

MOTION: Commissioner Tingey moved to accept the minutes. Commissioner Shippy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
R. Jeff Williams
Thad Alger
Doug Shippy
Orson Tingey

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ted Wilton
Ken Wellington

ABSTENTIONS: None

III. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC:

NON-ACTION ITEM

Commissioner Wellington arrived at the meeting.

There were no comments by the general public.

IV. AGENCY REPORT AND UPDATES:

ACTION ITEMS

A. NEVADA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION-PRESENTED BY MEGHAN BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ACTION ITEMS

- 1) Discussion and information related to the Spruce Allotment and the proposed wild horse sanctuary by Madeleine Pickens. Propose a county resolution in opposition to the anticipated conversion of the Spruce Allotment to a Wild Horse Sanctuary.

Meghan Brown, Nevada Cattlemen's Association, gave an update on the Spruce Allotment that was in the process of being purchased by Madeleine Pickens. She spoke with a representative of the national horse program to find out what comments they were receiving from the wild horse and burro goals and objectives that closed on September 3rd and Ms. Pickens' plan. She stated the representative feels private and government partnerships are going to be the future for wild horse management. She indicated there are proposals in New Mexico, Arizona and Montana. She further indicated that Ms. Pickens had released a fact sheet for the Spruce Ranch and she has purchased the private land and water rights within the boundary of the allotment and is also leasing Warm Springs which is a private property north of the Spruce allotment. She gave details about the Spruce Ranch and other property that is included in the fact sheet. She indicated Ms. Pickens has met with the BLM and discussed a draft plan which seemed to be more workable to the BLM than the Winecup Gamble option presented last year but she was unable to obtain a copy. She further indicated Ms. Pickens has been communicating with Congressman Moran from Virginia to submit legislation to the Natural Resource Committee in the House to make changes to the Wild

Free Roaming Horses and Burros Act. She stated Ms. Pickens has proposed to initially obtain 1,000 horses from the holding facilities and eventually increase that to 11,000. She further stated that there are three hmas in the Spruce Allotment and one is proposed to be gathered soon and there are currently horses within it that makes it appealing. She gave an overview of the costs to be paid by the BLM and the proposed savings to the government based on the proposal.

Commissioner Tingey expressed concern regarding the federal land in the area possibly being declared as a national monument or an international ecosanctuary which would restrict public access to public land.

Commissioner Wellington asked if the Taylor Grazing Act would have to be changed for the proposal to take place.

Ms. Brown indicated that is correct.

Commissioner Wellington asked how many horses are within the three hmas in the Spruce Allotment.

Ms. Brown indicated within the Spruce Allotment there are about 800 horses.

Chairman Spratling asked what the status of the three hmas would be if the proposed took place.

There was discussion regarding the location of the affected property and what portion is private property and what portion is public land.

Bryan Fuell, BLM Wells Field Manager, gave an overview of a map titled Spruce Area Sept. 2010, identifying the herd management areas in relation to the base property for proposal.

There was discussion regarding gathers in the hmas being planned and the fact that Ms. Pickens has a livestock/cattle permit which at this time would not affect these gathers. There was also discussion regarding Ms. Pickens not purchasing the livestock with the land and the Sorensen's continuing to use the allotment through the fall but what the process would be after that time in connection with the permits Ms. Pickens has applied for.

Discussion took place regarding the difference in cattle aums and horse aums and how they are calculated and the damage to public range caused by one animal compared to the other.

Commissioner Shippy asked if the Sorensen's run livestock year round on the property every year.

Mr. Fuell stated he couldn't say every year because the Sorensen's have taken non-use due to the forage condition because the area has been stricken with drought over the last number of years.

There was continued discussion regarding the Sorensen's existing permits and uses on the property.

Commissioner Williams asked Mr. Fuell if Ms. Pickens was being treated any differently than any other permit applicant.

Mr. Fuell indicated Ms. Pickens was not being treated any differently locally but that she has had communication with representatives in Washington instead of Elko. He gave some examples of ideas he has heard about that Ms. Pickens is proposing for the property.

Commissioner Wellington asked Mr. Fuell if he had ever heard of anyone proposing a project such as Ms. Pickens' proposal.

