201 South Roop Street, Suite 101  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5247  
Phone (775) 687-2000

**MINUTES**

**Date:** Thursday, February 22, 2024  
**Time:** 8:30 a.m.  
**Place:** DCNR Bonnie Room (First Floor)  
901 S Stewart St  
Carson City, NV 89701

**Microsoft Teams meeting**

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 270 044 596 68

Passcode: 6DLTKS

Download Teams | Join on the web

Or call in (audio only)

+1 775-321-6111,530340727# United States, Reno

Phone Conference ID: 530 340 727#

---

**Council Members Present:** Chris MacKenzie, Chair; Jake Tibbitts, Vice Chair; Bevan Lister, Steven Boies, William Molini, Sherman Swanson; Daphne Emm Hooper; Mathew Johns; Kyle Davis; James Settlemeyer, DCNR; Alan Jenne, NDOW; Justin Barrett, USFWS; Jon Stansfield, USFS; Jon Raby, BLM; Chris Rose, NRCS; JJ Goicoechea, NDA

**Council Members Absent:** None

**1 CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman MacKenzie called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**2 PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

*Public comment will be made on any matter relevant to the Council. Public comments will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting and may be taken at the discretion of the Chair on specific agenda items. Public comments may be limited to 3 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action will be taken on any matters raised during the public comment period that are not already on the agenda. Persons providing comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record.*

### 3 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\*

**\*ACTION:** Member Molini moved to approve the [agenda](#) for February 22, 2024; Member Johns seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### 4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\*

Approval of [minutes](#) from the meetings held on Tuesday, December 5, 2023 **\*ACTION:** Member Davis moved to approve the minutes for December 5, 2023, with the corrections mentioned to [item 6](#); Member Swanson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### 5 COUNCIL MEMBER ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

A. Council members may make comments at this time and the Program Manager will bring forward any pertinent correspondence directed to the Council.

- Member Davis asked for clarification regarding whether presentation materials for this meeting were posted Friday before the scheduled meeting? K. Steele responded that most items were posted on Friday and the rest as they came in.
- Vice Chair Tibbitts brought to the attention of the group that USFWS has a comment period open until February 29th for the review and comments regarding Raven Permits and that this committee should consider weighing in. K. Steele will address and follow up with submittal of comments and place this on item 11A for further agenda item.
- K. Steele reminded members that they are fully staffed now and she has two new hires that were not at last meeting here to introduce themselves. Sarah Hale who is hired as Nevada Division of State Lands staff and Skyler Monaghan who is hired as Nevada Division of Agriculture staff.

### 6 SUSTAINING LAND AND WILD AND FREE-ROAMING HORSE, AND BURRO HEALTH

– *Sherm Swanson, UNR: AVRS & UNCE*

Presentation on [Healthy Nevada Lands](#) and [Western Lands](#) handout presented to the group by Member Swanson and available via highlighted links above. Since this is an informational item questions only open to board members. A time for public comment and questions will be allowed under agenda item 7.

Member Molini stated what an excellent presentation this was. J. Barrett (USFWS) wanted to point out that everyone realized that Nevada is the driest State in the Nation, water resources in Nevada are incredibly precise and are susceptible to overuse, there is a huge biodiversity across the State. A wide range of species, not just horses, are dependent upon aquatic-like habitats and when these areas are overused or unmanaged there is a breaking point. Member Lister followed up in agreement commenting on the tremendous importance of the instruction given on how our habitats and animals work together and the importance of keeping those habitats healthy. J. Raby just echoed the previous comments on the thoroughness and the science that went into that preparation. This has been very informative to the BLM as we look at multiuse of lands not just in Nevada but across the Nation. It is certainly a body of work that helps us when looking at our landscape level, ecosystem management multiple use sustained yield objectives. Getting that scientific basis, the background, and how connected the presentation showed every aspect of the landscape we work in to be, between the aquatic riparian and terrestrial systems. I am hopeful this can help with further conversations on mutual solutions that can get us to healthy herds and a healthy landscape. Member Boies echoed appreciation for this presentation and that he is here representing the ranching industry and public land grazers. I must also commend BLM for their efforts in the last few years in trying to control the populations of the horses. I've spent my life watching the horses and grew up around horses and don't appreciate being painted as someone who is anti-horse. I am very aware of what happens out there and am very aware if we don't control those numbers the permittees are probably be impacted more than other users financially. I don't know how anyone would not want to do what is right for the land, the resources, the wildlife, and most of all the horses. I just want to commend Sherm for the presentation and BLM for the efforts and hope we can support that going forward.

