



Elko County Natural Resource Management Advisory Commission

540 COURT STREET, SUITE 104, ELKO, NV 89801
PH. (775)738-6816, FAX (775) 738-4581

ELKO COUNTY NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 2011

6:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

Once a quorum was present, Chairman Spratling called the regular meeting of the Elko County Natural Resource Management Advisory Commission to order at 6:28 p.m. on **June 29, 2011**, in Suite 102 of the Nannini Administration Building, 540 Court Street, Elko, Nevada.

Members Present: Craig Spratling
 John C. Carpenter
 Ralph R. Sacrison
 Meghan Brown

Absent: Ken Wellington
 Orson Tingey
 Thad Alger

Others Present: Randy Brown, Natural Resource Manager
 Jeff Williams, Elko County Commissioner
 Rama Paris, Elko County Farm Bureau
 Stephanie Licht, Elko County Farm Bureau
 Teven Perkins, Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Group Treasurer
 Steve Dondero, Elko BLM Associate District Manager
 Tom Montoya, USFS District Ranger

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Allegiance was pledged.

II. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES: ACTION ITEM

May 25, 2011 – Regular Meeting

MOTION: Commissioner Brown moved to approve the minutes for the May 25, 2011, meeting. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ken Wellington
Orson Tingey
Thad Alger

ABSTENTIONS: None

III. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC: NON-ACTION ITEM

There were no comments made by the general public.

IV. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF A DRAFT ORDINANCE FOR AN ADDITION OF CHAPTER 14 TO TITLE 6 OF THE ELKO COUNTY CODE REFERENCING AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISES AS PROPOSED BY ELKO COUNTY FARM BUREAU: ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown indicated Staff had reviewed the draft ordinance and identified some portions of the ordinance as potential issues. He continued by discussing the issues and possible revisions that could be included before it was presented to the Elko County Commission for their review.

There was discussion about the possible revisions and how they could be implemented.

Commissioner Brown asked for clarification of k. under the 14-1-2 Definitions.

Rama Paris gave an explanation of what their intent was by the definition. She also addressed some of the other issues that were brought up by Mr. Brown.

Commissioner Brown asked if Lyon County followed the practice of the documents going through the recorder's office and if that had increased the work load for the Lyon County Recorder's Office.

Ms. Paris indicated Lyon County does follow the practice of recording the document(s).

Mr. Brown indicated the amount of land sales in Elko County would be much greater than in Lyon County. He stated he felt some of the content would try to restrict someone's right to oppose a use because of its location to agricultural land and that is the purpose of zoning and master plans. He

provided further information in opposition to portions of the proposed draft code.

County Commissioner Williams gave a current example of an instance where if property owners would have been required to sign a disclosure acknowledging the fact that the property near them was zoned to accommodate an apartment complex then there probably would have been less opposition to the project. He stated he felt it would be beneficial for proposed buyers of property to have to sign a disclosure acknowledging the existing operations and uses in the area but the proposed buyer is ultimately responsible for knowing what they sign during a real estate transaction.

Mr. Brown indicated when there is a request for action on property regarding planning and/or zoning the applicant can be informed about its locality to agricultural land without adding additional government regulation.

County Commissioner Williams indicated there is a grievance process everyone can use if a property owner is not using their land properly by bringing the grievance to the County Commission who can intercede on their behalf to make sure things are being done right. He further indicated a disclosure would be a document that would not take a property owner's rights away but be used to inform a proposed buyer.

Mr. Brown indicated there are a lot of things that can be done through the Planning Department and Natural Resources to make sure people understand.

County Commissioner Williams stated Elko County Farm Bureau wants to make sure every transaction is aware of the disclosure.

Mr. Brown stated the title companies are a good place to have the disclosure presented and he could talk to the Recorder's office about informing anyone about the ordinance that comes into the office to record a deed or conveyance.

Chairman Spratling expressed concern about existing property owners that have not been informed about any regulations or requirements because they are located near agricultural property.

