



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

Date: Tuesday, December 12, 2018
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Place: Capitol Building – Guinn Room
101 North 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: Chris MacKenzie, Allen Biaggi, Steven Boies, William Molini, Sherman Swanson, Brian Amme, Meghan Brown for Jerri Conrad-Lewis, Jim Lawrence, Bradley Crowell, Carolyn Swed, Gary Roeder for Ray Dotson, Cheva Gabor for Bill Dunkelberger, Pam Robinson, Sheila Anderson.

Council Members Absent: Starla Lacy, J.J. Goicoechea, Bevan Lister, Tony Wasley.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chairman Chris MacKenzie Called the meeting to order at 8:34 AM.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment regarding proposed regulations will be taken at a later time. No public comment.

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

Approval of Agenda for December 12, 2018 SEC meeting – Allen Biaggi moved to approve the agenda, Steven Boies seconded the motion. ***ACTION**

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Approval of minutes for October 11, 2018 meeting. Steven Boies moved to approve the minutes, William Molini seconded the motion. ***ACTION**

5. COUNCIL MEMBER ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

No correspondence. Ms. Pam Robinson expressed the purpose of Executive Order 2018-32 as a first step in preceding a robust regulation process where the use of the Conservation Credit System (CCS) is required. Member MacKenzie expressed thanks to the Governor for the support and asked that a thank you letter be sent. Ms. Robinson expressed the support of the Governor from the creation of the program to the present and his appreciation of the time spent on the program by all involved. ***NO ACTION**

6. MITIGATION REGULATION WORKSHOP (called to order at 8:49 AM) - *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

See separate minutes for this item. ***NO ACTION**

7. SEC WILL PROVIDE SETT STAFF WITH COMMENTS AND GUIDANCE ON DRAFTING MITIGATION REGULATIONS - *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Member Molini asked for a clarification on how this program interacts with military operations? Mr. Bryan Stockton replied that there is a supremacy clause, and Congress can approve military actions and it is doubtful that the military would comply with the CCS.

Member Boies asked what the plan was for regulations moving forward. Mr. McGowan replied that following the next workshop there would be a hearing for formal adoption of the regulations.

Member Molini asked if there was discussion about what to do with exploration which can represent disturbed habitat? Mr. McGowan replied that yes there have been discussions and that there is extensive disturbance from exploration activities. It is a concern. The Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team (SETT) is working on a solution for how to address it. Possible options could be to use data for mitigation that was collected prior to the disturbance. Another option is to work with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to report more comprehensively on how the disturbance was rehabilitated. Another alternative would be use data from adjacent sites that have not been disturbed when exploration moves into a development phase.

Member Swanson recommended that remote sensing methods could be combined with some of the previous ideas to quantify habitat previous to the disturbance. ***NO ACTION**

8. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON THE SEMI-ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE- *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Mr. McGowan presented the semi-annual progress report.

Member Biaggi expressed his approval of the level and amount of information provided. Member Swanson moved to accept the progress report and Member Molini seconded the motion. ***ACTION**

9. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE 2018 ANNUAL CCS SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE REPORT- *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Mr. McGowan presented the performance report.

Member Biaggi asked for clarification that credits are not the same as acres. Mr. McGowan replied that they were not. Member Biaggi recommended that this be clarified in the legend on page 8 and 12 of the report.

Member MacKenzie asked if the seed funding will be regenerated and is not additional funding. Mr. McGowan replied that we should enhance the information to clarify that more seed funding opportunities will not be an additional appropriations request.

Member Boies moved to approve the performance report, Member Molini seconded the motion ***Action**

10. REVIEW AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF THE 2018-2019 CONSERVATION CREDIT SYSTEM CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS - *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Mr. McGowan introduced the report and listed the improvements that will be presented.

Ms. Andrlle introduced the topic of improvements on pipelines.

Member Boies asked if we have existing above-ground pipelines. Ms. Andrlle replied that all pipelines she is familiar with would be associated with other infrastructure (e.g., mines, geothermal etc.).

