



desert conservation

P R O G R A M

respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Community Advisory Committee

Regional Transportation Commission Building, Room 108
600 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

Draft Meeting Summary for August 26, 2010



Meeting Summary

Community Advisory Committee Meeting 19, August 26, 2010, 2:00 p.m.

Regional Transportation Commission Building, Room 108

The following pages contain a summary of the presentations and discussions from the Desert Conservation Program (DCP) Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting of August 26, 2010. These pages, together with the presentation slides and handouts, constitute the meeting record.

Meeting 19 Agenda

1. Opening and Introductions
2. Approval of Meeting Notes from the July 2010 CAC Meeting - Action Item
3. Discussion of Implementation & Governance Structure Recommendations - Action Item
4. Discussion of Next Steps for the CAC and Permit Amendment
5. Public Comment
6. Meeting Wrap Up and Closing

Appendix A - Meeting 19 Agenda

Appendix B - Presentation on Implementation & Governance

Appendix C - Next Steps & Staff Priorities

1. Opening and Introductions

Eric Hawkins, Facilitator, opened the meeting at 2:17 p.m. and noted that a quorum was present. Eric reviewed the agenda and meeting goals with the committee.

2. Approval of Meeting Notes From the July 2010 CAC Meeting - Action Item

Eric asked the committee if it had any changes to make to the July CAC meeting notes. Jim Rathbun, Education, asked about the project that Jane brought up in Arizona and if the committee would get the information for the HCP comparisons that were discussed at the July meeting. John responded those costs on the updated table will be emailed to the committee after the meeting. There were no other comments or changes and the notes were approved by consensus.



3. Discussion of Implementation & Governance Structure Recommendations - Action Item

Eric noted that he took several comments from the committee and sorted those comments in seven areas and prepared draft Recommendation #5. Eric reviewed the draft recommendation with the committee:

-Recognizing that implementation of the amended MSHCP, as described in the previous recommendations, will require a carefully defined management and oversight structure, the CAC is pleased to provide recommendations in each of the following seven key areas:

-Governance

- Parity: representation from all entities important; valley and "everyone else"
- Discussion to be held by elected bodies, political system established by political bodies
- Enough to justify a change?
- What we have works well administratively, focus on results
- Scattered political leadership leads to weaker organization

-Fee Collection

- How much spent/remaining?
- Program must change from an expenditure-based system
- Wise to maintain some type of savings account to get through tough times

-Minimization

-Compliance monitoring and reporting

-Reserve Management

- Our scenario very different from other regions
- Biggest challenge, very complex, will take time & care
- Pursue current outline until/unless it becomes impossible, then modify to match CAC other guiding principles/recommendations
- Now is the time to pursue the Reserve system-if it doesn't work, we'll need time to make something else happen
- We currently have the elements of time and reserve (extra, existing) funds

-Advisors

- Science oversight



- Financial oversight
- Financial and science reviews done regularly, not necessarily annually
- Include people/interests like the CAC
- Evaluate new science
- Accountability
- Conflict of interest policy needed in implementation agreement

John provided additional information on Implementation & Governance to the committee. (See Appendix B)

Paul Larsen, Business, asked if adequate funding for reserve management means a fund held in reserve or is it a mechanism for funding. John responded that the current plan is set up to create an endowment fund where fees collected are deposited into an account and is maintained to perform mitigation and conservation in perpetuity. The Permittees have begun discussing what type of endowment fund would need to be place. If there was a reversion of the reserve system back to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). If the County were to take over management, we include a provision that it would go back to the BLM either at the end of the permit or if there were a reversion. Paul asked about a voluntary reversion and John responded that is something we are talking about, whether it is at the end of the permit or under other circumstances. The take we incur will be an ongoing obligation associated the permit.

Jim commented that the reserve that we are getting from the BLM right, so why is USFWS included? John responded that one of the potential options is that the USFWS, which is well equipped to manage a large conservation area, could assume management of the reserve system, perhaps incorporated in their refuge system. Jane, Environmental, asked if the reversion clause were to be revoked before the end of the permit, the permit was granted on the inclusion of the reserve so that would call into question the permit itself so that would be a concern, and in the description of the reserve management system you don't really specify how land would change in its management responsibility. Is this because the Permittees are considering options about how that land can change status? John responded that the Permittees continue to work out the details and are looking at all options. Jane commented that we then have a guarantee that the land is managed under multiple-use principles for natural resource values under the permit. Jane asked if the mechanism at this point is still unspecified and John answered yes. Jane stated that she wanted to be clear about that because as most of you know the environmental community that Scott and Jane are constituents of are working with other people here locally and some of those stakeholders have



