Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council

Minutes
Friday January 12, 2007

BLM – Las Vegas Field Office (LVFO)
Las Vegas, Nevada

Resource Advisory Council members present and category represented:

Chair: Dr. John E. Hiatt	Wildlife
Coordinator: Chris Hanefeld	Ely PAO
John Ruhs	BLM Ely Field Manager
Steve Mellington	Public at large
Douglas "Stretch" Baker	Transportation and ROW
Claire Toomey	Permitted Recreation
Juan Palma	BLM Las Vegas Field Manager
Gerald Smith	BLM Battle Mtn. Field Manager
Joni Eastley	Elected official
Don "Skip" Canfield	State Agency Representative
Julie Von Tobel Gleason	Wild Horse and Burro
Tim Carlson	Mineral Development
Dr. Steven Parker	Academic/UNLV
Ed Higbee	Ranching/Grazing
Gracian Uhalde	Ranching/Grazing
Bill Fisher	BLM Tonopah Field Manager
Kenny Anderson	Native American
Bob Maichle	Environment
Greg Seymour	Archeology/Historic
Ron Clemmenson	BLM Caliente Field Office

Meeting Materials:

A copy of each attachment is listed in the text of or at the end of these minutes and is also on file with the official copy of the minutes in the Las Vegas Field Office of the BLM. Persons desiring to review said minutes should contact Hillerie C. Patton, public affairs specialist, at (702) 515-5046.

Chair, Dr. John Hiatt approved the meeting minutes from last RAC meeting.

8:00 a.m.
Chris Hanefeld introduced himself – PAO Ely Field Office. He will be coordinating the meeting for Hillerie Patton today.

Juan welcomed everyone to the LVFO and provided lunch suggestions. Scott Powers will not be present to discuss the Westwide Energy Corridor (scheduled at 1:00pm in our agenda), however, there will be some maps provided to create for visuals on this topic.

Steve Mellington complimented Juan and Gayle on the Field Trip yesterday. The outcome was great

Round 7 Nominations Review

Karla distributed maps for the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) projects and packets put together by the Working Group; which contain short synapses for today's discussion.

Karla also provided a briefing of SNPLMA's history. She explained this act allows for BLM to auction off land. The proceeds of these auctions are to be divided as follows: 5% towards Education and 10% to Southern Nevada Water Authority. She further explained this money would benefit capital improvements, conservation initiatives, etc.
The White Pine Bill was recently signed. A meeting was held at the LVFO to determine how this bill would impact SNPLMA.
Subgroups for SNPLMA include: PTNA, Conservation Initiative, Land Acquisition and Capital Improvements.
We are at the middle of Round 7. The process starts by nomination of projects by local entities and submission of these to the SNPLMA staff. The SNPLMA staff then reviews the projects and ensures the projects are in congruence with the Implementation Agreement. The subgroups will then make recommendations and send these out to the Working Group. The Working Group then analyzes and makes recommendations to the Executive Committee. After this is done, the proposal goes into Public Comment. Once we receive public comments, the proposal is brought to the RAC team and back to the Executive Committee. This document will then be forwarded to the Secretary. Once the Secretary has signed document, the project gets funding assigned. This entire process takes about a year. The man hours are charged to 5853 which refers to SNPLMA. The folks submitting proposals charge out of MLR dollars. Once the project is funded, we can charge our man hours to 1920.

MSHCP and Lake Tahoe Subprojects were briefly explained.

Karla explained there are currently:

- 118 projects in Land Acquisitions
- 192 projects in Capital Improvements
- 141 projects in PTNA

- 63 projects in Conservation Initiatives

Karla further introduced projects for Round 7. She stated we are getting ready to open Round 8. We expect to provide final recommendation to the Secretary for Round 8 by October 2007.
Karla will forward the status report to all members of RAC.

Each member of the SNPLMA staff will oversee proposed projects and ensure funding and budget are used accordingly. The SNPLMA staff will also ensure projects are kept on track.
Karla introduced the SNPLMA staff:

Jeremy Brooks – PTNA Manager
Libby White – Land Acquisitions Manager
Nancy Christ – Conservation Initiatives Manager
John Kerrigan – Capital Improvements. Manager

Karla explained there are some instances where additional budget is required for completion of a project. This could either be obtained from funding by the proposing/nominating entities' own pocket or by requesting a SAR; which will go to the Executive Committee for approval.