## 7 DISCUSSION OF THE WILD HORSE AND BURRO [LETTER](#) FROM THE COALITION FOR HEALTHY NEVADA LANDS, WILDLIFE AND FREE-ROAMING HORSES - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\* SEP Staff

Chair MacKenzie introduced item 7 and stated that this letter was presented at the previous meeting, and we have placed it on the agenda for action to be taken by the board. We have received many letters against the Coalition letter and in support of wild horses and burros. They have been submitted to the record and are listed on the website and linked below, but he will also name each public member for recognition and then move to anyone wanting to make further comments. Each person is limited to three minutes.

- Katrina Cantwell gave verbal statement in person which can be heard on the recording at 1:26:13
- Monica Ross gave verbal statement in person which can be heard on the recording at 1:29:22
- Tracey Wilson gave verbal statement in person which can be heard on the recording at 1:30:28
- Greg Hendricks gave verbal statement in person which can be heard on the recording at 1:40:48
- Casey Kern gave verbal statement via online which can be heard on the recording at 1:45:12
- Betty Sabo gave verbal statement via online which can be heard on the recording at 1:52:13
- Eric Molvar gave verbal statement via online which can be heard on the recording at 1:54:22
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter C Borkowski](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter L Dalton](#)
- Taunee Jensen submitted, and self-read into the record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter T Jensen](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter AM Damas](#)
- Craig Downer submitted, and self-read letter into the record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter C Downer](#)
- Robin Orloff submitted, and self-read letter into the record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter R Orloff](#)
- Laura Fuson submitted, and self-read letter into the record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter L Fuson](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter D McBride](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter A Boustred](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter G Hazelhofer](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter JD Winston](#)
- Lorna Moffat submitted, and self-read letter into record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter L Moffat](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter A Gogny](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter J Ghorso](#)
- Bryan Rosen submitted, and self-read letter into the record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter B Rosen](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter B Warner](#)
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter S Roy](#)
- Andrea Lonseth submitted, and self-read letter into the record:
- [Wild Horse and Burro Support Letter A Lonseth](#)

**\*ACTION:** Member Lister motioned to accept the letter and send it forward, seconded by Member Davis. Discussion was had by Member Davis, Member Lister, Member Molini and Chair MacKenzie. After discussion the motion passed unanimously. Break; returned to the recording at 2:21:50.

## 8 DISCUSSION OF THE SEC BEING A COOPERATING AGENCY, POSSIBLE ACTION TO ASK BLM TO ALLOW SEC TO BE A COOPERATING AGENCY - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\* *Nicole Ting, DAG*

