



STATE OF NEVADA  
**SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEM COUNCIL**  
201 South Roop Street, Suite 101  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5247  
Phone (775) 684-8600 - Fax (775) 684-8604

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**Date:** Tuesday, July 17, 2018  
**Time:** 8:30 a.m.  
**Place:** Nevada Legislature – Room 4100  
401 South Carson Street, Carson City, NV 89701

A full audio recording of this meeting is accessible through the following website  
[http://sagebrusheco.nv.gov/Meetings/Sagebrush Ecosystem Council Meeting/](http://sagebrusheco.nv.gov/Meetings/Sagebrush_Ecosystem_Council_Meeting/)

---

**Council Member Present:** J.J. Goicoechea, Chris MacKenzie, Allen Biaggi, Steven Boies, Bevan Lister, William Molini, Sherman Swanson, Cheva Gabor for Bill Dunkelberger, Carolyn Swed, Mike Courtney, Ray Dotson, Brad Crowell, Meghan Brown for Jerri Williams-Conrad

**Council Members Absent:** Gerry Emm, Starla Lacy, Bill Dunkelberger, Jim Barbee

Prior to the call to order, Kelly McGowan, Program Manager for the Sagebrush Ecosystem Program and Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Director Brad Crowell signed an agreement with Newmont Mining Corporation to protect sage-grouse habitat at Newmont's West IL Ranch. Newmont was recognized for their commitment to protecting sage-grouse habitat through Nevada's new Conservation Credit System.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman J.J. Goicoechea called the meeting to order at 8:37 a.m.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau, made comments related to adaptive management activities (agenda item 9) and updates to the Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (agenda item 11). Mr. Busselman recommended adding information related fuel loading into Table 4.1 of the Conservation Plan to proactively address adaptive management activities. He noted that the table describes ideal conditions, but falls short of proactively addressing resource management.

Jeremy Drew, Project Manager for RCI, represented Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) in expressing support for the proposed adaptive management process. Mr. Drew provided three minor recommendations for the Council's consideration: 1) include local partners in Step 1; 2) add HMA boundaries in Figure 2; and 3) clarify how issues get resolved at the adaptive management working group level when consensus can't be reached.

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

Approval of agenda for July 17, 2018 – Member Biaggi moved to approve the agenda; seconded by Member MacKenzie; motion passed unanimously. **\*ACTION**

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

Approval of minutes from the meeting held on May 18, 2018 – Mr. Courtney noted that Marci Todd was present during the last meeting. Member Biaggi moved to approve the minutes of May 18, 2018; seconded by Member Molini; Motion passed; Chairman Goicoechea abstained. **\*ACTION**

**5. COUNCIL MEMBER ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

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

There were no member comments.

**6. OVERVIEW OF MARTIN FIRE FROM A FIRE RESOURCES STANDPOINT AND A SAGE-GROUSE, HABITAT, AND CCS PERSPECTIVE - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

John Christopherson, Deputy Administrator for Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) provided the council with an overview of Nevada's fire season to-date and referred to a document titled, "Great Basin Coordination Center: 2018 Year-to-Date Fires and Acres by State" (a copy is located on the Program's website). He noted that 75% of fires to date have been human-caused, which is consistent with past years. He noted that at this point in the fire season there is likely to be an increase of lightning-caused fires.

Mr. Christopherson referred to a Fuel and Fire Advisory issued on July 5, 2018, specifically noting the large volume of cheatgrass. He informed the council that the fuel moisture for sagebrush is down nearly 80%, which is a significant contribution in fire spread and the resistance to control fire spread. He noted these circumstances contribute to rapid rates of spread, longer burn periods, and fire retardant resistant conditions.

Member Swanson inquired about past fire season fuel data and management options. Discussion ensued pertaining to fuel load, vegetation management options, and fire retardant resistant conditions. Chair Goicoechea added that additional grazing was requested over the past two years for areas that were burned by the Martin Fire, but the requests were denied.