On MSHCP the county comes to SNPLMA and applies for funding. We have contracting rules we need to abide by. Some of these rules have recently changed. The county goes to their advisory council to advise how to contract that money out. One of the things the White Pine Bill allows is for us to directly fund the county. On the other hand Congress and state law have mandated these processes to be fair and impartial to protect taxpayers from corruption. Juan stated the legislation that just passed allows us to transfer funds to the Counties within 60 days. Juan explained some of the counties like Lincoln and White Pine may not be able to provide the money upfront; the bill assists with this.

Karla explained representation for the Working Group.

It was said that the LVFO currently assists Beatty with Land Disposal.
Karla explained when someone builds an improvement, they will possess it. If by any reason this improvement is closed because the Park Services deems it no longer necessary; the concessionary will be reimbursed.

PTNA

Jeremy Brooks introduced himself as the lead in this division. He stated there are currently 12 PTNA projects complete, 17 projects in construction, and 59 projects in planning.
He explained we try to keep nominated projects as outdoor projects (Page 4, 10-11 in the "pink package" refer to PTNA projects).

The local nominating authorities are: Clark County, Lincoln County, City of North Las Vegas, City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson and the Southern Nevada Water Authority. Jeremy further introduced each current PTNA projects/nominations for Round 7.
Dollar figures were discussed in regards to planning and design for trails not including land acquisition for these trails. The challenge that local entities have is the cost of these trails, they are going through existing neighborhoods and lying concrete and lighting. Jeremy further explained there are a great number of studies that need to be realized by planning. The planning that goes into trails could be greater than the planning that goes into a major community park. Once a project is submitted there are requirements that need to be met as far as where the trail will be; who will it benefit, etc.
Some of the projects that were submitted for Round 7 and were not accepted will most likely be resubmitted for Round 8.

Capital Improvements

John Kerrigan introduced himself as the lead for Capital Improvements. He explained Capital Improvements is a federal program. He then distributed the nomination packages for Round 7; there are 24 projects for Round 7. John explained these projects include repair or rehabilitation of existing programs. He stated there are currently 182 outstanding Capital Improvement projects. He further distributed status report for these capital improvement projects.
John stated each nominating entity is trying to ensure they have the capacity to perform the work required for each and one of the nominated projects.
The first project is Hoover Dam Visitor Services Facilities Rehab and Safety/ADA Improvements. This project has been approved and will go to Executive Committee.
John provided a brief history on the River Mountain Loop Trail project. Great amount of consideration goes into the planning of these infrastructures such as maintenance.
The Implementation Agreement booklet has all of the ranking criteria contained in it. This Implementation Agreement can be found in the website. We have currently been working on this Implementation Agreement and have made the Ranking Criteria more objective. These projects go through four levels of review to ensure it receives the most accurate and correct Ranking Criteria.
Juan refocused the team on any comments the team may have for these projects to be submitted to the Executive Committee.
John reviewed the other proposals that include:

- Lovell Canyon Road Reconstruction
- Capital Improvements for Overton Beach Marina Facility
- Red Rock Canyon Visitor Center Amphitheatre
- Desert National Wildlife Refuge Maintenance Facility
- Stabilization of Historic Griswold Cabins

The intent of the law was to use monies in Clark County but definitely within Nevada. John explained 85% of these monies go back to SNPLMA; 25% of these go into Capital Improvements.

Conservation Initiatives

Nancy Christ introduced herself as the lead for this program. She explained there are currently 6 Conservation Initiative projects. She distributed the briefing documentation on these nominations. Nancy stated these nominations are interagency in nature. These projects are not nominated by only one entity but by all four entities.
She stated in Round 7, 30 nominations were submitted, 6 were denied. The subgroup met to review the remaining 24 recommendations.
The budget for funding these nominations went from 3.7 to 3.9 million dollars. 95% of funds for Round 5 have been expended. Approximately 12 million have been approved for Water 20/25 initiative. This nomination was submitted originally for 3.5 million dollars but reduced to 250 thousand dollars.
Nancy reviewed the other nominations. Such as "Take Pride in Nevada", which refers to 12 clean up sites per year; these sites have been affected by construction dumping and general public dumping.

Interagency wilderness Stewardship estimated to be completed December 2008.
Nancy discussed the following nominated projects:

Growth and Survival of Moapa Dace in the Muddy River System Habitat Study
This project refers to a scientific research project to provide studies on wildlife's toleration in Muddy River's System. This project will result in quantifying the effects of a changing thermal and hydrologic environment on several members of the aquatic community in the Warm Springs Area of the Muddy River system.