Chair MacKenzie opened discussion of item 8 and asked DAG Nicole Ting to start discussion. N. Ting started by giving the definition of what a cooperating agency is under Federal Regulations. 40 CFR 1508.5 defines a “cooperating agency” as any Federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or project alternative. A State or local agency of similar qualifications or, when the effects are on lands of tribal interest, a Native American tribe may, by agreement with the lead agencies, also become a cooperating agency. N. Ting’s recommendations are to first decide as a group whether you want to ask for or be a cooperating agency if so, a motion would be appropriate. Then as a council a formal letter of communication to BLM asking for an invitation to participate as a CA, then revisit and analyze the BLM response. Chair MacKenzie followed up with the background of the informal discussion of which this council should be a CA that can comment of deeper matters and be brought into confidential information that is presented to CAs to provide input through that process. Our SETT is already a CA, so the question is do we want to become a CA beyond the SETT? Chair MacKenzie stated what was said earlier that BLM looked at the council as an advisory committee and J. Raby stated for the record, that characterization does not reflect the BLM’s view of this council. Member Emm Hooper asked if the board is not considered a CA what mechanism is in place to allow discussion or input to the committee that is an CA? How does this board get to contribute to that conversation? K. Steele stated as it stands now DCNR is the CA that pushes the authority to the SETT as the resource experts who then bring important topics and issues to the council once it is open for public comment. Member Emm Hooper followed up with the question of how we know if this is being done in a timely manner, with respect to us having information to provide meaningful comments? K. Steele stated that a summary of all items is always provided at each meeting. Member Tibbitts referred to looking at existing CAs throughout the West on this effort, there are Conservation Commissions from Colorado and Wyoming, there are oil and gas Conservation Commissions from Wyoming that are all similar type bodies that are CAs and are at the table. Requirements under NRS state the council shall establish and carryout strategies for the conservation of Sage Grouse and Sagebrush ecosystems in this state. We are 85% BLM managed land. This land use planning amendment affects 85% or more Sage Grouse habit in the land. I don’t see how we can meet our role without being a CA. It talks about coordinating and facilitating discussions among persons, Federal and State agencies concerning the maintenance of Sagebrush ecosystems, how can we do that as a body where that is our statutory responsibility without being an CA? Third, not saying it must be as in-depth involvement as the SETT, and I acknowledge they are doing a great job representing the States’ interest, but there is much more than just the technical side of some of these discussions with BLM. There are policy considerations which are under this body that is something the SETT is not over; they are over the science and technical issues. An MOU with the agency defines what level of involvement we would have. I think this body could be a CA with a refined role in how we participate in that process, may not be the extreme detail the SETT is involved in but a more refined role so we can have some of those deliberative and pre-decisional discussions that are intended. This is to help the process move along and can be defined in the MOU that is establishing us as a CA. That way when there are all these administrative drafts that are being reviewed all the time, we can see what all the SETT or the Department or other agencies are saying on behalf of the State of Nevada. This is the body that is over this issue, and we should get to preview that and weigh in on it if it’s allowed under the open meeting law exceptions and allowed under the Federal Regulations. I really push for us to be an CA in a refined role so that we can have those important conversations that we are currently missing out on. Member Johns followed up on what M. Tibbitts just stated, from membership of the council members, how would that refined role look, especially for those members that represent projects that are being developed on Federal Land. Are we looking at more policy level type EAs and resource plans? Where is the fine line of conflict of interest? Member Lister fully concurs with what Member Tibbitts stated and each one is case by case. Member Tibbitts responded to Member Johns that you are bound to distill the Federal requirements of non-disclosure of the pre-decisional and deliberative information, as a council member you would be bound to that, and disclosure of conflict and ethical rules surrounding all our individual participation. Conversation continued between members regarding the Open Meeting Law and how it would pertain. N. Ting agreed that moving forward with the letter ask to BLM would be her recommendation to proceed and then followed up to the other discussion with the Open Meeting Law exception NRS 241.028, this exception to Open Meeting Law only occurs during the period before the Federal Agency publicly releases the document

addressing the action under the NEPA and begins the corresponding public comment period. It is also to just discuss things within the MOU, it is an Open Meeting Law exception however, it is narrow. More discussion between Member Molini, JJ. Goicoechea, Member Tibbitts and Member Davis regarding the definition of a CA and NRS 501.181 regarding NDOW.

**\*ACTION:** Member Davis motioned that we direct our staff to research and explore various agency interactions with BLM under this process and then draft and send a letter to BLM requesting an invitation for the SEC to become a Cooperating Agency, seconded by Member Tibbitts. Discussion was Member Johns, N. Ting, JJ. Goicoechea, Member Davis and Member Swanson. After discussion the motion passed unanimously. K. Steele will draft a letter to request an invitation to participate from BLM for approval by the council at the next meeting.

**9 REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE ADDITION TO NRS 232.162 REGARDING THE ABILITY TO ADOPT REGULATIONS TO COLLECT PROPOSED FEES AND PENALTIES; REVIEW PROPOSED OUTLINE FOR PROPOSED FEES AND PENALTIES - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\* SEP Staff-Kathleen Steele**