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

concerns about whether the BLM lands can be legislatively transferred to a non-federal entity. If there are more options being looked at for the liability, we think that is a good step to take. Marci stated that the Permittees primary goal is ensuring the authority to carry out the conservation actions, not necessarily who owns the land. As a result, the Permittees are reviewing all options and we hear your feedback loud and clear. Jane then commented they have reviewed Nevada Revised Statute and the authority of Clark County to act in a management responsibility. Catherine Jorgensen, Clark County, responded that NRS 244.386 authorizes the County to enter into agreements with other entities and to collect money and to use that money to purchase land including land used for conservation and in her opinion there is no statutory hindrance to developing the reserve system.

Jim asked if Red Rock NCA required legislation to set the activities that could occur and whether legislative action be needed to establish the reserve system, John responded that we are not there yet. Mike Ford, City of Mesquite, stated that everything that the BLM does, except administration under the mining law of 1872, is discretionary and there is sufficient latitude on the BLM side to deal with discretionary interests.

Jim asked how long the DCP has had a peer review process and Marci indicated that there had been such a process since 2005 2006 and that the USGS coordinayes our peer review, as they are the scientific advisor for the Department of the Interior.

John moved on to Compliance and Accountability in the presentation and Tom Warden, City of Las Vegas, asked if this changes the way that fees are collected and Marci responded that yes it would change if fee collection was centralized, as right now fee collection is decentralized and collected by each Permittee. Jane asked if this is because the grading permits are done in different places and the answer was yes. Joe Pantuso, Homebuilders, commented that the current process has worked very well. Marci stated that while it has worked well for customers from a programmatic standpoint, it has not been not as accurate as we would like. Although we have made a tremendous amount of progress training the counter staff at all municipalities, those are entry level positions and there is a large amount of turnover in staff so it becomes constant training and upkeep. Mindy commented the process seems simple enough, the worst thing in the world for developers would be if a developer pays the fee and it takes three days to enter information in the computer. As long as you have a receipt in hand that should work. John noted that the Permittees are nowhere near having these details. Marci stated that Clark County has heard the committees concerns and that the process needs to be close to what we have now.

Paul noted that the committee wants to keep the current process and he would support additional training . Any delay in the process would be detrimental to the development community, the process needs to be designed to be efficient. Marci stated that we need to find a balance between efficiency of the program and stay within the \$550 per acre. The current collection process is twenty years old and staff is confident



it can gain efficiencies in the process on the user end and on the back end. Paul commented that he does not think that centralization is the answer. Scott Rutledge, Environmental, asked if we should add fees on top of the miscalculated fees to penalize the person that made the mistake and Marci stated that would not happen as the Permittees are in the same financial crisis. John noted that we could have a system where the fee collection is done electronically. Paul commented that a centralized process might be disengaged and inefficient. Allan Spooner, Business, mentioned having an online certification. Mike noted that going to a computer and not a person at a counter is better citing the DMV as an example. Paul responded that DMV is not a good example because it is a sole entity responsible for that function and here we have multiple entities responsible. Allison Stephens, City of North Las Vegas, stated that the buzz word seems to be centralization versus decentralization and what she heard was that a centralized process overall and that includes training in multiple locations as opposed to one central location where everything has to be done. Patrick Foley, Banking/Finance, recommended that a system automatically calculate fees that each entity could use, then the calculations are done from a centralized area then when you do pay your fees you're already at that counter and then you go get your grading permit. Mindy stated that you have to have a situation where if someone is paying fees and there is a problem they need to be in the same location that issues the grading permit in case there is a problem. Marci commented that there will have to be QA/QC and that the Permittees are committed to ensuring a more efficient process.

Eric proposed that the committee begin collecting data to craft a recommendation for the next meeting. The committee was asked to write their ideas on either the green paper for support, the yellow paper for concerns, or the red paper if it is a deal breaker, and place their ideas under the appropriate banner within the seven categories.

