

NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (NACO)

Board of Directors' Meeting
October 23, 2015, 9:30 a.m.
NACO Office
304 S. Minnesota Street
Carson City, NV 89703

AGENDA

Some NACO Board members may attend via video link or phone from other locations. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The NACO Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The NACO Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Call to Order, Roll Call, Salute to the Flag

1. Public Comment. Please Limit Comments to 3 Minutes.
2. Approval of Agenda. **For Possible Action.**
3. President's Report.
4. NACO Executive Director's Report.
5. Approval of Minutes of the September 30, 2015 NACO Board of Directors Meeting. **For Possible Action.**
6. Approval of NACO Resolution 15-03, "Thanking Clark County for Hosting the 2015 NACO Annual Conference. **For Possible Action.**
7. Update on the Programs and Activities of the Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles.

Note: The NACO Board of Directors May Interrupt the Open Meeting and Exclude the Public from the Meeting for the Limited Purpose of Receiving the Information and for Deliberation Relative to Agenda Item #8 below:

8. Discussion and Possible Action regarding the Bureau of Land Management's and U.S. Forest Service's Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plans (ARMP'S) including:
 - a. Amending the Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief Filed by Western Exploration LLC, Elko County, Eureka County and Quantum Minerals LLC. **For Possible Action.**
 - b. Requesting Governor Sandoval to Assist in the Legal Challenges to the BLM's and USFS's Greater Sage-Grouse ARMP's and to Ensure that Greater Sage-Grouse are Managed in Accordance with the State Plan and Local Plans and Policies. **For Possible Action.**
 - c. Providing Comment on the BLM's and USFS's Proposal under the ARMP's to Withdraw Lands Within Sagebrush Focal Areas from Location and Entry under the 1872 Mining Law, Subject to Valid Existing Rights. **For Possible Action.**
 - d. Supporting a Congressional Concurrent Resolution of "Nonapproval" of the BLM's and USFS's ARMP's as Provided in Section 202 (e) of the Federal Land Management Policy Act of 1976 as Amended. **For Possible Action.**
 - e. Contracting for Mapping Services. **For Possible Action.**

9. Update on the First Responder Network Authority (First Net).
10. Update and Possible Action on AB191 Enacted in the 2015 Legislative Session which Authorizes a County to Place on the Ballot at the General Election on November 8, 2016 a Question which Asks the Voters in the County whether to Authorize the Board of County Commissioners to Impose, for the Period beginning on January 1, 2017, Annual Increases to Taxes on Certain Motor Vehicle Fuels. **For Possible Action.**
11. Discussion and Possible Action to Support the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, H.R. 2647. **For Possible Action.**
12. Update and Possible Action regarding a Proposal to Consolidate the University of Nevada, Reno College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR), Cooperative Extension, and the Nevada Agriculture Experiment Station (NAES). **For Possible Action.**
13. Update and Possible Action regarding NACO's Efforts Seeking to Compel the U.S. Bureau of Land Management to Comply with the Provisions of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act. **For Possible Action.**
14. NACO Committee of the Emeritus Update. **For Possible Action.**
15. National Association of Counties and Western Interstate Region Board Member Updates.
16. NACO Board Member Updates.
17. Public Comment - Please Limit Comments to 3 Minutes

Adjournment.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to notify NACO in writing at 304 S. Minnesota Street, Carson City, NV 89703, or by calling (775) 883-7863 at least three working days prior to the meeting.

Members of the public can request copies of the supporting material for the meeting by contacting Amanda Evans at (775) 883-7863. Supporting material will be available at the NACO office and on the NACO website at: www.nvnaco.org

This agenda was posted at the following locations:

NACO Office 304 S. Minnesota Street, Carson City, NV 89703

Washoe County Admin. Building 1001 E. Ninth Street, Reno, NV 89520

Clark County Admin. Building 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155

POOL/PACT 201 S. Roop Street, Carson City, NV 89701

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 5

NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (NACO)

Board of Director's Meeting

September 30, 2015

Immediately upon adjournment of the NACO Membership Meeting,
but no earlier than 8:15 a.m.