Mr. Fuell indicated this is a new concept and the way the program has worked over the last ten years is by contracting with contractors in the Midwest that have pastures that are high in aums and can graze a large number of horses for a long period of time at a smaller cost versus the property being open range with a different forage content.

Discussion continued regarding the different uses in the proposal and what the current uses are for the public land and private land in the area.

Mr. Brown gave a suggestion for a recommendation to the Elko County Commission as action for the item.

Commissioner Williams indicated he was not opposed to horses on private property or livestock on federal land as long as the guidelines for range management were the same for all ranchers.

Ms. Brown stated there is a broader concern from the perspective of the Nevada Cattlemen's Association as far as containment and management of livestock since the behavior of different animals are not the same.

There was continued discussion regarding the uses proposed and whether they are legal and if the members are in support or opposed to the project.

Chairman Spratling stated he understood that most of the members are opposed to the project but there are conditions that need to be listed why they are opposed to the project.

Commissioner Wellington suggested Ms. Brown address the County Commission on this issue for informational purposes.

MOTION: Commissioner Wellington moved to table the item to the next month's meeting and forward it to the County Commission for information purposes. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE:	Craig Spratling R. Jeff Williams Thad Alger Doug Shippy Orson Tingey Ken Wellington
------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NAY:	None
------	------

ABSENT: Ted Wilton

ABSTENTIONS: None

- 2) Discussion and information regarding the BLM filing for water rights for wildlife and horses.

Ms. Brown stated this has to do with the previous item and Ms. Pickens bought the water rights in connection with the allotment and the base property. She stated wild horses are not included in the definition of wildlife or livestock at this time and is concerned how Ms. Pickens is going to prove beneficial use for the water rights. She indicated she would like the County to come up with some strong wording opposing the use of water rights for wild horses or the BLM acquiring water rights for wild horses and be proactive in case the issue comes up with this proposal.

Mr. Brown indicated what Ms. Brown was referring to could be incorporated into the Public Land Use Management Directive Plan previously the Public Land Use Policy Plan that is currently being revised. He indicated the wording in the component within the plan concerning water rights is a basic statement but has never been worded as direct as the BLM nor the Forest Service or any federal agency should hold water rights in the State of Nevada which is by law and included in NRS. He agreed with Ms. Brown and recommended the concept be discussed later and could be incorporated into the directive.

Commissioner Williams stated he thought the project is stepping in uncharted ground in a lot of areas and the whole concept of what they're doing is what NRMAC is against because it is not helping the situation but magnifying the problem. He further stated he didn't think they had enough information to make a decision except they do not like the idea at this point.

Ms. Brown stated she would like the County to encourage the BLM to make this a local decision because it is going to affect the people and agencies in Elko County.

Mr. Brown indicated he would forward the item to the Elko County Commissioners for consideration.

Commissioner Wellington asked Mr. Fuell if the local agency has been able to communicate and express the concerns and action taken by this board and concerns of the County Commission with their representatives in Washington D.C.

Mr. Fuell stated they have had numerous phone calls and their Washington D.C. office is talking to Ms. Pickens about the concept of a sanctuary but not the details and they feel the Elko District office will be developing the plan with her for the public review process.

Commissioner Williams asked what the BLM's view is on the concept.

Mr. Fuell stated there are a lot of issues to be resolved and his biggest issue is how she is going to sustain the capacity she is proposing and keep the horses from going to the neighbors (property). He further stated he thought the concept was an interesting one and added when they went to the strategy to send them back east to the ranches that are productive they did not plan for bringing the horses back to Nevada and there could be a high mortality rate if they do.

There was discussion regarding Ms. Pickens proposal and the different aspects in terms of long term and short term holding for the wild horses.

Grant Gerber suggested that there be some communication with Ms. Pickens and the proponents of the project to discuss the affects of the proposal and put a plan together that would benefit the wild horses, Elko County and its citizens.

There was continued discussion regarding informing Ms. Pickens of the affects of the proposal to other animals and wildlife and communicating with her and her representatives personally about the proposal.

Commissioner Alger stated the Commission should address this issue next time and research it before the next meeting and make a conclusion.

Chairman Spratling encouraged everyone to visit Ms. Pickens website to inform themselves about her ideas.

