

# Northeastern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council

Elko, Nevada

March 4, 2010

## Resource Advisory Council (RAC) Members Present and Category Represented:

Vince Garcia	(3) Native American
Jeff White	(1) Energy/Minerals
Larry Hyslop	(2) Wildlife
Neil Frakes	(2) Environmental
John Winnepenninkx	(2) Wild Horse & Burro
Patsy Tomera	(3) Public-At-Large
Kevin Lee	(1) Transportation/ROW
Tom Connolly	(1) Federal Grazing
Cyd McMullen	(2) Archaeology
Martin Burdick	(2) Dispersed Recreation
Sheri Eklund-Brown	(3) Elected Official
Tony Corone	(1) Energy/Minerals

## Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Representatives Present:

Gerald "Jerry" Smith	District Manager - Battle Mountain District Office
Michael Herder	Associate District Manager – Ely District Office
David Overcast	Field Manager – Tuscarora Field Office (Elko)
Bryan Fuell	Field Manager – Wells Field Office (Elko)
Doug Furtado	Field Manager – Mount Lewis Field Office (BM)
Jeff Weeks	Field Manager – Egan Field Office (Ely)
Schirete Zick	RAC Coordinator – Battle Mountain District
Steve Tryon	SNPLMA Coordinator - Southern Nevada District
Michele McDaniel	Rangeland Management Specialist – MLFO (BM)
Casey Johnson	Rangeland Management Specialist – MLFO (BM)
Chris Worthington	RMP Team Lead – Battle Mountain District Office
Raymond Bales	Minutes – Elko
Samuel McRae	Recorder – Battle Mountain (recorded meeting)

## Other Attendees: (Public)

Bill Hall	Ellison Ranching Co. (ERC) – Tuscarora, Nevada
Don Decker	Century Gold
Myron Tybo	Tybo Ranch (filmed meeting)

**Call to Order** Vince Garcia, (NERAC) Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m. – Vince welcomed attendees and asked for self introductions.

**Corrections to the November 20, 2009 meeting minutes** – None were noted

**Minute's acceptance** Tom Connolly motioned to accept the minutes as written. Seconded by Patsy Tomera. Motion passed.

**Steve Tryon recognized by the RAC and the time was turned over to him by Vince to speak on:**

***Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act***

Steve began by wishing everyone good morning. My job out of Las Vegas (Southern Nevada) is to manage the implementation of the *Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA)*.

\*\*A hand out was passed around. \*\* (Please refer to hand-out)

I have addressed this group or someone from my staff has at least a couple times in the last two years.

We have up until a little after nine o'clock this morning carved out to talk about how implementation is proceeding and also some of the projects that are going to be recommended in the coming round for this part of the State. If memory serves were talking Lander, Eureka, Elko, and White Pine County. What else am I forgetting?

Couple of things I'd like you to keep in mind as we go through, and then maybe get your feedback either during or after? This is the North Eastern part of the state, and has been least affected by the land sales from Southern Nevada. Of course Clark County and Lincoln County which I'd call the southern part of the state has been most affected. And then increasingly all of the areas around Carson City including the Carson Range to the west of town and up and down 395 communities there are increasingly subject to project work under the SNPLMA, and the entire Lake Tahoe Basin including California is very much benefiting from land sales in Southern Nevada.

And so by statute there are limits on the amount of work we can do in the North Eastern part of the State. But there is opportunity for project work here that may not be fully tapped. And I'd also be interested in your thoughts on whether any of the Counties here would be interested in statutory changes that would make them eligible particularly for local parks and trails. And I'm going to talk about some of those in the Ely area.

Some of this information is a lot to digest and so I'm going to try to touch on the high points, but we are at a point in the programs history where we are 11 years in now. Where we have a whole lot of information about how successful project are, and how unsuccessful some of the

projects are also. I think a job of all three of the Resource Advisory Councils is to give us feedback on the overall management of the program. And that is why I'm hitting you with so many statistics as I am. We have some instruments available to us to help guide these projects along – some of them multi-million dollar projects. But we cannot out and out force termination of projects. Which seems to some of us, for some of these projects that are getting on up in there years they perhaps out to be considered by some of the agencies implementing them. And that's another thing I would appreciate some feedback from the RAC on. As we go forward into the future I'm going to ask your views on whether there is some broad themes (you all know we have much less money), but if there are some broad themes we really ought to be focused on? And we talked about this last year, but chairman Vince I'm going to ask if the RAC submits a letter about round 11 – that it also says whether there are a handful of things for the future going forward about round 12?

