Comments from First Round of PLPU Public Workshops

Nevada Division of State Lands
March, 2001

This document summarizes comments received during the first round of public workshops held for the Public Land Policy Update (PLPU) project. The workshops were held from October, 2000 through February, 2001 in each of Nevada's counties, except for Storey County (combined with the Carson City workshop) and Esmeralda (combined with the Nye County workshop). Additional comments have been received in the mail, and along with other comments received through this spring, will be included in the draft PLPU report.

Each section of this document consists of comments received at individual county workshops. Italics are used for comments recorded by a note taker and comments without italics were recorded by the facilitator on flipcharts.

Comments from First Round of PLPU Public Workshops

Table of Contents

Section	*Page Number*
1. Mineral County	3
2. Lyon County	5
3. Carson City and Storey County	8
4. Churchill County	12
5. Humboldt County	15
6. Eureka County	18
7. Lander County	20
8. Elko County	22
9. Pershing County	25
10. Douglas County	27
11. Lincoln County	31
12. Clark County	37
13. Washoe County	40
14. Esmeralda and Nye Counties	45
15. White Pine County	49

Section 1: Comments from Mineral County Workshop on October 10, 2000

- Especially concerned about the economy. *(Mineral County is in an economic mess and is susceptible to any economic changes.)*
- Would like to work with state more, especially in regard to federal land disposals;
- Need more land in private ownership; and
- Good to protect Mount Grant and other pristine areas.
- WSA's/ Wilderness shouldn't have "cherrystem" roads. *There are roads in the Gabbs Valley WSA and using "cherrystems" to create WSA's is wrong. Mining is important to Mineral County. There is concern that environmental groups are adding to existing WSA's. There is general support to establish wilderness designation to areas where there are wilderness characteristics, scenic values and recreational opportunities such as the Ruby Mountains and Mount Grant.*
- Endangered Species Act is too restrictive. *The ESA was not set up to apply to minor species.*
- Reclamation of land can lead to better wildlife habitat than wilderness. *The reclamation done by mining companies following mining activities actually creates habitat that is better than that which existed before mining took place.*
- Areas that have scenic value and special recreation opportunities should be preserved.
- Don't want "radical" restrictions on off-highway vehicle use.
- There should be areas open to off-highway vehicle use with no restrictions but certain areas should be protected. *Don't want outsiders dictating use of areas or "tearing up" areas. Allow OHV use where terrain is not susceptible to damage. Protect pristine areas such as meadows.*
- Maintain access to public lands.
- More public education regarding picking up trash, not cutting trees, need to take better care of our resources. *Education of the public on off-highway vehicle use is probably the most effective method way to reduce inappropriate use and vandalism but will not eliminate such problems. Don't restrict people-educate them.*
- Opposed to OHV registration fees and restoration programs like California has. *Don't want registration fees established because fees will just continually go up.*
- Want to avoid "playgrounds for the rich and famous".
- Better to use clubs, volunteers and "stewardship" groups. *Use search and rescue and other groups to help take care of damaged areas. Need to protect and develop Allen? Creek.*
- Need funding for more park and recreation facilities, a ranger, office, etc. A visitor center at Walker Lake. *Can there be rangers to patrol and protect areas? There is a need for an information center in the area. Ecotourists in*

the Sierra area are "spilling over" into Mineral County and such tourism should be promoted more.

- Walker Lake needs protection. *There is concern about getting more water to Walker Lake. What is the state doing? Lahontan cutthroat trout reintroduction was discussed.*
- Concerned about RS 2477 issue and want to maintain access to private and public lands. *There is concern that the feds are not recognizing such roads. The state should help out on the RS 2477 situation.*
- Weeds and fire risk: Use more grazing to control cheatgrass. *Noxious weeds and cheatgrass creates wildfire problems. What will the state do on this? Over management of grazing lands has led to fire situation. Need to allow more grazing. Cows will eat green cheatgrass. This will also help with the sage grouse situation.*
- Balanced approach is way to go: help economy while not trashing resources.
- We want controlled growth. *Mineral County has opportunity to select types of development that should come into the area. Resource and recreation values should be emphasized. Need to get some federal land privatized for economic purposes around Hawthorne. Looking for balance in using land and having economic needs met.*
- BLM and other feds shouldn't be able to own water rights used by ranchers: also shouldn't control development of springs and other water sources. Springs need to be "dug out"/developed to help wildlife, etc. *Waters improved by ranchers benefit wildlife. Ranchers should be able to develop water sources on public lands.*
- *County will benefit by having a public land advisory commission. Important to update county public land policy plan.*
- *Concern that Las Vegas will take water from rural areas of the state.*

Section 2: Comments from Lyon County Workshop on October 24, 2000

- More enforcement needed to comply with existing rules and regulations (e.g. wild horses). *There are too many rules and regulations. Already have many acts addressing public land issues. Need enforcement of existing rules.*
- States and their citizens should have more say in how public lands should be managed. *The feds need to pay attention to local people. Local people want more say on what goes on.*
- Funding of federal agencies needs to be sufficient to match their management responsibilities.
- Get Native Americans more involved in wild horse gathers.
- State should take feds to court through the federal Department of Justice to comply with Wild Horse Act requirements to meet AML's. *There are too many wild horses and the numbers need to be reduced. This affects riparian areas, livestock grazing and springs get trampled. The BLM needs adequate funding to properly manage wild horses. Legislation should be enacted to allow private gatherings. The state should file a suit through the federal Department of Justice to get federal lawyers to take the BLM to court for violating federal law on wild horses.*
- All proposed wilderness must meet criteria for wilderness in Wilderness Act. *Some wilderness areas are less than 5,000 acres in area and some contain roads.*
- Base resource management decisions on science, not emotion.
- Should be no net gain of federal lands within any county. *When feds purchase private land in a county a like amount of public land should be disposed in the same county. No net loss of private land.*
- Local governments should have approval authority over federal acquisitions and exchanges.
- Water rights shouldn't go to feds (e.g. Rolling A Ranch on Carson River): place of use should remain same. *Lyon County is concerned about water rights- oppose water rights going to federal agencies. If feds acquire water rights the place of use should remain where it is, not transferred to another place. State must keep all water rights.*
- Water should go back to state of Nevada. *On all federal purchases of land the water rights should be reverted to the state.*
- Feds and others need to demostrate beneficial use. *Feds have no beneficial use for water and can't qualify under state law to acquire water rights.*
- Continued fed acquisition of water will slow growth. *Feds are targeting lands to acquire which have water rights and riparian values- such acquisitions will affect growth of the state.*
- Feds need to show scientifically that water will be a beneficial use to Lahontan cutthroat trout, etc. *Make federal government prove <u>scientifically</u>*

beneficial use- i.e. if for Lahontan cutthroat trout, then the water they get for that purpose must be proven to be of benefit.

- NDOW instead of feds should hold water rights to water used to benefit Lahontan cutthroat trout in Walker Lake. *Feds don't own fish, the NDOW does. They can't claim water rights for something they don't own. Only the state can claim water rights for fish.*
- Federally-managed instead of federally-owned.
- Local input should go back to reflect prep-FLPMA concept of "public" being local publics instead of national public. In 1976 FLPMA changed from a "disposal" policy to one of "retention" of public lands.
- Increase accountability of feds by having measurable criteria, being more results oriented, e.g. How will we know if more water for Walker Lake was successful and should continue. *Need accountability for the feds when they try to solve problems- if their actions do not produce results then things should be allowed to go back to the way they were.*
- More science needed to set AML's. *(This comment was tempered with the suggestion that the new five-year plan of the BLM should first be followed to see if there are results.)*
- Economic impact studies should be done just like environmental impact studies. *Need economic impact statement whenever an environmental impact statement is prepared.*
- Revisit related executive order of Reagan administration. *This was to order that directed federal agencies to address impacts programs/plans could have on the economy and small business.*
- Federal government shouldn't be allowed to do anything in Nevada without local approval (including exercising Antiquities Act). *Congress should be urged to revisit the Antiquities Act to require Congressional and local input into the decisions made.*
- Need more oversight on agencies developing regulations that go beyond original intent of Congress: opponents of regulations should have an option for opposing regulations, or stopping, other than litigation (such as a direct appeal process or an oversight committee). *Federal agencies are making their own laws when developing regulations. Congress should be doing this. Some rules go beyond what Congress intended.*
- Support concept of releasing WSA's after certain period of time passes.
- Federal versus state and local law enforcement procedures need to be clarified.
- Opposed to "cherrystem" roads in wilderness. *A cherrystem road into a WSA should disqualify an area for wilderness consideration.*
- State needs statewide definition of roads and counties should be able to develop their own definitions that go beyond the state's definition and designate their own roads.
- Local government is proper place for deciding how public roads should be managed and used. *Local governments should have a say on what a public road is.*
- Push for resolution of RS 2477 issue.