Aliante Hotel-Casino, Camelback Room

7300 North Aliante Parkway

North Las Vegas, NV 89084

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Attendance

(NACO Staff: Jeff Fontaine, Dagny Stapleton, Tori Sundheim) President Wichman; President Elect Carson; Vice President Phillips; Pat Irwin, Pershing County; Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Clark County; Pete Olsen, Churchill County; Doug Johnson, Douglas County; Demar Dahl, Elko County; Micki Bates, Esmeralda County; J.J. Goicoechea, Eureka County; Jim French, Humboldt County; Patsy Waits, Lander County; Jerrie Tipton, Mineral County; Dan Schinhofen, Nye County; Jack McGuffey, Storey County; Jeanne Herman, Washoe County and Bob Roshak, Nevada Sheriff's and Chiefs Association.

Others: Carol Shank, Pershing County Commissioner; Steve Thaler, Douglas County Commissioner; Rob Stokes, Elko County Manager; Lawrence Weekly, Clark County Commissioner; Keith Westengard, Lander County Executive Director; Pete Goicoechea, Nevada State Senator; Roger Mancebo, NACO Committee of the Emeritus; Don Alt, Lyon County Commissioner; Greg Hunewill, Lyon County Commissioner; Jim Nichols, Douglas County Manager; Barry Penzel, Douglas County Commissioner; Varlin Higbee, Lincoln County Commissioner; Michael Sharkozy, Eureka County Commissioner; Norm Frey, NACO Committee of the Emeritus; Larry Brown, Clark County Commissioner; Bob Lucey, Washoe County Commissioner and Ray Fierro, Lyon County Commissioner

1. Public Comment. None was given

2. Approval of Agenda. The agenda was approved on a motion by Commissioner Tipton with a second by President Elect Carson with the change from the Camelback Room to the Sedona Room.

3. Approval of Minutes of the August 28, 2015 NACO Board of Directors Meeting. The minutes were approved on a motion by Commissioner Tipton with second by Commissioner Bates.

3b. Approval to Retain an At-Large Member from Clark County on NACO's Executive Committee. The item was approved on a motion by Commissioner Tipton with second by President Elect Carson.

4. Approval of the 2015 NACO Honor Roll, NACO 2015 Participatory Democracy Award and NACO Legislator of the Year Award. The awards were approved on a motion by Commissioner Tipton with second by Commissioner Irwin.

5. Approval of NACO Resolution 15- 02 Honoring Carole Vilardo, President Nevada Taxpayers Association. The resolution was approved on a motion by President Elect Carson with second by Commissioner Tipton.

6. Update and Possible Action regarding a Proposal to Consolidate the University of Nevada, Reno College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR),