Ms. Paris indicated they had thought about that circumstance and thought it would be beneficial to send out a statement on the tax roll that indicates Elko County has a farm and ranch ordinance.

Mr. Brown indicated that is a good way to get the word out to the public and again stated there are some actions that would provide an opportunity for education about the ordinance but did not want to require more government regulation.

County Commissioner Williams suggested a well designed brochure being provided with the information about the ordinance.

Commissioner Brown asked if a dispute did come up between owners of existing agricultural land and a new property owner that was unaware of the ordinance how would the ordinance be enforced. She added that there needs to be some accountability and everyone has to follow the law.

Mr. Brown stated enforcement has always been an issue because there isn't any political flavor for it or manpower.

Chairman Spratling stated he felt it was important to have it on the books so if someone had a problem and complained the ordinance would be in effect.

County Commissioner Williams stated he did not see the extra protection for the agricultural property owner.

Ms. Paris indicated the Elko County Farm Bureau wanted to get the information out to the public through real estate agents, title companies and any other means available.

Mr. Brown indicated acknowledgement would provide some enforcement if the property owner had signed a disclosure. He further identified some of the terms within the proposed ordinance that could be open to interpretation and suggested they be further defined. He added that he thought the details could be worked out.

Commissioner Brown indicated there could be differences in the impact to properties depending on how close they are to the agricultural land. She added that she had hoped that there were more references to the benefits of agriculture included in the ordinance and the positives or outcome of the activities being done on the property instead of them just being a concern to the neighbors.

Mr. Brown indicated Elko County has no jurisdiction over dust and odor, the EPA does.

Commissioner Brown stated she thought the ordinance was a great idea and a perfect way to have an educational point to give the general public another way to understand what is done and why.

Ms. Paris indicated they had developed a pamphlet about moving to the country that they intend to distribute to the real estate agencies and, if they could, be included in the tax roll envelopes it would be helpful. She added that the content of the ordinance was intended to include less verbiage to condense it to just a few pages.

Mr. Brown asked Ms. Paris if a meeting could be set up to work through the ordinance and some of the items he felt could become issues.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if there have been any problems in the areas that have an ordinance in place.

There was discussion on different ordinances in other counties and states and why they had been developed.

Stephanie Licht indicated in Iowa there was an ordinance passed on a state level but it was challenged and then it left each county without an ordinance in place and that is why they were looking at initiating the ordinance in the counties first. She added that NACo would be a good place to present the ordinance for discussion and obtain comments on the affects of each existing local county ordinance. She invited the Commissioners to present any language that would add to the ordinance and gave an overview of the development of the ordinance over the past two years.

Commissioner Carpenter suggested the District Attorney's office review the ordinance to make sure the County would not be open to any lawsuits because of its content.

Ms. Licht stated their intent is to protect their industry in a way that works.

There was further discussion about the content of the ordinance including benefits of the industry and not emphasizing items that could be considered negative.

Commissioner Brown indicated if she was an urbanite and required to sign the disclosure notice she would be nervous to embrace her neighbor.

Ms. Licht indicated County Code already states Elko County recognizes the value of agriculture and that might be the place to add the benefits. She also suggested an opening paragraph could be added to the ordinance recognizing the benefits of agricultural industry. She read a quote from the first edition of a newsletter sent out by the Elko County Farm Bureau.

Commissioner Brown volunteered to meet with the representatives from Elko County Farm Bureau and Mr. Brown to provide input on the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Brown recommended the representatives meet with County Staff for revisions and then bring back to NRMAC for consideration and possible approval to forward to the Elko County Commission.

There was discussion about when County Staff and the Elko County Farm Bureau representatives could meet and agreed on July 12, 2011, at 2:00 p.m.

There was also some discussion about how the draft ordinance may affect property rights.

Ms. Licht stated the Elko County Farm Bureau board appreciates the time NRMAC has taken considering the proposed ordinance and they look forward to doing what is best for everyone.