- Feds shouldn't make "de facto" wilderness by closing roads. *Need to have release established for WSA's that are not acted on by Congress within a certain period of time.*
- Stop eliminating access to public lands. *Don't eliminate access to public lands.*
- Consensus-building/voting power should be influenced more by land base than population. *Consensus on wilderness should not be based on what people outside the area (i.e. urban populations) desire but should give more weight to what local people want.*
- Should have more management of off-highway vehicles (OHV's).
- Need "green sticker"/registration fee program like California on OHV's with the revenues used for education, restoration of land, acquire land for OHV's; and build facilities. *Those using OHV's should be those paying.*
- Increase OHV opportunities near major urban centers so they don't cause damage in rural areas. *Rural areas are inundated by urban recreationists as urban areas expand and use areas near those centers diminish. Recreation areas for urban dwellers should be created or expanded near those urban areas.*

Section 3: Comments from Carson City and Storey County Workshop on October 30, 2000

- "Take actions to avoid listings under the Endangered Species Act..." *There should not be be an intent to circumvent the Endangered Species Act.*
- Preserve vast majority of public lands for future generations. *Preserve public land in public ownership for future generations. Save open space.*
- Add more flexibility to account for differences between urban and rural areas and other regional differences.
  -Urban communities support open space. Buy private land for public ownership. Recognize various needs of local areas.
  -Need more than one generalization- more flexibility to allow for urban and rural differences.
  -Clark County is leading in the conversion of public land to private ownership. The same principle applies to rural areas- there is a need for room to grow. Can't generalize on desire of urban areas not wanting to convert public land to private ownership since urban areas will also need more private land on which to grow.
  -There are community-wide efforts in the three western counties to protect public land for permanent open space. Need to cooperate between local and federal agencies.
- Increase cooperation and "put the shovels down". *(Reference to the Jarbidge situation.)*
- *Consolidate ownerships. Consolidation is OK but need to look at other factors such as utility extensions and utility service areas. Consider natural resources in area when exchanges/selling/buying lands.*
- Take utility service areas and other things into consideration during land transaction proposals: include natural resources, wildlife, water etc. and all urban infrastructure such as schools, etc. *Establish urban limit line for extension of public utilities, consider costs of extending services.*
- Should state rely on local governments for these types of decisions? Consider non-mandatory guidelines from the state. *Cow counties don't always know what is best for them on providing urban services. May need to develop state guidelines on expansion of community services to protect natural resource values. State should oversee what local governments do- can damage resources.*
- Consider more coordinated right-of-way planning including more state involvement.
- Should develop a policy for checkerboard lands. *How will state and feds deal with checkerboard situation. Need to address issue.*
- Non-market values should enter equation in exchange "value". Should include natural resource values. *Value is more meaningful than acres. Need more flexibility in the "no net gain" principle.)*

- Encourage local government and feds to work together to identify land *that should be sold* for development.
- State policy should help improve communication and collaboration among interest groups, local government, state and feds and not just rely on EIS's, etc. and other lengthy processes. *Environmental groups and others don't always agree with local governments when decisions are made to dispose federal lands. They need to be able to participate in decisions and get agreement on transactions. There is no relationship between market and process: markets "move" in months while the EIS process takes years.*
- Local governments and state could use non-profits (or by themselves) to help preserve land more quickly via options. *Need more involvement of private land organizations to buy/sell land to allow for quicker transactions. Local governments can do what non-profits do- buy options on private lands and use for exchanges.*
- Some citizens think it is OK for feds to acquire water with land. State policy should accommodate this. Consider arrangements where local governments own water. *State concerns about feds acquiring water rights make some land deals difficult.)*
- Water should be acquired for natural resources. *Water rights should be acquired for wildlife purposes as a beneficial use.*
- Consultation with local governments (versus approval) is adequate (where feds are disposing land). *(Comment was in regard to the differences in the proposed Nevada Land Management Acts which may still be "alive" in Congress.) Local governments should not have veto power on land sales/acquisitions involving federal land.*
- Feds shouldn't acquire any more water rights but OK for local government to hold them. *Feds don't need to acquire water rights. Can acquire land wiyhout getting water rights.*
- Consider having NDOW, state engineer, etc./state as holder of water rights. *Local governments feel water for wildlife, for example, can be held by the Division of Wildlife, not the feds.*
- We all need something to gain or lose to strike a balance. *Competing players must each have a part of the "action" to be able to have standing to collaborate. If the feds have all the rights then there is no bargaining position for others.*
- Need to maintain access to public lands including public roads: feds should preserve access to roads when they sell land. *There is a need to address access issues in land transactions. Need to maintain existing access when disposing public land. This is a big issue all around the state.*
- Historical access to public lands also should be preserved across private lands (state would have to override local jurisdictions). *State should provide funding to litigate for access rights when these rights are curtailed.*
- Consider new requirements in master plans that require local governments to plan for and identify access points/areas. *Need state policy that when land is developed that public access is maintained through the development.*

- State should set up a mechanism that ensures local governments and feds are aware of access issues.
- Waiver no net fed land gain policy when its being done to protect/increase public land: build in more flexibility.
- *State should not protest actions where locals and feds have already worked out details. (i.e. Div. of minerals have protested some actions.)*
- Federal land management plans should identify general approach and areas and criteria used during acquisitions. *Feds should identify in plans where access is needed so that such access can be acquired when possible. Feds should consider only acquiring easements or certain rights instead of acquiring land outright.*
- State should consider overall benefits of wilderness versus benefits of two track "ways" and other "roads". *State should not encourage local governments to claim RS 2477 to "break up" WSA's. Recognize wilderness qualities over existing rights-of-way. If there is a road, it should not be a WSA.*
- Need more unified comments from state agencies (on federal proposals): "would be nice to get one page letter from Governor's office".
- Consider elevating state clearinghouse process to increase agency coordination. *Clearinghouse needs to be able to create the balance needed. Needs authority.*
- *Need more regulation of OHV use. Require registering and licensing of all OHV users.*
- Consider program like California's regarding registration fee money being used for restoration of land and education. Also use to develop OHV parks. *State could get public land under R&PP and create OHV parks.*
- Support more management of OHV's.
- Exceptions to OHV regulation/prohibition OK in certain areas such as authorized uses of public land versus "casual use"; or doesn't result in significant resource damage. *OHV use is important in ranch management, should put restrictions on recreational users only.*
- Ability to enforce rules needs to be considered.
- State lands could develop OHV parks and generate revenue for schools.
- More proactive planning and coordination needed regarding fire planning.
- Local governments should do more to minimize conflicts in high fire risk areas.

In addition, the following written comments were submitted in response to written questions:

1. <u>What vision do you have for our public lands? In other words, what future conditions would you like to see on our public lands?</u>

   Take care of the land. No further degradation by invasive species-cheatgrass. Restore our riparian areas.

2. What public lands-related issues are you concerned about?

Access- road closures- uncoontrolled ATV,OHV use- uncontrolled kids riding ATV's (age requirement to operate?). Sage brush steppe. Checkerboard lands.

3. How can we resolve these issues? Do you have any specific recommendations for related policy changes?

More state inducement. Public land agency commitment to improve and enforce policy.

Section 4: Comments from Churchill County Workshop on November 15, 2000

- There is no such thing as a “wild mustang”, they are all feral horses which can be proved by DNA test results. Wild horses are unnecessarily “glamorized” by people and the language in the Wild Horse Act has contributed to this. Wild horses are not effective users of cheatgrass and are a cause of overgrazing that is wrongly attributed to livestock. There are too many wild horses on the range, the numbers should be reduced to appropriate management levels and maintained at that level. Advocacy groups for wild horses should pay for the maintenance of horses being kept in holding facilities for adoption and for the AUM’s consumed by wild horses on the range (much the same as livestock operators pay for the AUM’s for cows and sheep). Livestock operators should be paid for “depredation” costs caused by wild horses on their allotments, much the same as such reimbursements are made for damages caused by elk. These funds should come from wild horse advocate groups.

- The federal agencies have applying the ARPA (Archeological Resources Protection Act?) to private lands. People have been cited by federal employees when on private land and then are “blackmailed” into paying a fine to avoid a jail sentence. The BLM should not be harassing people on private lands. The state and federal government should post areas where archeological values exist and need protection so that people know where they shouldn’t collect artifacts. There should be a state policy on this. There also needs to be a definition of what “significant” archeological values are in the ARPA.

- Some wilderness study areas do not meet the criteria of the Wilderness Act regarding solitude. Aircraft over-flights preclude solitude and these areas should not be considered for wilderness. Wilderness eliminates access to public land by the disabled and therefore discriminates against them. Wilderness designation and WSA status prevents access by ranchers to water sources within such areas.

- Mining and agriculture are very important to rural economies and must be protected.

- The Division of State Lands should update public land statistics. (This comment was made because there is a sense that public ownership is increasing in Nevada.)

- Federal land actions (exchanges, disposals, acquisitions) are not well publicized and the public does not have adequate opportunity to comment. The general public needs to be better notified.

- "Willing seller" needs to be better defined because many willing sellers are not really willing but forced into selling private land. This is because circumstances are created which they can only overcome through selling.

- Acquisition of private agricultural operations/water rights by public agencies create a hardship on remaining farmers/ranchers by increasing their operational costs (i.e.: the economy of scale is affected).

- The BLM has changed the definition of a "road" which has reduced the amount of road funds that come to Nevada because less miles of "road" meet the new definition. This new definition also has eliminated what were roads before in wilderness study areas. These roads became non-roads only by definition. Access has also been eliminated to some areas with roads becoming non-roads. The feds should follow the state's definition of a road. The road ownership issue needs to be resolved.

- The Nevada Association of Counties resolution on RS 2477 roads should be followed. The resolution states that any road that existed prior to 1976 is a public road.

- Water improvements such as troughs and tanks are not allowed to moved on public lands under the Archeological Resource Protection Act if they are more than 75-years old. The ARPA needs to clarify what is truly historic. Too many insignificant things now included such as "trash dumps".

- The State must make the public land policy plan effective and make the federal agencies comply like they are supposed to. The State has not supported local people on federal land issues. Rural people are frustrated by lack of response of federal agencies to local concerns.

- State public land policy should defer to local plans.

- Rural people support <u>appropriate</u> management of public lands. Need open forum.

- There is too much control of the public lands by the federal government.

- There are areas where trees should be cut for firewood but the BLM has not opened any areas in Churchill County.

- Federal law enforcement should be limited. The County Sheriff should be the primary law enforcement agency on public lands. Do not want federal police!

The workshop concluded with many questions on the extent of state ownership and the management of navigable bodies of water on Churchill County. There were questions regarding how the state controlled the bed of the Carson River through the Stillwater Refuge based on the assumption that the Carson River ran to the Carson Sink. Many of these questions were deferred with the suggestion that these could be addressed by Ed Bittleson of the Division of State Lands who manages the navigable waters program for the agency.