PowerPoint [Fees and Penalties Discussion](#) was presented by K. Steele. Topics outlined were the history, the need, the conceptual authority ([NRS 321.594 & NRS 232.162](#)) and the decisions to move forward. Questions from Member Davis were directed at NRS 701.600; regarding the staff costs to review individual projects as they come in is funded through the General Fund allocation we currently get. He also questioned the needs slide, where the added fee structure to push for hiring outside of the State, is that to hire additional consulting capacity? K. Steele answered that is correct, hopeful this will mitigate the number of times the project comes back with adjustments needing to be rerun by the SETT, and will incentivize proponents to consult a consultant or verifier instead of us. N. Ting provided a further analysis of our legal authorities and the differences between Statues, NRS, and Regulations. Further directions regarding fees and costs must have specific statutory authority and NRS 232.162 limits the recovery of costs. Any fees and costs would have to be put into regulation, not statue, and would have to be very narrowly tailored under energy development projects pursuant to NRS 701.600 to 701.640. Discussions by Members continued regarding what the statue really says versus its intent and the discussions of what is asking too much. Member Davis stated that if we are only asking for an increase in the General Fund budget then it is helpful to have a mechanism of "self-help" of other ways to generate revenue within the Council. Discussion continued regarding whether we should look at NRS or NAC changes moving forward and that these fees would be for over and above staff's normal job duties to incentivize cleaner projects but not to lose overall funds due to the ask. Mentions of whether this should be a structure change ask more than a fee structure ask were discussed by members and the potential ask for more staff. J. Settelmeyer mentioned that a letter sent to the Administration from the Council asking for the need, and/or changes, would be a good backing when the ask is brought forward. N. Ting proceeded with the explanation that when sent over to LCB they can assist with the regulation process within your statutory authority and the steps of the process whether we want to do temporary or permanent changes. Member Tibbitts also suggested an option to address the "need" to add in a fee structure to allow the collection of a set cost for smaller credit amounts to be compiled to fund a bigger more impactful project; NAC does allow either transferring of credits to offset the debits or developing a standalone mitigation plan with the SETT. For the short-term without a change, with the guidance from this body we may be able to push some of those smaller projects to the larger landscape projects. K. Steele explained the intent of the stand-alone mitigation plan as it is written now and that is a great point Member Tibbitts has made.

**\*ACTION:** Member Molini motioned to direct staff to request or consult with Attorney General's office regarding authority, if so, makes the recommendation to start the process to make the changes to NAC to accomplish the objective, seconded by Member Swanson. Discussion from Member Davis asking that once authority is drafted that council be able to discuss before a formal workshop is held whether in person or via zoom. After discussion the motion passed unanimously.

**10 REVIEW THE UPDATED SCIENCE AND THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT TO THE CONSERVATION CREDIT SYSTEM'S GRSG HABITAT MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES. CONSIDER FOR ADOPTION PROPOSED UPDATED HABITAT MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\*** *SEP Staff-Kathleen Steele*  
PowerPoint [HMA Update](#) and [HMA Maps](#) was presented by K. Steele. The use of maps as a tool prior to finalization was discussed continually by members and can be followed by listening to the recorded meeting starting at 38:07. Public [Comment](#) was submitted in regard to item # 10 by J Drew

**\*ACTION:** Member Lister motioned to table the adoption of the map and revisit when USGS has made final, seconded by Member Davis. Discussion to address previous concerns and how no action would affect the SETT was continued by D. Etchegoyhen, K. Steele, Member Davis, Member Tibbitts, J. Raby, and a call for the question from Member Molini. K. Steele mentioned that the fully vetted maps are set to be final potentially by March 15, 2024. After discussion the motion passed unanimously.

**11 REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED DURING THIS MEETING AND SCHEDULING NEXT SEC MEETING - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\*** *SEP staff – Kathleen Steele*

A. With staff assistance, the Council will review items discussed, as well as items acted upon during this meeting, and determine which of those they wish to direct staff to do further work on, as well as which items the Council wishes to act on that may not have been acted upon during earlier discussion.

