



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

COUNTY OF ELKO, STATE OF NEVADA,
REGULAR MEETING TO BE HELD AT 6:00 PM, P.S.T.,
SUITE 102 OF THE NANNINI ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
LOCATED AT 540 COURT STREET, ELKO, NV.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2011

6:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Spratling called the regular meeting of the Elko County Natural Resource Management Advisory Commission to order at 6:05 p.m. on **October 24, 2011**, in Suite 102 of the Nannini Administration Building, 540 Court Street, Elko, Nevada.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown
Orson Tingey

Absent:

Thad Alger
Ken Wellington

Others Present:

Randy Brown, Natural Resource Manager
Eleanor O'Donnell, EC Planning Administrator
Elko County Commissioner Charlie Myers
Elko County Commissioner Jeff Williams
Ken Miller, BLM District Manager
Pat Laughlin, Nevada Alliance for Wildlife- President
Joe Bennett, Wildlife Services
Ken Grey, NDOW Eastern Region Game Supervisor
Laria Lovec, USFS Range Specialist
Susan Elliot, USFS Acting District Ranger
Stephanie Licht, Elko County Farm Bureau
Rama Paris, Elko County Farm Bureau
Chris Jasmine, US Fish and Wildlife Service

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Chairman Spratling led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes from the September 26, 2011 – Regular Meeting were tabled until the next meeting.

I. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC:

No comments.

II. PREDATOR CONTROL:

A presentation was given by Mr. Pat Laughlin Nevada Alliance for Wildlife- President and Mr. Joe Bennett concerning the predator control in Nevada. During the presentation it was stressed how important the raven issue is to help the sagegrouse stay off the endangered list and the importance of County support.

Joe Bennett – Wildlife Services District supervisor on the Eastern half of NV. Projects are contracted through Nevada Division of Wildlife (NDOW). Several projects including mule deer protection from coyotes, big horn sheep from lions, and recently over the past 4 years a considerable amount of raven work to protect sagegrouse. It has been well documented that ravens have a huge impact on nests. About 4 years ago projects were started in Elko and Lincoln counties. It was funded by the \$3 predator fee on the big game applications. More funding was brought in by the Nevada Alliance for Wildlife this year which enabled more projects in White Pine County and increased treatment of leks in Elko County. This past year they have identified badgers as a concern on ground nesting birds such as the sagegrouse. The project was funded by Heritage Project NA4W 10-27 for the removal of badgers and ravens. A lek is where all the males come to strut during the spring, where the hens come to the area to breed and then nest within a short area. It has been observed during the spring the ravens are attracted to these same areas. Raven control consists of hard boiled eggs treated with a small amount of DRC-1339. Toxin is very user friendly and there is very little if any secondary poisoning, with very low toxicity, only affects family *corvidae*. A permit is needed from the US Fish and Wildlife Service to remove ravens. NDOW applied and got their own permit to increase the number of ravens. Eleven lek complexes were treated in Elko County which can have 20 -30 leks within the area. They also treated the Jackpot and Midas disposal transfer sites, which are big attractions for these ravens. It has been observed that the ravens leave the transfer site and then go out and forage in these lek areas during the daytime. Badgers work about 400 yards and look in every nook and cranny which would be to the detriment to any sagegrouse nests in the area.

Treatment areas also include: Steptoe Valley (WMA) Wildlife Management Area, Kirch WMA and Key WMA to protect water fowl from raven problems in the areas.

Detailed reports are sent to NDOW, documenting the work we did as well as chick and brood counts.

Questions

Chairman Spratling- asked how much do ravens have to eat of the treated egg.

Mr. Bennett- answered just a small amount. He crunches the egg a little so that the egg falls apart and they stay in the area. Ravens usually take the whole sagegrouse egg to another location to eat it. In the deserts they are having a terrible time with ravens eating the desert tortoises they eat them when they are 4 years old when the shell is still soft. They have found piles of the tortoise shells with 20- 40 in a location that the raven likes to take them to eat.

Commissioner Tingey- asked if they are seeing an increase in the broods and chicks over the project's 4 years.