- B. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTION ITEMS
- 1) Bellinger Seeding Allotment Grazing Permit Renewal Environmental Assessment and draft Finding of No Significant Impact. **These documents were available for public review through September 23, 2010.**

Dave Overcast, BLM Tuscarora Field Manager, presented a handout and explained the location of the allotment. He indicated the review period ended September 23, 2010, and he was not aware of any challenges or protests regarding the permit renewal. He explained the rest of the process that would lead to a final determination and outlined the details of the permit renewal.

- 2) Record of Decision for Newmont Mining Corporation's Leeville Project (N-71251) and South Operations Area Project Amendment (N-70550) for the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements. **Appeals had to be received in the BLM office by September 25, 2010.**

Mr. Overcast provided a handout and indicated the Supplemental EIS' were a result of a court decision a number of years ago and these are the Record of Decisions. He pointed out the locations of the projects and gave an overview of the actions that had been taken including what was remanded back to the BLM by the court. He stated he was not aware of any protests or appeals at this time but there is the opportunity to take the BLM to court for about six years.

- 3) Finding of No Significant Impact for the Elko District Vegetation Treatment Maintenance Project Environmental Assessment and Decision of Record.
- 4) Finding of No Significant Impact for the Boulevard Fuels Treatment Environmental Assessment and Decision Record.

Mr. Overcast stated items 3 and 4 are fuels projects and he located them on a map. He stated the Boulevard Fuels Decision was signed August 30, 2010, and gave an overview of the project. He further stated the Elko District Vegetation Treatment Maintenance Decision was signed on August 30, 2010, and gave an overview of the project.

The meeting order was changed to discuss item 7) under the BLM.

- 5) Federal Register posting for Notice of Availability of the Draft Jarbidge Field Office Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Idaho.
 - a. Discussion and consideration of the Draft Jarbidge Field Office Resource Management Plan and EIS.

Steve Dondero, BLM, identified the area in Elko County affected by the Plan and gave specifics on opportunities for public input and comments regarding the Plan. He explained how the Resource Management Plans are developed and what types of issues are addressed during the process and how those may change during the time of the Plan which is usually about 20-25 years.

Mr. Brown indicated every Commission member should have received a cd of the Plan. He stated he has reviewed the Plan trying to limit interest to the area in Elko County. He further stated there is a 90 day period to make comments on the Plan and the item will be on the next agenda for further consideration.

- 6) Environmental Assessment for the Antelope Complex Wild Horse Gather located south of Wells.

Mr. Fuell stated on Monday of last week they posted their environmental assessment and gather plan for the Antelope Complex. He indicated where and when the gather would be held and that they are going through the planning process with the public and currently seeking comments. He gave information on appropriate numbers for the complex and what they want to move the numbers down to during the gather. He stated during the scope for the environmental assessment last summer they received more than 11,000 e-mails in opposition of the gather and would appreciate the Commission's support or non-support in writing for the record.

Commissioner Williams asked if the gather would be affected by the proposal from Ms. Pickens.

Mr. Fuell stated he did not know but thought there would be a possibility of Ms. Pickens wanting to stop the gather within her allotment.

MOTION: Commissioner Wellington made a motion that the Natural Resource Management Advisory Commission support the BLM in the Antelope Complex Wild Horse Gather located south of Wells. Commissioner Shippy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
R. Jeff Williams
Thad Alger
Doug Shippy
Orson Tingey
Ken Wellington

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ted Wilton

ABSTENTIONS: None

7) Map of Proposed Projects in relation to Carlin, NV.

Mr. Overcast gave an explanation of the map provided outlining the proposed projects south of Carlin, Nevada, and stated if the Commission has specific questions on any of the projects he could be contacted.

The meeting order was returned to item 5) under the BLM for discussion.

- C. UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE ACTION ITEMS
- 1) Tipperary North Fork Project for Concord Minerals to conduct additional exploratory drilling for precious metals on National Forest System lands.

Cheri Howell, acting district ranger, gave an overview of the location and the details of the project.

Commissioner Wellington asked if the project will be using and maintaining county roads.