Section 5: Comments from Humboldt County Workshop on November 20, 2000

- Review ongoing court cases when developing new policies. *Need to mention in policy items that are under judicial review and the state policy should be consistent with the state's position in those cases.*
- Address surface rights regarding grazing (i.e. what rights belong to the rancher vs federal government) and regarding adjudication and establishment of rights under the Taylor Grazing Act. Such rights are key to getting financing. *A proponent of grazing will be seeking a change in the Taylor Grazing Act. Surface rights were granted to livestock operators and these need to be protected.*
- State should support rights under Taylor Grazing Act. *State should oppose any change to the Taylor Grazing Act which will reduce or compromise the livestock operators interest in the use of public lands for livestock grazing.*
- State should help protect stockwatering rights of ranchers/permittees. *Stockwatering rights as stated in state law should be retained, ie: no federal rights for livestock. State should support 1925 stock watering rights.*
- Should expand the development of water on public lands. *Encourage action to expand development of water on public lands.*
- Access to public lands should be maintained whenever possible. *State should assure that permittees have access to federal lands to develop water resources.*
- *Need to protect certain areas but not close off through special designation.*
- *Support multiple use. Let BLM use existing regulations to manage land- not create special designations. This eliminates use for a lot of people.*
- Should be time limit for resolving Wilderness Study Area status.
- Use existing planning process (RMP's) to protect certain areas instead of special designations.
- OHV's should stay on existing roads but hard to enforce. *Tend to support restricting OHV use to existing roads and trails but don't think it is enforceable.*
- New registration fee program for OHV's is a good idea but environmentalist lawsuits may close OHV parks like what is being done in California.
- Don't give bureaucrats more authority.
- Feds should stay out of state and local business and state should stay out of local business.
- Feds should pay tax on all special designated places.
- If feds get more land via exchange or acquisition, they should pay taxes on it; taxes should be based on value greater than market value since it has special resources. *Feds should pay taxes on land owned like it was private ownership when it is set aside for special purposes.*

- *Nevada First Corp prefers it's land to be exchanged into federal ownership because if it goes into private ownership it could be developed thereby affecting the use of the rest of the allotment by Nevada First Corp.*
- Shouldn't be a net loss of private lands/tax base within counties.
- *The BLM takes care of land. Some land is "junked up" when it goes into private ownership.*
- Shouldn't be a net loss of tax revenue within counties.
- Feds should give state more land.
- *Retain access to public land when land is privatized.*
- Support first right to buy isolated federal parcels if you surround parcel with your private land.
- Review proposed Nevada Farm Bureau policies.
- People crossing private land to access public land should respect private property and should be allowed access.
- Triple penalties on people that cause damage, throw garbage, etc.
- Register people going across private lands to reach public lands.
- Use grazing as a way to better control vegetation/grass that is a fire risk.
- *Allow more use of AUM's to reduce fire risk.*
- Local federal employees should have more say on resource decisions relative to Washington, D.C.
- Improve first response in fire fighting by letting locals be more involved and provide them with equipment. *The BLM had limited local ranchers response in recent years but is now changing to allow locals to respond.*
- Better coordination between in-state and out-of-state fire fighters; pair out-of-staters with people from local area.
- Fire fighters need more training and should pay better attention to weather forecasts.
- *Get rid of idiots in charge.*
- *Support controlled burning to improve rangelands where appropriate.*
- Too much "brain drain" in last few years (some of Nevada's best fire fighters have left).
- Weed districts should have more statutory control to take care of weeds where private property owners aren't doing anything (see Oregon program).
- More education needed also. *Need more education on noxious weeds.*
- *Department of Agriculture should encourage formation of weed districts.*
- Get more state money to fight weeds and channel it to local weed districts (see related policies in draft Nevada Farm Bureau policies).
- If new action plan allows us to reach horse AML's, still need extra follow up money to maintain AML's. *Need to sterilize horses when AUM's are reached. This should be part of the wild horse plan.*
- Get government out of the wild horse business and give it back to private enterprise.
- *Need more funding for gathers.*
- Government should have ability to use wild horses for dog food and use proceeds for horse program.

- Mining regulations are going too far especially for small businesses; could put them out of business.
- Scrapers should be allowed to clean up old mine sites. *Allow BLM to sell for scrap the machinery left behind when a mine is abandoned.*
- See Idaho's Farm Bureau's draft federal lands policies regarding: non-profits should not be allowed to make a profit or retain mineral rights or else they should lose their tax exempt status.
- Nevada should consider having laws similar to Washington's Right to Farm Act.
- Need to clarify rights under Nevada's open range law: Senator Rhoads may introduce related legislation.
- State should look at planning regulations regarding the division of land into large parcels, etc. because it is too wide open now. *More authority needs to be given to local governments to regulate large property divisions.*
- State should let counties take care of local issues.
- State should help local businesses and not make jobs harder for them.
- Mineral rights shouldn't have been separated from land- big mistake.

Section 6: Comments from Eureka County Workshop on November 21, 2000

- Policies vary too much from BLM District to District. *BLM is too top heavy- local offices don't know how to interpret orders from above consistently. Get different answers from different people.*
- *Want to make sure county concerns reach the Governor.*
- Why is Nevada spending money on public land planning, etc. when the state has "shunned" its responsibility regarding public lands? *Why is state spending time and money doing what the feds and others should be doing? Taxpayers at state and local level are paying for what feds should be doing and what fed taxes should be paying for. Don't spend state money on management of federal land unless we are given more responsibility.*
- Don't have a consensus at state level- need more solidarity at state level, especially between the Governor's office and the Attorney General.
- *Fire Summit was an exercise in "ass-kissing". The Governor wants us to get along- not deal directly with federal agencies. State must address concerns and needs on federal land.*
- The state needs to come together with a firm position and strategy before we start working with the feds.
- *Need to take locals seriously- locals should count.*
- *Feds are taking away the livelihoods of rural people piece-by-piece.*
- Recent ruling by state Department of Taxation regarding mining property is a major problem for the county.
- Federal designated wilderness and other areas, and acquisitions have led to a situation where it is almost too late to save local economy.
- Support states efforts to protect water rights.
- Review Eureka County's public land policy.
- State needs to make maximum effort to be consistent with the county and other local public land policies. *State must defer to local plans whenever possible.*
- More education of Nevada's urban population is needed, especially with respect to importance of public land resources to local economies. *Urban people are attacking rural economies. They need to understand rural needs.*
- Wild Horse and Burro Act led to takings of grazing rights; they don't have adjudicated grazing rights therefore they are imposing on private property rights. *The AUMs for horses were taken from allotments and this must be addressed in state policy plan. The State seemed to allow this to happen and they shouldn't have.*
- *State must have strong policy on public land and enforce it.*
- Need more consideration of long-term affects of new laws; new legislation needs to be more sensitive to local concerns. *State must take a hard line on proposed regulations and not give in to feds. (Make sure the Governor understands that.)*

- States should not grant anymore peace officer status to federal and other special agents.
- Need to minimize OHV resource damage but enforcement is very hard to do.
- More self-policing by OHVers and education needed.
- Opposed to more OHV regulations and opposed to more resource damage by OHV's. *OHV users need to self regulate once they understand problems caused by OHVs.*
- *OHV use is not that big of a problem.*
- New regulations won't keep OHVers from throwing trash.
- Repeal and replace Wilderness Act and instead use existing management and planning to protect resources.
- *Wilderness areas are a problem- don't need any more.*
- Recreation related benefits don't materialize as advertised/projected regarding special designation areas. *State should not "buy into" tourism benefits that are supposed to come to local economies in place of natural resource use. (Great Basin National Park was given as an example. Designation did help but won't replace mining and agriculture benefits.)*
- If we lose anymore grazing, mining, etc., then we will have to ask the state for handouts. *State needs to protect rural economies from fed actions that diminish use of federal lands.*
- State tourism staff and others should promote agriculture and other rural characteristics of state just as much as other attractions like Tahoe and Las Vegas.
- *Multiple use of federal land can work. State needs to help local people promote this. Each county is special and unique and what they produce is special to the area. Promote what is already in the community.*
- *Bring scattered concerns around state together. Beef up state staff levels.*
- Commend legislation regarding water plan that said state plan needed to be consistent with local policies.
- More emphasis on predator control needed in sage grouse plan. *Predators more of a problem than loss of sagebrush.*
- State, instead of feds, should manage ravens and other predators. *Feds have over-extended their authority under the Commerce Clause to "protect" wildlife in a state.*
- Feds shouldn't be allowed to file for water rights on public lands. *Feds should not get water rights for wildlife.*
- Fed staffs doing predator control should be state employees, until then, however, we should support predator control by feds.
- How can you protect sage grouse and Lahontan cutthroat trout when you allow them to be hunted and fished?
- State should be in charge of wildlife management including Endangered Species Act compliance. *State should be in charge of wildlife and endangered species. Should not be federal responsibility.*
- Feds buying environmentally sensitive land not legal and not consistent with Constitution.

Section 7: Comments from Lander County Workshop on December 11, 2000

- Great Basin Restoration Initiative: they assumed that we will be working on this issue with those involved;
- Supported the efforts being made on the sage grouse issue to prevent listing;
- Wants Congress to act on the wilderness issue;
- Expressed concern about losing access to the public lands;
- Multiple-use of the public lands must be maintained;
- Have concern over the possible impacts of the new 3809 regulations;
- Stated that grazing is important to the county and that use must be protected;
- The state needs to help counties address the RS 2477 issue and define roads (the county has adopted a road plan as part of the master plan, however, a few roads still need to be addressed);
- Guidelines on off-highway vehicles need to be developed by the BLM but the BLM needs to work with local governments on this;
- Access to public lands for off-highway vehicles must be retained;
- The state needs to tie the noxious weed issue with fire rehabilitation;
- The state needs to work closer with counties on all public land issues;
- Local economies must be considered;
- Multiple use and access!!!
- The urban areas need to support the rural areas on rural issues;
- Mining is very important to Lander County and the state.
- OHV and wild horse policies are inconsistent; shouldn't allow damage from one but not other. *OHV use can be as damaging as wild horse use. These should be treated equally since wild horses are an introduced species.*
- *Private land in Nevada tends to be more open for public use than private lands in other areas.*
- *There needs to be more education on OHV use of public land.*
- More education needed; work with ATV manufacturers; don't need registration fees. *Not supportive of registration of OHV's. Need to have sellers of ATV's, etc. inform people of proper use of vehicles.*
- Fee monies might be used for other things. *Don't need more fees, government tends to misuse after they are collected.*
- Take a safety/education course instead of fees; maybe OHV'ers should pay for it. *People need to have a OHV training course similar to hunter training sessions.*
- We need noxious weed identification/awareness program.
- Look to users for funding of restoration and other projects instead of spreading costs over all taxpayers. *Primary users of public land should bear costs of noxious weed eradication.*