Eric collected the following committee input:

Governance:

- Single permit with severability
- We need more detail on the mechanism to give Clark County direct authority to manage BLM for national resource values in mitigation for take.
- Support central board with authority maybe existing structure
- Governance regional board needs to be revised to truly govern the MSHCP. Some that understand the purpose.
- Stack the board? Do you get a diverse opinion from central board?
- Concern with SNRPC in role of regional board



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

-Board should change to include representatives from all Permittees

Fee Collection

-Have central accounting system

-Strong support for centralized fee collection

-Support efficient centralized fee collection

-Fee collection centralized, whatever you call it we need to make sure proper fees are collected

-Exploring an automated system

-Centralized fee collection should not result in any additional agency with authority to "red tag" a project. Building/grading permit issuer should remain only agency with such authority.

-Oppose central collection of fees

-Central collection separate from grading permits

-Skeptical of centralized fee collection, can be inefficient for developers

-Support central fee collection if: electronic only (no trip across town) and pay before grading permit

-No computer validation among staff; receipts are adequate

Minimization

No additional comments

Compliance & Reporting

No additional comments

Reserve Management

-BLM trade to MSHCP not being a tool for loss of additional public lands from the public

Advisors

-Support science advisor and peer review

-We need public citizens on board along with advisors - each area mixed use, environmental, science, habitat

-Annual audit

Accountability

No additional comments



Eric stated that he will take the comments provided by the committee and draft a recommendation that speaks to the committee members positions.

4. Discussion of Next Steps for the CAC and Permit Amendment

John described the next steps for staff and the committee in the process. (See Appendix C)

He then informed the committee that Clark County is preparing the draft recommendations report and will send the report to the committee two weeks prior to the next meeting for discussion the report at the September meeting. The committee will collectively review the material, provide feedback on whether the recommendations make sense. Based on the feedback, the CAC will be asked to approve the report in either September or October. The recommendations report will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in November for direction. From there, the Permittees will work on the details of the draft HCP. John estimates six to eight months to draft the HCP. When we are close to release for public review staff will reconvene the CAC for at least one meeting to review the draft HCP. In the interim period, Clark County staff will complete a detailed cost and revenue analysis for the plan, flush out the conservation strategy, including minimization and mitigation measures, and complete the impacts analysis. Clark County will also be working with Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) to permit the proposed covered plant species. We will also work on the Reserve System agreement plan and looking at amending the County and City ordinances, where necessary. Staff will also review the development process to determine the timing and process for implementation, including reaching out to the development community to get input on how best to streamline the measures and address the fee collection issues and concerns. Staff will also be developing outreach strategies and public education for end users to make them aware of pending changes and how to best address issues. The County will develop a construction worker education program and will be working to build tortoise clearance capacity among local environmental firms. Finally staff will begin developing compliance reporting templates and prepare a staffing analysis.

Mike asked if the report will be taken to the City of Mesquite prior to taking it to the BCC, and Marci responded absolutely. Mindy asked if there were any contracts upcoming that need to be reconsidered given the current input by the committee. Marci responded that the County has not entered into any continuing contracts with any of the agencies, we are only performing ongoing actions to keep the permit in compliance.

5. Public Comment

Rob Mrowka, Center for Biological Diversity, stated that this country is unique among nations in the world as we have the National Heritage Program that was established early on through the work of



desert conservation

PROGRAM

respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Teddy Roosevelt and others like him at the end of the last century turn of this century that established a system of National Public Lands the National Forest the Public Lands system managed by the Bureau of Land Management, the National Wildlife Refuge managed by Fish & Wildlife Service. Congress deemed in their wisdom that lands be made available for the use and enjoyment of all the citizens of the country regardless of where they lived. Now, I'm really concerned about this reserve system that your considering, what I hear you saying is that your going to take lands out of that system, National Heritage Wildlands, and dedicate them for the use of promoting unsustainable growth in Southern Nevada for the benefit of a few developers, it doesn't strike me that is the right way to be going, to take away lands of the American public who dedicated them now to line the pockets of a few. If you look at the reserve systems like at the last meeting, most of the reserve systems are located on private lands that had to be bought and paid for by the developers, not public lands that were usurped from general public use. At the very minimum, if you are considering a public land based reserve system the developers in the MSHCP program should have to pay a land rent in addition to a mitigation fee, to pay land rent to acquire that access, just like if you were acquiring an oil and gas lease or under Senator Reids proposal on solar lease you pay an up front land lease to be able to use that land for your unique and sole purpose and then on top of that add on the mitigation fee whatever it is \$550 or above an acre to pay for the damage and the conservation activities that occur on that land.