Cooperative Extension, and the Nevada Agriculture Experiment Station (NAES). Jeff reminded the Board that members of the University came to the August meeting to speak about the proposed consolidation of the departments and the history of the consolidation first proposed several years prior. He noted that the original proposed consolidation was placed on hold when NACO and several counties strongly opposed the idea. Jeff stated that not much had been heard on the subject until he received direction from the Board at the June meeting to contact the University. He said that he and several Commissioners met with the University regarding the resurrection of the proposal, which ended with the counties again strongly objecting to the consolidation. Jeff said a number of questions were sent to the Provost and that communication was received that they are moving forward and will bring the proposal to the Board of Regents in early Spring and intend full implementation by the early Summer. Jeff noted that the issue appears black or white and that the President intends to move forward with the reorganization and that the issue is complex and will require discussion within the counties as to what is best for each individual county. He also stated that at some point it may be appropriate for the Board to take a position at the October or November meeting. He stated that the discussion and comments to University representatives at the August Board meeting centered around the fact that they are not making Cooperative Extension a priority and that while the current Dean of the College of Agriculture is highly regarded there is more to Cooperative Extension than the College of Agriculture can provide, especially in the urban areas of the state. President Wichman noted that Nye County voted not to fund the program. Commissioner Johnson inquired as to the initial discussion beginning three years ago and that nothing has changed, especially when it comes to reduced funding for Extension within the counties. Jeff noted that concern has been expressed by several counties and how the funds provided are being used. He said the perception is that the funds will be put into a larger pot, and what assurance the counties will receive that the funds will be used within the counties. He also noted that the four new positions proposed within Cooperative Extension are campus positions and will have less than 50% of their time within the counties. Commissioner Kirkpatrick noted the history of lack of funding and the programs that were eliminated. She noted she reached out to the Chancellor and the meeting she had informed the Chancellor that funding issues could be fixed within the legislature and that the counties should not give an inch regarding the issue. Commissioner French said that Arizona went through a similar reorganization and that the worst of the Board's concerns were realized there within a year with all of the funding reverting back to campus services. He said that the blanks could be filled in resulting from the 75% cuts in budgets and that after his discussion with Extension staff, some of which were included in the questions sent to the University, that the Humboldt County Extension Educator was contacted by the Provost that he "needed to change the narrative in Humboldt County". Commissioner Herman noted that 4-H programs and agriculture programs in Washoe County are almost non-existent and what are active are quickly going downhill. Commissioner Tipton stated that Cooperative Extension in Mineral County is almost non-existent and that she is ready to propose removal of the funding to the program. Commissioner Kirkpatrick stated that she is passionate about the issue because she fought for it and that the budgetary and funding cuts are unacceptable. She also noted that the University doesn't like bad press and that if all 17 counties come together to remind the public what the programs are and are supposed to be that could change the narrative of the University. President Elect Carson stated that about a week after the August Board meeting that White Pine County's Extension Educator gave notice and went to work in the private sector. Commissioner Waits said Lander County is in a similar position with their educator retiring. Commissioner Irwin said that Pershing County has a great program but that their fear is that if their educator retires or leaves that it would take years to rebuild their program. He also said that Clark County has one of the best 4-H programs he has seen and that to lose those programs would be detrimental. President Elect Carson also echoed Commissioner Irwin's comments regarding the University's lack of willingness to listen to how important the Extension programs are to the individual counties. Commissioner Weekly noted that Clark County has taken a strong position on the issue and that their Chairman has been vocal about it as well. He also echoed Commissioner Kirkpatrick's statement that NACO and all the counties need to have a joint statement and/or position and that the proposal is a one size fits all approach and that Extension means something different to each county and geographical area and that the counties deserve to be heard and have consideration and that the implementation of the plan will have wide and long term adverse effects. Commissioner Dahl noted that rather than continuing the discussion that a motion might be appropriate. Commissioner Hunewill spoke to the Act that created extension services and that the implementation of this plan will ignore the intent of those Acts.

Commissioner Tipton moved to request the Chancellor to be at the October Board meeting and have a NACO statement ready at the meeting, with second by Commissioner Herman. The motion was amended to state that the minutes will be forwarded to the University as a part of the statement. Commissioner Goicoechea requested the statement be prepared prior to Eureka County's next meeting as the item is on their agenda. Commissioner French inquired as to the strength of the threat of all counties going back to their individual commissions and look seriously at defunding the program. Commissioner Kirkpatrick noted that she will be placing the possible defunding of the program on her Commissions agenda and that the statement needs to be done as soon as possible. Jeff clarified that the line item for Cooperative Extension is in the executive budget and that there is the ability to create a work plan to change things and that those funds are already set aside for programs and that with attempts to create new work plans that the counties need to be ready.. President Wichman inquired as to the groups understanding of the motion and if there was any further discussion. With no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.