Member Courtney mentioned that a report compiled in the mid-2000's on the Murphy Fire addresses fuel loads. He noted that it is a challenge for BLM to be nimble and flexible with the management of grazing preferences in accordance with fuel loads. He noted that BLM has limited management tools that entail a lengthy NEPA process. Chair Goicoechea suggested addressing the NEPA issue in the adaptive management portion of the Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan. Member Courtney stressed the need to include site-specific information in the plan. Further discussion ensued amongst the Council related to the utilization of grazing to reduce fuel load.

Mr. Christopherson referred to the [Martin Fire Progression Map](#), a copy of which is located on the Program's website. Mr. Christopherson noted that due to the dryness and volume of the fuels in conjunction with weather conditions, it was difficult to contain the fire spread in the Martin Fire. Mr. Christopherson explained that aviation resources dropped water on the fire, followed by fire retardant – at that point dozers were able to get close enough to the fire's edge to put in line. Once a dozer line is in place, ground crews go in and make sure the line holds. He noted that these were extraordinary firefighting tactics that were required given the extreme fire behavior. Mr. Christopherson also noted that due to the compressed nature of fine fuels on the ground, fire was able to creep underneath fire retardant making control difficult.

Member Courtney affirmed that there will be an after action report on the Martin Fire. Meghan Brown, with the Nevada Department of Agriculture, noted the importance of communication with private land owners and suggested including private land analysis in the after-action report.

Mr. Christopherson discussed the management of the Martin Fire, noting that management strategies were deployed to protect as much sagebrush habitat as possible.

Mr. Dan Huser, NDF representative on the Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team (SETT), reviewed a PowerPoint presentation titled, "[The Martin Fire, Habitat, and Greater Sage-Grouse](#)," a copy of which is located on the Program's website. Mr. Huser discussed the geographical perspective of the Martin Fire, revealing that the Martin Fire burned 0.6% of Nevada as a whole, and burned 1.6% of the greater sage-grouse habitat footprint within Nevada. Mr. Huser noted that much of the area burned had not seen wildfire in a hundred years or so. He also discussed the land ownership within the fire footprint, the grazing allotments impacted, how CCS credit projects fared in the vicinity of the fire, as well as the low resistance and resilience of the area burned, which was going to make for challenging rehabilitation efforts. He also noted that a total of 47 leks were impacted by the fire. Sean Espinosa, Nevada Department of Wildlife, explained that after leks are burned birds go back and attend leks for about 3 years often with diminishing returns. If the habitat converts to cheatgrass over that period of time, birds tend to stop attending leks altogether.

Member Courtney provided remarks pertaining to the rehabilitation process, including burn severity assessment and reviewing previous status of plant communities. He noted that the rehab plan will take approximately four or five years based on the size of the fire. Member Courtney noted that he can provide a more comprehensive report at the next meeting.

The council had further discussion, questions, and concerns regarding impacted BSUs, cheatgrass grazing, critical habitat, and rehabilitation, which are captured in the [audio recording](#) located on the Program's website. **\*NO ACTION**

## **7. BARRICK NEVADA SAGE-GROUSE BANK ENABLING AGREEMENT. OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL USED MITIGATE IMPACTS TO SAGE-GROUSE HABITATS - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Prior to Barrick's presentation, Mr. Kelly McGowan pointed out that the two mitigation systems, the Conservation Credit System (CCS) and Barrick Bank Enabling Agreement, have some similarities and also some differences. He noted that each system calculates functional acres differently and mentioned to the Council that some of their concepts and rationale in projecting outcomes from conservation efforts could potentially be incorporated into the CCS.

Gail Ross, Barrick Gold Corporation, provided background remarks on the Barrick Bank Enabling Agreement. She noted that the Bank Enabling Agreement (BEA) is a voluntary agreement reached by Barrick and the U.S. Department of the Interior to mitigate for loss of sage-grouse habitat within the Barrick Nevada Sage-Grouse Bank.

