

STATE LAND USE PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES

August 19, 2022
Elko Convention Center
Silver Room
700 Moren Way, Elko, NV

Members Present

Jake Tibbitts, Eureka County (Chair)
Lorinda Wichman, Nye County (Vice Chair)
Hope Sullivan, Carson City
Jim Barbee, Churchill County
Sami Real, Clark County
Maureen Casey, Douglas County
Wilde Brough, Elko County
De Winsor, Esmeralda County
Jim French, Humboldt County
Mike Reese, Lincoln County
Wes Henderson, Lyon County
Curtis Schlepp, Mineral County
Roger Mancebo, Pershing County
Kathy Canfield, Storey County
Jeanne Herman, Washoe County
Marla McDade Williams, Nevada Indian Commission
Charlene Bybee, Nevada League of Cities & Municipalities
Jacob Brinkerhoff, Nevada Association of Counties

Members Absent

Art Clark, Lander County
Bill Calderwood, White Pine County

Others Present

Curtis Moore, Elko County
Bret Hess, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors
Donna Corey, Southwest Central Regional Economic Development Authority
Brett Waggoner, Nye County
Megan Labadie, Nye County
David Pritchett, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Carolyn Sherve, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Jeremy Drew, Resource Concepts Inc.
Fred Steinmann, University of Nevada, Reno
Andy Rieber, Consultant for Humboldt County
Cliff Banuelos, Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada
Sari Nichols, Nevada Indian Commission
Stacey Montooth, Nevada Indian Commission
Jaina Moan, the Nature Conservancy
Alex Tanchek, Silver State Government Relations
Ed James, Carson Water Subconservancy District
Candance Stowell, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony
Pete Goicoechea, Nevada State Senator
Greg Ott, Office of Attorney General
Charlie Donohue, Nevada Division of State Lands
Ellery Stahler, Nevada Division of State Lands
Scott Carey, Nevada Division of State Lands

Nevada Division of State Lands

State Land Use Planning Agency
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, NV 89701

Telephone: (775) 684-2723
www.lands.nv.gov/land-use-planning

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by **Jake Tibbitts** at 9:02 am. A roll call was held for members of Council and a quorum was established. Introductions were made by others who were present.

2) Public Comment

Jake Tibbitts called for public comment. There was no public comment, and the public comment period was closed.

3) Review of the Agenda

Jake Tibbitts stated that the June 3, 2022 meeting minutes were not able to be completed by staff prior to the meeting and suggested that the Council remove those minutes from the agenda. There were no other changes to the agenda suggested by the Council.

Maureen Casey made a motion to approve the agenda as suggested. The motion was seconded by **Jeanne Herman**. There was no discussion on the motion. There was no opposition to the motion and the motion was passed unanimously.

4) Approval of February 10, 2022 SLUPAC Meeting Minutes

Jim French made a motion to approve the February 10, 2022 SLUPAC meeting minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by **Wilde Brough**. There was no discussion on the motion. There was no opposition to the motion and the motion was passed unanimously.

5) Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Management Planning in Nevada Presentation

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands provided an overview of the staff memo for this item that was included as pages 18-19 of the [meeting packet](#). Scott stated that the purpose of this presentation was to provide an update on this project, allow the Council an opportunity to ask any questions and provide feedback to the BLM. He stated that following the presentation the Council could provide direction to staff to prepare a formal response regarding the Nevada-wide Resource Management Plan (RMP) update project at future meeting.

David Pritchett and Carolyn Sherve with the BLM provided the Council with a [presentation](#) about the Nevada-wide RMP modernization project.

Jim French stated that there is a huge investment of time, money, and effort not only the part of the Federal Government but also with state and local governments during any Resource Management Plan update (RMP). Jim stated that it is incredibly frustrating to see the process starting over again after so much time and energy was invested in previous RMP updates that were not completed. He stated that he has been involved with RMP updates in the past and questioned whether the BLM will be able to complete an update on a statewide basis.

Hope Sullivan asked why the BLM stopped the 4 plans including the Carson City District RMP from being updated.