Commissioner Carpenter indicated he felt there should be information regarding what the industry is doing to protect the animals, range and water. He stated he thought adding the information might make a difference but when it comes to dust there are other agencies monitoring that. He further stated the ordinance would need to be reviewed in depth but could work.

V. PRESENTATION BY THE NORTHEASTERN NEVADA STEWARDSHIP GROUP (NNSG) AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPOINT A MEMBER AS A LIAISON TO THE NNSG: ACTION ITEM

Teven Perkins, Treasurer of the NNSG gave an overview of the projects they are involved in and stated they are looking for a liaison from NRMAC to be part of their group. She stated they meet once a month and further explained the process of how they decide what projects they become involved in.

Commissioner Brown volunteered to be the liaison for NRMAC to NNSG.

Mr. Brown explained that the action to be taken would be a recommendation to the County Commission for their final approval appointing Commissioner Brown to the NNSG because the Elko County Commission already has an NNSG representative.

Chairman Spratling asked Ms. Perkins if they were looking for a representative from NRMAC in addition to a representative from the County Commission.

Ms. Perkins stated she was unsure a representative from the County Commission has been attending their meetings.

Chairman Spratling thought it would be appropriate to have a representative from NRMAC.

Mr. Brown again explained the action that should be taken in the form of a recommendation to the County Commission.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to nominate Commissioner Brown to be appointed to the NNSG as liaison and submit the request to the County Commissioners. Commissioner Sacrison seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ken Wellington
Orson Tingey
Thad Alger

ABSTENTIONS: None

County Commissioner Williams commented that he was unable to determine who the representative from the County Commission for NNSG was but at the next County Commission meeting he would ask to be appointed to be the representative.

Ms. Perkins indicated when the next NNSG meeting would be held and the location.

Chairman Spratling moved the order of the meeting to item VII.

VI. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE ON IDENTIFYING WATERS PROTECTED BY THE CLEAN WATER ACT: ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown indicated the County has been working on this issue for quite some time and provided information on the action that has been taken by the County Commissioners and other agencies.

Commissioner Brown stated the comment period has been extended so it wasn't necessary to take action tonight but felt it would be beneficial for NRMAC to recommend to the County Commission to send a letter reflecting the opinion stated in the letter from Nevada Cattlemen's Association, Staff, County Commissioner Dahl or a combination of the information in the letters. She further stated she has contacted the State Water Engineer and the Director of Nevada Department of Conservation Natural Resources and asked them to provide comment because she feels the action would infringe on State water rights but she hasn't received a response.

MOTION: Commissioner Brown moved to recommend to the County Commission to allow Staff to draft comments regarding the Draft Proposed Guidelines for the Clean Water Act and continue working with the State Water Engineer and encourage them to become involved in the process. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ken Wellington
Orson Tingey
Thad Alger

ABSTENTIONS: None

Before there was a second on the motion, Commissioner Carpenter asked about including in the motion that the State Engineer be asked to intervene.

Mr. Brown indicated the County Commission has already asked but will ask again.

Chairman Spratling moved the order of the meeting to item X.

VII. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF THE CHINA MOUNTAIN WIND PROJECT DEIS: Commissioner Brown/Other ACTION ITEM

Commissioner Brown stated she had submitted comments on the project which included that the concerns of the Y32 Ranch be taken into consideration. She further stated that the Twin Falls RAC for the BLM picked the F alternative which means no turbines in Nevada and northern haul road and no use of the southern haul road. She continued indicating from the Cattlemen's perspective they are supporting the proposed alternative with the caveats that they address the concerns of no net loss of aums, the rehab, fencing and concerns of the Y32 Ranch. She further indicated the Y32 Ranch is in negotiations and the transmission line and haul road will go through private land and their allotment.

There was discussion that a recommendation be made to the County Commission to submit a letter reflecting the same concerns as the letter from Nevada Cattlemen's Association.