Remember the original legislation passed in 1998 and amended in 2002. We now have eight categories of work and the scope of the legislation keeps on increasing as the money goes down. The BLM in Southern Nevada has disposed of over 34,000 acres. Which has made possible some master plan communities and some commercial development in Las Vegas, and that to us is a real win – win. We've been able to allow development to take place where people want to development to take place. I think though personally there's a downside to it in terms of how bad the real estate market has crashed in all of Nevada, but particularly in Southern Nevada. I suspect that, that was in some way fueled by the rush to sell land in the mid 2000's. And so sometimes I think about how my own house has lost 60% value – thinking my own program might be partly responsible for that. That is kind of an untold story in here – some personal speculation.

In the last few years we have done I think a lot to work on the accountability of the SPNLMA. I would say in the early years the rush as much as anything was to shovel the money out the door. And in the last few years it's after the fact to put accountability in place. So if it were another County or another State implementing this I would encourage them to think about the accountability measures and things like how you vote on projects from the start rather than in the middle of the process, but we did a report to congress summarizing the first ten years last year. We are finalizing the annual report covering 2009 right now, and we will report to congress annually as long as there is legislation still to be implemented.

We have developed a strategic plan for the next five years, and it's more than just these three goals, but that give you an outline at a high level. Dispose of land working with what local governments want; the local government work with developers to conserve and restore the quality of the outdoor environment and promote recreational opportunities. And then the third one gets to this kind of collaborative government where we have decisions made with Federal, State, and Local governments participating in the process. We are looking now at signage for SNPLMA project sites. This is very important to me! I think it will probably take us another two or three years to go back to existing project sites to add some sort of permanent record there. We took a National asset and we sold it. And what we converted it into is a bunch of different

things and some of them are tangible assets like a local park. That don't have any record that it came from public domain. And I believe it's our responsibility to acknowledge that somehow.

I also think when we get into the business of funding labor that is temporary and it runs its course and evaporates and then that labor's gone. If you can't put a sign on a thing like that – it sort of questions whether it was consistent with the original legislation in my mind. And we do a fair amount of that sort of thing. That is funding labor that contributes to resource protection, but after a time it's gone.

Some of the other accountability measures we've put in place include a requirement to do a work plan that covers the life of the project, quarterly reports against those work plans. We are fixing to do a sort of news letter that would go out by Email. That would just say that for this past quarter here's a project that was really neat – had a lot of work done on it. We could feature the seed warehouse or something like that. Or in this little news letter this on-line thing we would say how many projects were completed in the last quarter. And it has a dual purpose to keep the public informed, but also some friendly competition between the implementing agencies. And you will see in a minute some of these agencies are varying project over a long period of time. So anything we can do to kind of incentivize them to finish that stuff up. Our staff is not providing automatic approvals for time extensions, or request for additional money, or scope changes. You might think we would rubber stamp that sort of thing, but we are frequently giving stuff a hard look and recommending against what some of the agencies are looking for, because as we have less money – absolutely we need to be asking harder questions about why they need more money. And attempting to have agencies live within the budget they purpose.

As far as some trend information and some of the same basic picture we shared a year ago. It turns out that SNPLMA has increased the federal land base –it is not enough to change the percentage of ownership across the State, and clearly we've sold more in Clark County than we've acquired. So there's a selling in Clark County and acquiring primarily in Washoe County. I don't know if eleven years ago people realized that would happen under the legislation? We're not doing a lot of land acquisitions in this part of the state. But there are opportunities over the years including Rock Creek here in the next year.

\*Funding trends have shown that fewer projects are being purposed and approved – and the dollar amount is going down as well. We look at this as a positive change.

\*The sales of Federal land have fallen way down, and it is concerning because worker (Federal staff) that would have charged some of their time to these projects are unable to do so – therefore it becomes a management issue for the Agencies themselves. RAC reports show retrenching in and review of these projects and practices.

\*We are recycling old project and money for new ones.

\*2010 we are done! We will not sell any more land this year – It was just 22 ½ Acres for 2.3 Million dollars. 2.3 Million would not even fund a single project. So we will not do much of anything in Round 11

\*Discusses pie charts from hand-out . . .

\*Steve believes it is the job of the RAC to do oversight – and there are oversight issues.

\*We have completed or terminated all of our projects down to 8% of the projects that were approved.

\*In regards to capital improvements we still have 66% of those projects in progress from earlier rounds.

