

State of Nevada
Sagebrush Ecosystem Council
Draft Minutes

Date: Wednesday, March 27, 2013
Time: 9:00 am – 4:00 pm
Place: Capitol Building, Guinn Room, 101 N. Carson Street, Carson City, NV

Video Conference was made available to Elko at UNSOM Griswold Room 31, Winnemucca at Great Basin College Room 201, and Ely at the White Pine County Cooperative Ext.

A full recording of this meeting is accessible through the following website - http://sagebrusheco.nv.gov/Meetings/Sagebrush_Ecosystem_Council_Meeting/

Council Members Present: Allen Biaggi, Steven Bois, Doug Busselman, Jeremy Drew, Bill Dunkelberger, Gerry Emm, JJ Goicoechea, Ted Koch, Starla Lacy, Amy Lueders, Kent McAdoo, Tina Nappe.

1. **Call to Order** – Chairman Goicoechea called the meeting to order at 9:14 am. He noted movements would be recorded on the whiteboard to facilitate action items or assignments assigned to the Technical Team.
2. **Public Comment** – Chairman Goicoechea open the meeting for public comments.
 - a. Cliff Gardner, representing Rural Heritage Preservation Project – Mr. Gardner voiced his concerns and read a statement into the record. Mr. Gardner's letter was given to the recording secretary and is available upon request.
3. **Adoption of Agenda** – A motion to approve the agenda was made by Vice-Chairman McAdoo, second by Councilman Drew, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried.
4. **Approval of Minutes from February 21, 2013 meeting** – Jim Lawrence, Administrator of the Division State Lands, commented that minutes for the February 21, 2013 meeting would be available by the June 4th deadline and will be placed on next agenda for review and approval. Audio recordings of all the meetings have and will continue to be posted to the website. Summary minutes will be finished after the meeting and then submitted for the council's approval.
5. **Comments from Congressman Mark Amodei** – Congressman Amodei extended his thanks to the Governor for enabling the council to act as a credible response in light of the proposed Sage-grouse listing. He also wanted to extend his thanks to Councilwoman Lueders for the opportunity the state has to engage with the BLM and for her work in ensuring that DCNR was a cooperating agency. He also voiced his gratefulness for the relationship with Councilman Koch, and sees strength in collaborating on a comprehensive work product. Congressman Amodei spoke of his work as a Member of the Federal

Delegation, with stakeholders, in preparing legislation for introduction to separate federal suppression funds from rehabilitation funds. He is also working on a proposal, to be introduced within 30 days, which will act as a new version of the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act. The proposal will work to ensure that half the monies from federal land sales will be returned to the state, with the goal that they can be used for resource purposes. The Congressman concluded in stating his pride for the state's work with Sage-grouse, thinks it noteworthy that other states have voiced an interest in Nevada's process of avoiding listing, and likes that Nevada's plan is specific to the state's needs. Congressman Amodei introduced Meghan Brown, his rural representative, and asked that they be used as a resource for any questions. Chairman Goicoechea thanked the Congressman for his time.

6. Council Member Items and Correspondence –

- a. Councilman Boise provided a map from the SANE group for the council to review; displaying proposed projects from landowners.
- b. Mr. Drozdoff stated that DCNR submitted paperwork to be a cooperating agency with the BLM.

7. Federal Agency Updates:

- a. *US Fish and Wildlife Service* – Councilman Koch provided an update that the USFWS released its Sage-grouse Conservation Objectives Team report on Monday; a link to the report is available at www.fws.gov/nevada. Secretary of the Interior's Governors' Task Force members have expressed concern regarding the report. Councilman Koch explained that the report is a science document that the Service thinks should support policy decisions. Director Ash wrote a cover letter to clarify its purpose. Councilwoman Lueders suggested the report be a future agenda item. Councilman Koch would like to include Pat Deibert to a council meeting and feels the NTT REPORT should be reviewed by the council.
- b. *Bureau of Land Management* – Councilwoman Nappe asked how the BLM meets with DCNR and NDOW, separately or together as they're both cooperating agencies. Councilwoman Lueders explained that the BLM will meet with all cooperating agencies and will be briefed on any developed alternatives. The COT report will be sent out to the councilmembers prior to the next meeting. Staff will also make hard copies available at the next meeting.
- c. *United States Forest Service* – Councilman Dunkleman dispelled rumors regarding projected staffing for the 2013 fire season. He noted the USFS will have the same fire staffing as last year.