MOTION: Commissioner Sacrison made a motion to recommend to the County Commissioners that they include the letter from the Nevada Cattlemen's Association into their response to the China Mountain Wind Project DEIS. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ken Wellington
Orson Tingey
Thad Alger

ABSTENTIONS: None

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF THE RECENT FEDERAL ACTIONS PERTAINING TO WILD AND FERAL HORSES AND BURROS IN THE WESTERN STATES: Commissioner Brown/Other ACTION ITEM

Commissioner Brown indicated she didn't have any updates but would like to hear from the BLM if their proposed wild horse and burros strategy is going to become final and if they have made their report to Congress. She referred to a report regarding horse welfare and she identified two things from the report that would affect public lands issues being to reconsider conducting horse inspections and allowing slaughtering within the United States. She further stated the Brand Department had reported to them about how many horses are dumped on public lands because people don't have the funding to pay for euthanization and talked about transportation of horses to slaughter and having better leverage of resources for compliance. She asked the BLM for an update on the item.

Steve Dondero, Associate District Manager for Elko BLM, stated currently there is not an update that they have heard of to the strategy.

Commissioner Brown indicated Commissioner Wellington had asked her to follow up with the BLM to see if there have been any trespass horses in the Spruce area.

Mr. Dondero indicated they are doing regular range monitoring and watching the fences in the area where Ms. Pickens horses are located but there hasn't been any evidence of trespasses. He added that the few times that there have been horses along the fence or just outside the BLM has contacted Clay Nannini and the issue has been addressed immediately.

Commissioner Brown asked if there have been breaches of the fence but that they have been addressed.

Mr. Dondero answered stating that was correct. He continued stating the BLM is getting ready to conduct the Triple B horse gather next week and currently they are watering four head of geldings in the Cherry Creek area that appear to have been dumped on public lands.

There was some discussion about domestic horses being dumped on public lands, how they are identified and how the horses have problems adapting to being in wild conditions.

Commissioner Brown indicated there is a problem with liability when permittees want to turn off their water because they are not using the area but there are stray horses on the property.

Mr. Dondero indicated the stray horses on the public lands are the responsibility of the State and during the gather they will be given to the State.

County Commissioner Williams asked if there is a law and what can be done to a person that abandons their horses on federal lands.

Mr. Dondero indicated the horses are not considered trespass and are taken care of by State statute.

Commissioner Brown indicated that is a problem because the Brands Department does not have money to deal with the care of the stray horses on public lands.

There was discussion on how the State handles the problem of stray horses.

IX. AGENCY REPORT AND UPDATES:

A. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

ACTION ITEMS

1) Cole Creek Exclosures Environmental Assessment.

Mr. Dondero provided a map for review and indicated the purpose of the Cole Creek Exclosure is to improve about 1.4 miles of riparian habitat along Cole Creek within the Pine Allotment. He added that Tomera Ranches is the permittee and the proposal is to have two wire fence exclosures that the BLM would pay to construct and then the permittee would have to take care of maintenance. He further indicated that there wouldn't be any reduction in cattle aums and he explained the alternatives considered in the environmental assessment. He continued stating that the permittee is in favor of the exclosures but would rather not be responsible for the repairs. He further indicated the project would be done under the typical cooperative agreement where the BLM would pay for construction and the permittee would be responsible for maintenance. He continued stating that the environmental assessment has been out for public comment and the BLM has not received any comment as of yet. He further stated the Tuscarora Field Manager plans on issuing a decision to construct the wire fence exclosures on July 8, 2011. He further identified the area in reference to Carlin and the Tomera's home ranch on the map provided. He continued stating the area was impacted by two separate fires in 2006 and 2007 and the riparian area along Cole Creek has excessive use.

Commissioner Brown asked if the enclosure was going to be permanent.

Mr. Dondero indicated it would be designed as a permanent enclosure with permanent fencing but he did not know if the environmental assessment addressed the concept of there being a determination in the future that it was not necessary.