- A lot more money will be needed to hold on to what we have, let alone restore or improve land and other resources. *Need increased funding to maintain quality of environment.*
- *Support requiring training certificate for OHV users but no fee. For safety, education and conservation purposes.*
- *Noxious weed plan doesn't have enough action as part of it. Needs to be stronger.*
- Since public lands are so massive, consider letting peopole own more and they will take good care of it. *Support getting more land into private ownership to help reduce weed problem- more people owning land the more people to take care of it.*
- Don't want to pay to see local sites; locals especially shouldn't have to pay. *Need to keep access to all public lands without paying fees. Opposed to adding fees if special use designated area.*
- Consider statewide lodging tax and designate proceeds to preservation and conservation of land. *Consider statewide lodging tax to support conservation of lands.*
- Taxes are OK if they are fair. *Taxes okay if for genuine needs- oppose taxation in general.*
- More accountability needed regarding money spent to fight fires; need to hire more locals to fight fires. *Need more accountability of funds spent for fire fighting purposes. Money seems to be misspent in some situations.*
- Look at all natural alternatives to breaking cheatgrass cycle. *Use natural alternatives where available to combat cheatgrass.*
- Regarding fire policy: prioritize areas and greenstrip to protect high value areas first. *Determine what areas are most prone to burning frequently, then protect sensitive areas with green striping.*
- Should come out with brochure-like document for education/information purposes.
- *Private land owners are better stewards of the land.*
- *Need frequent meetings with residents of area by state to let them know what is going on with public land issues (quarterly?).*
- *Wild Horse Commission support of wild horse funding/ 5- year plan was key to getting funding from Congress.*
- Grazing fees should be locally determined by local BLM offices, based on local market conditions, not set nationally. *Grazing fees need to be locally determined. Important to help local economies.*
- Fire policies should be set locally also.
- The more autonomy local managers have the more ownership they will have. *Need local policies on management to meet local needs.*
- *Better decisions are made at local level. Should strive for this.*
- Why do formulas for grazing fees and other things have to be so complex?
- BLM should have sale authority regarding wild horses like the National Park Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs do.

Section 8: Comments from Elko County Workshop on December 18, 2000

- Concerned about more wilderness and adverse effects on local tourism industry. *There was much discussion on wilderness and the designation of wilderness. It was felt that environmental groups should not be adding more areas to consider. Want definition of wilderness to be what it was original in act (i.e: definition of a road has changed over the years). There could be better uses of the land in the future besides wilderness.*
- *There were strong statements made regarding federal ownership of water or water rights (in opposition).*
- *There were concerns expressed about land exchanges that reduced private ownership in rural areas.*
- *There were many questions regarding the consistency provisions in federal law and the affect this planning effort would have.*
- Make it clear that state, not feds, own water; feds can't acquire water rights including those when they acquire property.
- Use wilderness definitions from original act.
- Conservation easements should have time limits- consider 25 years to reassess.
- The Thompson Bill on October 18th gave United Nations control of our land (see Desertification Treaty #33).
- State should look at new options like state ownership, trust, etc. (ie: some type of intermediary) to hold land until buyers are available. *Opposed to private land trusts buying private land for the federal government.*
- *State should set up trust to buy land from private owner to provide alternate for owner instead of selling to federal government. State should hold and then sell later back to private ownership.*
- Periodically review every 5 to 10 years to see if desired outcomes were achieved. *(Put a 10-year review on all actions to determine if action was effective in accomplishing purpose intended.*
- Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution: Will federal use comply with this and under what jurisdiction are they using?
- Using land for environmental purposes is not constitutional.
- Strictly adhere to NRS 321 regarding acquisitions and exchanges.
- Stronger support for RS 2477 from state (incl. funding from the state to help support local litigation: see Utah).
- More emphasis on fire protection v. fighting; more cost effective.
- More grazing could help reduce fuels.
- Don't want more restrictive recreation policy regarding OHV's, snowmobiles, etc. Example: No human zones being established in some wilderness areas in California. *Federal policies are leading to more restrictions on the public lands. Need to allow more use of public land. Some wilderness areas are being designated for non-people use.*

- Consider “big and little W” wilderness areas with varying degrees of restrictions. *(Two different types of wilderness are needed- one very restrictive, the other allowing more recreation use such as snowmobiles.*
- OHV registration fees can be used to promote off-road recreation, snowmobile grooming, OHV access; overall more positives v. negatives. Can track down stolen vehicles, creates dollars for federal matching funds.
- Will be more difficult for feds to shut down roads and other areas if we use matching funds on them.
- *Need to add roads for OHV use on public land. Promote use, helps prevent designating as “roadless” or wilderness.*
- Local snowmobile club has considered a local sticker program. *(Will be a problem to enforce but is needed.*
- Don’t spend too much of registration fees for law enforcement.
- Use cross-section of local and state representatives to determine how to spend registration fees.
- Use of registration fees monies has to be approved by user groups.
- Rural areas receive most benefits of green sticker program with urban dollars.
- Green sticker program should exempt agricultural related vehicles.
- Covenants and restrictions on federal land transactions should protect access for hunting, other recreation and other public uses. *(Don’t close off lands after acquisition.)*
- State should manage all wildlife and be responsible for enforcement of ESA.
- Try to get Great Basin Restoration Initiative monies down to state and local level to work on weed control, etc.
- Need someone to approve plans created from green sticker type program for water quality protection, etc. (e.g: State Conservation Commission, local districts, etc.).
- Feds shouldn’t be entitled to anymore land until they take better care of what they have already (e.g. Ruby Mountain trails).
- State legislature should approve all private land purchases by feds.
- Ownership of land by ski resorts and others should be allowed v. leasing only (approach being proposed at Ward Mountain in White Pine County). Would help financing and would serve public benefit and improve recreation experience. *Reduce roadblocks preventing acquisition of federal land. Need to make land available for appropriate uses such as recreation.*
- Should consider limiting foreign ownership; would be hard under free market system. *(Restrict land acquisition to domestic companies.)*
- Coordinate with Dept. of Ag.
- Make plans more definitive than they have been in past (weed plan was too generic). *Natural resource plans of state need to more specific on implementation.*
- Certified weed free program can go too far if were not careful; could be too extreme: stop short of harming local economy or not acting fast enough.
- Promote state and federal lead on weed program.

- SNPLMA money should not be used for acquiring more land; instead improve what they have like fighting cheat grass. Northern Nevada equivalent also should use money in same manner and add predator control (this may require federal legislation).
- Should increase predator control to help avoid listings under the ESA.
- Have “black sticker” program for ravens when you buy ammo, poisons, etc.
- Feds shouldn’t be allowed to take actions without local approval.
- Take into account more than just biology before making decisions.
- We need more money to achieve goals and things talked about tonight. *Need more staffing for state agencies to implement good management on various issues such as noxious weeds.*
- Increase more public access, use monies for this.
- Consider access across private land to reach public land but need to protect private property rights.
- Improve, don’t shut down public roads.
- Maintain easements/access on land disposed by feds.
- Need to better define a road.
- Need more education to try and reduce trash, damage, etc. *Feds close roads when there is too much litter.*
- Access to private inholdings should be allowed/maintained to protect private property rights of inholders. *State needs position on inholdings. Need policy to prevent creation of wilderness that will affect property rights of an inholder.*
- Need to preserve hunting and other recreation areas in public ownership to protect access and keep user costs low. *Public land provides better access for hunters than private ownership in a lot of situations. TPL and others buy private land and close off access. Private ranchers selling hunting rights affects access to others.*
- Make sure comments from workshops are sent to people on mailing list.

Section 9: Comments from Pershing County Workshop on December 19, 2000

- Policies should define when state should provide legal assistance to individuals and local agencies. *Need to get attorney general to back up individuals or local governments on issues against the federal agencies. They have been very inactive in this area.*
- *Rural people need to get active and united to combat environmental interests.*
- *Need to educate urban people in Nevada of rural interests.*
- *Need to do historical research on public land issues.*
- Major problem with Washington D.C. handing down mandates without local decisions driving process.
- Individuals can't afford to fight feds. *Fighting feds is a winless situation.*
- *The stronger the state and local policy plans are the better it is for the state in implementing their policies.*
- State should have more say/ "teeth" with respect to Endangered Species Act decisions and enforcement. *The state needs more say-so on the ESA. Should be more of a state decision.*
- Nevada Division of Wildlife agrees with the BLM decisions too often. *NDOW is too supportive of the BLM in the reduction of grazing rights.*
- Nevada Division of Wildlife has too much authority.
- Water rights should belong to state and its citizens and not the federal government. *Water rights should not be acquired by federal agencies when acquiring land by purchase or exchange.*
- Need to define roads in state policy. *Need to look at definition of roads in Nevada.*
- Need to protect private land owners in or near specifically designated areas. *Need policy to protect private property interests in such areas.*
- Money generated by Clark County federal land sales shouls stay in Clark County.
- Green sticker OHV program would be too much regulation; more education is needed. *Don't want increased regulations on OHV's in Pershing County. Doesn't seem to be a problem in county yet. Most OHV use is on existing roads.*
- OHV registration fee exemptions would be needed for agriculture and mining.
- Need to overcome jurisdictional problems with fire fighting; local fire fighters should be used first to put out fires quickly; locals should not be told to "go home" by feds.
- *List cheat grass as noxious weed.*
- *Need to curtail whitetop and salt cedar infestation. Need to take action to spray it, if not, will change character of county.*
- *Need to allow more use of forage by livestock to reduce wildfire problem.*
- Private property rights including fencing should be better respected.