\*PTNA has a fair amount of older projects compared to Lake Tahoe restoration and conservation and these were authorized approximately the same time. The Lake Tahoe projects seem to have a more successful completion rate with their projects.

\*98% of all conservation projects approved are still active. That money that is on those sidelines could be used for other project.

\*The Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project is doing great – no projects are completed yet, but was not authorized until 2008 – and the project are well managed and in line.

\*Hazardous Fuels is another thing mentioned in the hand-out (Steve refers to it).

\*Pre Proposal Planning helps to scope out big projects ahead of time.

\*All in all there are more than a thousand projects now that have been approved by the secretary; along with other types of projects with different authority using the same funding.

\*The table that has project completion termination and overall progress – roughly a third do the work that they had committed to do. 2009 was a positive sign for completion.

\*2010 should have much more project completion.

\*Getting older project completed is something that vexes the SNPLMA. There are 49 projects that are more than 6 years old. There are 8 projects that are more than 7 years old. Typically 5 years is the upper limit for project completion. This is an issue we would like to resolve.

**Q.** Kevin asked about why some of the projects have been active for so long. What should the time line be?

A. Steve stated that land acquisitions should take no longer than 2 years. He provided timelines of 3 years for a local park and 4-5 years for NEPA and believes that agencies with active projects 6-7 years or older should not be eligible for more funding.

A. Largely this is due to turn over in the middle of a project with staff in charge of a project. We propose that those agencies that have older project should not be eligible for future funding. (From the Hand out) examples are shown. Steve would welcome guidance from the RAC on this going forward from round 12 and beyond!

\*Steve – In 2009, 36 projects were completed (and refers to hand out again)

\*Round 11 – we are selling much less land with much less interest. Two years ago we were earning 8 million dollars a month from interest. Today we are at \$280,000 per month

\*Carson City became eligible for funding in round 11 (with boundary adjustments).

\*Starting round 11 we envisioned we believed we should allocate about 15 million dollars worth of projects – Since then we have had returned about 17 million more dollars, because of the bid (vs) fare market value from past projects.

Q. Sherri asked about the Lake Tahoe set-aside?

A. It will be finished – a new bill will pass without regards to SNPLMA. They are looking for new ways to get money rather than selling land.

\*In round 11, 45 projects were purposed totally 59 million dollars in requests, and we had 15 million set aside.

\*Steve explained the difference between projects that require money over time without an end in sight – like Fire project – that require money and don't have a foreseeable end in sight. And then the clear difference between that and a construction project or weed project with clear goals and manageable deadlines and a finish date.

\*Concerns those projects need to have clear deliverables, that projects have health and safety concerns met readiness of the project – will it start this year or be set on the shelf?

\*It was recommended that project can be terminated or resubmitted, but currently that is not done.

\*Long term monitoring – Did we do what we said we would do? Did it have the desired effect?

\*Overall schedule we are about to the Public Comment Period – So each of you will be receiving a package for public comment.

Q. Sherri asked for clarification of funding targets.

\*14 million dollars is what will go to the public next week along with 8 million set aside to complete projects.

\*From previous rounds almost 25 Million Dollars was left over from various projects.

\*PTNA discussed

Q. Gerald asked what PTNA stands for.

A. Steve: Parks, Trails, Natural Areas.

Q. Gerald asked if White Pine Co. was added through the land bill to apply for SNPLMA.

A. Steve confirmed yes.

\*Steve discussed SNPLMA Rounds 1-10 and gave progress/status. He stated that Northeastern Nevada was least affected by SNPLMA land sales. He asked Chairman Garcia to look at items for Round 12 and solicited feedback from the RAC. He stated that through SNPLMA, more public lands were selling in Clark County while more public lands were being acquired in Washoe County. He felt that 5 years is the upper limit in contracting and was concerned about the number of active projects 6 years or older.

Steve stated that the public comment period for Round 12 would be March 15 – April 28 and that RAC members should be receiving packages soon.

Q. Sheri asked about watershed assessments anywhere else outside of Northeastern Nevada?

A. Steve said “yes” in Lincoln Country under conservation initiatives, and maybe in Clark County.

Q. Larry asked who is eligible to apply for these?

A. Steve stated that the BLM, USFS, FWS, and NPS were nominators in the process. Public lands and tribes benefit.

\*example listed from the handout

Q. Sheri asked how much funding there was for the Tahoe area.

A. Steve said \$250 million has been set aside – up to \$300 million.

Q. Sheri asked if any improvements had been seen.

A. Steve said there were improvements in water clarity and wildland fire safety.

Q. Tom said are they partners with other groups on this project?

A. Steve stated Nevada and California provided bond money and that private landowners match fuels treatment funding with their own money.