Mr. Bennett- answered he relies on counts from NDOW and doesn't really get involved in the counts but has seen an increase numbers, whether it is the weather or the predator control or a combination of reasons there has been an increase. There have been a lot of efforts putting cameras in nests here in Eastern Nevada over the last few years and it shows 70–80 percent of these nests are being predated mostly by ravens. Ravens and badgers are having a huge impact on these nests.

Commissioner Tingey- are you seeing a rebound of these ravens after you have treated an area?

Mr. Bennett- has learned a lot over the last 4 years, ravens migrate a lot, they go into an area and do a precount in early spring or January and then go back a month later and there are a lot of ravens. He has seen places, like Jackpot where there has had tremendous results in the decrease in raven numbers; there has been a good reduction of ravens in most all the areas treated.

Mr. Laughlin- mentioned there are a couple of studies by NDOW and several studies in Idaho and Utah that show the sagegrouse chicks are not surviving to adulthood because of the ravens. Chicks were tagged with microchips to be monitored, within a 2 week period over 90% of the chicks didn't make it and 90% of those were all attributed to ravens. So even if they make it past the nest they are still getting hammered by these predators.

Commissioner Brown- asked if there is a cycle in which you can treat certain areas and then leave and focus on other leks?

Mr. Bennett- in his opinion the first year they should hit these areas hard and have a great reduction in ravens and then they do site visits to determine how to limit the treatment so that they don't lose the production they have gotten in the past. Start with a heavier treatment and then tapered off with monitoring to achieve a balance with production and predation of these threatened species and allow the populations to get back above the threshold in order to allow for them to take predation.

Commissioner Brown- what is the cost per egg?

Mr. Bennett- hasn't really done a cost per egg; it has the chemical, eggs and transportation included. It is very inexpensive per egg but is labor intensive.

Commissioner Brown- how the process works, do you have to be certified to use the toxins?

Mr. Bennett- a Nevada State Pesticide Applicator Certificate is needed, but 1339 is only labeled for their agencies use and a permit is needed to remove ravens. They are ultimately responsible for these treatments.

Commissioner Carpenter- what percentage of the funding for predator control is for use on Ravens?

Mr. Bennett- about \$16- \$17,000 per year in Elko and Lincoln counties, additional funding through the Nevada Alliance for Wildlife will enable him to increase the number of leks treated and do some work in White Pine County.

Commissioner Carpenter- about the funding for the upcoming coming year?

Mr. Laughlin- \$50,000 this last year, \$50,000 for a missing year and technically another \$40,000 so estimated about \$90,000 for next year. But there are still arguments to stop the funding. In the end more money is being spent out of Elko County than in the county. He would like to get the boards in Elko County to support this project.

Mr. Bennett- mentioned the eggs work only on *corvids* (birds) but not on larger animals like badgers or coyotes. They have cameras on the sagegrouse nests that show how the badgers come right into these nests.

Chairman Spratling- is there a conflict if you get funding from outside sources on your permit?

Mr. Laughlin- granted funds are from a heritage fund, where funds are derived from the sale of big game tags. This is one of the designated uses for the funds by the NRS statutes.

Chairman Spratling- there is a definite increase in the raven population over the last few years.

Mr. Laughlin- the life expectancy of a raven is 25-30 years; sagegrouse is about 4-5 years.

Chairman Spratling- ravens are smart especially if they live that long.

County Commissioner Williams- stressed how important it is that they know this is not the only thing killing sagegrouse; habitat, fires, etc. but these other issues will take a long time in order to get turned around in order to see some good. What they are doing here protecting the young and egg, is something we can do right now to make a difference to keep these birds from being listed.

Mr. Laughlin- they have the funding what they need is the support for this program to head off the controversies that are coming.

Commissioner Sacrison- as far as giving support, this sounds like when the spotted owl was listed the agencies did not want to investigate other options (like predation), except the human factor.

Protected birds eating other protected birds are an issue; a look at the policies is needed.