- If public land becomes private and was used for access, then access should be maintained as a condition of sale.
- Need to clarify feds authority regarding their right to use water (e.g.: federal reserved water rights). *Need to clarify what are federal reserved water rights and what are not.*
- If wild horses exceed AMLs then locals or state should be allowed to gather.
- *Need to look at other alternatives for wild horse management besides adoption, such as private gathers and use for dog food.*

Section 10: Comments from Douglas County Workshop on January 17, 2001

- A major part of the effort needs to be directed at influencing feds, especially Washington, D.C. *Policies need to influence federal agencies on the federal level. New administration may be more susceptible to state and local concerns.*
- Move quickly and take advantage of transition in D.C., try to reverse decrees. *Need to reverse many of the recent federal decrees. Get away from the political aspects- the pendulum has swung too far to the left. The other side needs to have some influence now.*
- Could go slow in spirit of bi-partisanship- don't swing pendulum too wildly. *Don't expect large scale changes or reversals of what has been done. Many people support what the previous administration has done.*
- We need to de-politicize land use planning and related decisions (e.g.: Forest Service roadless initiative).
- Collaborative planning with local governments- bottom up approach.
- *Standardization of policies get diluted the farther "east" they go. Need more consistency within federal agencies themselves. Regional and national levels don't respect local level agency input.*
- Access key issue.
- More consistency needed between local federal offices and D.C.- too many arbitrary decisions.
- Action plan the most important part of project. *Nevada needs an action plan. For the most part people can agree on the policies. Action plan will be difficult.*
- More control of OHV's ok; avoid conflicts with other uses and damage to resources. *Need to control OHV use. Restrict from fragile areas. Need places for people to go where there are no vehicles.*
- Don't let closures go too far. *Allow in areas where land can tolerate the use.*
- *Need natural areas where animals can have their peace and quiet.*
- This is good issue for collaborative planning.
- More open areas needed that can tolerate use.
- Registration program too much government control. *Don't think "green sticker" program is good idea. Too much regulation and control.*
- Wilderness good but more understanding among conflicting uses (e.g.: hunting/hiking, x-cross country skiing and snowmobiles- maybe restrict uses during certain time of year). *Wilderness areas are appropriate. There are conflicts between recreationists and hunters in wilderness areas. Need to limit use to certain groups at certain times of the year. Consider wilderness areas for different uses. Conflicts between skiers and snowmobiles.*
- Some WSA's don't meet wilderness criteria (2 million acres of 5.1 million don't meet criteria). *Need to restrict wilderness designations to areas that have*

wilderness values. Areas that don't meet wilderness criteria needs to be released to multiple use.
    - more communication and education needed;
    - a balance needed;
    - Congressional action needed soon.
- Scope of Newlands Project is too big.
- Restoration of wetlands to BC not realistic. *Restoration of wetlands in Stillwater is going too far. Trying to restore to prehistoric levels.*
- Regarding controlled burn at Jack Wrights Pass, opposed to this; they need better control and management of burns. *BLM tends not to be able to control burns.*
- *Some years ago the feds cut down pinyon-juniper to improve habitat- that led to too much grass that tends to burn.*
- Feds used to be honorary members of local fire departments, this led to better communication.
- Prescribed burns shouldn't be used during fire seasons.
- *OHV restrictions will help reduce fires since catalytic converters and smoking causes fires.*
- More help from feds regarding tall whitetop and other noxious weeds. Need more consideration of toxic sprays of weeds.
- More control of weeds the major challenge- lots of money and time needed.
- *Identification/mapping of weeds has been getting better. Found out we have more weeds than previously thought.*
- *Weed control districts are helpful in combating weeds. Not all areas have a weed district.*
- Need immediate seeding after removing weeds.
- More consideration of grazing as a tool to control weeds. *Livestock grazing helps reduce cheatgrass and noxious weeds.*
- Protect public access to public lands.
- *There has been a petition against the mass exchange involving Bentley Corp. and the BLM. The Pine Nut Preservation League has been formed to protect multiple use of lands in the Pine Nuts. Avoid the term "access" because that tends to be too limiting. Also, avoid term "open space" because that tends to mean restricted use. Want to keep lands available for public use.*
- Make resources available but preserve at same time.
- *Concerned about BLM disposing public land. That land becomes developed and public use restricted. Some land for privatization is OK.*
- Consider exchanges to increase access to public lands.
- *Need better access to public lands in south county area where there is an abundance of Indian and private lands.*
- Support maintaining access on land sold to private parties, if appropriate.
- Open space preservation initiative needed to address both supply and demand sides.

- State should purchase more federal lands and then let people of Nevada decide how to use it. *State should purchase land from feds and use for exchange purposes.*
- *State should be involved in the Pine Nut plan effort.*
- State/local control of land better than federal control. *State can amange public land as open space just as well as feds.*
- Uniqueness of land resources should be a criterion used to determine what state should acquire.
- Use state parks as a way to better control use vs. federal special designations. *State should acquire special areas for state parks.*
- *Special designation of federal land tends to attract people and impact resources more than before.*
- If we keep closing areas we won't have enough left over for other uses. *Oppose to feds closing off a lot of areas from public use.*
- How can NDOW allow hunting of sage grouse when it's being considered for listing under ESA?
- *Should limit hunting/shooting when it is too close to private land.*

Written comments were also provided by one attendee during the meeting:

1. What vision do you have for our public lands? In other words, what future conditions would you like to see on our public lands?

   I would like to see more "home rule" of public lands in different jurisdictions. Interlocal agreements with local government when public lands are up for disposal or trade. Spend revenue in jurisdictions where lands are located. Swap conservation easements for public lands to keep revenue in jurisdictions where public lands are located. Proactive management and return as much public land to local jurisdictions.

2. What public lands-related issues are you concerned about?

   Access to public lands. Cooperative planning of public lands to maximize positive impacts on local jurisdictions. Health-safety issues. Flood fire, etc. More cooperation from USFS, BLM, BIA, BR, DOD lands. Ownership of water located on public lands. Shared responsibilities for impacts like flooding, drainage, fire, watershed. Access to Southern Nevada Land Act money if a jurisdiction has a master plan and/or open space plan.

3. How can we resolve these issues? Do you have any specific recommendations for related policy changes?

   Local government needs to have input on planning and use of public lands. Better working relationships with local-federal jurisdictions. Home rule local government knows what they need from public lands. Better communication and clearly defined federal policies and chain-of-command. It's very difficult

to get local needs addressed at a regional or federal level. US government should participate in acquisition of conservation easements that help provide “natural or passive” infrastructure that deals with water, flood, drainage, sewage disposal, and natural hazards.

Section 11: Comments from Lincoln County Workshop on January 22, 2001

- The word “protecting” in the vision statement of the project should be changed to “conserving”.
- There needs to be a balance between federal, state and local input. Things are too top heavy now. More state and local input is needed in public land management and decisions. Everyone needs to be involved in the decision-making process.
- There should be state and local input on what should be designated wilderness. Designate those areas that have wilderness quality as wilderness then release the rest. Need to get done after all these years.
- The 30% of Lincoln County that was proposed for wilderness in Lincoln County previously was too much.
- Environmentalists are now proposing specific types of wilderness now such as archeological and historic areas.
- The state needs to take the lead on defining wilderness and roads for Nevada, such as Utah has done. Determine what are appropriate. County is identifying roads that exist in WSA’s. The federal agencies change definitions and allow what are roads to exist in WSA’s.
- State legislature should make recommendation to Congress as to what should be designated as wilderness.
- Need to preserve as much as the natural environment in Nevada as possible. Diversity. Shouldn’t base on whether a road or not exists. Should preserve areas under other methods and designations, not just wilderness. This would allow preserving some appropriate areas which may have roads or otherwise don’t meet wilderness standards.
- Wilderness is the top issue in Lincoln County.
- The common person should have input on what is designated wilderness, seems like only agencies and interest groups have input to the process.
- The BLM decided what to do regarding the desert tortoise and didn’t allow local people input. Needs to based on science. Some areas shown as habitat when it isn’t. Some things are blamed for the demise of the tortoise incorrectly. There is an advantage to do habitat conservation planning but it needs to be done right.
- There is a movement now to sue the BLM over the desert tortoise plan.
- No public land will be released for disposal until there is a habitat conservation plan.
- Poor science leads to taking of private land.
- Opposed to conservation easements.
- Habitat conservation plan does now allow use of private land. Takings occur even with HCP. Opposed to HCP but it is being shoved down our throats. Need to fight and oppose.

- Environmentally sensitive private land will ultimately end up as public land. The government will not be able to take care of it. Private land owners are better stewards, especially when they know what needs to be done.
- HCP is extortion- not science. One can pay to do what they want at the right price. Need to change ESA because it allows taking of private property and puts money in someone's pocket. HCP will have no benefit for the species- just for political "agendas".
- HCP doesn't provide for protection of species, only provides for the takings of the species.
- Problem also with southwestern willow fly catcher which is no different from other flycatchers.
- Environmentalists look for ways to overcome conservation agreements. They then file lawsuits to destroy.
- There is a feeling that Lincoln County desert tortoise populations are being enhanced by transplants from Clark County, then designated as habitat. This is not fair to Lincoln County and should be stopped.
- It is hard to collaborate with people you don't trust such as the BLM and USFS. They continue to give livestock operators trouble.
- Funds generated for takings permits for endangered species should be used for habitat improvement. These funds have not been available for Lincoln County-only Clark County. Money raised in Lincoln County should be used in Lincoln County. The USFWS says they don't have money to give to Lincoln County since they didn't keep track of it.
- Reduce fire risk on public lands. Lincoln County has pinyon-juniper plan that the BLM, County and others have developed. Need to do manipulation/removal of p-j to reduce fire hazard. Need to increase livestock grazing to reduce fuels. With less p-j there are more opportunities for use of the land including recreation and grazing.
- Lincoln County had someone lined up to harvest p-j but the BLM won't allow. The BLM wants to burn it.
- Lincoln County has set up a local sage grouse recovery team and is getting started on effort.
- Noxious weeds are getting to be a problem where one didn't exist before. Lincoln County and White Pine County have formed a joint weed district.
- The state needs to recommend that additional and continuing funding is provided by the state to allow weed districts to control weeds.
- The wildlife refuge is a big weed problem area and they say they have funds to address the issue.
- Most people in Nevada are opposed to registering OHV's.
- The BLM and USFS already have regulations in place to address OHV abuse.
- Those that abuse the land with OHV use don't care if they are registered or not.
- Don't need more law enforcement. Too much now. If BLM adds OHV laws then they should enforce.