\*Bighorn Sheep projects cited. . .

Q. Kevin asked if the Bighorn Sheep Restoration in the South Snake Range was still a viable project.

A. Steve stated that he didn't know, noting that this was listed as Priority 5 among 7 Round 11 conservation initiatives.

\*Steve talks about specific examples and what actually affects this part of the State.

\*Steve encouraged RAC members to write letters for or against support for projects, and to indicate what RAC members wanted to see out of SNPLMA for Round 12? And going forward.

\*\*Steve wraps up his comments and takes questions . . . \*\*

Q. Kevin asked if there was anything for the legislation for timelines.

A. Steve stated that the legislation requires a work plan.

\*Patsy stated that it made more sense for every county to be eligible for SNPLMA money. It should be available to all counties, not just a couple?

Q. Sheri asked about lands bills.

A. Sheri explains how difficult the land bills are to get through congress.

Q. Patsy asked if, regarding SNPLMA, wasn't it the idea to get rid of some public land?

A. Steve stated that lands in Carson City area and were appealing to people.

Q. Patsy asked if placing sage grouse in protected status would affect projects.

A. Steve said that sage grouse would make projects more desirable due to more benefits and funding for sage grouse.

Q. Larry asked questions regarding Elko County.

A. Steve talked about SNPLMA land acquisitions in Elko County, citing Rock Creek as an example.

\*Gerald pointed out that Rock Creek is in Lander County.

Q. Vince Garcia asked about the water issue for land sales and expressed concern regarding accountability 10 years into SNPLMA.

A. Steve confirmed yes and mentioned Lake Mead as an example.

\*Steve asked the RAC members if there are things in the future that they would like to see more of.

\*Gerald expressed concern about access to hunting lands and is not opposed to lands acquisitions.

\*Sheri stated that she is opposed to public lands acquisitions, noting that it lowers the tax base and makes counties more dependent on programs like SNPLMA.

\*Kevin stated that the best opportunities are in getting checkerboard areas corrected.

\*Vince stated that he believes we must have lands for public use.

Q. Patsy encouraged looking at allotments in Elko County. She stated that she has three allotments, one of which is surrounded by private lands. Inquired about the possibility of land trades to correct the checkerboard and stated that she had been trying for 10 years to no avail.

\*Neal stated agreement with public lands acquisitions.

Q. Cyd asked Steve if he wanted RAC member recommendations.

A. Steve confirmed yes.

**9:20 a.m. break**

**9:32 a.m. reconvene**

Vince solicited for public comments.

**Battle Mountain Complex Grazing Permit Renewal - Doug Furtado, Michele McDaniel, and Casey Johnson**

\*Doug introduced this and turned the time over to Michele (Casey ran the Power Point Presentation for Michele as she discussed the issues).

\*The permit renewal process was discussed – why it has become a burden to the permittees and to the permitting renewal agencies.

\*There was a hand-out that mirrored the Power Point Presentation – explained by Michele.

Q. Asked about Western Watershed Projects (WWP) comments for the November 2008 EA.

A. Michele said they received the same comments from WWP as Elko and Ely from other EAs and that WWP referenced in their comments allotments that were outside the state of Nevada.

Sheri stated that it was disturbing that there are allotments like this with little or no monitoring and that it sets us up for failure.

Q. Patsy asked how many horses were on the North Buffalo and Copper Canyon allotments.

A. Michele stated that they are horse free areas and that there are no issues with horses on the allotments.

Q. Myron Tybo asked if base land was required to obtain a permit.

A. Michele stated that, in general, base property that has preference tied to the AUMs is needed.

Q. Patsy asked Gerald if the rules regarding base property have changed.

A. Gerald stated that the interpretations of the rules have changed.

Q. John asked about the four water developments on the allotments, if they are on private lands, and how many are functioning.

A. Michele stated that all are working now and are located on private lands (?).

Q. Gerald asked if the mines are working cooperatively to protect water resources on the allotments.

A. Michele confirmed yes.

Q. Patsy asked if Willow Creek Reservoir would qualify to SNPLMA funding.

A. Gerald stated that it probably would, that they were working on a private to public lands exchange, and that he advocates fixing the checkerboard.

Vince expressed concern about the amount of moisture over the past 10 years.