Environmentally Responsible Closure of Abandoned Mine Safety Hazards in Lincoln County
This project will enable the BLM to secure 120 abandoned mine land which pose significant threats to public and wildlife safety in Lincoln County.

Round 4 was the first Round that Conservation Initiatives were improved. Round 5 is 95% task ordered. In Round 6, 1/3 of the funds have been tasked ordered.
Funding for LE and personnel was also addressed.
The RAC team demonstrated concerns and willingness on how the team can help BLM obtain more personnel.

Land Acquisitions

Libby White introduced herself as the lead for this project. She stated there were 15 Land Acquisition projects nominated for Round 7. There are 7 projects, which toped-ranked and are being recommended for funding.
The criteria for Federal Lands Transaction Facilitation Act (FLTFA) were explained. It was said to be very similar to those of SNPLMA.

Some nominations are being recommended for FLTFA and some are being recommended for SNPLMA. Those recommended for FLTFA go through the Land Transaction Recommendation Council.
Libby further explained approval process of FLTFA funding. Disposal of Lands not included in SNPLMA are designated for FLTFA funding.
The land acquisitions that are being proposed for SNPLMA funding are marked with red stars in the map (see attached). The land acquisitions that are being proposed for BACA funding are marked with yellow stars (see attached).
Libby provided a briefing of the 7 nominated Land Acquisitions:

Cave Rock Summit – 40 acre property at 10.8 million dollars (estimated cost). This is the owner's requesting price and does not mean it will be what we will pay for the property. A published federal appraisal will be done on the land. There may be situations were the owner would donate easements or water rights; in these situations, we will offer the asking price. This property is located in Lake Tahoe shoreline. This is a Forest Service acquisition. This property provides great scenic views with potential to create access and develop protection of water shed.

Homecamp – This property was previously nominated in Round 4. Terminated due to inability of obtaining final title describing what was being offered for sale. This has been clarified; we are at the point were the land is ready for sale. 1,300 of these acres have been donated to the Nevada Land Conservancy. There are considerable resources in this land, including riparian meadows.

Stillwater Farm Conservation Easement – This property is to be partially funded by SNPLMA and partially by FLPFA. This property constitutes 5,000 acres of wetlands and associated uplands. These lands have been and will continue to be managed. The easement will protect the most extensive habitat for sensitive species. $14.6 million dollars for funding out of SNPLMA is the preliminary recommendation. The remaining $10.4 million dollars are recommended to be funded by FLPFA.

Winter's Ranch – This property consists of 320 acres; it has been recommended for FLPFA funding. This property is a BLM acquisition. Has wildlife and Riparian habitat with historical interest.

Offer Creek – This property will complete old Winter's Ranch acquisition. This acquisition provides resources for wildlife habitat. The estimated cost is $3.5 million dollars.

Galena Forest Property – This property consists of 4 acres; it is a Forest Service acquisition. This property will provide recreation activities.

Sierra Hunter creek Property – This property consists of 80 acres. The estimated cost is $4.3 million dollars. This property has sensitive plant species and wildlife habitat.

Libby explained we will review funding available so that the Executive Committee may decide how to decide funding for Stillwater Farms. The water rights for this project will be tied to the land as part as the conservation easement.

Libby further stated we have had to terminate many nominations in the past due to a great difference in the owner's asking price and the actual appraisal of the property offer.

January 22nd is the last day for Public Comments for these nominations.
Karla will send quarterly status report to all participants of the RAC Team

One of the requirements in the nomination process is that the nominating entity needs to have informed the County of their intent of nomination so that before we receive the nomination packet, we are sure the County has been informed. In most cases, a letter of support is requested from the County. In regards to conservation easements, nominations must include a description of what the easement will protect.
Taxes for these lands were briefly discussed. It was estimated that the cost per acre would be 11cents.
Libby stated there are binders in our public room that contain information on all of these nominations.

A letter of recommendation will be put together from the RAC team.

The money in the special account is an investment account. Setting up Endowment Accounts were also discussed.
Juan explained all of the leases that the BLM will continue to monitor are a bi-product of SNPLMA.

