



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

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEM COUNCIL'S COMMITTEE ON MONITORING**

**Date/Time:** Tuesday, June 24, 2014 – 8:00 a.m.

**Location:** PEBS Conference Room, First Floor, Bryan Building

**Address:** 901 South Stewart Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701

A full audio recording of this meeting is accessible through the following website –  
[http://sagebrusheco.nv.gov/Meetings/Committee\\_Meetings/Monitoring\\_Committee/](http://sagebrusheco.nv.gov/Meetings/Committee_Meetings/Monitoring_Committee/)

---

**Committee Members Present:** Steve Boies (SEC), Bevan Lister (SEC), Tina Nappe (SEC), and Sherman Swanson (SEC).

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Tim Rubald (SETT), John Copeland (SETT), Melissa Faigeles (SETT), Kelly McGowan (SETT), Lara Niell (SETT), Lee Corum (USFWS), Joe Tague (BLM), Mark Coca (BLM), Lee Turner (NDOW), Greg Simonds, Cheri Howell, (USFS), and Cliff Gardner (Rural Heritage Preservation).

- 1. CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Swanson called the meeting to order at 8:12 AM.
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT** – No Public Comment taken at this time. Public comment was provided throughout the meeting. The meeting was conducted in a 'workshop' format with all present allowed to participate in the discussion.
- 3. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
No minutes available for consideration. **\*NO ACTION TAKEN**
- 4. COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE**
  - A. Committee members may make comments at this time and the Program Manager will bring forward any pertinent correspondence directed to the Committee.  
  
No comments or correspondence was discussed.
- 5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF CHANGES TO THE MONITORING SECTION OF THE 2012 STATE PLAN**
  - A. Ms. Niell provided an overview of the outlined draft Monitoring and Adaptive Management section of the Nevada State Plan. Mr. Swanson requested from the group additional concepts that should be incorporated into the section. Concepts recommended by the group included: wild horses,

livestock, weeds, fire, restoration projects, drought, and riparian health. Ms. Niell indicated she would include these concepts in revisions and bring this back to the Committee at their next meeting. **\*NO ACTION TAKEN**

A full account of the discussion is captured in the audio recording and is available on the Program's website.

## **6. PRESENTATION ON SHORT AND LONG-TERM MONITORING CURRENTLY IN USE AND ANTICIPATED FOR LINKING OBJECTIVES, MANAGEMENT ACTIONS, AND DOCUMENTATION OF THE RESULTS.**

A. Mr. Coca explained the BLM's data collection protocols for its Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring (AIM) Strategy for Integrated Renewable Resources Management. Data is collected on a landscape scale rather than at the allotment scale. The BLM collects about 400 plots worth of data each year through Great Basin Institute (GBI) crews and specific district personnel. Plots are randomly allocated among Disturbance Response Groups. Plot size is determined by the ARS. The plots are located across soil unit, and collected data is located in a GIS geodatabase that can call up AIM information from all known plots for several different types of analysis.

Mr. Turner explained that NDOW uses GBI crews for data collection with the purpose of documenting what has been done on individual projects. Most of the projects have pre-treatment sampling done, and have regularly scheduled post-treatment monitoring. This is a focused data collection effort that has over 1,100 field plots identified and monitored. New plots are added each year. It currently costs approximately \$350 per plot.

Mr. Simonds noted the best monitoring data is a combination of remote sensing and ground photography/measurements that utilize high resolution DLSR and sub-meter GPS. This allows for monitors to return to a specific point with a high degree of accuracy.

Chairman Swanson asked about monitoring components and how they fit together, e.g. horse monitoring to set and manage towards AML. Mr. Tague stated that all AML has been set and there is no set vegetation monitoring protocol associated with the BLM's horse management program.

Ms. Howell stated that the USFS locates plots in key use areas.

Mr. Tague and Mr. Coca noted they believed the State would be covered every 8 to 10 years in a repeating basis. Chairman Swanson asked the BLM how to combine the understanding of range monitoring and the AIM process. Mr. Tague and Mr. Coca indicated that AIM data is used to calibrate remote imagery. The BLM monitors GRSG at four levels: Broad Scale, Midscale, Fine Scale, and Site Scale. The BLM crews work in the southern part of the State March through May, and the northern part May through September. In regards to AIM, the CC District is the farthest along in the State. Other states included in the AIM Program are Idaho, California, Washington, and Utah.

Mr. Tague stated that for burn monitoring, the BLM uses funding called Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR) for up to 3-years of monitoring, post-fire on fires where treatments are applied. On fires where greater than \$500,000 is spent on rehabilitation/restoration activities, monitoring goes on for 5 to 10 years.

Ms. Howell noted that the USFS horse monitoring is focused on herd areas and the air survey has a specific protocol for data collection. The USFS does livestock monitoring on approximately 10 percent of its Nevada allotments per year.

Concerning short-term monitoring, Mr. Coca stated that currently there is no comprehensive database that takes in all the BLM data. Mr. Coca will provide more information on short-term monitoring by the BLM at the next committee meeting.

Mr. Gardner noted that water production monitoring and watershed monitoring should be a consideration for state and federal agencies, as well as, wet meadow sites, past actions, and riparian conditions.

Discussion moved to monitoring on private land. Ms. Howell indicated that the USFS has cooperative permittee monitoring. Those people wanting to do their own monitoring are trained by USFS staff. Currently, there is no formal agreement.

Mr. Coca stated that BLM has an agreement document for permittee monitoring that it will send out. The data from this type of monitoring is collected by the BLM and entered into a database. The BLM's monitoring data is publically available.

The Committee discussed who should be the keeper of Nevada's monitoring data. Currently, it is being collected and housed in several different locations by several different agencies, with no centrally located database. **\*NO ACTION TAKEN**

A full account of the discussion is captured in the audio recording and is available on the Program's website.

**7. A DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE STAKEHOLDER MONITORING, ITS INTRICACIES AND STRATEGIES.**

Some discussion was held on these issues but no action was taken.

A full account of the discussion is captured in the audio recording and is available on the Program's website.

**8. DISCUSSION, POSSIBLE MODIFICATONS, AND CONSIDERATION OF THE CURRENT OR REVISED DRAFT STAKEHOLDER MONITORING AGREEMENT AND OTHER EXISTING MONITORING AGREEMENTS AND HANDBOOKS.**

**9. DISCUSSION (TIME PERMITTING) OR POSTPONEMENT OF ITEMS DEEMED IMPORTANT BUT NOT URGENT AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

**10. REVIEW ACTION ITEMS, DETERMINATION OF NEXT MEETING DATE, AND DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Action Items:

- SETT to Develop a Revised Chapter in the State Plan
- Create a Cooperative Permittee Monitoring Agreement
- Combine the BLM's Monitoring Guidelines with State of Nevada Guidelines
- Make Needed Revision to the Nevada Rangeland Monitoring Handbook

**11. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment.**

**12. ADJOURNMENT – Member Nappe moved to adjourn; seconded by Member Boies, motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM. \*ACTION**