

Sagebrush Ecosystem Program

201 Roop Street, Suite 101
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Telephone (775) 684-8600
Facsimile (775) 684-8604

www.sagebrusheco.nv.gov



Kelly McGowan, Program Manager
Daniel Huser, Forestry
Katie Andrle, Wildlife

STATE OF NEVADA
Sagebrush Ecosystem Program

SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEM COUNCIL
STAFF REPORT
MEETING DATE: September 14, 2017

DATE: September 13, 2017
TO: Sagebrush Ecosystem Council Members
FROM: Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team
Kelly McGowan: kmcgowan@sagebrusheco.nv.gov
Katie Andrle: kandrle@sagebrusheco.nv.gov
Daniel Huser: dhuser@sagebrusheco.nv.gov
Telephone: 775-684-8600
SUBJECT: Staff reviews of S.O. 3353, Response, and the State's feedback to the Sage-Grouse Task Force

SUMMARY

The purpose of this item is to provide the SEC with an overview of outstanding items where inconsistencies or discrepancies exist between the Order or Response and the State Plan.

PREVIOUS ACTION

Ms. Pam Robinson, Office of the Governor, provided an update to the SEC at their August 13, 2017 meeting relating to the State's actions and response to Secretarial Order 3353. She related that the State has participated in several federal Review Team meetings to present the State's concerns. Ms. Robinson expressed to the SEC the need for each member to collaborate with their constituents in order to provide additional guidance from the State's perspective.

BACKGROUND

On June 19, 2015 the SEC met to finalize their recommendations to the Governor's Consistency Review of the Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/FEIS. The Governor's Consistency Review is intended to allow the Governor to identify, provide recommendations, and if possible, work to resolve inconsistencies between the LUPA/FEIS and State or local plan, policies, or programs.

In June, 2017 the staff of the Governor's Office, BLM State Office, and USFS State Office reviewed the comments submitted during the Governor's Consistency Review

and revisited the Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment (ARMPA) and the State Plan to discuss and outline the significant differences within each of the Plans.

These documented inconsistencies were submitted to the DOI Sage-Grouse Review Team (DOI Team) and incorporated into the “Report in Response to Secretarial Order 3353” dated August 4, 2017.

ADDITIONAL SETT REVIEW

Inconsistencies between the State of Nevada and Federal Plans that were identified within the recent Consistency Review submitted to the Sage Grouse Task Force, but were not included within or appear to be insufficiently covered in the Sage Grouse Task Force Response (Response) to Secretary Zinke.

- Disturbance Caps
 - If fully implemented on all anthropogenic disturbances, the Nevada Conservation Credit System (CCS) would likely adequately address net conservation gain.
- Exclusion/Closed Land Use Plan Allocations
 - If fully implemented on all anthropogenic disturbances the CCS would likely adequately address net conservation gain.
- Mitigation and Consistent Sage Grouse Habitat Baseline Conditions – is covered in the Response but very open-ended.
 - All mitigation should use consistent metrics that are science based and equally rigorous to that of the CCS, to quantify both baseline disturbance and mitigation to achieve net conservation gain.
- Wild Horse and Burro Management – is covered within the Response in Appendix E despite its importance to the State of Nevada.
 - The State Plan encourages the BLM and Forest Service to implement the wild horse and burro management actions set forth in the ARMPA, consistent with the Wild Horses and Burros Act.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: SETT review of literature referencing Captive Breeding, Predator Control, Triggers, Population Targets, and Hunting.