West Side EIS Energy Corridor

Juan presented this project. He explained this corridor would bring power from the northern states to Los Angeles.
The yellow line in the map (see attached), is the proposed interagency corridor. This proposal is within Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) land.
This is a very important project at the National level. The current number of power lines is five.
Juan explained this corridor will divert before getting to Pahrump. This corridor is a conceptual idea of bringing power from Wyoming to the rest of the western United States. This corridor may house natural gas lines. Actual topography and construction obstacles have been discussed.
Discussion for this corridor should be put back into the agenda to have a more descriptive presentation, so that the team may make a more informed comment/decision. Scott will provide a more extensive presentation next meeting.
Juan wanted to make the team aware of this proposal as it is eminent that it will be signed. The BLM will keep the RAC informed of the process, dates and timelines for this proposal.

Public Comment Period

Robert Bazaar, on behalf of Dunes and Trails ATV organizations, whose members utilize and recreate in the public lands in an environmental conscious and responsible manner, urge the BLM to continue to allow for responsible ATV use on all BLM administered public lands in Southern and Eastern Nevada.

Ely Resources Management Plan

Bruce Flinn presented this project. He is a contractor to BLM. He is also a retired BLM employee.
Bruce explained the Ely Resource Management Plan (RMP) has been ongoing since 2002; a draft was produced that went out to the public during the summer of 2005 with a 120-day public comment period.
BLM then came up with an updated version for the Planning Handbook. Since August, significant changes have been done to this RMP in order to be in compliance. All of Lincoln, ELY & NYE counties will administer 5 million acres of Public Land.
There is a preliminary final document for the cooperating agencies going out for review through mid February. A second copy will be produced for the Washington Office's review in March and April. In June we will expect to have the final Ely RMP.
After the final document is filed with EPA; a 30 days protest period will be triggered, followed by a 60-day governor's consistency review. This will ensure plan consistency with state and/or local plans.
Once this period closes a record of decision will be created.

The changes in the draft and the final documents are due to:

- Public comments
- Agency comments
- Planning Handbook Compliance
- White Pine County Bill

Bruce further distributed a copy of the Vegetation portion of the draft from 2005. Bruce further reviewed and briefed the team on the contents of this document. Some of the changes made to this document were also done due to some confusion this document created.
Bruce then distributed the final format of this document. Chapter 2 now starts with BLM's proposed plan. He further explained the contents of the new document. This document offers a complete vegetation plan for ELY.
The plan that comes out in June will start with proposed action of ELY RMP and continue with alternatives A, B & C. The same will be done with impacts chapter. The last section of this document includes a monitoring section. This is a much improved document, as it has been drafted creating more clarity.
ACECs have also been modified based on reviews received from Public Comment.

John Hiatt commented on new draft; he concurred that the new document is a much better document.
Juan stated this RAC body commented last year on this document and inquired if there are anymore stages in which this body will contribute during this process. Bruce stated the implementation process is a public process and would require BLM's participation. Bruce stated we are working on a Biological Assessment for 11 species; we plan to give this to FWS so that they may provide a Biological Opinion by fall.

Lincoln County Archaeological Initiative

Dr. Colleen Beck presented this topic. She distributed a document which contains Initiative Priorities for 2007 Round 1.
She explained this is part of the Lincoln County Land Act which states 5% of the sales go towards education; 10% for Lincoln County and 85% to be set in a special account in the National Treasury. Currently, 40 million dollars have been put into this trust account. Special account provisions for use of proceeds are as follow:

- Inventory, evaluation, protection, and management of unique archaeological resources.
- Development of a Multi-species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) in Lincoln County
- Reimbursement of cost incurred by the BLM for the land sale
- Cost of acquisition of environmentally sensitive land.

The Lincoln County Archaeological Initiative (LCAI) and its priorities were explained. The first step was to establish Archaeological Site Priorities (Site Monitoring and Site Stewardship). Other priorities include:

- Damage assessments
- NVCRIS (GIS) database verification and upgrade
- Inventory, evaluation, protection and management of at-risk rock art sites
- Formative (Fremont) Settlements Inventory
- Historic mining district inventory (limited to sites at least 100 years old)
- Obsidian tool stone source inventory
- Ethnographic evaluation of archaeological sites (conducts interview with Shoshone peoples at these sites)

The project nomination process was also explained. The process is as follows:
- Nomination period
- Team Screening & Ranking
- Public Comment & RAC Review
- Team Proposal Refinement
- Working Group Recommendations
- Executive Committee Review & Recommendation
- BLM Director Review & Approval