Commissioner Brown- how do we communicate effectively with the public and policy makers to ask for permit increases so that they understand the importance of killing one species to save another. To continue to get funding, permits and to continue to advocate for good predator management there has to be a good general understanding of what is going on.

Mr. Bennett-the science is pretty much on our side. He found if you can get 3 or 4 good science based bullets and stick with them it is hard to disprove the points. There are a few who you will never convince for several reasons. Hard facts, trail cameras, pictures of these animals raiding these nests, with data that numbers are declining. This isn't the only solution; this is only a part of the big picture to bring these sagegrouse back. Personally what he is doing here with NDOW has been a good thing.

Chairman Spratling- we need to gather all of this type of information.

Mr. Bennett- recommended having someone from the USGS come in, who are actually monitoring these nests to give the board the whole picture.

Mr. Laughlin- suggested Gary Back NNSG (Northeastern Nevada Stewardship Group) has done a great study on sagegrouse habitats.

County Commissioner Williams- this issue is very important because if the sagegrouse are listed this could make the Travel Management Plan seem minor, this would impact every road and everything we do on the public lands. What we are talking about could be one of the most important things to face this commission as well as the county commission. Personally he really appreciates the opportunity to hear from these guys on this issue.

Public Comment

Ken Grey, Eastern Region Game Supervisor for NDOW- would like to commend Joe Bennett, since he has got here our relationship has increased tremendously. The relationship has greatly increased the effectiveness in these counties. These decisions on permit numbers are made above his level but he would like to answer some questions as a biologist at the local level. They are trying to associate the treatments with some of the long term leks that are in the databases, and develop a trend by treating the same leks and compare to areas not treated. We pick our priorities where we have available habitat where the birds are just not there, these areas had fires 10-15 years ago and have the sagebrush coming back in but the birds haven't caught up with that. This is an area where decreasing the raven population to allow the sagegrouse the ability to move back in. We are choosing these areas for a reason so that we can back it up. Ravens have been known to have 27 eggs cashed in one area. We have to key into those older ravens that really know how to hunt sagegrouse and target these ravens that are really keyed into these sagegrouse. We realize that ravens are a subsidized predator; everything we do enhances the ravens out there. We have roads and power lines, some of the strategies would include making sure the dumpsters are clean, picking up road kills, anti

perching devices on all the power lines. There some real opportunities to surgically remove the ravens that target the sagegrouse.

Commissioner Brown- if the anti perching projects funding have to come out of predator control funds?

Mr. Grey- on almost all new projects we are asking for anti perching to prevent raven nesting and encouraging different types of towers to discourage ravens from perching, we can us litigation monies or other funding. There are some big improvements in this area.

Mr. Grey- there are other options to start focusing on to discouraging ravens populations in these areas, such as working with the cattle industry on feedlots.

County Commissioner Williams- NDOW works with the permitting process on new power lines in these areas to discourage the raven population.

Mr. Grey- that right now it is almost standard operating procedure to include these items.

Commissioner Carpenter- if there are any biologists strictly for sagegrouse?

Mr. Grey- no we do not, the biologists are matched to the areas and habitats instead of species. There is a statewide biologist that works strictly with sagegrouse. Shawn Espinoza is the staff specialist in Reno.

7:15:19 PM FTR interruption during the discussion on recommendation to the Wildlife Commission.

Discussion on options on what type of recommendation to make to the Wildlife Commission and/or County commission followed.

Mr. Laughlin- stressed how important it is that Elko County singles itself out as to what we feel is important for Elko County.

MOTION: Commissioner Brown made a motion that we send a letter of recommendation to the Elko County Wildlife Advisory Board regarding the importance of predator control in Elko County to the sustainability of the multiple uses and diverse economic activities within the county and its important role in other habitat and wildlife management techniques, seconded Commissioner Sacrison.

Commissioner Carpenter suggested to come back at the next meeting with a proposal, he agrees to the letter but would like to have the proper wording to get it right to be in tune with the Wildlife Board and the County Commissioners.

Mr. Brown- understands what commissioner is talking about but he thinks the motion is broad enough.

County Commissioner Myers recommended that it would be advantageous to have a collective board meeting.