Carolyn Sherve with the BLM stated that the Basin and Range National Monument RMP update was stopped due to the lack of funding. Carolyn stated that Battle Mountain District RMP was stopped due to an almost complete turnover of staff. She stated that the Carson City RMP was ready to go out for final review in 2017 but the BLM received direction from BLM Headquarters to make additional changes to the plan. She stated that the additional changes requested were too complex to allow for a final version of the plan to move forward.

Maureen Casey stated that she takes offense that the Carson City RMP plan update could move forward because there has not been enough solar development included in the plan. She stated that the main focus of an RMP should be on natural resources and not solar development.

Jim French stated that one major weakness he finds with this project is the lack of subject matter experience within the various District Offices covered in the plan. Jim stated that the BLM has lost a lot of institutional knowledge and history within the Battle Mountain District Office. He stated when the BLM does not have this subject matter experience and local on the ground knowledge, it can lead to the errors seen in the previous RMP updates. He questioned that given the short timeline proposed as part of the project, the ability of the BLM to effectively utilize subject matter experts in the process. He stated that he questions whether the BLM has the resources and the specific personnel needed to carry out this planning project.

Jake Tibbitts stated that Eureka Council has heard this presentation before and recently met with BLM State Director Jon Raby. Jake stated that Eureka County shares a lot of concerns expressed by **Jim French** with respect to this planning effort. He stated that over six years were spent on the Battle Mountain RMP update and that a lot of effort was spent on getting to a draft of the plan because of local issues. He expressed concern that it could be difficult to address hyper local natural resource issues as part of a statewide planning process. He stated it will be important for the BLM to remain in close coordination with the Council on this project throughout the entire process.

Marla McDade Williams stated that she is a new member of the Council and requested to meet with the BLM to get a better understanding of this project and to learn how Tribes will be included in these types of plans.

David Pritchett with the BLM stated that they would include the Nevada Indian Commission and the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada as one of their targeted outreach meetings during the planning process.

Sami Real asked when the invitations by the BLM will be sent out for each local government to become a cooperating agency during this planning process.

Carolyn Sherve with the BLM stated that they cannot send out invitations to cooperative agencies until the agency receives funding for the project. Carolyn stated that once the BLM receives the funding it will send out invitations to local governments to become cooperating agencies.

David Pritchett with the BLM stated that they hope to receive funding from the project soon, but they have begun conducting pre-planning activities using other sources of funding.

Mike Reese asked about the differences with wildfire management between the BLM and the Nevada Division of Forestry. Mike stated that nearly 500,000 acres of Nevada is burned each year and asked what the plan is to restore the land to make it productive again once wildfires are out.

Carolyn Sherve with the BLM stated that wildlife operations are an implementation level decision. Carolyn stated that the BLM does have Burned Area Emergency Response Teams (BAER) that are able to assist communities restore the land after wildfires. She stated that the funding for wildlife operations and restorations is not an issue that an RMP can address.

Lorinda Wichman stated that relationships between a county and the local District and Field Offices are essential in order to play a bigger role in the implementation of an RMP and the day-to-day management of the land. Lorinda stated that Nye County extensively engaged in the development of the RMP for the Southern Nevada District and all other RMP's that cover the county. She stated that the Southern Nevada RMP was stopped, and that Nye County has been waiting over a year to hear about what happened to the focused plan amendments. She asked what the status is of the focused plan amendments and if these amendments will play a part in the statewide RMP update.

David Pritchett with the BLM stated that the Nevada-wide RMP update would include any updates put forward by Nye County as part of the previous focused plan amendments. He stated that focused plan amendments

and other project driven amendments do not receive additional funding to be carried out, so they often take longer to be completed.

Lorinda Wichman asked if Nye County is going to receive any confirmation or assurance from the BLM that their focused plan amendments are going to become a part of the statewide RMP plan update. Lorinda stated that Nye County is currently being bombarded with 52 applications for solar development while at the same time trying to create a conservation plan for the desert tortoise. She stated that some of these RMP decisions are years out, but these solar applications are going through the EIS process now which could interfere with the statewide RMP update.