Doug stated that all key species are gone, blamed on historical grazing. Stated that they must manage permits for drought years in order to be sustainable.

\*Bill spoke up for the Livestock man, and said with proper management it doesn't matter if it's a drought year or not. He believes that the on/off dates need to be more flexible.

Q. Bill asked if the same rules and regulations for grazing permits apply to each district.

A. Gerald confirmed yes.

Patsy stated that range cons sometimes don't listen to the ranchers and there needs to be more common sense in the process.

\*Michele wrapped up the presentation.

\*Vince called for a break.

**10:38 a.m. break**

**10:57 a.m. reconvene**

### **Presentation on Battle Mountain Resource Management Plan – Chris Worthington**

Discussed RAC role as an integral part in advising the BLM on issues/concerns and alternatives. RAC is a subgroup that participated in scoping meeting in the RMP process.

Presentation on Cooperative Monitoring – Michele

Gerald stated that permit renewals are a continuous issue for the RAC and that all BLM districts should give updates on cooperative monitoring agreements.

Gerald discussed NERAC protocols, stated that Ken Visser will put out IB for state direction to get more cooperative monitoring agreements.

Sheri stated that that would be a good time to bring the Nevada Cattlemen's Association in for support.

Q. Bill asked about the submission of monitoring data for EAs to the BLM, and whether those involved with data collection must be certified to hold up in court. Expressed concern about the data submitted for EAs and the verification of data.

Gerald stated that cooperation between the BLM and permit tees is the most important thing and that permit tees can collect data with the BLM and get training. The BLM must defend the data in court regardless of how it was obtained.

\*Vince called for other business if any?

Sheri expressed concern that USFS law enforcement officers (LEO) rangers were pursuing off public land and initiating arrests. Stated that they are not authorized to implement and enforce state and county laws. Asked when the BLM would enforce laws off BLM lands.

Gerald stated that BLM LEO rangers enforce speed limits and can cite for reckless driving on public lands. Also discussed the possibility of setting up a presentation by LE personnel at a future RAC meeting, maybe at Eureka or Ely.

Sheri said Ely would be a good choice because of the frequent incidents there. Mentioned gray areas and the need to work together to simplify and coordinate. Stressed that BLM LEO personnel are not trained in state and local laws.

Q. Patsy asked about the LEO ranger situation in the Elko District.

A. Bryan stated that the Elko District had two new hires. One will report in later in March but leaves shortly thereafter to attend FLETC (Federal Law Enforcement Training Center), the other will report in late spring from the USFS. (Did not fully hear Bryan's response)

Mike stated that USFS and BLM LEO rangers are managed differently.

Sheri stated that USFS was issuing citations in Lamoille Canyon and stressed the need for formal public notification that enforcement is beginning.

Gerald stated that the LEO issue should be put on the agenda and the USFS should be invited to attend.

\*Patsy made a motion to break for lunch.

\*Vince called for a lunch break. . .

**1143 Break for lunch**

**1325 Reconvene**

### **Mining Update – Jeff White**

Jeff stated that there were a lot of cooperative efforts with abandoned mine lands (AML) in Clark County. Discussed Cortez Hills and the motions and cross-motions being filed. Stated that the district court should rule on a preliminary injunction of the 9th Circuit Court around late March to mid-April. Stated that there is a lot of public concern and interest regarding jobs and the economy and that northern Nevada has benefitted greatly from mining when compared to the economic state of the rest of the country.

Sheri stated concurrence. She discussed a mining conference October 4-7 in Elko and solicited for those willing to do a presentation at the conference, and stated that it would be a good idea for RAC members to go.

Q. Tony asked what the time frame is for a mining project.

A. Jeff stated that mine development takes 48-60 months from time of filing to plan of operations, after exploration.

Q. Sheri asked the mining about costs.

A. Jeff stated \$80,000 for permitting, \$10 million for some of the bigger long term projects.

Q. Sheri asked about the percentage and how costs are figured.

A. Jeff stated that the reclamation bond estimate is based on cost for production rates, equipment costs, .... - Stated that the biggest driving cost is water management.

### **District Manager Updates**

#### **Battle Mountain District – Gerald Smith**

\*Gerald talked about the district and discussed his hand-out (the members had previously received)

Q. Sheri, referencing page 7 of the RAC handout regarding the Tonopah Field Office, asked if past precipitation data was being considered in current monitoring efforts.