Ms. Howell indicated they will be using the North Fork Road and they are required to maintain it. She further indicated the mining company requested that based on proprietary reasons there not be a detailed map of the area enclosed with the proposal but she would provide a general area map to Mr. Brown for distribution.

Commissioner Wellington stated our biggest concern is the public roads and access to the area.

- 2) Report on Creeks and Communities efforts in the Southwest Ruby Mountains summarizing information and insights gathered during the workshops held Tuesday, August 17th and Wednesday, August 18th.

Gar Abbas gave an overview of the effort being to improve communication with all stakeholders but most of the participants have been permittees, ranchers and some private landowners. He explained the different assessments that have been completed and that the data is being compiled for a report to be presented at a meeting scheduled for October 27th at the Jiggs Community Hall from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. He stated the Nevada Creeks and Communities Team formerly the Nevada Riparian Service Team being a part of the UNR Extension and the National Riparian Service Team were involved with the complete process and will be in attendance at the meeting to interpret the results.

V. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA MINING CLAIM FEES AND MATTERS RELATED THERETO: ACTION ITEM

- A. Article in Northern Nevada Business Weekly entitled "Exploration companies battle higher fees".

MOTION: Commissioner Williams moved to table this item to the next meeting.

Commissioner Alger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
R. Jeff Williams
Thad Alger
Doug Shippy
Orson Tingey
Ken Wellington

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ted Wilton

ABSTENTIONS: None

**VI. REVIEW, UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF THE NATIONAL MONUMENT/
GREAT OUTDOORS INITIATIVE:**

Commission and Staff Presentation

ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown stated he hasn't heard anything new on the item since the report last month.

VII. REVIEW, UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL SB 787:

Staff Presentation

NON-ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown stated this is to amend The Clean Water Act proposal with the main point being jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers from navigable waters of the United States to all waters of the Unites States and it is still in committee.

Chairman Spratling asked if the makeup of the Congress changed substantially would there be a chance these items would be pushed through.

Mr. Brown answered that he thought they would be and the definition of navigable water needs to be identified to clarify the issue.

**VIII. REVIEW, UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF USFS RUBY MOUNTAIN
AND JARBIDGE RANGER DISTRICT TRAVEL MANAGEMENT**

PLAN:

ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown indicated Dr. Danny Gonzales, political science professor at GBC, has been selected as a facilitator between Elko County and the Forest Service. He further indicated the County and the Forest Service will be going forward with their joint facilitation meetings in October with the facilitator. He stated Elko County has been working on revising the former Public Land Use Management Policy Plan to be more demanding about how our public lands in Elko County are managed. He further stated that there is a committee of approximately twenty people with

different area interests that have been working on the plan for about two months and the County has employed Dr. Leaming who is an economist out of Arizona that had provided a report in 1994 and is updating it with 2010 data and standards. He added that the County is diligently working to present a document to the Forest Service that will change their mind.

Chairman Spratling asked when the revisions to the Plan will be done.

Mr. Brown stated the economic study will be completed by November 15th. He further stated the environmental issues should be done about the same time and everything should come together for presentation to the County Commissioners by the first meeting in December. He continued stating that the item will be before the Natural Resource Management Advisory Commission in October and final presentation in November and possible recommendation of approval to the County Commissioners for their first of the month meeting in December.

Chairman Spratling asked when the County would be meeting with the Forest Service and the facilitator.

Mr. Brown indicated they will be meeting with them through the complete process but he was unsure how many times they will meet. He stated the guidelines and procedures for the meetings still need to be worked out. He further stated the Plan that is being revised is for what is going on right now and what may happen in the future.

Commissioner Williams commented as was discussed earlier with the item with Ms. Pickens, most of the decisions for public land are not being made locally but at the federal level and takes the control out of Elko County and being able to communicate with the people that are making the decisions.

Mr. Brown indicated public lands belong to everyone in the United States but culturally, historically and economically the citizens of Elko County rely on these for their way of life and quality of life. He stated we have the opportunity that others don't have and we want to preserve that right by making a stand against those that have not even been here but are making decisions regarding the public land in our county.