Hermi Hiatt, Citizen, I have been one of those conservationists here for over 35 years and have seen changes. I have seen Coyote Springs Valley disappear to a private developer, I have seen Ivanpah designated as a private airport and just recently I got to see the map with all the proposed or applications for renewable energy projects be wind or solar, and I really wish this group got to see this map because it is quite extensive. So another words, we have so much public lands here in Southern Nevada but we are losing it very rapidly so I am not in favor of the reserve management that was proposed and I have listened to the conversations today, we have had private conversations with Marci and John, and I know there are some options that will be looked at and I think you really need to consider something like either a lease system with BLM to make sure it is still BLM land or federal land or there should be some working together with BLM, and have a memorandum of understanding that could be worked out that actually the two parties are talking together which apparently has been a problem in the past from what we have heard just recently at a meeting. So, I am really approaching this group to consider these kinds of options rather than actually privatize it, even it has a clause that it would come back to the BLM if it did not work out. Things change, there is a big turnover with people that work for Clark County, for the government, and there is a turnover with BLM, and a lot of the institutional memory literally goes away. So I think we need to make sure that this is really carefully planned out and so that we do not lose all of our public lands. I even forgot



the OHV, here is the multiple use, so we even have another group of people that uses the land. I know we are not done with that discussion but I had to make a comment since I was not able to put one of those stickers on the wall.

6. Meeting Wrap Up and Closing

Eric reviewed the plan for the next CAC meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 16, 2010. The plan is to finalize recommendation #5 and to present the draft recommendation report. The action items for this meeting are to 1. Send the cost/fee structure on the comparable HCP's to the committee and include Coyote Springs. 2. Send draft recommendations report to committee two weeks prior to September meeting.

The committee agreed to meet from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. for the September meeting. Scott Rutledge and Allan Spooner voiced that they will not be in attendance in September.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 p.m.



| Committee Members Present | Attendance | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Clark County Staff | Others In Attendance |
| Jane Feldman, Environment/Conservation | Jodi Bechtel | Vickie Adams |
| Patrick Foley, Banking/Finance | Marci Henson | Hermi Hiatt |
| Mike Ford, City of Mesquite | Ann Magliere | Michael Johnson |
| Stan Hardy, Rural Community | Mark Silverstein | Jeri Krueger |
| Paul Larsen, Business/Small Business | John Tennert | Rob Mrowka |
| Joe Pantuso, Developer/Homebuilder | Sara Zimnavoda | Ian Zabarte |
| Jim Rathbun, Education | | |
| Scott Rutledge, Environmental | | Eric Hawkins (Facilitation Team) |
| Allan Spooner, Business/Small Business | | |
| Allison Stephens, City of North Las Vegas | | |
| Mindy Unger-Wadkins, City of Henderson | | |
| Tom Warden, City of Las Vegas | | |
| Darren Wilson, Nevada Taxpayers Assn. | | |



Flipcharts

Notes:

Agenda

1. Opening and Introductions
2. Approve July Notes
3. Implementation & Governance
4. Next Steps
5. Public Comment
6. Meeting Wrap-up
7. Adjourn

Goals

- Approve July, 2010 meeting notes
- Approve recommendations on
 - Minimization
 - Mitigation
- Discussion on Implementation & Governance

Action Items

| What | Who | When |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add Coyote Springs to the list• Add price tags to comparable hcp's list | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DCP | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 8/16 |

Next Meeting

- 16 September 2010
- Topic: Implementation & Governance, Final Report



Flipcharts

Notes:

Recommendations

Comment Categories

- I support the recommendation as presented
- I can support with the following conditions
- I cannot support the recommendation

Recommendations

Preamble

- Whereas, the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was convened by the Clark County Board of Commissioners to provide community and stakeholder perspective on the development of an amendment to the Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP), and

Recommendations

- Whereas, the management and staff of the Desert Conservation Program (DCP) in its capacity as Program Administrator for the Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP) is tasked with preparing and submitting the amendment to the US Fish & Wildlife Service for its review and approval, and

Recommendations

- Whereas, these recommendations are provided by the CAC to provide perspective and input to the DCP in its development of the MSHCP amendment and represent the preferred intent of this Committee for the various facets of the amendment, and
- Whereas, it is the desire of this committee is to keep the costs & fees of administration and conservation efforts for the MSHCP at their current levels as prescribed by NRS, and



Flipcharts

Notes:

Recommendations

- Whereas, it is the desire of the CAC to avoid undue complexity and maximize the efficiency of the Program's efforts,
- Now, therefore, we the members of the CAC submit the following recommendations for the development and implementation of the Clark County MSHCP