Ms. Liz Munn, The Nature Conservancy, reviewed a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Barrick Gold and TNC on Barrick Enabling Agreement: Sage-Grouse Conservation Forecasting," a copy is located on the Program's website. Ms. Munn stated that the key questions the TNC seeks to answer are; 1) where on the landscape can TNC improve habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) and what is the value of those gains, and 2) what are the impacts to habitat from new mining infrastructure and what is the value of those losses?

Ms. Munn outlined the road map of the TNC methodology for Landscape Conservation Forecasting as follows:

1. Maps: Ecological systems and current vegetation classes
2. Models: State and transition ecological models – existing "library" version refined and customized for project data area.
3. Metrics: Habitat suitability of GRSG
4. Interactive Modeling Process: design and simulation of scenarios, analysis GRSG suitability and ST-Sim results, and review and input by experts and stakeholders
5. Future vegetation conditions under custodial and active management
6. Change in habitat function for GRSG due to management intervention

A detailed explanation of the methodology for Landscape Conservation Forecasting are captured in the [audio recording](#) located on the Program's website.

Ms. Munn noted the following key findings related to trends and drivers; 1) without intervention, the value of the landscape for GRSG will continue to decline, and 2) the fire-annual species cycle is primarily responsible for the continued decline in GRSG habitat.

Ms. Munn revealed the following key findings related to landscape-scale impacts and offsets; 1) the mine expansion modeled for this report will cause the loss of GRSG habitat both directly and indirectly, 2) restoration actions can more

than offset the loss of habitat from this mine on this landscape, and 3) preserving or enhancing late-brood rearing habitats can avoid significant losses and/or significantly improve habitat suitability.

Finally, Ms. Munn noted the following key findings related to spatial context and scale; 1) landscape-scale restoration efforts are most effective when including uplands and public land, and 2) the value of restoration actions is spatially-dependent and often incremental.

Ms. Ross stated that based on the analysis of TNC, the BEA Project plans to treat over 47,000 acres over 35 years on both public and private land. She noted that risk is managed through TNC modeling dynamics targeting 10% conservation gain. Ms. Ross also mentioned that there are two BEA project plans – one for public land and one for private land.

Member Brad Crowell, commenting on the two different mitigation systems, asked if there was a conversion rate established and if Barrick will be using the CCS mitigation system moving forward. Ms. Munn responded that there has not been a lot of time spent in thinking about the conversion rate. Mr. McGowan concurred with Ms. Munn's comments, adding there are some challenges, but opportunities as well – specifically with utilizing TNC's predictive model. Ms. Ross noted that Barrick is working through the CCS for current projects.

Chair Goicoechea asked a question related to the guarantee of future activities. Bob Ingersoll, Barrick Gold Corporation, noted that Barrick is putting bonds in place for both private and public lands (roughly \$17 million and \$40 million respectively), which provides guarantee that there is money in place for the work to be done. Further, Mr. Ingersoll noted that there is a mechanism to do adaptive management on annual plans and true-up the model every four or five years. He explained that once a new baseline is established the next project proponent would be subject to that new baseline with an obligation to mitigate their impact on the new baseline through the NEPA process on public lands.

**\*NO ACTION**

Chairman Goicoechea called for a recess at 11:00 a.m., and reconvened at 11:12 a.m.

**8. U.S. FOREST SERVICE (USFS) PRESENTATION OF POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE PLANS REGARDING GREATER SAGE-GROUSE CONSERVATION - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Monique Nelson, USFS Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, reviewed a PowerPoint presentation entitled "[Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest Greater Sage-Grouse Planning](#)," a copy is located on the Program's website. The presentation detailed the proposed changes to the 2015 sage-grouse plan amendment. Ms. Nelson explained that the USFS Forest Plan has four components: desired conditions, objectives, standards, and guidelines. Ms. Nelson detailed proposed changes to habitat management areas, sagebrush focal areas, the adaptive management plan, mitigation, exception process, seasonal timing restrictions, desired conditions table, livestock grazing, as well as definition revisions.