IX. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF THE FIRST DRAFT OF ELKO COUNTY PUBLIC LANDS USE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PLAN DIRECTIVES: ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown stated this document was formerly known as the Public Land Use Management Policy Plan and was prepared for Elko County by the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council (SLUPAC) but belongs to Elko County. He indicated Elko County was asked to provide them with policies of how they would like to see public lands managed in Elko County and those policies were developed by PLUAC. He further stated he has included directives to federal land agencies on how Elko County wants their public lands managed. He gave an overview of the Plan including its contents which contains a lot of history and data and asked the Commission to review the Plan and provide their input and comments to him for consideration.

Commissioner Tingey asked if there was a time frame of when the Plan needs to be complete.

Mr. Brown indicated he would like to have it completed by the meeting in November. He gave an overview of changes and additions to be made which will include Dr. Leaming's report and indicated it will continue to be updated as he receives information. He indicated some of the wording contained in the current plan is not direct and gives the agencies the option of complying with the policies or not. He cited some areas within the plan that deal with water rights issues and law enforcement in Elko County. He added that there are areas within the Plan he needs help with developing and would appreciate input from the members of the board. He further indicated Elko County is in favor of conservation but should not be done by prohibiting certain uses such as motorized vehicles but if the agencies are going to they should provide the data for coming to that conclusion. He gave some examples of the occasions that the citizens in Elko County would want to use the public lands that may be in conflict with the federal agencies proposals. He indicated there are numerous boards that the County has and is presenting this plan to in an effort to obtain their support.

Ms. Brown asked about including a mitigation directive as part of the plan, specifically elevating one use over another use.

Mr. Brown indicated the issue was addressed in the plan but that he would get together with Ms. Brown and look at that area further to revise or add additional language to address mitigation. He indicated the Plan will expand over the next month and a half as information becomes available and again asked for the Commission to provide communication, comments and information.

Chairman Spratling asked how Mr. Brown would like to receive comments regarding the Plan.

Mr. Brown indicated he would receive comments at any time and would interject them into the draft and would assign a color to each Commissioner's comments. He further gave an explanation of the remaining issues regarding roads and maps that the County is still trying to work out with the Forest Service.

X. RUBY PIPELINE – EL PASO NATURAL GAS ACTION ITEM

Comment and proposal submitted by Commissioner Wilton regarding forwarding a recommendation to the Elko County Commission to enact an ordinance that would require full disclosure of any agreements between project proponents and project opponents prior to any permits or letters of support being issued when the project involves public lands and if there is an agreement subsequent to the issuance of a permit or letter of support by the County the permit or letter be held in abeyance until the agreements are made public.

Mr. Brown stated Commissioner Dahl was in Twin Falls regarding this issue and could not be present. He indicated they had met in Salt Lake City with the eighteen county coalition but El Paso was not present and is not willing to disclose their agreement. He indicated El Paso was going to provide the agreement to Commissioner Dahl for a brief review at the meeting but not a copy and Commissioner Dahl chose not to review the document because he felt it would allow El Paso to state they had shared the contract. He further indicated Commissioner Dahl had tried to obtain a complete hard copy but has not been able to do so.

Commissioner Williams indicated he was at a forum for candidates the previous evening and felt he was not misquoted but misunderstood by the newspaper and stated he didn't think the project

should be stopped but other things should be done in order to get them to come to the bargaining table because there is a lot of money in the project and a lot of people's lives depending on it including revenue to the County through taxes. He stated he agreed with Charlie Myers when he stated culture is involved because there is ranching, grazing and other things. He further stated there are other ways to penalize Arizona Pipeline for what they are doing such as through the county roads and law enforcement. He added if all of the counties stood together and slowed the project down it will make them recognize they need to do certain things for the counties to get through the problem they started with Western Watershed and the Oregon Environmental group.

Commissioner Wellington indicated at the last meeting there was discussion to take a proactive approach and make it a recommendation. He further stated Commissioner Wilton has come up with some wording for a recommendation to the County Commission to create an ordinance so this won't happen again and he is ready to make a motion in regards to that from this board.

Commissioner Tingey stated if his understanding of the wording were correct it would make any private agreements between two entities available to the public and asked if his interpretation was correct.

Commissioner Wellington said yes that was his understanding also.

Commissioner Tingey stated he has concerns with requiring agreements between two private entities to become public but understands that if it impacts public land it should be disclosed.