Discussion

Minimization Recommendation

- After reviewing and discussing the requirement for minimization, and with the understanding that fees for minimization and/or mitigation measures will not be increased above existing levels, the committee finds the following minimization strategy (developed by the Permittees) to be acceptable:
 - We agree that minimization is a prudent step that significantly strengthens the likelihood of the permit being issued by the US Fish and Wildlife Service

Recommendations

Minimization Recommendation

- The species selected for minimization measures are those most likely to benefit from such efforts and those in need of greatest consideration
- The concept of impact zones (modified to two) is in keeping with the requirement to minimize and mitigate to the "maximum extent practicable" and appropriately differentiates the quality of habitat lost with the mitigation requirement

Discussion

Minimization Recommendation

- The minimization measures proposed for Zone B should be implemented without negatively impacting development time lines or increasing the complexity or cost of the process



Flipcharts

Notes:

Recommendations

- Covered plant & animal species found during clearance surveys should be considered prime candidates for carefully planned and appropriate relocation to designated areas so as to augment native populations and count toward the recovery of the species

Recommendations

Minimization Recommendation

- We conclude the above based on the fact that the measures outlined in these strategies are logical, purposeful and consistent with the committees guiding principle on activities/mitigation strategy, and rely upon the program characteristics outlined in the CAC's recommendation(s) for implementation.

Recommendations

Mitigation Recommendation

- After reviewing and discussing the requirements for mitigation, and recognizing that
 - the mitigation strategy outlined in the 2000 MSHCP is largely an expenditure based strategy which has not proven to be as effective or efficient as originally envisioned, and

Recommendations

- while a limited number of conservation actions have proven effective, many actions have been difficult to verify or track and do not provide sufficient transparency or accountability, and
- with the understanding that fees for minimization and/or mitigation measures should not be increased above their existing levels;
- the committee finds the following mitigation strategy (developed by the Permittees) to be acceptable:



Flipcharts

Notes:

Recommendations

Mitigation Recommendation

- We support the development of a Reserve System, consisting of lands currently managed by the BLM, to be transferred to the Permittees for the purposes of long-term conservation of species and mitigation of impacts in the developing areas of Clark County, thereby providing greater control over conservation efforts and maximizing the efficiency of the MSHCP.

Recommendations

Mitigation Recommendation

- We recommend that the reserve areas are developed to ensure the following:
 - That the reserves be developed to protect a variety of uses of these lands, including (where possible) historical or existing recreation uses, that are in addition to and/or consistent with habitat conservation, and that any reduction in historical or existing uses are done only when deemed critical to the conservation of a species

Recommendations

Mitigation Recommendation

- That the Permittees should develop at least one additional alternative that includes Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and is not dependent on the northeast area of Clark County, north of Interstate 15
- That scientific and financial oversight will be required to successfully develop and implement a reserve system

Recommendations

- That these recommended actions will supersede or modify existing programs, with a few limited exceptions such as protection of plant species specific to a conservation or mitigation need that cannot be addressed through the Reserve System, and that certain mitigation and conservation efforts currently administered by the County will need to continue, including:



Flipcharts

Notes:

Recommendations

- Pickup of wild tortoises from construction sites
- Management and maintenance of the Boulder City Conservation Easement and Muddy River properties
- Management and maintenance of currently acquired grazing allotments and water rights
- Public information efforts including the Mojave Max program
- Desert Tortoise Fencing
- Tracking & reporting of habitat loss under the permit

Recommendations

Mitigation Recommendation

- We conclude the above based on the fact that the measures outlined in these strategies are logical, purposeful and consistent with the committee's guiding principles on activities/mitigation strategy, and rely upon the program characteristics outlined in the CAC's recommendation(s) for implementation.



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Appendix A
Meeting 19 Agenda



AGENDA

Desert Conservation Program Community Advisory Committee Meeting County Of Clark, State Of Nevada

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a meeting of the Desert Conservation Program Community Advisory Committee (CAC) has been called and will be held on Thursday, August 26, 2010, beginning at 2:00 p.m. at the Regional Transportation Commission Building, 600 Grand Central Pkwy, Room 108, Las Vegas, Nevada. Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda.