AMENDMENT: Commissioner Brown amended the motion to have it go to both the Elko County Board of Commissioners and Wildlife Board, seconded by Commissioner Sacrison.

Commissioner Carpenter agrees if the motion is broad enough and let the Wildlife Commission deal with the particulars.

Discussion followed on supporting predator control based on all multiple uses on public lands and the role of the County Wildlife Advisory Board.

County Commissioner Williams recommended to amend the amendment to include to suggest a joint meeting with all 3 boards to look at the issue.

Mr. Brown pointed out that getting all 3 boards together would be an issue in itself and discouraged it.

County Commissioner Williams- there are 2 issues: the political issue for the County Commission and the statutory issue for the Wildlife Commission. At a minimum there should be 2 boards but he would like to see all three involved. Because it would allow for a dialogue since this board is looking at it from a different perspective than the Wildlife Board; even if it is just one member from each board at a combined meeting that is important enough to have. If we lose the fight against sagegrouse we've lost camping, we've lost hunting, and we've lost it all.

Commissioner Brown- maybe that is a good place to start to have 3 members to start and figure out the logistics of getting us all together and maybe we have liaisons to have somebody attend the County commission meeting, somebody attend the Wildlife Commission meeting.

Mr. Brown- if we have 3 members we have to agendize it, instead of 1 or 2. It just makes it cleaner. Allow the County Commission to set the date and time.

Commissioner Brown would like to withdraw amendments and the main motion and the second.

Mr. Brown clarified that we will establish a meeting with the County Commissioners and 3 members of the Wildlife Commission and NRMAC.

Discussion followed on the recommendation from this board that this issue is very important let the County Commissioners set up some type of meeting with liaisons from this board and the Wildlife Commission. It might be just one member from each board.

AMENDMENT: Commissioner Brown would like to amend the main motion to include some type of meeting with all three boards and her main motion still stands.

Commissioner Carpenter suggested the motion should specifically about the sagegrouse and directly to predator control for helping the sagegrouse. After we have the meeting then we can talk about other species, but for now talk about at sagegrouse.

Discussion followed on the specifics included in the recommendation.

AMENDMENT: Commissioner Carpenter made a motion to amend the amendment to give the NRMAC support to the predator control that has been initiated by the Wildlife Services with the cooperation of NDOW in regard to predator control for sage hens to keep them off the endangered species list; and further a meeting between this board and the wildlife board and the county commissioners be held, to talk about predator control in general. Commissioner Tingey seconded the amendment.

Commissioner Sacrison did not agree to this amendment to the first amendment to the main motion.

Point of order - the person who originally made the second has to agree to the amendment. The original motion with the amendment is on the floor and the amendment from Commissioner Carpenter would die because of a lack of second.

Chairman Spratling called for the vote on the amendment to original motion to send this recommendation to both boards.

VOTE:

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

NAY: None

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS: Ken Wellington
Thad Alger

Commissioner Carpenter voted yes reluctantly. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Spratling called for the vote on the original motion as amended to send this recommendation to both boards that we support the predator control and have all 3 boards have some type of meeting.

VOTE:

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

NAY: None

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS: Ken Wellington
Thad Alger

III. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT:

A Presentation of items by Brian Fuel, BLM-Wells Field office:
Mr. Fuel presented the grazing and environmental assessment and objectives to approve.
The Elko District has sent a number of documents to the public for review.

- 1) Draft Standards and Guidelines Assessment for the Cotant Seeding and Mexican Field Allotments (Tuscarora Field Office)

Wolf and son allotments is an assessment from the resource advisory council basically just looking at the grazing in order to move forward with an environmental assessment in order to renew the grazing permit on those allotments. Open for public review until the end of this month.