Member Swanson strongly recommended changing grazing standards to grazing guidelines. His suggestion prompted discussion pertaining to flexibility and not putting grazing into a box. Ms. Nelson indicated that she was open to the suggestion, but noted the difficulty in putting guidelines into permit terms.

Chairman Goicoechea encouraged council members to work with the Forest Service on proposed changes in the coming weeks. **\*NO ACTION**

**9. REVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL AND HABITAT THRESHOLDS (ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROCESS) AND POTENTIAL ADOPTION FOR INCLUSION IN THE NEVADA GREATER SAGE-GROUSE CONSERVATION PLAN - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Karen Boeger, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, provided public comment on Agenda Item 9. Ms. Boeger provided a letter written to Interior Secretary Mr. Zinke regarding the draft revision of the BLM's May 21018 draft Land Use Plan Amendments. The letter details concerns from the sage-grouse science community.

Chairman Goicoechea called for a recess at 12:23 p.m., and reconvened at 1:26 p.m.

Ms. Katie Andrie, Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team (SETT), reviewed a PowerPoint presentation entitled "[Adaptive Management Recommendation for State Plan](#)," a copy of which is located on the Program's website. Ms. Andrie noted the SETT convened a Science Work Group (SWG) and held two meetings to discuss population and habitat triggers and warnings focusing more on the habitat trigger process. She continued the introductory slides discussing additional steps taken since the May SEC meeting, why adaptive management is important and how the new process differs from the 2015 federal strategies.

Ms. Andrie outlined the three scales analyzed in the adaptive management process include the lek, lek cluster, and biologically significant unit (BSU). Member Boies asked if the BSU scale had defined boundaries and if responses were to be applied to the entire area. Ms. Andrie stated that they do have defined boundaries but the management response is determined by technical teams and the area will be targeted at affected areas, which may not encompass the entire BSU. Member Molini asked why biological significant units (BSU) apply to population only. Ms. Andrie responded, noting that the lek scale was too small of a scale to identify habitat triggers. She noted that the SWG had a lengthy discussion on the lek cluster BSU scale and how to apply habitat trigger at the BSU scale when it is really more of a priority and ranking process. Mr. McGowan noted the BSUs are massive and triggering a BSU is not always representative of the habitat disturbance. Rather, the focus should be on pinpointing lek and lek cluster disturbance. Ms. Swed expressed concern from the FWS perspective the need to monitor and examine the trends at the BSU scale as well as within other spatial scales. Member MacKenzie also stated that it makes sense to analyze and look at disturbances at the three different levels (spatial scales) because there may be different and overlaying causal factors. Member Lister expressed concern that the adaptive management process being outlined is more based on reactive rather than proactive management. Mr. Magaletti stated there is nothing in this process that restricts a proactive approach; the adaptive management team can describe and recommend proactive responses and approaches, however he also stated a proactive approach should be made clearer. There was further discussion, comments, and questions pertaining the adaptive management measurement scales.

Ms. Andrie described that population warnings and triggers were identified using the USGS hierarchical modeling at all three spatial scales. Habitat warnings would include wildfire or natural disturbance larger than 1,000 acres or new anthropogenic disturbance. Habitat warnings would be evaluated by a team of specialists (statewide technical team) to determine which habitat warnings warrant management and would then be considered triggers. Member Lister asked why the triggers were not addressed by a local working group and at a statewide technical team. Ms. Andrie mentioned the reasoning in keeping the Statewide Technical Team to government officials was due to Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) regulations. Ms. Cheva Gabor explained the regulations as they pertained to this Technical Team. There was further discussion pertaining to the FACA regulations and how they impact the proposed team. Chairman Goicoechea suggested to include local government in step 1 of the causal factor analysis. Mr. Drew suggested adding "...and other appropriate Local, State, or Federal Agency Partners" on page 8 of the "[Adaptive Management Recommendation for State Plan](#)." There was discussion on who would be responsible for convening the statewide technical team, Chairman Goicoechea stated to be in compliance with FACA it would likely be either the federal land management agency or other State or Federal agency depending on whether habitat or population triggers are reached, however stating the technical team comprised of various government representatives that meet regularly would be the cleanest way to convene this type of team. Ms. Andrie continued to explain the causal factor analysis, which includes a five step process.