8. State Agency Updates:

- a. *Department of Conservation and Natural Resources – Director Leo Drozdoff* – Mr. Drozdoff reiterated that DCNR signed as a cooperating agreement with BLM. AB461 is the bill that will incorporate the Council and Sagebrush Ecosystem Team's work into state law; it has currently been referred to Ways and Means. Chairman Goicoechea asked if solidifying the Council in state law will help with the lack of regulatory mechanisms going forward. Councilman Koch replied that it would in that state law is stronger than an executive order. In clarifying the work of the Sagebrush Ecosystem

Team, Mr. Drozdoff stated that the members can act as a clearing house as a point of contact for their agencies to ensure there is a coordinated effort, allowing the team to access the information within their respective departments. Mr. Drozdoff suggested that the council ask the team to assemble topic-by-topic research briefings and present them to the council along with corresponding recommendations they've worked through with their points of contact. Mr. Drozdoff informed the council that he would be participating in the upcoming Western States' Task Force meeting, April 9 and 10, in Salt Lake City. Mr. Hunt voiced that the mission of the council was laid out in the executive order but that, generally, the council will guide the management of state ecosystems; the near-term issue is the listing and implementing the state plan. The council is also tasked with implementing the recommendations of the Sage-grouse Advisory Council, i.e. implementing the mitigation bank and revising maps.

- b. *Department of Wildlife – Interim Director George Tskuamoto* – Mr. Tskuamoto expressed the importance of NDOW's work in collecting species information. Regarding Sage-grouse, NDOW has been working to determine the pending status of leks by affirming whether or not there are two males attending the lek for two consecutive years. NDOW is using both fixed-wing technology with infrared vision in monitoring leks, and helicopters in monitoring and searching for new leks. Mr. Tskuamoto also spoke to NDOW's participation in a USGS led response to the Executive Oversight Committee to prioritize research efforts. They are currently working to rank 900 research questions and 320 topics. USGS expects to have a report to the EOC by September of 2013. NDOW is also conducting a genetics study across the range to determine range-wide connectivity, particularly in northwestern and northeastern Nevada. NDOW is looking at Dr. Peter Coates' model for raven control and the key habitats where it can be applied.

Councilwoman Nappe reminded the council that they had designated ravens to be the number four threat to Sage-grouse, and mentioned that the Commission had approved another project for raven control. She noted that project success is dependent on removing road kill. Councilman Drew added that the other facet of raven control in the project is working with landfills and open animal pits in critical Sage-grouse habitat. Councilman Drew also spoke to the volunteer lek monitoring course in Smith Valley, wanting to acknowledge NDOW's efforts.

Mr. Drozdoff feels that the discussion of the coordinated approach on ravens is a terrific example of how topic-specific updates and briefings could work and be beneficial to the council. Councilwoman Nappe suggested that Conservation Partners, a program working with NDOW to rehabilitate burned or low-production areas, be invited to make a presentation to the council. A discussion ensued regarding how to inventory work on the range. Councilman Bussleman requested a report on the findings NDOW's telemetry work as well as the telemetry work USGS has conducted. Chairman Goicoechea asked Mr. Tskuamoto if NDOW envisioned conducting predator work in compromised habitats as a priority. Mr. Tskuamoto replied that the efforts would be focused where they would be most effective with populations and leks in a geographic area. Vice-Chairman McAdoo asked if there were a way to increase the 2500 bird kill permit. Mr. Tskuamoto answered that though the request can be made, USFWS suggested that NDOW look at nonlethal resolutions to the nuisance.

- c. *Department of Agriculture – Director Jim Barbee* – Mr. Barbee encouraged that the council look at the issue of raven control closely as there are an estimated 100,000 ravens in the state and a combined 4,000 permits between NDOW’s 2500 and Agriculture’s 1500 permits. The Board of Agriculture met yesterday and voiced that it supports the work with producers and their resources efforts (both private and under permit). Mr. Barbee shared that he would be happy to help make direct contact with producers. Mr. Barbee said that the Department of Agriculture was evaluating its noxious weed program as it relates to invasive plant species and how the program’s resources can be utilized. He suggested that they present their findings at a future meeting.