- 2) Standards & Guidelines for Achurra Seeding, Browne, Corral Canyon Seeding, Lindsay Creek, Little Porter, Merkley-Zunino Seeding, Mitchell Creek, Pearl Cree, Twin Creek East, Twin Creek North and Twin Creek South. (Tuscarora Field Office)

- 3) Environmental Assessment analyzing the renewal of Livestock Grazing Permits and installation of a watering well for the Ruby #8 and Bennett Field Allotments. (Wells Field Office)
Permit renewal Overland Land & Livestock, Buster and Wynn Wines, & Neil and Kristin McQueary permittees. The environmental assessment addressing the renewal of their grazing permit with changes to the seasonal use that reflects the actual use of the permit. Also a proposed well that will improve distribution. The well is being analyzed by the BLM with the well being funded by the permittees.

- 4) Environmental Assessment analyzing the renewal of Livestock Grazing Permits on the Badlands and Goshute Mountain Allotments. (Wells Field Office)

Southeast corner of Elko District, Hank Voegler is the permittee, it is a sheep permit being renewed with the change requirement on sheep bedding, no more than 1 weeks use and then move no less than ¼ mile to the next bedding location. Permittee has no issue with change.

- 5) Environmental Assessment for the permit renewal of the Metropolis Seeding Allotment. (Wells Field Office)

Winchell Ranches north wells, renewing permit with no changes.

- 6) Update and discussion of Clark, Lincoln and White Pine Counties Groundwater.

- 7) Grazing plans for 2.35 million acres of public land in Idaho and Wyoming have been declared unlawful by a federal judge. Recent ruling pertains to two plans that are test cases, since the lawsuit challenges a total of 16 resource management plans in Idaho, Montana, Utah, California, Wyoming and Nevada.

B. BLM – Other Correspondence and Items of Discussion NON-ACTION ITEM

Commissioner Brown would like to have on the next meeting the fire issue with Shane and Sam from NDF to discuss the end of the fiscal year and release of resources issues.

Commissioner Carpenter commented that the county commissioners are going to have a fire summit that we can discuss this issue at instead of discussing it twice.

Commissioner Brown withdrew the request.

Discussion followed on renewing the permits with minor changes.

Meghan left the meeting 7:52:06 PM

Meghan returned to the meeting 7:54:08 PM

IV. UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE:

A. Presentation of items by USFS Representative:

Overland Pass Exploration Project (Sniper) request for comments and concerns.

Susan Elliot acting Ruby/Jarbridge District Ranger gave an overview of the Overview Pass Exploration project at the south end of the Rubies. This is an exploration project by Sniper Resources who is proposing to drill up to 25 exploration bore holes and up to 1500 feet deep. The Scoping documents were sent out.

Creeks and Communities Pilot Project – October 26th, 2011 Lamoille Rancher Center

Laria Lovec, supervisory rangeland management specialist on the Ruby Mountain Ranger District gave an overview of the project. 2001 was the 2nd year of the of the Creeks and Communities project on the Ruby Mountain Ranger District. There was a meeting last May in Jiggs to introduce the process, and then in August a community workshop in Jiggs was held to explain about the Proper Functioning Assessment process. The field assessments took place during the month of August. Team consisted of: Andy Keller- range & vegetation, Gar Abbas- fisheries, Jim Hurja- soils and Robin Malory- hydrologist. Gilbert Creek to Lamoille Creek for a total of 50.7 miles of those miles 48.2 miles were found to be properly functioning condition and 2.5 miles were functioning at risk. For 2012 they will be surveying the East Humboldt Range estimating 32 miles of perennial stream will be assessed.

Commissioner Tingey- what functioning at risk entails?

Ms. Lovec- explained functioning at risk means the stream is functioning however it is susceptible to damage by a high flow event. Which means it will take longer for that stream to recover from a high water event than if it was properly functioning. Reasons why these are at risk could be for a variety of reasons: beaver removal, increase in sedimentation, the presence of noxious weeds, misgrazing management, head cuts or some other erosional processes that are not appropriate for that stream.

Commissioner Tingey- if this was any one of those reasons or a combination?

Ms. Lovec- it was a combination. Over all basically 5% of the streams were at risk.

It was several reaches throughout the area at risk and not just one stream. 95% PFC is pretty good, most of the streams have limited public access (limited camping) there weren't any roads; there are a lot of it in the wilderness areas. All of the streams are currently being grazed except for Lamoille creek in Lamoille canyon.

