



STATE OF NEVADA
SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEM COUNCIL
201 South Roop Street, Suite 101
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5247
Phone (775) 687-2000

DRAFT MINUTES

Date: Friday, December 13, 2024

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Place: Nevada Department of Wildlife
Main Conference Room
6980 Sierra Center Pkwy #120
Reno, Nevada 89511

Zoom Access for the Public

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 233 937 824 512

Passcode: 3V5izS

Dial in by phone

+1 775-321-6111, 505190464# United States, Reno

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 505 190 464#

1) CALL TO ORDER @ 8:37 am; ROLL CALL

- a. Council Members Present: Chris MacKenzie, Chair; Jake Tibbitts, Vice Chair; Bevan Lister, Steven Boies, Mathew Johns, William Molini, Sherman Swanson; Daphne Emm Hooper; Kyle Davis; Alan Jenne, NDOW; Kristen Jule, USFWS; Jon Stansfield, USFS; Jon Raby, BLM; Chris Rose, NRCS; Meghan Brown, NDA
- b. Council Members Absent: James Settelmeyer, DCNR

2) PUBLIC COMMENT

- a. Adrian Juncosa made public comment stating that responses to his previous concerns seem inadequate. No concrete assurance that technical comment on the program will be protected. Needs to be added to the NAC text. Suggested removal of 'misrepresentation' in the NAC language to address this. Urged the council to provide formal public comment and response process for the HQT. At a minimum, would like responses to technical comments to be made public, either at SEC meeting or in other public forum so that interested parties know what action was taken and why or why not.
- b. Naomi Jensen made public comment as general member of public but owns small environmental consulting firm (in CA) and has helped project proponents in the past. Speaking from a perspective of a third-party that is needing to hire verifiers to comply with this program. Has concerns with regulation as written. Too much subjectivity written into

this. Understands needing to nip fraud in the bud or data mishaps, but disagrees with adding wording such as efficiency and added workload and misrepresentation. Feels that there is back-door intimidation of verifiers going on. There needs to be open dialog and cooperation with the SETT on working out issues on large complex projects. Seems to be a lack of this. There's confusion about role of verifiers and the transparency with the project proponents and consultants that hire these verifiers.

3) NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING – POSSIBLE ADOPTION OF THE TEMPORARY REGULATIONS FOR CHANGES TO NAC 232.400 – 232.480

- a. Sarah Hale gave a presentation on the Proposed Amendment to NAC 232.480.
- b. SEC Members asked questions and held discussion based on the presentation.
- c. SEC members discussed the specific language and proposed changes to the updated NACs.
 - i. See updated document during next hearing.
- d. Member Davis proposed that DAG Ting review all new changes to see if we need to adjourn this hearing and continue at a later date.
 - i. SEC, along with Ting, agreed to adjourn the hearing and have another.

***ACTION** Member Swanson Motioned to accept the proposed changes to the regulations with the understanding that they have to come back for another hearing. Member Davis seconded. All were in favor.
- e. Discussion was held about the intention of the role of a verifier.

4) PUBLIC COMMENT

- a. Josh Vittori made public comment inquiring as to whether a verifier could appeal the decision if their application were rejected due to not meeting the minimum qualifications (e.g., if they were right on the edge of the qualifications or if there were a misunderstanding/misinterpretation of their resume)
- b. Naomi Jensen made public comment expressing concerns. Has questions on the role of the verifier and how they are representing the program since her understanding was that the verifier is an objective third party. Commented that some amendments should be made to definitions and some areas in earlier sections of the NAC with respect to verifiers and their roles. Commented that in the form for adoption, filing amendments, or repeal of regulations, in 5a there is only one sentence about economic impacts on the people who hire the verifiers that could occur from the need to hire new verifiers or project delays. Commented that this was an understatement and that there are severe implications if the proponents aren't involved when a verifier is being questioned (since it is kept confidential). Encouraged council to consider the effects not only on verifiers but on those that are trying to comply with the program.
- c. Adrian Juncosa made public comment that the verifier definition should include the calculation of credits resulting from restoration actions on private land.

5) ADJOURNMENT

- a. Member Lister motioned to adjourn the hearing. Member Davis seconded. All in favor. Hearing adjourned at 10:10am.