9. **Presentation and discussion of potential collaborative training for Council.** FOR POSSIBLE ACTION –

Mike Lunn – Working with the SANE landowner group – gave a presentation on to the council. His PowerPoint presentation is available upon request. Mr. Lunn discussed his work with small communities in the state and the work he sees ahead of the council, particularly with landowners. Mr. Lunn discussed options of a two-day workshop that focuses on shared purpose/vision and effectiveness. Mr. Lunn feels that trust is built on respecting and listening to what someone has to say, making a point not judge their viewpoint. Mr. Lunn asked Councilman Boies to read the SANE’s vision statement. Mr. Lunn said that he and his partner, Laura, focus on slowing down interaction, and insisting that everyone has the time to be heard. Through a trust-based environment they work with an organization to get everyone sharing information and learning from each other. For the purpose of the council, he would like to engage the group in a two-day workshop and would like to see the council work through some of the issues they’re facing with a focus on finding how different parties can fit into their work. He asked the councilmembers to each speak about the issues that he or she felt needed to be addressed for the work to be successful.

- a. *Councilman Koch* - thinks they need to define the work the council and team are doing. They’re seeking regulatory certainty and to conserve sagebrush ecosystems, but he wants something even more defined beyond that. He feels that it is essential for the council to reconcile their interests as much as possible and to build trust so that the council can be successful.
- b. *Councilwoman Lueders* - thinks it is important how to define how they’ll measure their long term success as well as what the short term and mid term actions. It’s important to see how work at the local level can be incorporated in a way that’s most effective. She feels that due to the diverse interest but common need statewide, the ability to build trust and be candid is important moving forward.
- c. *Councilman Dunkleberger* - feels that a day together would be beneficial to come together and draft a vision statement for the council. He also thinks it would be beneficial for everyone to communicate their objectives.
- d. *Councilwoman Nappe* - is concerned that the commitment of the group is to Sage-grouse and perceives that NDOW is being alienated. She is also concerned that time is passing and that the council needs to put a project on-the-ground that can be demonstrated. She is also concerned about how long project funding will take, and that when the money is finally on-the-ground, that the land will be overgrazed or

burned. Judging and evaluating projects will demonstrate the credibility of the group.

- e. *Councilman Drew* - feels a day learning what everyone's strengths are and what they can bring to the table would be most beneficial.
- f. *Chairman Goicoechea* - agreed with Councilman Drew. He also feels the council needs to focus on building a foundation and moving forward using it as their guide.
- g. *Councilman Boies* - feels that it's important to think out of the box and feels taking a day as a team is important. He also feels that it will be a learning experience and that it could help them develop a new and effective approach.
- h. *Councilman Emm* - feels there is an opportunity for information to go both ways for the best end result and can be shared with the tribes.
- i. *Councilman Bussleman* - thinks that the group needs to develop a balanced conservation plan that will be implemented and monitored. He is also concerned that though a two-day event will be a stretch, a one day may not be enough. He thinks it important understand how the council can be effective in tasking people on the local level with work on their behalf.
- j. *Councilman Biaggi* - thinks it makes sense to define common visions and directions. He feels that the council owes it to the staff to facilitate an effort to give the staff a clear direction and clear goals.
- k. *Councilwoman Lacy* - feels that there is a great opportunity for a role beyond the listing decision, and wants to explore what that is. She thinks finding trust and commonality in getting to know one another is important.
- l. *Vice-Chairman McAdoo* - synthesized all the comments at the request of Mr. Lunn. He feels that the council needs the two-part goal that the original committee devised – improve and sustain Sage-grouse habitat while maintaining the state's economy. He agrees with Councilman Bussleman and feels that the group should make a commitment to a two-day meeting to ensure that they don't end up finding out that one day isn't enough. He moved to have a two-day collaborative team building process, and suggested the group discuss it. A discussion ensued about important dates and the logistics of scheduling a two day meeting during the legislative session.

Vice-Chair McAdoo motioned for a two-day meeting, seconded by Councilman Busselman; Vice-Chair McAdoo amended the motion to a one day meeting with a possibility of a second day. Discussion, Councilman Busselman motioned to table the item until agenda item 17, vote to table – all in favor, motion carried. Motion captured under item 17.