- Utah has “green sticker” program. They are now trying to get people to turn in snowmobilers that are violating rules.
- Need to use soil surveys to determine where OHV use can occur. This will tell you what areas are too sensitive to use.
- The BLM is inconsistent in allowing off-road vehicle uses/races.
- Would not object to paying fees to register OHV’s if money is used for education/public relations.
- WSA’s already prohibit OHV use, isn’t that enough?
- If state has policy on OHV use, then it should use DOT/DOW people to identify areas where there is too much damage/use. Then address these areas.
- Can’t have blanket policy for state on OHV use. Would be foolish. Registration is also a waste of time.
- Waste of time to try to educate urban interests about rural land issues.
- Lincoln County is viewed as an urbanites playground. Rural areas are at urban interests mercy. They control what is going on.
- It is not the urban people that are the problem- it is the top down bureaucracy of federal agencies.
- Can support conservation plans when worked out jointly if feds allow opening up more land to compensate.
- The federal government will eventually take our land incrementally.
- Private property owner needs to be assured that property rights will be protected. Environmentalists don’t care about private property.
- If environmentalists really wanted to help species, they would allow locals more ground to assist in species protection and management. Create incentives for private property owners to help protect species, instead of putting them out of business or taking their land.
- Create open space corridors for wildlife to help them. Work with private property owners to help keep them on the land.
- Too many regulations which harm private property owners.
- Livestock operators do take care of land they use because it is in their best interest. Too many other people trying to run their lives.
- Government should leave people alone. People will take care of what they have without regulations. Private property owners are good stewards of land. Trust the people!
- Lincoln County doesn’t have AML’s set for WHMA’s. State needs to participate in setting appropriate management levels.
- Wild horse advocates should fund wild horse program.
- Wild horses may be contributing to sage grouse problem.
- When livestock must be removed from the public land, wild horses and elk should also be removed to be fair.
- Management of public lands must be based on local conditions and science. Need to look at local studies specifically to resolve problems.
- Need raven control to help sage grouse and desert tortoise.

- Use more local studies/scientists on Nevada problems. Don't use national "handbooks".
- Encourage federal government to work with local people. Find out what locals need and help them.
- Update and amend state policy plan annually. Don't wait too long.
- Feds don't comply with NEPA or FLPMA. Supposed to do economic evaluations which they don't do. State needs to help on this.
- Need comprehensive socio-economic evaluations in plans and EIS's. Not being done now. The Governor needs to require this.
- Use NACO study on grazing impacts that is now being prepared. Economic impacts on local areas are substantial.
- State needs to encourage more land available for disposal at fair market value.
- Competitive bidding for property raises the prices too high and locals can't afford to acquire.
- BLM appraisers value property incorrectly.
- Feds owe local government in Lincoln County a lot of land which then can be sold by the county.

The following written comments were submitted at the workshop:

1. Wilderness- work closely with BLM to clear areas out of WSA that do not qualify as wilderness. Held up many years in limbo. Areas that are special and should be protected go ahead with but don't hold everything in abeyance.
2. Endangered species listings- take the offensive like we have been doing with the sage grouse, make sure our plans demostrate where the populations are and what those numbers are and what we are already doing to improve the habitat for the sage grouse so that the birds do not need to be listed as endangered. Not about egos or who is right or wrong, but what is best for the bird.
3. Reducing fire risk on public lands- strong need for community based plans that deal with the types of fuels out there. Valid point to be made for the pinyon-juniper project and the PJ encroachment on our community of Pioche, disastrous fire last two summer seasons. Good sound science to have grazing and thinning on these areas around communities, do not allow the fuels to build up. Solid program for management of fuels on public lands. Thick areas of trees, the under story is choked out, the PJ project proposes to thin the big trees that will release the under story for rejuvenation. Our plans must be based on what is sustainable and renewable. When we take out the big tall thick trees only and wait until the smaller trees grow up to come back to that specific area.
4. Meeting public recreation needs- varied uses, hunting, camping, off road casual and off road competition. Use the soil surveys to decide where the soil types are that will handle volume of vehicles. We are trying our best to make more opportunities for more kinds of public land recreation with this PJ project. Release under story to develop, build more kinds of places for more

wildlife and livestock, we have to have healthy range lands and that will sustain a higher degree of recreation.

5. Increase role of state and local governments in public land issues- We compliment you for coming on this review trip to local communities. We encourage you to be much more involved in the local concerns and issues so both the state and the counties can speak with one voice, ask you to encourage the feds to respond to local needs, work in close with commissioners, recommend an annual review of lands and recreation and economic benefits of Nevada's public land policies. Come here and see where you can be of help to us. Especially commend the support and activities of Carl Dahlen, the rural counties director of Nevada Economic Development. Been very encouraging about our PJ project, accompanied by the strong support of LT Gov. Lorraine Hunt.
6. Weeds- Support the work of Cooperative Extension Service, UNR, Nevada Dept Ag, hiring weed specialist, Bob Wilson and Don Holloway CES here county weed commission White Pine and Lincoln, help us keep the funding coming so UNR and counties have the money to continue this work.
7. Federal land transactions- Mesquite, county line, Aerojet properties, MX wells, power plants, school sites, industrial park sites, work with feds to keep this line of progress moving.
8. Mining and grazing regs – encourage use of more local sciences, specifically those trained scientists at UNR and College of Ag and Mackay School of Mines, discourage the use of the national handbooks, one size fits all approach, more site specific, use scientific studies of local people who are actually doing research, use of the national handbooks only have put us in the mess of regulations that we are in right now.
9. Wild horses- worked closely with Senator Reid to get 9.5 million dollars for Nevada for gathering excess horses, we are way over populated again, the problem is the money is in Washington, DC. BLM and they will not release it to come to Nevada so we can actually accomplish the intended purposes of gathering overpopulation of horses. Washington is micro managing, asking for more and more paperwork even now, not releasing the money as intended. Meanwhile the horse numbers are skyrocketing and the damage to the resources here in Nevada are tremendous. Asking Nevada to lean on Washington DC to break loose the money, send it here so we can do the gathers in a timely manner. Small window of opportunity for correct season of the year to do gathers. We need it now. Quit the game playing. Senator Reid publicly critical of delays in Washington BLM.
10. Off highway vehicle management- use community based committees to establish in conjunction with the bureau and the event promoter safe areas to use, where soils are capable of sustaining this traffic, we invite you to come help local governments with this planning effort, weeds can establish and create more problems, key is use of soil surveys.
11. Local economies dependent on public lands- 98.16 percent of Lincoln County is extreme, but we live with that constriction each and every day with all these issues. Access is the key, without access to public lands to manage with

good community based plans, we are dead. As I have said before, we appreciate the support of Carl Dahlen and Lt Gov Lorraine Hunt and Senator Reid, it is going to take all of us working together to stay alive. Invite you back at your earliest opportunity.

Section 12: Comments from Clark County Workshop on January 23, 2001

- Maintain or increase access to public lands: less environmental controls.
- *The goal of the environmentalists is to keep people off the public lands.*
- There is enough wilderness now. Don't cut off everything: keep roads open.
- *Private citizens need access to lands but protect land from commercial use.*
- Increased cost/less opportunities for hunters that can't afford to hire packers *(Wilderness makes hunting much more difficult, if not impossible, to hunt large animals.) (Access exists to areas on cherrystem roads- plenty of access now exists.)*
- Keep guzzlers in wilderness areas. *Any legislation that establishes wilderness areas must include provisions for guzzlers.*
- Streamline BLM permitting process, especially recreation-oriented. *If permitted one year, then approve in timely fashion for following years.*
- Cherrystem all roads into WSA's and wilderness to maintain access.
- Make resource sustainability a priority.
- Watershed protection, riparian area restoration and habitat improvement should be a high priority.
- Improve existing conditions and populations, reverse decreasing population trends while avoiding listing. *Need to improve habitat to enhance wildlife-not including wild horses.*
- New wilderness shouldn't include OHV trails- they should be "roadless".
- More involvement by hunters and others needed in future wilderness studies.
- Need more state and federal law enforcement on public lands *(and in WSA's).*
- Money spent under Pittman-Robertson program should only be used for hunting related activities. *Areas paid for with such funds should be restricted for those uses.*
- Grazing management needs to better protect riparian areas. *Livestock operators need to work with BLM to protect riparian areas but want livestock grazing to continue.*
- More actively managed trail systems and designated areas for OHV's.
- ATV safety course a good idea but don't need to expand to other vehicles. *They are now required for operators.*
- Safety course a good idea for motorcycles.
- Green sticker program has led to unrealistic expectations; OHV'ers restricted to too few areas.
- Too much of a "driving mechanism", i.e. too much influence by OHV'ers; carrying capacity of land being exceeded.
- Clear definition of how money *collected under a "green sticker" program* will be spent in future legislation.
- More effort and education and fines needed regarding trash pickup.

- Hire homeless guys to pickup trash or use prisoners.
- BLM should have a tiered fee schedule for recreation special use permits; non-profit groups should pay less than commercial groups.
- State needs fire, weed and habitat management policies regarding rangeland health. These policies should be rolled together.
- *State needs statement on grazing policies or a vision on what the public lands should be. Range land health is not addressed by state- need policy on this.*
- Avoid registration fees for OHV's going to the general fund.
- Grazing can play a role in fire management but needs to be carefully managed and controlled.
- Don't let DMV manage OHV registration fee program *(if it does pass).*
- OK to have some limited areas for open use for OHV's but for most part, OHVs should stay on existing roads and OHV trails.
- *Restrict use of OHV's only in areas that are susceptible to erosion damage.*
- As opposed to more OHV management, rely upon more education (with lots of consensus on education program); expand upon "Tread Lightly" program.
- OK to go off-road if you don't cause damage and for specific purposes such as retrieving a shot animal (see Arizona legislation).
- Spread OHV use out, don't concentrate use on a limited number of "sacrifice areas". This causes too much damage. *For OHV events, spread event out to different areas every year. Disperse use and land won't suffer.*
- Encourage more management of other uses where there are conflicts (like horses and mountain bikes), especially in areas near urban areas.
- Consider new funding sources (like Pittman-Robertson program) to provide more money for mountain bike, horse recreation uses, etc.
- Consider expansion of programs like Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson to other uses (e.g. excise taxes on all types of outdoor recreation equipment).
- Mountain bikes and horse people should pay more of their fair share relative to other users such as hunters.
- Bond issues only provide money for short-term, need ongoing funds from license plate fees, taxes, etc., over long period of time. Needed for matching federal monies under CARA, etc.
- Make people more aware of "Simms?" trails program funds being available (20% matching requirement).
- Keep "driving for pleasure" category in next update of SCORP.
- Need more areas for special recreation purposes like field dog trials.
- *Seems to be an influx of noxious plants in southern Nevada. Need to educate people about the problem. Reduce infested areas now, if not, will cost much more later.*
- Noxious weeds very important issue, new weeds need to be added to list, more education and awareness needed to control them.
- More control of weeds at ports of entry needed.
- Try and get more free publicity from media regarding noxious weeds (e.g.: who to call, how to get rid of weeds).