Commissioner Carpenter asked why the other alternative that provided for grazing of the land had not been chosen.

Mr. Dondero indicated he did not know.

There was continued discussion on possible reasons the alternative was chosen and what it would comprise of.

Commissioner Brown expressed her concerns with enclosures in general.

There was continued discussion about the reasoning behind the enclosure and what the details of the enclosure are.

Mr. Brown indicated the County Commissioners had heard this item last week at their meeting and they were o.k. with the decision.

2) Safford Seeding Well and Pipeline EA.

Mr. Dondero identified the location of the project on a map and gave an overview of the proposed project including the costs and different alternatives. He added the environmental assessment has been issued for public comment which runs through July 5, 2011, and they have not received any comments. The Tuscarora Field Manager anticipates issuing a decision in late August or early September.

Commissioner Carpenter asked who would hold the water rights.

Mr. Dondero indicated he was not sure.

There was comment that the County Commission had taken positive action on the item.

3) Memorandum from Secretary Ken Salazar regarding the Wilderness Policy.

Mr. Dondero indicated the memorandum had directed the local BLM that federal funding was not to be used to designate or inventory wild lands.

Commissioner Brown stated Ken Miller from the BLM had informed the Animal Grazing Board that the BLM would still inventory but just not implement.

Mr. Dondero indicated the BLM would not be doing a blanket inventory because they do not have the funding but they will continue to examine lands and identify wilderness characteristics on a project by project basis.

- 4) Clark, Lincoln and White Pine Counties Groundwater Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Mr. Brown indicated County Staff has volumes of the document and is reading it but does not have much input. He further indicated he had sent the summary to the members.

B. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT – OTHER CORRESPONDENCE AND
ITEMS OF DISCUSSION. NON-ACTION ITEMS

C. UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE ACTION ITEMS

- 1) Jim Boy Placer Exploration proposal on National Forest System lands located in Section 23, T. 44 N., R. 57 E., MDB&M, about fifteen (15) miles east of Wild Horse Reservoir in the Charleston Mining District.

Tom Montoya, District Ranger for the Mountain City Ranger District, indicated the project is close to Jarbidge and consist of three trenches maximum and about one-half acre total disturbance in size. He further indicated the operator wants to look at placer deposits to see if there is any gold to further develop the site. He added that the operator wants to conduct the operation this fall and there will probably be a decision by the end of August so he can implement in September or October. He continued stating the operator would be given an additional year for reclamation of the site being in fall of 2012 which should require the operator to revegetate the site. He further stated the project's access is by existing roads and there wouldn't be a need to build any temporary roads.

There was discussion that the Forest Service is pressured to use native species during reclamation and the operator will be required to do monitoring and weed control after the revegetation.

D. UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE – OTHER CORRESPONDENCE AND
ITEMS OF DISCUSSION. NON-ACTION ITEMS

There was no correspondence or items of discussion.

Chairman Spratling moved the order of the meeting to item XI for the Travel Management Project.

E. U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE ACTION ITEM

- 1) The Washington Post May 10, 2011, article regarding the settlement between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Wild Earth Guardians to clear a backlog on endangered species listings.

There was discussion about the article and its affects to the taxpayer.

Chairman Spratling suggested placing the item on the next agenda for consideration and during discussion the order of the meeting was moved to item VI.

X. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE 60TH CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON (AMC) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR TRAVIS AFB C-17 USE OF FIVE CENTRAL NEVADA MILITARY TRAINING ROUTES (MTRs): ACTION ITEM

Mr. Brown indicated the routes exist and are being proposed to be used again. He added the aircraft being proposed to use the routes are large and the areas affected would be in Butte Valley near the Southfork area. He continued stating the large aircraft traveling at a high speed at a low height could be alarming and he is putting together some comments and doesn't know if they will impact the decision of the Air Force since the routes exist and they are being proposed to be used by different aircrafts. He added that one of the things that alarmed him was the amount of sorties and the possible time of flight for twenty-five percent of them would be at night. He further indicated there are only a few ranches in the area but it still could impact them or anyone in the area.