Member Bevan Lister questioned about preemptive management and how topics such as fuel loads could identify a trigger. Ms. Andrie stated there is room for improvement to incorporate more detail on a proactive approach, however in Step 3 there are items listed that address proactive management. Chairman Goicoechea asked what it would take to add a habitat warning/trigger (excessive fuel loads). Ms. Andrie stated that additional criteria could be added to the habitat warning and trigger list. There was additional discussion on original intent of the adaptive management plan, current and active management, and how to potentially incorporate more details to address a proactive approach to the plan. There was also discussion concerning how the AMRTs are organized across the State, and whether they should be identified by District/Field office or similar, or whether to have more fluidity to outline the AMRT response area. Mr. Swanson recommended that a fuels based warning or trigger should be included, or possibly nothing, and rather focus on proactive strategy rather than a reactive strategy. Member Allen Biaggi asked for the SETT to return with a recommendation of a more proactive approach, such as fuel loading, versus the currently proposed reactive approach.

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to approve the current adaptive management recommendation, with the following amendments: in the "[Adaptive Management Recommendation for State Plan](#)," add "Excess Fuel Loads" under "Habitat" on page 2, overlay the Service Area (SGMA perimeter) on the maps on page 4, and add "and other appropriate Local, State, and Federal Agency Partners" into Step 1, page 8 where the Statewide team is referenced. Also, the SETT is to convene the Science Working Group to address the excessive fuel loads for the State Adaptive Management Plan. The motion was moved by Member Biaggi, seconded by Member MacKenzie. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

**10. CONSOLIDATE AN OFFICIAL RESPONSE FROM SEC AND STAFF COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE "BLM NEVADA AND NORTHEASTERN CALIFORNIA GREATER SAGE-GROUSE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Ethan Mower (SETT) reviewed a document entitled, "[Nevada and Northeastern California Greater Sage-Grouse Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement](#)," a copy of which is located on the Program's website. Mr. Mower provided explanation on the highlighted sections of the document for Council comments and feedback.

Member Swanson noted a technical correction in Section B-1, inserting "minimize" in place of "mitigate." He suggested adding clarification to Section D-04 related to determining how much of an acre needs to be sagebrush before the acre is considered "sagebrush." He also recommended removing comments related to Section D-07. Chairman Goicoechea suggested Member Swanson submit his comments related to sagebrush cover through another industry group.

Mr. Mower noted that any comments that are resolved by the adaptive management strategy may be removed if they are already addressed.

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion specifically to approve the comment highlighted in green for 2-3 and 2-17, as a reiteration of the importance of the CCS in the Nevada State Plan as a critical component. This motion was made in response to the possibility that the BLM may change requirements for mitigation in the future. The motion was moved by Member Molini, seconded by Member Lister. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to approve the comment form as a whole with the understanding that any comments that are resolved by the adoption of the adaptive management document approved under Agenda Item 9 may be removed from the official comment form. Other technical changes within the motion include the deleting the comment pertaining to D-07 and changing "mitigate" to "minimize" in B-1. The motion was moved by Member Swanson, seconded by Member Boies. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

Later in the meeting Chairman Goicoechea reopened Agenda Item 10.

Member Biaggi made a motion that the SETT staff comment with regard to the EIS process, that Site Specific Design Features as outlined in the State Plan are adopted by the federal agencies as guidelines. The motion was seconded by Member Swanson. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to include SETT comments one and three (as listed in Agenda Item 11 presentation, [Site Specific Consultation Based Design Features](#), slide 4) , related to site specific consultation based design feature for the DEIS. The motion was moved by Member Molini, seconded by Member Lister. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to include SETT comment number two (as listed in Agenda Item 11 presentation, [Site Specific Consultation Based Design Features](#), slide 4), and inserting the language, "consistent with NRS 569.431." The motion was moved by Member Lister, seconded by Member Boies. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

**11. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF SEC AND STAFF REVISIONS AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE 2014 NEVADA GREATER SAGE-GROUSE CONSERVATION PLAN - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***



Ms. Kathleen Petter (SETT) outlined updates made to the [2014 Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan](#) (State Plan) since the last council meeting. She reviewed a PowerPoint Presentation entitled, "[Site Specific Consultation Based Design Features](#)," a copy of which is located on the Program's website.