- Update: the Greater Sage Grouse Plan from BLM should become public mid-March and they will be holding public meetings across the State to discuss the ARMPA. K. Steele will send out prior to the meeting to have members bring questions, comments, and concerns to the next meeting.
- Raven EA was published January 24<sup>th</sup> with a 30-day comment period, do we want to review the EA and put together comments and/or approval? Due to the time restraints we as a council do not have time but the SETT will be submitting comments. J. Barrett pointed out the 3 alternatives being considered, the intent is to raise the allowable take of Ravens being 1-no action (currently 5,000), 2-increase 11,000 (preferred based on 2013 Model), 3-just over 19,000. Member Tibbitts reminded the council that this board is already acting in this matter and that there is also recent legislation requesting targeted take. As a council we have already gone on record as to our position and I think that can be taken into consideration to draft comments to be submitted.  
**\*ACTION:** Staff will take in comments and actions from previous council meetings and discussions and submit a letter on behalf of the council along with the SETT comments.
- Item # 8 create letter to submit to BLM to be considered a Cooperating Agency, bring research and data back to next meeting.
- Bring back item # 10 if maps are final

B. Determination of any specific items the Council would like to work on at their next regularly scheduled Council meeting.

- Nevada Native Seed Partnership –NDA Presentation
- Western Solar Impact –BLM Presentation
- Bistate use CCS to mitigate

C. Scheduling of the next Council meeting date, time, and place.

- April 19, 2024 - location TBD.
- Members Boies and Lister have waived payment for meeting fees to be able to meet in person.

## 12 FEDERAL AGENCY UPDATES AND COMMENTS:

### A. US Fish and Wildlife Service – Justin Barrett

- A few listing updates: petitioned to list the Carson Valley Monkey flower found in Carson City, Lyon, and Douglas Counties in Nevada, as well as Alpine County in California. Tecopa Bird's-beak is found in Esmerelda and Nye Counties in Nevada and Inyo County in California. Starting the 12-month listing decision for several species. We have already discussed Raven EA. Our Field Supervisor position that has been vacant is open again and will be closing on the 26th.

### B. Bureau of Land Management – Jon Raby

- Nevada Resource Management Plan, we have been doing baseline inventories and updates including evaluations for the 9 of the 12 existing resource management plans. Only considering doing the amendment because of the vintage of our RMPs (oldest vintage mid 1980's-newest vintage early 2000's).
- National Western Solar PEIS, held a public meeting last week in Las Vegas, mid-April is the timeframe for submitting comments for that. We will give a presentation at the next meeting with areas preferred for development and areas unavailable for development.
- Wild Horse and Burro update as of today we have gathered nearly 6400 animals, removed nearly 6000. Have treated nearly 300 mares with fertility control. Two upcoming gatherings: 1-Blue Wing Complex looking to remove nearly 1300 horses and 350 burros; 2-Triple B Complex looking to remove nearly 2300 horses. Fertility control work with Wildlife Services is ongoing at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center, it does look promising.
- This year we are looking at implementing right around 270,000 acres of fuels treatments near or adjacent to Sage Grouse habitat for protection of these core areas. Last year in 2023 we did 212,000 acres and nearly 75% of that had a Sage Grouse habitat restoration or protection focus.

### C. US Forest Service – Jon Stansfield introduction of his self to the council and is open for questions.

- D. Etchegohyen asked about the announcement of the 500 million specifically for wildfire resilience, we understand that maybe 19 million would come to Nevada, do you have any news on how those dollars can be used in Nevada? J. Stansfield responded that right now we have received 27 million, half of our ask but a sustainable sum of money. Between going out right away with contracts to do work as part of our wildlife crisis landscape, which is the Sierra Front and what we call the Elko Front over the westside of the Rubies, are intentions is contracts and to continue to work with our state partners; NDF, NDOW, and DOA in the agreements we created last year. That is really the plan, to continue the great work we had from last year.

### D. USDA – Natural Resources Conservation Service – Chris Rose submitted updates via email.

- NRCS is currently working on a new commitment letter for the Bi-state sage grouse. It will update the information contained in the 2018 letter.
- Kaelie Pena has accepted the position of Intermountain West Joint Venture (IWJV) coordinator and will be reporting to Nevada full time in March. She recently worked on the Salmon-Challis NF in Idaho as a rangeland management specialist and has a Bachelor of Science in Rangeland Resource Science with minors in Ecological Restoration and Fire Ecology from Humboldt State University and is currently working towards a M.S. in Environmental Science through University of Idaho. She also has some connections to Nevada having worked for the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest's Bridgeport Ranger District. The coordinator position was funded through an agreement between the Intermountain West Joint Venture and NRCS. The role of the coordinator is to expand partnership opportunities, work with other IWJV positions throughout the state and find resources that can be used to put conservation on the ground. She can be reached at [kpena@pheasantsforever.org](mailto:kpena@pheasantsforever.org).