David Pritchett with the BLM stated that the scenario Lorinda mentioned with the solar applications is a reason why the BLM would like to update its RMP's around the state. David stated that Lorinda can talk to the Las Vegas District Office to get an update on the status of their focused plan amendments.

Hope Sullivan thanked the BLM staff for their presentation today and for establishing a relationship with the Council for this project. Hope stated that the Council should consider a letter to the BLM providing input and feedback on the project. She stated that the Council should be looking at establishing procedures with the BLM that all local governments should be invited to become cooperating agencies automatically. She stated that it would also be good for the Council to revisit the topic of renewable energy on public lands and the impact of this this development across the state.

Jake Tibbitts stated the Nevada-wide RMP update is an important issue statewide and will have impacts on land use planning throughout the state. Jake stated that it would be good for the Council to craft a formal letter on this issue at its next issue meeting that incorporates the feedback and discussion from today's meeting.

Maureen Casey stated that she agrees with **Hope Sullivan** that the Council should have another discussion on the renewable energy development issue and provide a letter regarding the Nevada-wide RMP update project.

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that the discussion at today's meeting should provide staff with enough information and direction to be able to craft a letter concerning the Nevada-wide RMP update project for consideration by the Council at its next meeting.

Jake Tibbitts asked the members of the Council to take this issue back to their respective jurisdictions and seek additional information about the Nevada-wide RMP update project. Jake asked that each member of the Council bring back any input on this topic for the next meeting.

6) County and Member Planning Updates

Due to time constraints no County and Member updates were provided at this meeting.

6) Elko County Presentation

Curtis Moore with Elko County provided a presentation to the Council about natural resource and land use planning related issues within the county.

Maureen Casey stated that Douglas County has a wild horse issue but its likely not as big of an issue as Elko County's. Maureen stated that the county has a large advocacy group who is very active in controlling the wild horse population and caring for the animals.

Curtis Moore with Elko County stated that the county has been involved with an organization called Freeze who consist of a large group of stakeholders across the country. Curtis stated that this organization has been successful in bringing people together to conduct joint fact finding and help make decisions for wild horses based on science.

Mike Reese thanked Curtis for brining up deer tags and predators in the county's presentation. Mike stated that according to the Congressional Sportsman's Foundation and the Sportsman's Alliance, in 2020 sportsmen in Nevada spent a total of \$414 million at the cash register which resulted in over \$39 million being collected in sales tax from sportsman. He stated that this is enough revenue to pay for the annual salary of 4500 law enforcement officers. He stated that this year 408,000 applications for big game tags were submitted to NDOW with a \$3 predator fee. He stated that this fee generated over \$3.5 million in past two years that will be used towards predator control.

Hope Sullivan asked if the county has looked at allowing for construction licensing reciprocity between Nevada and adjacent states to help with finding builders for the area.

Curtis Moore stated that construction licensing is not an issue that the county has much authority over. Curtis stated that it's not a bad idea and that there are other areas that Nevada should look at allowing for licensing reciprocity.

Wilde Brough stated that Southern Idaho and Western are two major growth areas and contractor in these areas seem to be busy at home. Wilde stated that when he served on the school board, that there was an "Elko County factor" that added 20% on a bid for out of area contractors to come build in Elko County. Wilde stated that this issue should be changing a little bit and there are more local contractors now.

8) Drought Impacts and Climate Change on Northwestern Nevada Agriculture

Ed James with the Carson Water Subconservancy District provided the Council with a [presentation](#) about drought impacts and climate change on agriculture in the Carson River watershed.

Jim French asked if the district has a dataset that goes back further than 1940 to show if global warming is a unique issue or it's having an impact on this part of the Great Basin.

Ed James with the Carson Water Subconservancy District stated that the district does have datasets that go back further into the late 1800's. Ed stated that the problem is if you look at the record, they didn't capture the low flows, only the high flows. He stated that the 1940s data is continuous and is in multiple locations along the river. He stated that looking at this data there is definitely an impact in the flows in the river and the runoff change. He also stated that the area has seen a lot of changes with agriculture over the past couple of decades with the region having less agricultural areas.