Member Boies asked if this improvement incorporates impacts from vertical structure under the 3 meter limit which establishes de minimus impacts. Ms. Andrie said that the science to inform how ravens are using different vertical heights is not available, but that there may be increased impacts from increased heights.

Member Biaggi asked if it would make sense to investigate different classifications for pipelines that offer differing perch heights. Ms. Andrie replied that she would investigate that avenue.

Member Swanson commented that many impactful pipelines include travel corridors and this improvement makes sense from that point of view. Member Swanson asked if livestock pipelines would be exempt. Ms. Andrie responded that yes, agricultural activities are classified as de minimus.

Mr. Brian Amme asked if municipal water supplies and towers would be exempted as well. Ms. Andrie replied yes, if it fell under that criteria. Mr. McGowan replied that public health and safety would need to be a consideration in many of these cases.

Member Swanson asked if there would be an issue with pipelines being a barrier for brood migration. Ms. Andrie replied that there is no research pointing to this specific issue, but that it would not be significant due to chicks being able to fly at an early age.

Mr. McGowan commented that a big issue is that ravens follow linear features per. Dr. Pete Coates research. It doesn't necessarily matter what the feature is, as long as it is linear.

Member Swanson asked if it would make sense if debits could go away if the linear feature was rehabilitated such that the linear feature was no longer present. Ms. Andrie replied that it could be a possibility, but that all debit projects are required to buy credits with a minimum of 30 year term. There are some ways that flexibility could be added to allow shorter terms. Mr. McGowan agreed with incentivizing a rapid restoration of disturbed sites, but in the case of large pipelines it would be impractical to assess which areas are reclaimed and which are not. Member Swanson suggested that we could incorporate a penalty or buying more credits if the issues are not addressed after the term is up.

Member Swanson recommended assigning different classifications for infrastructure associated with pipelines (e.g., pump station). Ms. Andrie responded that yes we could look at that.

Ms. Andrie introduced the landfill improvement topic.

Member Biaggi asked if classifying landfills as part of an urban environment takes into account a situation where landfills might be out of town for some distance. Ms. Andrie replied that the disturbance would be similar even with the disparate locations.

Member Boies asked if this would have impacts on private landowners. Ms. Andrie responded that no, as with pipelines, agricultural activities would be exempt, but that the SETT works with projects to actively minimize private lands impacts from ravens. Member Boies emphasized that ravens have a large impact.

Member Swanson indicated that a major problem from ravens in addition to sight lines, are subsidies they get from anthropogenic disturbances and that landfills represent a significant subsidy. He suggested a 50km radius, with reductions down to 3km based on raven management techniques that are employed. This would make it prohibitive for a landfill, but it should be prohibitive since it should serve as an incentive to decrease subsidies. It is not the footprint that is at issue, it is the subsidy that counts. Ms. Andrie asked for direction from the council about what to investigate.

Ms. Sheila Anderson asked for clarification if this would apply only to new landfills, but also to those existing that may need to renew a permit. Mr. Jim Lawrence responded that it would depend perhaps on the regulations and commented that predator control may need to be part of a permitting process. Mr. Lawrence asked how landfills are re-permitted.

Mr. Brian Amme asked in light of linear features, if the category should be broader than pipeline and instead have the category be linear rights of way? Mr. Lawrence asked if "all other linear facilities" should be an encompassing category.

Mr. Amme responded that it could be “linear rights of way” and all the associated structures that go into that type of feature.

Member Swanson asked if there was an incentive for power lines to be buried, and if there were are created when powerlines are buried, and if those same kinds of incentives could be applied in the case of pipelines? Mr. Lawrence responded that the incentive in his mind was the loss of the 6km buffer when transmission lines are buried, but that the immediate surface area is disturbed. Ms. Andrie responded that in the Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) as it functions currently, there would be no weight or distance associated with burying a pipeline.