A. Gerald confirmed yes.

Q. Sheri, referencing page 8 of the RAC handout, asked if direct land sales had been vetoed.

A. Gerald stated that lands are identified for disposal in the resource management plan (RMP).

Q. Sheri, referencing page 11 of the RAC handout regarding healthy landscapes, asked why there is imminent loss and asked about pinion/juniper (P/J) encroachment.

A. Gerald stated that P/J encroachment and wildfires are always a threat.

Q. Larry asked about P/J reduction in the Sulfur Springs area.

A. Gerald stated that the bitterbrush will be kept. Stated that Sulfur Springs is a hazardous fuels project.

Q. Larry when is about the Dixon-burro gathering.

A. Gerald stated that it had to be put off this year, that the USFS came out with notification setting AML for Wild Horse Territory (WHT), otherwise it would have been conducted in February.

### Ely District – Mike Herder

Discussed the Eagle HMA gather as the main project. Stated not enough time available when the record of decision (ROD) was issued and will be put off until fall or winter 2010.

Discussed Wind Mountain and Wilson Creek wind projects, plan of development (POD) done for both.

Discussed Southwest Intertie Project (SWIP), ROW applications for transmission lines with partial notice to proceed for SWIP corridor.

Discussed the Ely and White Pine coal-fired plants, deferred indefinitely for the NEPA process, one plant may change from coal-fired to gas-fired.

Discussed ARRA – AML, biomass utilization projects, and travel management plans (TMPs).

Q. Sheri asked if wilderness designation was driving the TMP.

A. Mike stated yes, somewhat, and that roads must be designated as either open, limited, or closed.

Q. Sheri asked question about RMP.

A. Mike stated yes, not open for cross-country travel.

Martin stated that agencies should work together.

Mike stated that the biggest challenge is getting public involvement.

Gerald stated that Battle Mountain has not started their TMP and stressed the intention of taking their time with an open public process.

Sheri expressed concerns about TMP permitted use such as weed cutting, game retrieval, ...

Gerald stated that the first thing to do is to plot all of roads and use citizen volunteers in the process.

Sheri stated that the main public complaint with the TMP in Elko County was that the on-the-ground work had not been done. Stated that the USFS had an unrealistic timeline to work with.

Q. Tony asked about the status of the USFS TMP.

A. Sheri stated that it is in the draft EIS stage.

Q. Sheri asked a question regarding what geographic area was being looked at and if it was on a watershed basis.

A. Mike stated incorporate roads into watershed assessments in some cases. In other cases, try to determine the best way to package it, taking into consideration resource issues such as wildlife and multiple use.

Q. Sheri asked a question regarding lawsuits and which RMPs were involved.

A. Jeff Weeks answered six states, 16 RMPs, with three close to litigation.

Sheri asked regarding solar energy development change, what where the conflicts with the solar panels.

A. Mike stated that the military has some concerns with the power towers because of their height, reflectivity, and "ghosts." Mentioned concerns that sonic boom could cause damage to fragile solar panels.

Sheri expressed concerns about an increase in restricted airspace limiting land development and usage.

Mike stated that the military doesn't dictate and that Nellis AFB was consulted early on in the solar studies.

### **Wells Field Office – Bryan Fuell**

Discussed TMP in the Spruce Mountain area, designated in 2005. Land use plan amendment in the works. Area to change from off-road to limited, get started in Spring 2010.

Discussed Antelope Complex gather, scoping done.

Issued EA permit renewal for Hubbard Vineyard.

Discussed Long Canyon exploration and possible future expansion.

Discussed China Mountain project, scoping done with draft EIS coming soon.

## Tuscarora Field Office – David Overcast

Discussed Tribal consultations and efforts to work on improvements.

Discussed the issue of being understaffed. David solicited to the group any thoughts on creativity in filling positions.

Discussed Rock Creek HMA gather; Oregon-California Trails Association (OCTA); Carlin Trend Mule Deer working group; working AML hazard issues.

Concluded District Manager updates.

Vince stated the next RAC meeting will be in Eureka on June 17-18. There will be a field trip on the first day and the second day will be a half day. RAC meeting on September 30 will take place in Ely. Tri-RAC meeting will be in mid-November.

**Q.** Tony asked about writing a letter of recommendations for SNPLMA.

**A.** Vince stated that this could be addressed at the next RAC meeting and asked members to bring ideas.

\*Jeff Weeks announced his retirement and wishes everyone well.

Patsy made a motion to conclude the meeting – seconded by Tom.

**1447 meeting adjourned.**