Wild Brough stated that he recently saw Lahontan reservoir empty and asked if the reservoir is gravity fed or if it's pumped out.

Ed James with the Carson Water Subconservancy District stated that the Carson City and Truckee River canal flows into the reservoir by gravity. Ed stated that the flows out from the reservoir are also gravity. He stated that Lahontan does go dry in most years and that it's not unusual for it to go dry. He stated that in 2015, the cut off for irrigation was the earliest ever on July 4th because Lake Tahoe went below the natural rim. He stated that when the Truckee River goes dry it has a big impact on agriculture in Fallon.

Maureen Casey expressed a concern about water rights being purchased by a national home builder within the watershed and that these rights could be sold for additional residential development in Douglas County. Maureen also expressed a concern about the amount of hardscape in communities along the Carson River to the east and its impact on agriculture in Fallon.

Hope Sullivan asked what the relationship is between the district's study and the State Engineer.

Ed James with the Carson Water Subconservancy District stated that the district has asked State to be a partner on this study. Ed stated that the State Engineer is helping review the data. He stated that the study will have a working group including 13 water purveyors, agricultural interests like TCID, the counties, Federal Water

Master, State of Nevada, and USGS. He stated that as the study starts developing the data set, they will work with each of these entities moving forward.

Jeremy Drew with Resource Concepts Inc representing Churchill County stated that one of the benefits mentioned for the river is agriculture in the Carson Valley. Jeremy stated that there are opportunities to preserve this agriculture with Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) funding to purchase conservation easements, but these efforts have failed because the BLM determined these projects to not be in the public interest.

Curtis Schlep asked if the Carson Water Subconservancy District is involved with managing any of the water within the Walker River watershed.

Ed James with the Carson Water Subconservancy District stated the district, and the study is only focused on the Carson City watershed.

9) State Land Use Planning Agency Update

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands provided an update of the State Land Use Planning Agency that was included as pages 20-23 of the [meeting packet](#).

Charlie Donohue with the Nevada Division of State Lands encouraged members of the Council to follow up with staff if they have any information or updates to provide to the rest of the Council between meetings.

10) Future Agenda Items

Jake Tibbitts stated that it would be good to bring forth a letter about the Nevada-wide RMP project and encouraged the Council to provide their thoughts to staff prior to the next meeting. Jake also suggested a future item suggested by **Maureen Casey** to revisit renewable energy development in Nevada. He also suggested a future item for the Council to look at Bill Draft Requests that have been filed for the upcoming session of the Nevada Legislature.

Maureen Casey stated that she would like to have a presentation from the Nevada Indian Commission on their communication with the Tribe's around the state and how the Tribe's are being impacted by renewable and mining activities on Federal land.

Hope Sullivan stated that she would like to hear a presentation from the Governor's Office of Economic Development about what are the opportunities and challenges in attracting people to Nevada.

11) Scheduling of Future SLUPAC Meeting Dates and Locations

Scott Carey with the Nevada Division of State Lands stated that the next Council meeting is looking to hold one more meeting before the end of the year. Scott stated that staff was looking to schedule its next meeting in early November and hold it somewhere in northwestern or central Nevada.

Wes Henderson offered Lyon County to host the next SLUPAC meeting in Yerington.

The consensus of the Council was to hold the next meeting at 9:30 AM on Thursday November 10, 2022, in Yerington.

12) Public Comment

Jake Tibbitts called for public comment. There was no public comment, and the public comment period was closed.

13) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Carey

/s/

Meeting Recorder

Please note that minutes should be considered draft minutes pending their approval at a future meeting of the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council. Corrections and changes could be made before approval.

The meeting was digitally recorded. Meeting minutes and recordings of the meeting are available for inspection by the public within 30 working days after the adjournment of the meeting, the minutes and recordings are retained for at least five years in accordance with NRS 241.035(2). Anyone wishing to receive or review the recording may call (775) 684-2723.