Mr. McGowan mentioned a powerline that needed to be replaced on National Forest Land, the action would have required many credits to be purchased through the CCS, and this persuaded the power line to be buried. That burial was a significant conservation gain. It would be a tough sell if this program asked for credits from ground disturbance impact resulting from burial. Member Swanson responded by suggesting an incentive to bury linear features and mitigate surface impacts by relinquishing the requirement to purchase long term credits if a proper rehabilitation is shown? Mr. Lawrence asked if Member Swanson was thinking about a 5, 10, or 13 year credit. Member Swanson replied that he was thinking along those lines. Mr. Lawrence thought that if the program would require that for pipelines it would need to be the same for transmission lines. Member Swanson replied that yes, if the pipeline could be installed in a way that did not result in any linear features it would follow that we do not generate debits for that. Member MacKenzie responded by expressing his thought that transmission lines and pipelines are two different activities. Impacts from transmission lines are greater than pipelines that incentivizing the burial of powerlines should be top priority. Ms. Cheva Gabor clarified that the direction from the Forest Service is that transmission lines should be buried, but even that residual impacts would need to be mitigated. Member Swanson wondered what the impacts would be when comparing a pipeline to a transmission line. Ms. Andrie replied that the difference in debits generated would be very large. Member Swanson then remarked that the incentive to bury a transmission line even if some debits were required for a surface disturbance is by nature much more than for a pipeline. Ms. Swed addressed the importance of the acknowledgement that some disturbance remains after the burial of a transmission line. Ms. Andrie mentioned that the majority of the debits generated from disturbances come from the indirect buffers applied to the actual disturbance areas. Ms. Swed agreed with the thought. Mr. Alan Jenne expressed that within the HQT, the weight and decay curve address within the calculation the different direct impacts between a transmission line and a pipeline. That is already present and differentiated between the two types of disturbance. Ms. Andrie commented that the decay curve will capture most of the disturbance within a third of the specified distance of the impact where the majority of the impact is captured. Mr. Jenne recommended to revisit to make sure that the concerns are captured. Mr. Jenne commented that the system is pretty close right now. Ms. Andrie clarified that the direct disturbance will be comparable, but that the distance where the indirect impacts are applied is the more important question. For a buried transmission line for example, the question of the appropriate distance where any indirect impacts would be extended to is important. Calculating the direct impact is simple because it is based on the actual footprint, but what should the indirect impact be for a buried transmission line or a buried pipeline? Determining what those indirect distances are should be the next step. Instead of specifying various types of categories for buried features, if they could all fall under a larger linear right of way category might be the way to go. Member Swanson mentioned the direct disturbance vs. the indirect effect which may have three categories: 1. Perch elevation visibility, 2. Creation of anthropogenic subsidies (e.g., roadkill), 3. Nesting habitat (e.g., transmission line towers). Ms. Andrie asked if the distance should be defined based off of raven impacts. Should the indirect impacts be 0 if there were none of the above criteria associated with the project? Member Swanson agreed but clarified that the direct impacts would still be present. Ms. Brown commented that we could be strategic with an approach that rewards mitigation done well vs. mitigation not done well. Member Swanson mentioned that we should emphasize the “minimize” aspect of our mitigation hierarchy. Member Boies mentioned that there are possibilities for large pipelines in the future and anything we can do to get these pipelines underground is key. Ms. Monique Nelson clarified that in the Forest Service Draft Environmental Impact Statement there are no specific reclamation requirements and the Forest Service will not authorize new infrastructure outside of existing rights of way in Priority and General Habitat Management Areas unless there is an exception granted. Ms. Andrie acknowledged that there is room to investigate different levels of rights of way based on heights, width, ground disturbance, and residual impacts. Capturing different disturbance types not currently analyzed is important.

Mr. Ethan Mower gave a presentation regarding enhancement and uplift within the CCS.

Member MacKenzie asked under the current situation what happens to the uplift when the main project ends after 30 years? Mr. Mower responded that the initial quality for the uplift needs to be maintained regardless of the surrounding conditions for the entirety of the uplift term. This presents a disincentive for people to engage in uplift when different pockets of land are managed in a different way from the surrounding areas.

Member Swanson asked for clarification that credits are not generated until uplift is measured, and the duration of the credits would then be shorter. Mr. Mower responded that yes, the duration of the credits are determined by the prorating formula.