Greg Seymour pointed out next year; there may be an entirely different set of nominated projects.
Ed Higbee inquired if local people were utilized to identify and prioritize sites. It was said that this process is done in combination of public input and archaeologist conducting work.
Dr. Colleen Beck handed out a brochure for this program. She explained and provided membership for the LCAI Archaeologist Resources Team. Team Members are:

- Tom Burke (BLM State Archeologist)
- Maurice Frank-Churchill (Representative – Duckwater Shoshone)
- Rebecca Palmer (SHPO Archeologist)
- Will Reed (USFS Archeologist
- Nathan Thomas (BLM ELY Archeologist)

Colleen further stated the sites were ranked based on Archaeology goals which are:

- Preserve and Protect Archaeological Sites in Place
- Conserve Archaeological Collections and Records
- Utilize, Share, and Interpret Archeological Research Results
- Increase Outreach and Participation in Public Archeology
- Support current demand for administrative, commercial and recreational use of Public Lands, conserve archaeological resources for future use, and restore damaged watersheds for archaeological protection
- Support scientific and humanistic use of archaeological resources through inventory, evaluation, protection and management.

The 20 nomination sites/projects were reviewed and briefly explained. There has not been a determination made for the funding of these projects. There are only $600,000 dollars available for funding. There is additional money set aside for the actual management of these projects. John Ruhs will follow up with the RAC team and provide explanation of how the $600,000 dollars were designated.
Overall, there is a great commitment for Public Interpretation for these projects.
Bob Maichle inquired if other historical sites that do not fall under the 100 year requirement, receive assistance from other plans. Colleen confirmed this.
Public Comment is open and will extend through February 28th. The content of the website will not differ from the information provided today. Greg Seymour inquired on requirements for submission of nominations. Colleen stated people nominating need to at least have permits with the BLM, however, anyone can nominate projects. Request for proposals would be a competitive process.
Colleen requested feedback from the Team. Greg commented on project#7 on the list; he believes this helps protect archeological sites. People doing the work are volunteers. These types of projects have demonstrated to be a great success in Nevada, therefore would push for supporting this project.
Juan commented on the nomination process. Colleen stated if the RAC has any comments they would be referred to Nate Thomas. The Working Group is the same body used for SNPLMA.
John Hiatt inquired, once the BLM Director signs this process, are there any parameters established for completion of projects? Colleen stated when people nominate projects

they need to submit a projected timeline. Colleen will then steward projects to ensure timeline is kept and followed.
The team decided to proceed and move forward expeditiously with the projected plan. There is much work to do and not nearly enough time to do it. Greg stressed all of these projects carry imperative historical, research and cultural importance. A letter of public comment will be drafted by Dr. John Hiatt in response to this.

Round 6 Pilot Adoption Program Proposal

Juan introduced this topic. Julie Von Tobel Gleason provided a PowerPoint presentation. This presentation provides proposals on how to improve adoptions for the future. If the RAC supports our recommendations, we ask for the RAC team with the help of John Hiatt (Chair) to provide letter of support.
Julie provided background and historical participation for this program. The Mustang Foundation was called the Wild Horse Foundation created by BLM and Wild Horse Foundation. BLM does a great job gathering the horses; however, the problem arises when horses need to be distributed to the public

There were nine suggestions that came out of the meeting:

1) **Virtual Adoption Program initially proposed to BLM**. NV mustangs will be offered thru virtual adoptions. A website would be developed where people from across the country would adopt wild horses "virtually". This money will come back to the program to support it. Another portion will come back to a fund where a number of individuals will decide where to spend it best. This will open up a new virtual target. The Mustang Heritage foundation could serve as a potential vehicle for the program's initial costs. This program supports both horses and burros. This recommendation has the potential of great expansion. John Hiatt suggested on a more generalized support instead of supporting an individual horse, who may die and cause grief to the person or group who adopted it. Bob Maichle suggested on doing further research as far as maintenance cost for this program, to ensure adoption money will cover costs.
2) **Sister City Mustang Adoption**.- BLM creates relations between BLM Nevada and volunteer groups in large cities.
3) **Nevada "High Stakes" Mustang Futurity**- this program will impact the lives of adopted Mustangs for four years following their adoption – by making them eligible for futurity prize money during those four years.
4) **Southern NV Wild Horse & Burro Volunteer Program Coordinator** – We would hire a person to help us implement 1) Individual Volunteer Recruitment, 2)Coordination with BLM LVFO WH&B Staff, 3)Coordination with BLM LVFO and Nevada State Office Volunteer Coordinates, 4) Training/supervision and safety. This position would help facilitate public education and outreach through volunteers