1. **Opening and Introductions**
2. **Approval of Meeting Notes from the July 2010 CAC meeting - Action Item**
3. **Discussion of Implementation & Governance Structure Recommendations - Action Item**
Goal:
 - To continue discussions regarding draft Implementation & Governance Structure recommendations required for an amended MSHCP
 - To make a recommendation on the draft Implementation & Governance Structure for the amended MSHCP
4. **Discussion of Next Steps for the CAC and Permit Amendment**
Goal:
 - To review the next steps to complete the CAC's work and the anticipated process to complete Permit Amendment
5. **Public Comment**
No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken. Speakers are asked to sign in to speak. Speakers are asked to introduce themselves with their name and affiliation, if any, before speaking. Each speaker will be limited to three minutes.
6. **Meeting Wrap Up and Closing**
Goals:
 - To recap meeting results and identify follow-up activities
 - To outline agenda topics for the next meeting
7. **Adjourn**

continued on next page



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Committee members are asked to remain at the meeting until adjournment so that items requiring action are able to be heard as needed. Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically handicapped persons desiring to attend the meeting. Please call Ann Magliere at (702) 455-3536 in advance so that arrangements may be conveniently made.

MDH:aem

Dated: August 20, 2010

The above notice/agenda of a meeting of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Desert Conservation Program Advisory Committee scheduled for Thursday, August 26, 2010, at 2:00 p.m. was posted on or before the third working day before the meeting per Open Meeting Law requirements at the following locations:

Clark County Government Center Lobby
Clark County 3rd Street Building Lobby
Clark County Courthouse Annex
Laughlin Community Center
Sahara West Library

Las Vegas Library
Paradise Community Center
Winchester Community Center
Searchlight Community Center



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!


Appendix B
Presentation on Implementation & Governance



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Implementation and Governance


August 26, 2010

desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Governance


- Permittees recommend using existing regional Board to govern implementation of the MSHCP
 - Would not create new bureaucracy or new board
 - Enhances regional cooperation and accountability
- Permittees would be signatories under a single permit
 - Single implementing agreement
 - Same as current model
 - Provides for severability



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Fee Collection and Minimization


- Fee collection and implementation of the Plan would be centralized
 - Plan Administrator would implement the MSHCP “cradle to grave”
 - Includes minimization and reserve management



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Reserve Management

- Reserve management would be centralized
 - Reserve management plans would be developed for each reserve unit and approved by governing board
 - Management plans would include risk management plans (law enforcement, fire response, volunteer management, etc)
 - Would include provisions for reversion to BLM or FWS with adequate funding if Permittees fail to properly implement MSHCP



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Advisors


- Independent Science Advisor
- Independent Peer Review
 - Including review of Science Advisor recommendations
- Independent Financial Advisor
 - Annual audit of program funding



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Compliance/Accountability

- Annual Compliance Report to FWS
- Biennial Project Symposium
- 5-year Biological Monitoring Report
- Conflict of Interest Policy
- Board Resolution on Reserve Protection and Management
- Records and Document Management Policy
- Ethics Policy and Training for Staff and Board



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Questions?



desert conservation
PROGRAM
respect, protect and enjoy our desert!

Appendix C
Community Advisory Committee
Next Steps & Staff Priorities



Community Advisory Committee Next Steps

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| September 2010 | Discuss and/or Approve Draft Recommendations Report |
| October 2010 (If Necessary) | Approve Final Recommendations Report |
| November 2010 | DCP Staff presents CAC recommendations Report to Board of County Commissioners |
| Spring 2011 | Receive Presentation on Draft Amended MSHCP |

DCP Staff Priorities for 2011

- Prepare Draft MSHCP for public review
- Prepare cost and revenue analysis for the amended MSHCP
- Obtain master permit from Nevada Division of Forestry for covered plant species
- Prepare and pursue reserve system development plan to ensure a sound transition and resolution of issues/concerns
- Amend County and City Ordinances (urban wild land design standards & minimization measures)
- Analyze the development process and determine timing and process for minimization measures to ensure development process remains as streamlined and timely as possible
- Develop outreach strategy and public education program regarding changes to the MSHCP, in particular to the development process and minimization requirements
- Develop construction worker education program
- Build desert tortoise clearance capacity among local environmental firms and increase desert tortoise handling classes and qualified biologists
- Issue Request for Quotes and pre-qualify consultants for species clearance surveys
- Develop compliance reporting templates, develop programmatic metrics and benchmarks, develop tools to track and report on compliance and metrics
- Prepare staffing analysis and optimize use of volunteers and student interns where appropriate