Mr. Mower commented that more details will follow but that this is a foundation that can provide flexibility in the future.

Ms. Meghan Brown asked if we were creating credits that would expire at the same time. Mr. Mower responded yes. Ms. Brown appreciated the effort to simplify the uplift process and provide consistency in timelines. This approach may cause other issues, but that may be needed to get uplift actions.

Mr. Mower indicated that in the future there are ideas that the SETT will bring forward that deal with confusion around term length and when they expire, and that ongoing discussions with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are important. Ms. Carolyn Swed responded that the USFWS appreciates that effort to incentivize uplift which is central to halting the decline of the GRS and its habitat. Some of the discussions give the USFWS pause, but that the service embraces the conversation around solutions around uplift. There may not be solutions to some dilemmas, but continued dialogue is important. Ms. Swed emphasized the desire to have a holistic conversation presented instead of incremental pieces introduced. Mr. Mower responded that the SETT intends to bring that holistic picture forward in the future, but that this particular piece was foundational to framing the rest of the discussion.

Ms. Gabor expressed that it is important to have discussions regarding restoration and enhancement. Ms. Gabor mentioned that the SETT has spent a few years discussing how the CCS could be applied on public lands. The preservation credits which are the foundation for the CCS currently are not something that federal agencies can implement on public land. Public lands needs more of an uplift approach and this idea is central to that discussion.

Member MacKenzie commented that this gives people a choice for either signing up for an additional 30 years or taking a shorter term.

Mr. Lawrence commented that this may lead to larger scale restoration projects and that this concept is needed to implement further action.

Member Swanson commented that the graph on page 10 may not make sense. If the credit purchase was for 120 years, and uplift came after 20 years, then 83% of the time those credits were purchased for the uplift would be present for, and so it ought to be worth 83% as much as an uplift that came right at the beginning. The slope of the boxes on page 10 should be the opposite direction. The higher the proportion of time the uplift is available, the more credits it ought to generate. Mr. Mower responded that in the example there was only 20 years where uplift occurred, so if a purchaser would like to stretch the 20 years term into a longer term, then those credits should be worth less to the purchaser. Member Swanson replied that that is not what the axes on the graph indicate. Member Swanson indicated that work may need to be done to make sure that the math is correct.

Mr. Dan Huser commented that we would be awarding a successful uplift project and not stating either way whether uplift was available for the 120 years or not. It lasted 120 years someone could go and verify that it did actually last 120 years.

Dan Huser introduced credit site verification.

Member Boies asked about flexibility around the time of reverification due to many ranchers being on a set schedule with ranch plans? Mr. Huser responded that it was best written firmly in the document while recognizing the flexibility can be granted. Mr. McGowan responded that especially if known beforehand, flexibility could be built into the management plan.

Ms. Meghan Brown asked if the SETT would outline the qualitative assessment and whether it would be consistent for different properties and if noxious weeds would be addressed. Mr. McGowan and Mr. Huser responded in the affirmative.

Member Swanson remarked that this plan sounds consistent with the rangeland monitoring handbook.

Ms. Sheila Anderson asked if the HQT still requires 2 people to do verifications and how the workload would change. Mr. Huser responded that there are instances where 1 person has verified on their own, but generally two people perform the verifications. The workload would change from 150% of the HQT over 5 site visits to 100% of the HQT effort over one site visit. This would represent reduced effort going into visits. The SETT would experience an increase in workload, which may reduce workload in the long term. Mr. McGowan expressed a concern with increased workload as well, and expressed the view that the 5th year SETT verification would be more of an in-house desktop type evaluation and site visits would be combined with already scheduled trips and that this will be revisited when remote sensing capabilities are increased. This approach will offer data that will be more useful than the data we currently collect.

Ms. Anderson asked if this will increase costs for landowners. Mr. Huser responded that the status quo requires 150% of the HQT effort and 5 site visits. We would be changing to 100% of the HQT effort with only one site visit from a verifier which would represent a significant savings.