10. **Discussion of USFWS September 14, 2012 informal draft comments on Nevada's Greater Sage-grouse conservation strategy: FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** – Councilman Koch clarified that the document sent out via email were informal staff comments. Chairman Goicoechea added that the comments were requested as a result of Mr. Drozdoff and his office drafting an alternative. Mr. Lawrence will send or hand out a document that explored the comments and explains where the comments were addressed in the EIS alternative. Mr. Drozdoff wanted to reiterate that he requested the document after DCNR was put on point regarding the issue in late August. They then used the input of Councilman Koch and Councilwoman Lueders and the previous council's recommendation to develop an EIS threat-based alternative. Mr. Drozdoff ensured they satisfied the

USFWS's concerns and noted any disagreements between their concerns and the Advisory Council's direction.

- a. *Mapping* – Chairman Goicoechea reminded the council that they based the mapping exercise on Sage-grouse, looking at breeding density. Chairman Goicoechea expressed his concerns that local groups the council worked with will be upset that the map deviates from that effort and will be unwilling to perform future on-the-ground work. He asked Councilman Koch if he feels that the council's use focused on anything other than Sage-grouse. Councilman Koch said he didn't know. A discussion ensued regarding the development of the maps in the COT report as well as revisiting the Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee's maps with the local working groups input; how maps were created with the understanding that they were starting points. The technical team staff was encouraged to discuss avoid, minimize, and mitigate with USFWS staff and draw a distinction between habitat and management maps; to narrow down from several to one map; mitigation and mapping; to review the Sage-Grouse Advisory Council's map in comparison to the NDOW maps. They were asked to be mindful that the first map was intended to be whittled down with ground truthing over time; and to develop a direction moving forward.

Mr. Drozdoff stated that the overarching issue that several members touched on is that the council is trying to find new and innovative ways that will be best for the species but will also work well with multiple users. Moving forward the council will need to spell out their actions for what will be best for the species, or for the multiple users as sometimes they will line up and sometimes they won't. Chairman Goicoechea said that it was important for the council to give the task of evaluating the maps developed last summer as there will be further disagreement in the agenda ahead. Councilman Drew felt the issue bigger than the mapping; the Sage-Grouse Advisory Council's strategy for management going forward should be implemented. The comment document that pointed out issues in the strategy should be taken to task by the technical team. Have them look at all comments and suggest a strategy on how the body can develop the ideas moving forward. Councilwoman Lueders feels addressing policy issues should occur between the draft and final EIS planning effort. It will allow the technical team to address any USFWS concerns or draft concerns. Mr. Drozdoff suggested putting together a timeline that details the major points before the council, out to 2015, so everyone can have a better understanding of what their priorities should be.

- b. *Invasive Species* – Vice-Chairman McAdoo suggested that the council take care in saying that livestock can spread cheat grass invasion as it can also be preventative. He feels that the emphasis should be on proper and excessive grazing. Councilwoman Nappe addressed the idea of developing a policy that the council can utilize in evaluating decisions that will include wild horses and burrows as well as cattle.
- c. *Council Direction On Other Concerns* - Councilman Drew reiterated the directions that the council would like to task the Technical Team as a result of the discussion:
 - i. Get to one map—how to distinguish between the current distributions and future management.

- ii. Establish the mitigation bank
- iii. Address the comments, with a timeline of August or September.

Meeting convened for lunch at 12:10 pm.

Meeting reconvened at 1:18 pm.

Councilman Koch made a motion to have the technical team meet with NDOW and USFWS to work through comment response and further to find the citation in the federal register that pertains to avoid, minimize, and mitigate. Councilwoman Nappe seconded the motion, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried. ***Action**

Councilman Drew made a motion for the Technical Team to establish a timeline for addressing mapping, establishment of the mitigation bank, and policy issues associated with the comment response, and report back at the next meeting. Seconded by Vice-Chairman McAdoo, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried. ***Action**

Councilman Koch asked for a briefing paper, drafted by the Technical Team, to identify regulatory assurances. Councilman Koch will work with Mr. Rubald and their teams to create a list of regulatory assurances. Councilwoman Lacy pointed out that the exercise will also help the team to anticipate lawsuits. He provided his examples of regulatory examples for the council.

1. An approved state plan within the context of BLM's NEPA process
2. Mitigation bank
3. Mitigation strategy
4. Non-listing
5. Section 10 permit.