5) **Public Education and Outreach –** The volunteer coordination would facilitate a strong public education and outreach program. Opportunity exists to develop a Wild Horse and Burro junior explorer program for example.
6) **Gentling and Adoption Program –** Individual trainers would gentle mustangs four at a time. Individuals need to be at least 18 years old.
7) **Fully Develop education materials from the Desert Learning Center**
8) **Red Rock "Store Front"**
9) **Have at least two adoptions in 2007 –** one in Spring and one in Fall

This proposal is to develop a mustang prison-training program similar to the program in Carson City to utilize prisoners to help gentle and train the horses. This program has proven to be a "win-win" situation for both the BLM and the prison system. Gentling has proven to raise the value of these animals and prisoners have shown significant social-behavior improvement.
Another possibility for funding is to seek legislation for a specialized mustang license plate with the proceeds to go to the prison-training program.
We are looking for recommendation from the RAC team in form of a letter, whether they are all supported or just some of them.
We currently have enough funding to implement these 8 recommendations. The LVFO budget for the Wild Horse & Burro program is currently of $800,000. Currently we distribute the gathered horses in different facilities throughout the State.
Bill Fisher inquired on how the virtual adoption recommendation would assist in solving the adoption issue. Julie stated this recommendation would not solve the issue, but assist in the funding for the solution. Juan stated the request on the table is to shift original SNPLMA proposal to the 8 recommendations presented today.
This topic received general consensus and approval on moving forward with these recommendations.

Field Managers Report

Chris Hanefeld provided an update on the Wild Horse gathers in Ely. If you haven't been to a gather and are interested in attending one, contact Chris at 775-289-1842. No other significant changes other than the White Pine County Bill. John Hiatt inquired on Holy pipeline project. How do we deal with energy corridors if they are under continual change? John Ruhs stated the resolution of the Westside Energy Corridor will assist with the resolution of this issue. Chris stated he has the ELY energy proposal and suspects to receive notice of intent in the Federal Registry by February 26th.

John Ruhs – One of the big issues is to get deadline for processing renewals by 2009.

Bill Fisher – The Madrid Mountain allotment is still ongoing. Comments have been received and a meeting is scheduled on January 23rd in Death Valley. Emergency Stabilization in the Bay area is being worked on. Concerns have been received from the East side of Beatty for resource protection; signs have been ordered. Seed procured is in place. There will be a horse gather scheduled for January 22nd thru February 12th. North Beatty land sale has been a real issue; this is a 40 acre parcel. The Della Patterson direct

sale offer has been issued to Ms. Patterson. The sale is expected to be completed early summer 2007. The Notice of Intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement was published in the Federal Register on December 26, 2006. A public scoping period will run from Dec. 26th to Jan. 25th 2007.
All of Rhyolite signs have been received and will be transported to the Nye County Roads Department sign shop Dec. 21st. Final placement of the signs will be discussed at the next partnership meeting. There has been some clean up done in Rhyolite.
Rhyolite funding for protection and maintenance for this site was discussed. There was a suggestion of making this site a "special areas" so we may receive maintenance assistance from the County. The team concurred on writing a letter to the State Director to address this issue; this letter is to be kept along the donations line.

Juan Palma – Asked Angie Lara (Associate Field Manager) to discuss the three-tier organization. Angie provided a brief history of BLM reorganization. In November, we were advised the BLM needed to go back to a three-tier organization. One of the reasons of this reorganization is to have consistency throughout the nation. Another reason is to have an additional level for issue resolution. This would allow more opportunities to resolve issues. We have been told "No additional people, no additional money". We have talked about what this would mean to the LVFO and presented different scenarios. Many personnel changes have taken place in the LVFO. Sharon DiPinto, Lands AFM for the LVFO has retired. Currently we need to decide whether we should or shouldn't fill behind this position. Angie explained this would be geographically-based opposed to programmatically-based. Juan stated whatever we decide to do, we will do it rapidly. We will take the best information and advice and move forward. Our plan is to execute this plan as soon as possible. Before a resolution is made, advice from the RAC will be requested.

Chris Hanefeld – Distributed the Ely Westside Rangeland Project document.

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

APPROVED BY:

_____ _____

Date

John Hiatt, Vice Chair
Mojave-Southern Great Basin
Resource Advisory Council

- Minutes provided by Olivia Sierra, BLM Las Vegas Field Office Executive Assistant-