Member MacKenzie asked if this would decrease interest in the verifier program. Mr. McGowan responded that no, he did not think it would result in any less interest in the verifier program. The bottom line is that we need to collect data that is useful to all involved. Ms. Anderson expressed that there is still some value to the data as they are permanent transects.

Mr. Brian Amme asked if 100% effort could be done every 5 years. Mr. Huser responded that it would be cost prohibitive, but that remote sensing could eventually achieve that.

Mr. Gary Roeder asked if the HQT changes through the years. Mr. McGowan responded that there is a version control implemented on each project. Mr. Roeder commented that reverifying anything will be a challenge. Mr. McGowan agreed that this is a large challenge, but that remote sensing would get to a point where we could collect meaningful data in a timeline that does not allow gaps. Mr. Huser emphasized the need for high quality data at a reasonable cost.

Member Biaggi moved to approve the improvement report with direction to the SETT to revisit pipelines and landfills to look at various linear features and how best to modify them. Member Boies seconded the motion. Member Swanson expressed concern with potential issues with the prorating formula. Member Biaggi stated that if that was a concern the SETT should work with Member Swanson to rectify any mistakes, but that the motion did not need to be amended. Member Swanson expressed that as long as the concept was in place that the longer the benefit exists, the more credits are awarded. Mr. Mower clarified that what was stated by Member Swanson was the concept behind the improvement. ***ACTION**

11. OVERVIEW OF THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE (USFS) GREATER-SAGEGROUSE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Presentation by Monique Nelson.

Member Molini asked if the management approaches that have influence on the sage-grouse outlined specifically in the plan? Ms. Nelson indicated that the relevant portion of the plan are sorted by resource area into sections. The most efficient way of searching the document would be to search "management approaches." Member Molini asked if standards and guidelines were replaced. Ms. Nelson replied that there still exists standards and guidelines.

Member MacKenzie asked if exceptions apply to powerlines that serve wind and solar development. Ms. Nelson replied that yes, powerlines that extended through Priority or General Habitat Management Areas could receive an exception.

Member Biaggi asked if exceptions would apply to the military. Ms. Gabor replied yes.

Ms. Meghan Brown commented that some separate discussions were had with the Forest Service regarding livestock grazing desired conditions in riparian areas and that some of this language was worked out in cooperation with the Forest Service.

Member Boies asked for an example of Standard 41. Ms. Nelson responded that this standard is easy to abide by because most water developments are generally protecting sage-grouse habitat. Ms. Brown commented that development might not be adverse, but timing of grazing might. Ms. Brown commented that in other states this was a guideline and not a standard. Member Boies commented that he could see a scenario in which water might be piped away to make a grazing plan work. This might be viewed as adverse. Ms. Brown agreed, but that this was better than previous iterations. Member Molini commented that while it might not incentivize development, this standard does not preclude it. Ms. Nelson commented that it does compel the Forest Service to do an analysis of the effects. Member Swanson remarked that including the word “net” adverse effect might be preferable. Ms. Cheva Gabor concurred with Member Swanson.

Member Boies asked if the threat of wildfire through targeted grazing is addressed. Ms. Nelson responded no.

Ms. Gabor offered further information at a later meeting about how the Forest Service will address targeted grazing and flexibility.

Member Swanson commented that we cannot fix everything in the plan amendment now, but that there is a forest plan amendment process coming and we can better address some concerns in that process. Ms. Nelson responded that challenges will still exist specifically relating to flexibility, but that these guidelines could lay a foundation for those conversations. Ms. Brown emphasized trend and how we need to look at things over time vs. a snapshot approach. Ms. Brown feels that these guidelines allow a tiered approach and we should not become too prescriptive. Ms. Gabor talked about the need to keep things general in the sage-grouse plan so that it does not hamper flexibility later in the process. Member Boies expressed the importance of trend as well in order look at a larger picture.

Member Biaggi asked why there was debate over finer point in the DEIS that are best left in comments submitted at a later date. Member Biaggi asked the intent of this discussion. Ms. Nelson responded that comments are important.