The season close out meeting will be Wednesday, October 26th at the Lamoille Ranchers Center from 1:00 – 5:00pm.

B. USFS – Other Correspondence and Items of Discussion

V. UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE:

Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan

Chris Jasmine US Fish and Wildlife Service discussed the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan. The document is available on the Sheldon wildlife webpage. It is

open for public comment now; the comment period is open until November 8th.

Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program

Mr. Jasmine was asked to come in and discuss a little of what he does in Elko County. He administers the Partners for fish and Wildlife program. The program has been around for about 25 years. Initially developed to address migratory bird issues but soon evolved to private land issues with all impaired species. Limited funding, but funding has been growing, there are currently 3 biologists with the state of Nevada, out of offices in Las Vegas, Reno and here in Elko.

The program is a technical and financial assistance program that provides roughly a 50% cost share for a voluntary partnership with private landowners, tribal, city and county lands.

Work on restoring habitat for any species that fall under the word “trust”. Trust species are: threatened and endangered (T&E) species, candidate species, migratory birds, T&E plants and State species of concern. It is not a regulatory program, really just a voluntary private lands conservation program. Types of projects include: bioengineering stream bank stabilization, riparian fencing and grazing management, fish barrier installation, offsite water development, irrigation diversions and fish passage issues.

Basically a landowner comes to them with a project and then they can formulate what the best treatments are to benefit the native wildlife and habitats.

Commissioner Carpenter- is it was all on private land?

Mr. Jasmine- it is all on private land, tribal, city or county lands, state and federal lands do not qualify for the program.

Commissioner Carpenter- can water sources can be developed under the program?

Mr. Jasmine- yes, they are looking into restoring native habitat, if water development or putting in troughs somewhere helps to distribute grazing and intern helps the habitat, yes it is possible.

Chairman Spratling- what strings are attached to the program?

Mr. Jasmine- if an improvement is put in on that land it is expected that the improvement will stay on that land for the life of the agreement. Normally the agreements are about 10 year agreements. These are not regulatory documents they try to make the agreements as simple and friendly as possible in order to get work done, because they understand that private landowners have some of the most important habitat on the lands. The different types of agreements and the liability toward the landowners were discussed. Basically projects that will benefit the landowner, benefit a species, and are fairly simple to get going.

Commissioner Tingey- how many projects are ongoing?

Mr. Jasmine- they have 3-5 projects per year which use about all the funding for that year. He is aware of other types of funding opportunities that can be brought into the project as well in order to get the job accomplished.

VI. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION OF A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ELKO COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF A DRAFT ORDINANCE FOR AN ADDITION OF TITLE 6 CHAPTER 14 OF THE ELKO COUNTY CODE ENTITLED AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISES.

Stephanie Licht – Elko County Farm Bureau proposed Elko County Code addition Draft VB was discussed the draft ordinance with Ms. McQueary’s legal recommendations.

Commissioner Tingey- on the disclosure notice what obligation do you have for the buyer.

Ms. Licht- acknowledging that the buyer understands that they will be next to an agricultural

operation.

Mr. Brown- the county code can't cover every private sale.

Ms. Licht- having this in the county code shows that agriculture is important to the county.

Agriculture is recognized as important in all 50 states.

Discussion followed on the enforcement of the ordinance.

County Commissioner Williams believes this is trying to alert the people before moving in next door to be aware of what is part of agriculture and they are not a nuisance.

Ms. Licht - discussed educational materials on "Welcome to Elko County" and this is what you can expect, in order to put agriculture in a positive light and educate newcomers. They would like to produce some more materials to help educate the public.

Commissioner Sacrison- questioned the enforcement and it is appropriate that the seller or realtor also to sign this disclosure.

Mr. Brown- there is no vested interest for the broker or seller to sign this; they already have disclosures that they abide by. This will be an ordinance and will be covered under the general disclosures of county codes. Requiring a disclosure notice will be hard to enforce, this will go to

the planning commission and then on to the county commission.