Member Biaggi expressed concern over the rationale for removing the design features from the state plan because they are included in the BLM's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He also noted the change of required design features (RFD) from consultation-based to required elements. He stated that within the development of the state plan there was clear policy direction that the RFDs would not be required. Ms. Petter noted that the RFDs can be included if it is the desire of the council. Member Swanson suggested that federal agencies put RFDs in as guidelines rather than standards. There was general consensus for Member Swanson's suggestion.

Mr. Petter noted three site specific consultation design features to include as commented in the BLM's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Chairman Goicoechea, referring to the comment related to design and construction of fences, recommended referencing Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) to maintain consistency of fence standards.

Mr. Biaggi recommended removing the four options for sustainable management of the Wild Horse and Burro Program from the State Plan, but including the following statement: "The State of Nevada supports the most comprehensive and effective plan available to achieve and maintain AML in accordance with the Act as originally intended." There was general consensus for Member Biaggi's recommendation.

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to approve Section 7.4 Wild Horses and Burros Management and striking the four options presented to Congress and accepting the rest of the section. The motion was moved by Member Boies, seconded by Member Molini. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to approve Section 7.5 Livestock Grazing. The motion was moved by Member Boies, seconded by Member Molini. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

Member Biaggi made a motion to not move forward with item 12 site specific design features and to allow the status quo as existing in the state plan to remain. The motion was seconded by Member Lister. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

**12. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE JUNE 2018 SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Mr. McGowan solicited final comments from council members for the June 2018 Semi-Annual Report to the Governor's Office.

Chairman Goicoechea entertained a motion to approve the June 2018 Semi-Annual Report to the Governor's Office. The motion was moved by Member MacKenzie, seconded by Member Molini. Motion was approved unanimously. **\*ACTION**

**13. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED DURING THIS MEETING AND SCHEDULING NEXT SEC MEETING - \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

- 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.
- B. Further discussion on fuel loads and proactive adaptive management.
- C. The Council scheduled their next meeting for Thursday, August 30, 2018, in location in Elko and time to be determined.

**\*NO ACTION**

**14. FEDERAL AGENCY UPDATES AND COMMENTS**

- A. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) – No updates
- B. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) – Mr. Courtney reminded council members that the Draft Sage-Grouse Resource Plan Amendment is out for 90 day public comment, which ends on August 2, 2018. BLM held four public meetings during the last week of June. He also reported the removal of 507 horses to date, with about 2,000 more planned.
- C. US Forest Service (USFS) – Ms. Cheva Gabor reminded the council members that comments for the Notice of Intent are due August 1, 2018.
- D. US Department of Agriculture (NRCS) – No updates.
- E. Other – No update.

**15. STATE AGENCY UPDATES AND COMMENTS**

- A. Office of the Governor – No update.
- B. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) – Mr. Crowell thanked Newmont for their participation in the CCS.
- C. Department of Wildlife (NDOW) – No update.
- D. Department of Agriculture (NDA) – Ms. Brown noted there is a workshop being held on August 9, 2018.
- E. Conservation Districts Program – No update.
- F. Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team (SETT) – Mr. McGowan noted that the SETT is updating and consolidating the CCS and Sagebrush Ecosystem Program (SEP) website onto the state’s website. SETT intends reach out to industry folks as well as BLM and USFS district office staff members to communicate the opportunities and benefits of the CCS. Mr. McGowan stated that he would like the Nevada Collaborative Conservation Network (NCCN) and other local working groups to present successes and/or challenges at a future meeting.
- G. Other – No update.

**16. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**17. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.