- NRCS staff has been working with the SETT on the development of a brochure that talks about how NRCS programs and the Credit Conservation System can complement each other and what benefits are available for using one system over another.
- Over the past several months, NRCS has been working to inform people about using the EQIP program to accomplish conservation on public lands. The basic requirements for an applicant are they be an agricultural producer, have a BLM or Forest Service grazing permit, and have a resource concern that needs to be addressed. Anyone interested in learning more should contact their local NRCS office. A map with office contacts can be found at <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/conservation-basics/conservation-by-state/nevada>
- March 29, 2024 - Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) EQIP is a voluntary, financial and technical assistance program providing funding to agricultural producers and non-industrial forest managers to address natural resource concerns and deliver environmental benefits such as improved water and air quality, conservation of ground and surface water, increased soil health and reduced soil erosion and sedimentation, improved or created wildlife habitat, and mitigation against drought and increasing weather volatility. EQIP funding can be used on private and public land. Higher payment rates and other options are available for underserved producers including socially disadvantaged, beginning, veteran and limited resource farmers and ranchers.
- March 29, 2024 - Agricultural Management Assistance (AMA) AMA program funds help producers use conservation to construct or improve watershed management structures or irrigation structures, install high tunnels, plant trees to form windbreaks or improve water quality. AMA funding can also mitigate financial risk through production or marketing diversification, or the implementation of resource conservation practices including soil erosion control or integrated pest management.
- April 5, 2024 - Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) CSP is for all private working lands and agricultural land under jurisdiction of a tribe. This program provides annual payments for meeting certain benchmarks in the management of the land. Additional payments are earned by agreeing to complete enhancements to the land. On-farm benefits include increased crop yields, decreased inputs, wildlife habitat improvements, and better resilience to weather variables.

E. Other

**13 STATE AGENCY UPDATES AND COMMENTS:**

A. Office of the Governor – *None in attendance*

B. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources – *Dominique Etchegoyhen*

- NDF transition with number of inmates used in the Conservation Camps Program, they provide the bulk/brunt of work we do in fighting fire and restoring landscapes. We got Legislative approval during the last Session to take several of our crew bosses and crew supervisors and reclassify those to firefighters. We still have a lot of positions to hire but is looking promising with a lot more local success with the Marlette Crew and the work they have been able to do in the Sierra Front.
- We received 25 million through ARPA specifically being used to buy and retire water rights, we had three programs that were funded.
- NDEP Supplemental Environmental Improvement Project accounts for which we have placed fees from past water and or air violations. We have found two old settlement agreements that were specific to Humbolt, Pershing, and Elko counties to be used on private Sage Grouse habitat that was impacted by wildfire, so our teams have been looking how we can use those monies effectively, for example the Cheatgrass Initiative and Humbolt County projects we are working on. I will have updates at the next meeting.



C. Department of Wildlife – Mark Freese

- Tech review program is continuing to review some of the large planning documents we have been discussing today, the Sage Grouse RMP amendments, the Solar PEIS and localized projects.
- Restoration Rehabilitation Front: Wildfire rehab with BLM and other partners, over 90,000 acres of treatments this year; over 10,000 acres of Pinyon/Juniper removal; over 330 acres of Spring enhancement projects.

D. Department of Agriculture – no comments

E. Other – Justin Barrett

- Just a reminder that we are still working on a distinct decision on Bistate Sage Grouse

**14 PUBLIC COMMENT**

Comment mentioned online in chat from Floyd Rathbun: Item 10 --- please discuss including Nevada portion of Bi-State sage grouse area in Nevada Conservation Credit program.

*Public comment will be made on any matter relevant to the Council. Public comments will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting and may be taken at the discretion of the Chair on specific agenda items. Public comments may be limited to 3 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action will be taken on any matters raised during the public comment period that are not already on the agenda. Persons providing comments will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record. No public comment.*

**15 ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman MacKenzie adjourned the meeting at 1:49 pm.

All details not covered in these minutes can be heard on the meeting recording at <https://sagebrusheco.nv.gov/Meetings/Meetings/>.