Commissioner Wellington stated his motion would be worded for projects that involve public lands.

There was discussion regarding the wording of the proposed motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Wellington moved to forward a recommendation to the Elko County Commission to enact an ordinance that would require full disclosure of any agreements between project proponents and project opponents prior to any permits or letters of support being issued when the project involves public lands and if there is an agreement subsequent to the issuance of a permit or letter of support by the County the permit or letter be held in abeyance until the agreements are made public. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion. Motion passed with Commissioner Tingey opposing.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
R. Jeff Williams
Thad Alger
Doug Shippy
Ken Wellington

NAY: Orson Tingey

ABSENT: Ted Wilton

ABSTENTIONS: None

Mr. Brown stated there isn't a road maintenance agreement in place yet and the decision to obtain one was given to the District Attorney and he was told that the roads would be maintained at a high standard.

There was some discussion regarding an agreement for the maintenance of the roads and what standard would be required to transport the pipe used in the project.

XI. ELKO COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD TO MANAGE WILDLIFE / NDOW:
Commissioner Wellington / Other NON-ACTION ITEM

Commissioner Wellington stated at the State meeting in Las Vegas they supported the Elko County Travel Management Plan resolution. He further stated there were several items on the agenda including wolves being an issue and based on a recommendation they are going to work with US Fish and Wildlife Services to declassify wolves from endangered in the State of Nevada. He added that they also spoke about lions but the animal rights groups were in attendance and want to move them into a predator status but NDOW doesn't feel the quota is set for lions as it is. He further stated the Elko County board looked at a subcommittee to look at going back to units to try and move people into areas that aren't being looked at because it is too hard to hunt and they recommended not doing that. NDOW has been directed to create a bear hunt in the Carson/Tahoe area which will be available to sportsmen and they also looked at a bull elk hunt that are four points or less. He commented that there has been two moose sighted near O'Neill Basin near Highway 93.

There was discussion regarding wolf sightings and the stand that the advisory board has taken to rid them from the area.

XII. CORRESPONDENCE REPORT AND DISCUSSION: NON-ACTION ITEM
NONE

XIII. NEXT MEETING DATE ACTION ITEM

- A. Review, discussion and action to change the date of the next regular meeting from October 27, 2010, to October 20, 2010.

All Commissioners voted unanimously to change the date of the next meeting to October 20, 2010.

XIV. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSIONERS AND COUNTY STAFF COMMENTS: NON-ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown indicated Ms. Brown had brought in the China Mountain Wind Project Sagegrouse Conservation Plan that has a draft EIS coming out in December.

Ms. Brown indicated the China Mountain Wind Project is on the Idaho, Nevada border with most of it being in Idaho. She stated the project is located on private and public land and the company put together a Sagegrouse Conservation Plan to mitigate the prime sagegrouse habitat they are planning on putting the project over. She further stated the plan is a proactive plan that puts together a technical advisory committee that will control a \$15 million fund that will be used for mitigation for sagegrouse. She indicated the plan was put together by Tetrattech who was paid by RES and will be incorporated in their draft EIS which talks about how they are going to mitigate the project footprint by reducing or having cessation of livestock grazing. She quoted from the document and indicated she has provided lengthy comments to Mr. Brown who will be forwarding it to the County Commission.

Mr. Brown stated he has sent the information to the County Commission and will forward to NRMAC tomorrow for information but the County will not be able to provide comment until the draft EIS is out in December.


Ms. Brown asked that the item be left on the agenda and stated the situation is unique because the development is not in the hands of the BLM and RES can do what they want right now as far as the plan so there is an opportunity to provide input on specific issues. She gave an overview of the location and the size of the proposed project and indicated NDOW is reviewing the project and they are going to provide comment to include opposing cessation of grazing being included in the plan. She further stated the livestock industry should not take responsibility of one company's cumulative effects but the company should find ways to deal with it that will not negatively impact another industry.

There was continued discussion that the concern among agencies is that this plan will be used as a template for all other renewable energy projects and it could impact other industry in the county.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

ACTION ITEM

Chairman Spratling adjourned the meeting as there was no further business.

Minutes Clerk, 
Kelly Watson

Date Approved, January 26, 2011