- Need to prioritize since limited money for enforcement; new rules won't change much without enforcement.
- *More rules/regulations lead to more funding needs. Lots of problems need to be addressed but no money to take care of.*
- *Need fines of violators to fund programs.*
- More planning for maintaining access to public lands should occur in local master plans.
- *Needs to be mechanisms to allow access across private land to public land without harming private property rights.*
- Public access also should be maintained (via conditions on patents, etc.) when public land is sold.
- Create more public roads to access public lands.
- More management needed of wild horses.

Section 13: Comments from Washoe County Workshop on January 31, 2001

- Policy plan should define United Nations policies, such as Global Diversity and the Earth Summit, that are impacting land use in Nevada.
- *What power is available to influence federal land management through this planning process?*
- Include state lands in scope. *Should also include state lands in policy plan. Federal agencies have better ways of getting public input on land management. Public needs to know what the state policies are.*
- *Citizens of United States own the land, feds just manage for the citizens.*
- Improve methods of public participation.
- Review Nevada Land Ownership Act. *Recently adopted Nevada Public Lands Act should be included.*
- *Plan should recommend a legislative repeal of the "Sagebrush Rebellion" sections now in NRS.*
- Rescind Nevada Land Ownership Act.
- Collaborative management *of wildlife* plus collaborative planning.
- More state investment in lands.
- *Public lands are the greatest resource Nevada has.*
- Public lands should be in best condition possible.
- More input from local government.
- Public lands should stay in public ownership.
- Under what authority does federal government have to own land? *Consider Constitutional aspects of federal land ownership, i.e. no right to own.*
- More restoration and enhancement of public lands and stewardship.
- Should maximize utilization of *natural* resources for the *benefit of the* people.
- Lands should be managed for the benefit of wildlife: it doesn't have a voice.
- Maintain and increase public access.
- Add clean air and clean water/ protection of watersheds and show tie-in to public lands.
- Keep Tahoe blue: take-out Tahoe Keys.
- Keep a healthy fishery at Walker Lake.
- Protect and restore wetlands.
- Protect quality and diversity of recreation on public lands.
- Study how ranchers and other private users have helped the environment *and wildlife*.
- Respect private property.
- Respect local government *opinions, not federal bureaucrats.*
- Private owners need to maintain access when they buy federal land.
- Should be concerned about trend towards more federal ownership and loss of tax revenue.

- *Land conservationists are buying private land and turning it over to federal agencies- adversely affects private land base.*
- *Private land prevents access to public land in a lot of areas: encourage local governments to acquire rights of access to public lands across private land. Policy plan needs to include state involvement with local government in getting access.*
- Encourage more proactive planning at local level to increase access.
- Need to define "access": need more details on types of uses.
- Look at master plan contents.
- Federal government should not purchase land to block access (especially in-holdings). *There is a federal program to purchase inholdings to remove need to allow access to those lands in the future. This contributes to a further loss of potential access to some areas.*
- No net gain in federal lands during exchanges, based on acre for acre, not just market value.
- Need to study land exchanges statewide and the difference in ownership that has occurred.
- More comments needed by state (including Governor's office) on all land transactions; need more public awareness of comments made.
- Gain in public lands okay as long as public access increases and market values are equal.
- *Need a study on what the net affect of land exchanges have had on Nevada statewide.*
- Include out-of-state exchanges that affect Nevada: break these out separately in study of exchanges.
- Don't allow inter-basin transfers of water and avoid related adverse impacts to sending area. *Need to retain water rights in local areas, not export to urban areas. Keep for local uses.*
- Better inform local communities regarding transactions.
- *Need better notification of public on federal activities.*
- This report should identify public lands for sale. *State plan should include the identification of land proposed by federal agencies for disposal.*
- Need study on what water resources we do have and look at growing demands and water conservation.
- *Need to know what Las Vegas is going to do regarding water usage and conservation.*
- The Governor needs to implement the state water plan findings and action items.
- Take a harder look at de-watering from mining.
- State needs to raise revenue to hire more people, fund education, restore habitat. *More state personnel need to be hired to work on natural resources.*
- *State needs to improve wildlife habitat.*
- Education should especially consider restoration, good management, stewardship.
- No more fees on all recreation. *Against all fees.*

- Green sticker program good for funding education and keeping track of users.
- *OHV community supports "green sticker" program. Use for education of OHV users. Program can help protect natural areas by allowing identification of abusers.*
- *Opposed to "green sticker" program. Funds in other states have not been used appropriately. There has not been equal treatment of all users. Just a program to take money out of people's pockets.*
- Fees should be commensurate with use; visitor days and economic activity as measurement of use.
- California program doesn't work because too much goes to general fund and not OHV-related programs. Need more accountability of where monies are going.
- True market value not accounted for in transactions; need more appraisals.
- We already pay enough, don't need new fees.
- Some of the proceeds from *public land sale* transactions should be used for recreation facilities, erosion control, etc.
- More consideration of local tax base/economic impacts from exchanges; mitigate adverse impacts by requiring acreage to be equal.
- More review of groundwater and interconnections with surface water.
- State should work with federal government on incentives for good land stewardship.
- More/better native seed bank program. *Can create economic benefits in rural areas.*
- States should consider encouraging consolidation of checkerboard lands.
- More programs like SNPLMA monies to fund recreational facilities.
- Sticker program in Oregon worked well and there was good accountability and good involvement and discussion with users.
- If new sticker program: it should be for motorized vehicles only.
- More planning at local levels to protect watersheds.
- More sales and less exchanges (or no exchanges).
- Change policy of BLM which requires at least 100 acres of "prime" private property before they are interested in an exchange.
- State should oppose nuclear waste storage and transportation within state.
- *Retain policy opposing Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste storage facility.*
- Should recycle nuclear waste and use it for nuclear generation to help solve energy problems: more studies needed of economic advantages of recycling.
- State should propose waste be stored where it is generated. *Affirm this instead of just opposing storage at Yucca Mountain.*
- Should identify areas for alternate energy generation and related resources in Nevada, *such as geothermal, wind and solar.*
- Government shouldn't interfere with private property rights at Tahoe and elsewhere: government should protect and defend private property rights.
- More publicity of next round of workshops.
- Continue 2,000 mile OHV event and other competitive activities like it.

- Fees *from OHV use* should be used especially to restore roads damaged by activities.
- Our Governor and Western Governor's Association should try and take back public lands from federal agencies.
- Protection of watersheds in California being used by Sierra Pacific Power Company water utility: will this occur after they sell water system?
- Restoration of Argenta Marshes along Humboldt River; mange as a wetland and the state should help achieve this.
- Oppose idea of turning more public lands over to the state.
- *Oppose state ownership of public land.*
- Utilize hunting license and DMV mailing list during education of OHV'ers.

The following written comments were also received at the meeting:

1. What vision do you have for our public lands? In other words, what future conditions would you like to see on our public lands?

a. Public lands should <u>not</u> be for private profit. Let these lands be wildlife preserves. No cows. Leave the forage for antelope, sheep, coyotes and cougars. Sell hunting licenses for income.

b. I am a native who has enjoyed free access to Nevada range and recreation lands and hope to always be free to enjoy Nevada....in a non-destructive manner.

c. The greatest challenge is preserving natural landscapes in the face of livestock grazing' wild horses' OHV activities, fire, weeds, roads, etc. sagebrush which once covered most of the state is now rapidly declining.

2. What public lands-related issues are you concerned about?

a. Wildlife habitat. Sage grouse a bellweather (sp) species, becoming endangered. ORV's tearing up land and riparian areas. Cattle spreading noxious weeds; trampling native plants. Water diverted to agriculture that "belongs" to Walker lake, Pyramid Lake and wildfowl wetland areas.

b. Growth and development issues; <u>prudent</u> access issues; resource-dependent rural community issues. I don't want to see ranchers become an extinct species either. All they need is education on how to use rangelands wisely,
and invest in restoration.

c. - The states and communities disinterest in managing OHV activity; The states lack of financial commitment to helping protect natural resources; and Protecting land and water for wildlife.

3. How can we resolve these issues? Do you have any specific recommendations for related policy changes?

a. The state should encourage the feds to retire grazing permits. The state could share hunting permit fees in lieu of lost AUMs.

b. We need to discuss growth policy. We can't keep Nevada any vestige of pristine if we continue urban sprawl, which only trickles over into the desert.

c. State needs to recognize the problem on public land- help with the management; Take a lead in collecting information or distribution of information to interested citizens; and Stop federal agency bashing.

Section 14: Comments from Esmeralda and Nye Counties Workshop on February 7, 2001

- Feds should pay taxes to local government for every acre taken out of multiple use, esp. Wilderness, *in addition to PILT*. Taxes should be paid at the local rate.
- SNPLMA process not constitutional; proceeds should go to paying national debt.
- Not enough local input during land disposal process; disposals need to be for land that has economic development potential (development related criteria in state and local policies). *Latest Resource Management plan of the BLM did not use local input in the development plan, especially in designation of land for disposal. Did not provide for land needed for agriculture or industrial, etc. The plan only provides for disposal of "junk" land.*
- *BLM can't sell "junk" land and then says no one is interested.*
- *BLM won't allow amendments to the RMP.*
- Maintain and increase access to public lands.
- Regarding access, there is more education needed. *Use education/information regarding use of areas instead of closures.*
- WSA's shouldn't be designated if they don't have wilderness qualities; boundaries are adjusted to block access and other uses. *Feds keep expanding these areas even if there are no wilderness qualities. As they adjust boundaries the areas always get bigger- not smaller. Table Mountain is an example.*
- People should have their say on public lands because they belong to the people.
- When people from other areas come to our county they should pay a fee.
- No more taxes/fees.
- California's program (green sticker) is ok as long as beneficial use on public lands. *If money is used for beneficial purposes then OHV users would support.*
- *Retain areas as open use to allow OHV's to go where they want.*
- Still need OHV "open areas" in addition to OHV parks.
- Don't need program like California's.
- Gas users already paying gas tax. May be ok to shift some of this money to OHV programs.
- *Take 10% from DMV to use for OHV purposes.*
- More control of predators needed (e.g. ravens affect on sage grouse). *Ravens/mountain lions big problem.*
- State needs to charge federal government more fees.
- What good is local weed effort if nearby federal land isn't taken care of and weeds move back to private land.
- More money needed at all levels to fight weeds.