11. Presentation and discussion on possible utilization of Dr. Peter Coates model for sagebrush ecosystem efforts. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION –

- a. *Overview of model mapping products:* Dr. Coates' model is a process to evaluate the most important areas where Sage-grouse occur. The goal is to understand what aspects of environment increase the probability of Sage-grouse. Dr. Coates' model was completed in the Bi-State area with a Technical Advisory Committee made up of multiple agencies, nonprofits, and private parties. Dr. Coates suggests that a similar collaborative group exist for the state. The purpose is to use Sage-grouse data and what is known about the environment to bring into a GIS and develop a Decision Support Tool to manage Sage-grouse populations. The Decision Support Tool has a hierarchal approach - develop a map where grouse occur and understand if those areas meet microhabitat standards or objectives, and then develop management objectives within those zones. The Decision Support Tool gives an index of value to Sage-grouse; it's driven by telemetry data; a benefit is developing seasonal maps. The tool can be used to determine which factors are threats and which are beneficial to set up management strategies. The data used is existing vegetation layers. Another option is to use high resolution imagery to reclassify vegetation layers. The model will follow the grouse to determine where good habitat is. Dr. Coates work with the bi-state included the development of a base-layer map—will use Nevada Synthesis Map from the Nevada Heritage Program to expand on modeling and will use vegetation, topography, ruggedness, elevation, and anthropogenic factors for

modeling the property of occurrence. The model can predict phases of pinyon-juniper encroachment. The model follows a five-step process:

1. Compile GIS points
 2. Overlay the views data
 3. Select random points across the environment to characterize what's available to the grouse
 4. Contrast random points from used points
 5. Take the estimated parameters and apply them everywhere there isn't telemetry data.
- b. *Time and cost proposal for mapping Greater Sage-grouse habitat areas statewide*
A discussion ensued regarding data collecting methods and costs associated, and how the data can be focused. Dr. Coates explained that the map ultimately breaks high-use areas into red and low-use into blue. The Coates model differs from the NDOW map in that is a continuous model as NDOW's work depicts a category map. The Coates model also shows where Sage-grouse might be for shorter periods of time, which would be disregarded on other maps. The cost of the Coates model is estimated at \$845,000. Mr. Drozdoff noted there is currently no funding available for this project. Long term funding sources will be critical in funding the council, technical team and may be available through a set-aside from the various mitigation projects. Mr. Drozdoff also proposed a loan option from the federal partners and industry sectors as well as accessing funds from the Ruby Pipeline dollars. In addition, Q1 funding is available for habitat conservation. A combination of funding options has been discussed and will continue to be pursued by the Department of Conservation and will be present to the council the available options.
- c. *Process for map refinement to include on-the ground verifications and "Occupied", "Suitable" and "Potential" habitat mapping.* – A discussion on what management actions will be most cost effective. The predictive models allow for refinement to incorporate the state transition models. Councilman Lacy noted that to have a scientifically defensible map is a great value. Councilwoman Lueders noted the common currency of the state map is excellent, but asked Dr. Coates if there is a way to construct the NEPA requirements, confidence intervals and data richness into the statewide model. Dr. Coates confirmed the incorporation is absolutely possible. A copy of Dr. Coates' presentation is available upon request.

Allen made a motion to direct DCNR to move forward with a presentation at the next council meeting to identify all of the funding sources that may be available in order to meet the monetary goals of moving forward with Dr. Coates and a statewide mapping process. Seconded Councilwoman Nappe, all in favor, none opposed, motion carried. Councilman Koch noted this is a great value for the level of detail the model will provide.

***Action**

12. **Discussion of "Best Science". FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** – A discussion ensued regarding the definition of best science. Councilman Koch noted the Endangered Species Act states "based on the best available science". He agreed credibility, peer review, relevance, legitimacy and buy in are factors of establishing best science. Councilman Koch recommended inviting technical individuals to elaborate on definition of best science. Cliff Gardner presented a document from 1984 regarding best science. Mr. Gardner presented

his documents and reference material to the recording secretary and is available upon request.