Enforcement of the disclosure notice was discussed further.

County Commissioner Williams suggested we are getting into an area that is best dealt with the planning commission, he recommends that we send this to the county commission and then to planning.

Ralph left the meeting. 8:36:44 PM

Commissioner Brown- understands Mr. Brown's point of view but disagrees. It takes an additional step to educate and inform the new comers to the area about how to interact with agriculture.

Ralph returned to the meeting. 8:41:48 PM

Mr. Brown- explained the options: recommend to planning commission, county commission or carry over to next meeting for further discussion. I would encourage to recommend this to the planning commission.

Motion: Commissioner Brown made a motion to recommend to the County Board of Commissioners to remand the proposed Elko County Code Addition of the County Code: Agricultural Operations Title 6– Business Regulation Chapter 14- Agricultural Operations to the Planning Commission for review and approval, seconded by Commissioner Tingey.

Discussion continued on the outcome of the Planning Commission's review. The intent is good, but there are so many zoning laws out there, it is all up to interpretation. Douglas and Lyon Counties already have a right to ranch ordinance.

Commissioner Brown called for the question.

Chairman Spratling called for the vote on the motion to recommend the proposed Elko County Code Addition of the County Code: Agricultural Operations Title 6– Business Regulation Chapter 14- Agricultural Operations to the Planning Commission for review and approval. Motion passed unanimously.

VOTE:

A YE: Craig Spratling
John C. Carpenter
Ralph R. Sacrison
Meghan Brown
Orson Tingey

NAY: None

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS: Ken Wellington
Thad Alger

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

County commission is still working on getting a meeting set up with the Forest Service. Landers, Eureka, Nye and Douglas Counties have gotten information concerning our request, and have asked to be included. Eureka and Nye Counties have been approved to be included as per the Forest Service. We have also asked for the record of decision not to be published until we have a chance to meeting with them on it. Ms. Higgins the forest supervisor for the state has tentatively agreed to that, but we are not sure how long she will hold off on that. We are working on trying to get everybody together, but it is a very difficult process. It was hoped to get something done by this week, but that is not going to happen. The County Commission would like to have at least one workshop to get together, to discuss the issues before the meeting with the Forest Service, this board will be notified of the meeting details, with a quorum agenda so everyone can attend the meeting.

Eureka County has had 3 years and have not had their plan reviewed by request for the last 2 years. Discussion followed on the type of meeting, final EIS and annual reviews.

Public Comments

No comments

VIII. ELKO COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD TO MANAGE WILDLIFE / NDOW:

No comments

IX. CORRESPONDENCE REPORT AND OTHER ITEMS OF DISCUSSION:

Mexico's Newest Export to U.S. May Be Water

SAN DIEGO-- Mexico ships televisions, cars, sugar and medical equipment to the United States. Soon, it may be sending water north. Western U.S. states are planning two of North America's

largest desalination plants in Playas de Rosarito, about 15 miles south of San Diego. They would produce 150 million gallons a day combined -- enough to supply more than 300,000 homes on both sides of the border. It is one of the latest strategies by both countries to wean themselves from the drought-prone Colorado River. Plans for the desalination plants have sparked concerns that American water interests are simply looking to Mexico to avoid lengthy U.S. environmental reviews and legal challenges. Backers say they expect the new plants will adhere to U.S. environmental standards, including water quality.

Commissioner Sacrison sent it in as an information item. He discussed the issue of California and Arizona looking at desalination plants in Mexico.

Discussion on the Southern NV Water Authority issues. Everyone likes it except SNWA because they have a lot of resources invested in the pipeline. California and Arizona are looking at other options.

X. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSIONERS AND COUNTY STAFF COMMENTS:

No comments

XI. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC:

No comments

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE

Discussion and consideration of setting the November meeting date.

Possible meeting dates: Monday November 21, 2011 or Monday November 28th, 2011

Next meeting was set for Monday, November 28th.

Possible meeting dates for December were discussed.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned at 9:05:17 PM.

Minutes Clerk: Eleanor O'Donnell

Date Approved: November 28, 2011