- “Fill-gap” measure (more money) needed when private owners not taking care of land; liens against landowner don’t mean anything if land is never sold.
- *Dept. of Ag can require county to take care of weeds but county can’t afford to do.*
- State shouldn’t take down quarantine signs. *The county quarantined the Fish lake valley for weed control but the state took down the signs that were posted.*
- Landowners should be more responsible if they have weeds on land and aren’t doing anything; something should be done about it.
- Is chemical application cost effective? If not, what other methods are available? *More chemical application could be used to control weeds on federal land. Need to accommodate such use or find other effective alternatives.*
- Treat weeds like fire: attack them aggressively and don’t worry about cost.
- Agencies need to do in more timely manner and let people know how they can address the situation. *Agencies need to tell people what they are doing like they used to.*
- Agencies should let locals help more.
- Encourage renewable power generation on public lands (e.g. geothermal, wind. etc.).
- *Biomass/wood areas/etc. are located on federal land and are “closed” to use.*
- Local power projects should benefit locals (e.g. wind project at Test Site).
- State’s rights should apply to new power projects; state should have approval process and right of first refusal on power.
- Use pinyon-juniper as a biomass fuel instead of just burning it; also look at other uses of wood. *Prescribed burns of pinyon-juniper are wasting a viable energy resource. Don’t burn:harvest. Stockpile until a plant is built to produce power.*
- Need to consider alternative land management options for achieving same objectives (p-j management).
- Review and incorporate Nye County’s work on their policy plan. *Nye County updated land use plan in 1980’s and had a lot of good ideas. Will be sent to the state after the county commission adopts.*
- Strong action needed by state on water rights; feds should be lowest priority and should not “sit” on their water rights: they need to prove beneficial use. *Limit time to prove beneficial use to 30 days.*
- See Ruby Valley Treaty of 1863 regarding “peace and friendship” which is established between tribe and people of the United States. Feds can’t alter terms and conditions of the treaty without local consent. Road closures, etc. are unlawful. All routes for travel shall be kept open by all travelers. (See Article 1, Section 2 of Nevada Constitution.) *Actions of many violate the treaty. Treaty doesn’t address land ownership. We are successors to the treaty. Treaty states “routes for travel shall be kept free from all obstructions by all people”.*

- Federal agencies are responsible for weed problem (see NRS and Taylor Grazing Act) and should solve problem. *NRS says managers of the land are responsible for weed control/elimination. They must do under NRS. Taylor Grazing Act supports this. Feds must control under county authority.*
- Allow local men and women to tend land without hindrance or molestation. *People on land know what to do best and should be allowed to do it without threat of federal regulators.*

In addition to oral comments, the following written comments were submitted during the workshop:

1. What vision do you have for our public lands? In other words, what future conditions would you like to see on our public lands?

    a. I would like to see more multiple use of our lands, large tax base, mining, ranching, farming, off road use.

    b. More local control, more land released for economic development and local government revenue. Greater management input by those who know the land, ie: those who live on or directly adjacent to it.

    c. I, and most of those among the group I represent (Off Highway Vehicle Users), envision a future for Nevada's public lands characterized by access and preservation. Access to lands as it is today and preservation through public custodianship. (WISE USE)

2. What public lands-related issues are you concerned about?

    a. Some area of the wilderness should be reduced or cut down, that do not meet the Wilderness Act.

    b. ACEC's, wilderness closures, % of land federally controlled, distant decision making.

    c. I am very concerned with the maintenance of access for all users of the land. I am most concerned with restrictions placed upon hunters, fisherman and off-highway vehicle users.

3. How can we resolve these issues? Do you have any specific recommendations for related policy changes?

    a. Make the feds- BLM USFS, Wildlife pay for the lands they have taken off the tax base.

    b. Stronger, more unified state stand, comprehensive plan/vision.

c. Public education programs! All constituent organizations with interests in environmental and public lands issues have a distinct stake in any public policy on the management of public lands.

Section 15: Comments from the White Pine County Workshop on February 7, 2001

The following questions were raised after a brief overview of the project:

- Will state agencies accept the vision agreed on and presented? (There were concerns that state agencies such as NDOT and NDOW do not follow their own plans after they are adopted.)
- How will state agencies follow policies and what will happen if they don't?
- Who will take the lead in local collaboration efforts? *(Locals many times take lead on public land issues- there is a lack of state leadership.)*

The following comments were then made by workshop participants:

- Add tribal activities to "Related Plans" on the Natural Resource Plan "umbrella" diagram.
- Make sure state agencies comply with products of this project. How will compliance be assured?
- *Don't need state level people ignoring locally developed plans and solutions.*
- *Some state agencies do not have agreement even within their own sections.*
- Local activities regarding weed fighting needs to be better coordinated.
- Collaborative planning should start at local level and then move to state level.
- Not enough assistance at local level available from state agency staffs.
- CRM committee is still looking for a state person to serve on committee. *Want state representation on the local CRM group. Been trying to get someone but hard to get them here. Need someone desperately.*
- Need new legislation for more money to hire more state workers to help with public land issues.
- *In local group there are 22 members but can't get people to attend meetings, especially from tribes and state. Can't get quorum to take action.*
- NDOW and BLM implementation of elk management plan not going well; same problem may occur with ongoing OHV plan being developed by county technical review team/BLM/USFS.
- *Support elk plan that was prepared but not happy with how NDOW and BLM implements it.*
- *Lack of implementation of elk plan will also likely occur on any OHV plan the county is working on.*
- Elk plan implementation problem due to lack of agency respect/compliance with plan findings/agreements: need to better police ourselves. The NDOW is saying we can do what we want since the BLM first "dropped the ball". *NDOW ignores plan- only interested in selling elk tags.*
- *Administration of NDOW needs to pay attention to elk plan, if not, will destroy local faith/confidence in state following their own plans.*
- Make sure plan's action items and policies are implemented.

- All money from SB 220 (if adopted) shouldn't go to State Parks: should go to counties for rebuilding roads, signs, maps, etc.: disbursement of funds on land mass instead of population. *Most OHV use takes place in rural areas away from populated centers.*
- Stickers shouldn't be needed for ag-related and other business uses.
- Also have $5 sticker for all four-wheel drive vehicles as long as used wisely.
- This plan needs to deal with fire planning and management. *Pinyon-juniper and cheatgrass must be managed.*
- *Keep all existing roads open for access and hunting purposes.*
- *Should allow local people to determine which roads should be kept open or be closed.*
- *White Pine County wants to be allowed dispersed, un-focused recreation.*
- Fat tired motorcycles need to be included in SB 220.
- Tri-county OHV planning is moving towards more management of OHV's including containing them to existing roads and trails and some limited areas with open use.
- Pro-disbursement recreation but at same time don't have multiple roads to same location.
- State needs to help more counties get together like Tri-County model.
- Make sure OHV planning by RAC's is used by BLM. *Don't feel that the BLM follows local RAC input.*
- *Need mutually acceptable definitions.*
- State government needs to listen more to counties; even when counties join together.
- *State should lead multi-county collaborative planning groups. Tri-county agreement is a good model.*
- County commissioners need help to make sure inter-local agreements are followed by state agencies and legislators.
- State agency doors are harder to open than federal agency doors.
- *State agency people are not responsive to locals (worse than feds).*
- *State must get resource people working at the local level.*
- Grants to locals from state much more complicated than federal grants (ie; state forms are up to 40 pages long while feds are about half as long.
- Keep tribes in circle and involved. *State grant requirements are more complicated than federal grant requirements.*
- Make it easier to get certification for chemicals to fight weeds.
- Let local or state agencies or local residents fight weeds instead of outside contractors. *Contractors hired by NDOT to handle weed problem were not doing job- NDOT now doing their own work.*
- Chemicals being used by BLM on weeds can combine to form dangerous compounds like Agent Orange and then when chemicals are burned, dangerous gases are released.
- Need more coordination among agencies regarding chemical use.

- State needs to support the Natural Resource Management School at UNR. *The quality of natural resource education at UNR has declined. Need to reinstate the former high levels once provided.*
- Need more money at state level for matching federal and non-profit, etc. for funding.
- State plans need to be written with mining needs in mind; mining companies need flexibility to access elk habitat, areas closed to OHV use, etc. and other uses- key to economic base.
- *Need to address practical side of mining when addressing issues related to mining. Too many areas are being closed to possible future mining. Mining is being squeezed out by other uses and withdrawn areas.*
- Still need some restrictions of mining in sensitive areas including tribal cultural sites, endangered species habitat, water supplies; need to comply with clean air standards.
- *Need to recognize the economic base in rural areas that use of natural resources provide.*
- The key is balancing multiple uses and related conflicts and working together to solve problems.
- Pinyon is the state tree and should be protected from burning and mechanical harvesting; people also use trees and nuts for cultural and spiritual needs.
- *Pinyon-juniper needs to be managed for other beneficial uses.*
- Others feel some thinning for fire control and habitat diversity is okay.
- Too much government regulations hampering lives of everyday people; more thought needed before developing new regulations. State should also weigh pros and cons before making new laws.
- New law should be: make a new law only if you eliminate one.
- State's 303(d) water quality monitoring data all near population centers except in eastern Nevada; since eastern isn't a "priority watershed" and lack of data, its hard to get EPA and other types of funding. (Make sure NDEP knows about this problem.)
- Soil surveys and geomorphology should be considered during local land use planning.
- Ruby Valley Treaty and related portions of Nevada enabling act should be recognized during this study and by others.