13. **Process for memorializing and implementing Council agreements. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** – Mr. Lawrence noted the collaborative team building process along with DCNR, BLM or F&WS actions and the mechanism would be between agencies. This will ensure recommendation from this council become implemented. *No Action Taken
14. **Report from Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team regarding inventory of local area working group projects and other sagebrush ecosystem projects. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** – Mr. Rubald provided an update on the efforts and action providing a spreadsheet for the councils review. This is a large undertaking as it is difficult to account for all the work being done on private land. Lee Turner PCD Partners Conservation Development is building a database to track the project, but will not be ready for release for another 2 months. Mr. Rubald is working with NDOW to obtain an accurate list of their projects. It has been decided that the database would be housed with the technical team. Mr. Rubald attended Lincoln and White Pine, and Elko county NE Stewardship group. He requested all planning and accomplished projects. Additional information is pending from BLM and USFWS. Along with the collection of data, the plan is to capture individual property owners; in doing so, they have been collaborating with NRSC and district conservationist. Mr. Rubald noted there may be duplication initially, but the Technical Team will sort and filter the information. Councilman Busselman questioned beyond drawing from the local group, how will they identify and define their role moving forward? Mr. Rubald expressed this to be a process not an event. They are currently working on those partnerships and recruiting for the field position on the technical team. *No Action Taken
15. **Update on creation of Sagebrush Ecosystem Mitigation Bank. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** – Mr. Drozdoff noted this is a key priority; however, funding will be necessary. He deferred this item and said it would be expanded upon at the next meeting. *No Action Taken
16. **Update on implementation progress on Bi-State plan** – Councilman Dunkelberger provided an update that the Forest service has taken the lead on the EIS. They are working with the Carson BLM District that would amend both the forest plan and resource management plan for the Carson- Battle Mountain Districts and will include specific regulatory mechanisms for conserving the Bi-State bird. The draft EIS will be out for public review in July and he will provide a presentation for the council at that time. The Carson City Bi-State and Greater Sage-grouse populations are included in the California/Nevada sub-regional plan. This EIS is addressing solely the bi-state population. They are in the process of developing alternatives, with a possibility of 3 to 4 alternatives. Looking at elements to preclude development- regulatory assurance constraints approved would require revision of the RMP which is a cumbersome process.
17. **Future Council Meeting Dates and Agenda Items. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION** - The council agreed on the following dates for the next two council meetings; April 22, 2013 - time and location to be determined and May 3, 2013 will be a collaborative team building meeting with an abbreviated business agenda; time and location to be determined.

Councilwoman Lacy offered a meeting space for the collaborative meeting at the NV Energy Auditorium in Reno. Councilman Biaggi made a motion to reschedule April 22 and May 3 as the next council meeting dates; one will be a partial business meeting and partial team building facilitation, dates will be decided upon availability of the facilitator. Once the facilitation date is confirmed the other meeting date will be a full business meeting and if neither of those dates is available for the facilitator, they will cancel the facilitation and hold the business meeting on April 22. Seconded my Councilman Boies, all in favor, none opposed, motioned carried. Possible agenda topics may include the following and updates from the discussion item recap list. ***Action**

- Presentation from the Technical Team
- Funding of the telemetry
- Discussion on Mitigation
- Gunnison Listing and Major Factors
- Jim Barbee – Invasive weed work - will provide update under agency update item.
- Vice-Chairman McAdoo – requested ½ hour to discuss Sage-grouse reconciling science and history.

18. **Council Member Comments**

No additional comments.

19. **Public Comment**

a. Mike Baucome – Provide an overview regarding the benefits of cloud seeding to the council. A discussion ensued regarding investigative research, conservation cycle of seeding and legislative actions. A full account of the discussion is available through the meeting audio recording.

20. **Adjournment** – Vice-Chairman McAdoo made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded my Councilman Emm. Meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Discussion Item Recap

DCNR to bring back funding option for COATS model.
COT/NTT discussion – what is it/what isn't it?
Presentation from Partners for Conservation
Discussion about where partners fit it with the Technical Team
NDOW's & USGS findings from telemetry work
Dept. of Agriculture presentation on weeds
(Ted) Gunnison listing (Kent) Sage-grouse in Nevada reconciling science
Amy – Laura's time (cost/pro bono)
Tech team – put together a timeline (now – 9/15) w/ key milestones
Tech team – review of comments USFWS 9/14 memo, avoid, minimize, mitigate, NEPA
Develop next steps, citation in federal register re: avoid, minimize, mitigate, timeline – for mapping, bank review of contract for policy.