Commissioner Brown asked if the issue of using the routes for practice would trump fire suppression.

Mr. Brown answered stating he wouldn't think so because that would be an emergency.

There was discussion on similar uses being conducted in the past and if Elko County has any influence on the decision of the proposed use.

Chairman Spratling moved the order of the meeting to item XII.

XI. REVIEW, UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF USFS MOUNTAIN CITY, RUBY MOUNTAINS AND JARBIDGE RANGER DISTRICTS COMBINED TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PROJECT: ACTION ITEM

Mr. Montoya stated they are putting the final touches on the final EIS and planning on having that on the federal register the week of July 11, 2011, or the week after depending on scheduling. He added that there is a forty-five day review period before a record of decision can be signed so it will probably be the end of August or September before the record of decision is signed.

Mr. Brown indicated the County is going to be requesting an immediate six month extension and asked the Board to recommend to the County Commissioners for that action. He added that due to Staffing levels the County would need more time to review the final EIS thoroughly.

MOTION: Commissioner Carpenter moved to recommend to the County Commission that they ask for a six month extension on the comment period for the Forest Service's EIS on the Travel Management Plan. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison

Meghan Brown

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ken Wellington
Orson Tingey
Thad Alger

ABSTENTIONS: None

After the vote there was discussion on the recruitment process to fill Mr. Montoya's position since he is transferring to Oregon.

MOTION: Commissioner Brown made a motion to recommend to the County Commission that they make a request to the Forest Service Regional Forester to be part of the process of selecting a replacement for Tom Montoya's position. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

AYE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown

NAY: None

ABSENT: Ken Wellington
Orson Tingey
Thad Alger

ABSTENTIONS: None

Before the vote was taken there was discussion whether it would be appropriate for Elko County to be involved in the replacement process.

The Commissioners requested that a letter of appreciation for coordination efforts by Tom Montoya be sent out.

Chairman Spratling returned the order of the meeting to item E. under IX. Agency Report and Updates.

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

Mr. Brown indicated NRMAC had talked about trying to have a public hearing to invite some representatives from NDOW to provide some information.

County Commissioner Williams indicated he had talked with County Commissioner Myers regarding scheduling of a meeting between many of the local entities and the problems that could cause for the County and that the Governor may have more of an effect on what takes place with the Commission and what is happening with NDOW.

**XIII. CORRESPONDENCE REPORT AND OTHER ITEMS OF DISCUSSION:
NON-ACTION ITEMS**

Commissioner Brown stated there is the Great Basin Landscape Conservation Coalition through the BLM and they are hiring a coordinator for the State that will be a high level position and she feels the counties and/or NACo should be involved somehow because she sees the decision having some implications on management. She further stated some of the agencies that will be involved with the process of hiring a coordinator.

There was continued discussion regarding the Great Basin LCC and what its purpose is to be in the State of Nevada and Elko County.

Commissioner Sacrison stated he had received the full document on the SMWA because he had provided original public comment and he has some concerns in the draft EIS and asked Mr. Brown if the County is working on a response.

Mr. Brown indicated he is working on providing comment and the major concern is over pumping of Spring Valley since the draft EIS is geared toward the transmission line not on production which doesn't have that much of an impact on Elko County.

Commissioner Brown stated there are several renewable energy projects that are in queue so when the power line goes in next to the pipeline they will develop.

Mr. Brown stated the draft EIS pertains to the transmission line and comment can be offered on any of items of concern but may not be considered.

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

There were no comments made at this time.

XV. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC: NON-ACTION ITEM

There were no further comments.

XVI. ADJOURNMENT ACTION ITEM

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

Minutes Clerk, Kelly Watson
Kelly Watson

Date Approved, August 29, 2011