Member Molini asked about management approach 45 and asked if it was not more important to implement factors rather than determine them? Ms. Gabor commented that Forest Service Staff are making changes in preparation for the final document. Member Biaggi asked if changes can be made to the preferred alternative. Ms. Gabor responded that yes, as long as it is within the scope of what has already been analyzed.

Mr. Mower commented that the SETT has a meeting with the Forest Service where specific issues could be discussed and resolved as the council directs.

Ms. Nelson commented that she was taking a detail and will not be available past the end of the month. ***NO ACTION**

12. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON STATUS OF STATE LANDS WITHIN THE SAGE-GROUSE SERVICE AREA - *FOR POSSIBLE ACTION*

Kathleen Petter presented information regarding state lands located within sage-grouse habitat. Strictly state owned lands, does not include lands leased by the state.

Member Boies asked where HD Summit was. Mr. Alan Jenne responded that they were mule deer migration corridors.

Member Biaggi asked if the new state park on the Walker River was in bi-state habitat. Ms. Petter responded yes.

Member Biaggi asked about state owned school lands. Mr. Lawrence stated there was not much left. ***NO ACTION**

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

Member Boies expressed that it would be valuable to look into what additional states are doing for their mitigation actions and the effectiveness of those actions. Mr. Lawrence commented that different states have different approaches and are at different stages of development. Member Boies expressed that other states do not view the CCS in a very positive light currently and that perhaps the Sagebrush Ecosystem Council (SEC) needs more information.

Member Boies asked about where wildlife corridors are in Nevada and what work is being done? Mr. Jenne offered to provide the SEC with a presentation on migration corridors but that much of that information is online as well. Member Boies stated that if the information was available that was sufficient.

Member Molini asked if Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) was in a better position to offer more information regarding different State's mitigation programs and efforts. Mr. Jenne offered the services of Sean Espinosa to give that type of presentation in coordination with the SETT.

A doodle poll will be sent out for possibilities around the 14th of February.

14. FEDERAL AGENCY UPDATES AND COMMENTS

- A. US Fish and Wildlife Service
Seeking public comment for the 2013 proposed listing for the bi-state sage-grouse. This will be in the federal register in January, and will be looking at a data call in the future.
- B. Bureau of Land Management.
No new state director yet. Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for greater sage-grouse is published and 30 day protest period is ongoing. 11 million in emergency stabilization and rehabilitation for this season. 980 Wild Horses gathered with planned gather in the Pinenuts.
- C. Natural Resource Conservation Service.
Awaiting Farm Bill. EQIP applications received, one applicant for the greater outcomes for greater sage-grouse partnership. Another funding round planned for April. Mr. Gary Roeder is retiring at the end of the year.

15. STATE AGENCY UPDATES AND COMMENTS:

- A. Governor's Office.
Ms. Sheila Anderson commented that the staff was working on the Governor's consistency review of the BLM FEIS. There has been no contact with the incoming Governor's team, but that staff was working on reports to leave behind. Ms. Anderson would be retiring on the 14th.
- B. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR).
Mr. Jim Lawrence commented that the Nevada Department of Forestry lost the appeal to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for funding. Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) is watching Assembly Bill 84, which is a conservation bond relating to purchasing and retiring conservation credits, and other conservation efforts.
- C. Department of Wildlife.
Fourteen thousand acres of Pinyon and Juniper (PJ) removal have been done.
- D. Department of Agriculture.
The department is working on collecting data to inform future FEMA requests and to generally inform resources lost in the case of wildlife. This data can also be used to show the value of rehabilitation work.
- E. Conservation Districts Program.
Twenty eight districts were in good standing at the state conservation commission meeting. Nevada Association of Conservation Districts and Natural Resource Conservation Service supported 7 resource concern assessments.
- F. Sagebrush Ecosystem Program.

Tumbling JR Ranch will be reverting funds back to the state and there may be another round of state solicitation for projects. Environmental Incentives produced a one page document as a marketing tool for both credit projects and debit projects.

16. PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments

17. ADJOURNMENT

Member Biaggi moved to adjourn the meeting, Member Molini seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 2:44 PM.

DRAFT