7. Update on Efforts by NACO, Individual Counties and Others to Seek an Immediate Injunction to Bar the Federal Agencies from Implementing the Northeastern

California – Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA). Tori updated the Board that the prior Monday the suit was filed and that NACO is not currently named on the suit. She noted that she has been in communication with many of the counties and support in the form of declarations is important and that maps have been created to show the impacts. She noted that she can provide information and support to assist in individual county decisions regarding the issue. Tori also noted that any declarations need to be received by the 7th or 8th in order to be included in the hearing. She noted the importance of winning the preliminary injunction and the support of specific examples of how the LUPA will affect each county individually. She noted that she is the consistent resource for each county still making decisions and that she can be called at any time. Commissioner Lucey inquired as to the timing of Tori's attendance at the Washoe County Commission meeting; she stated she is attending the meeting but that the meeting date is after the legal deadline for declarations and that if Washoe County can obtain a signature prior to the deadline it would be beneficial. Commissioner Goicoechea inquired as to why NACO isn't listed on the top of the suit and Tori stated that is because of the establishment of venue. Commissioner Goicoechea stated that the Board voted to be listed on the suit and that by not being listed the suit doesn't hold as much weight. Jeff clarified that the withdrawal of the original suit without prejudice has not been completed and that until that occurs that if NACO is on the new suit that the defendants might try to use that to move the venue to Washington D.C.. Tori again stressed the importance of declarations to be turned into her before the 8th of October because if opinions are not brought up now we will lose the opportunity to protest at all. Commissioner French noted that is imperative that whoever signs the declaration needs to be able to defend it. Commissioner Goicoechea noted that Eureka County took Board action and did not need a resolution. President Elect Carson stated that White Pine County voted to join the suit and Tori clarified that the more counties that join the suit the better but that in order to be named in the suit there is the necessity for a monetary commitment. Commissioner Kirkpatrick noted that it is important for each county to submit something in writing (i.e. a declaration statement regardless of being named in the suit to ensure their future participation and/or ability comment in the future.

8. Briefing and Discussion regarding the Governor's Drought Summit 2015 September 21-23 and September 28 Drought Forum Meeting. This item was not heard due to time constraints.

9. County Updates. This item was not heard due to time constraints.

10. Public Comment. None was given.

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 8A

<https://www.law360.com/cases/560419072eaa9615db000001/dockets>

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 8c

http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/info/newsroom/2015/october/state_office_blm.html

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-09-24/pdf/2015-24212.pdf>

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 8d

<http://www.blm.gov/flpma/FLPMA.pdf>

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 9

<http://firstnet.gov/>

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 10

<http://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/78th2015/Reports/history.cfm?ID=430>

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 11

[Date]

The Honorable [First Name] [Last Name]
United States Senate
[Address Line 1]
Washington, DC 20510

Dear [Senator Last Name],

As a [Title] in [County Name & State] and a member of the National Association of Counties (NACo), I am writing to express support for quick action in the United States Senate to reform federal forest management practices and wildfire suppression funding challenges, like what was included in the House passed legislation H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015.

Across the United States, 26 percent of counties contain federal forest lands. While I applaud Congressional efforts underway to address funding for wildfire suppression, I urge Congress to move legislation that addresses both fire borrowing and federal forest management reform. Unhealthy forests not only increase community wildfire risk, they also impair clean water and air quality, threaten wildlife habitats and reduce access to forest related tourism and jobs for millions of Americans.

Enacting legislation like H.R. 2647 that promotes active forest management and reforms wildfire suppression funding will improve the health and wellbeing of federal forest lands and forest communities by: promoting collaboration and streamlining regulations for forest health projects, protecting communities through wildfire risk reduction, reforming forest revenue sharing, providing flexibility within Title III of Secure Rural Schools to ensure county first-responders have the equipment and training they need to provide high-quality emergency services and reforming funding for wildfire suppression costs for restoration projects.

My county contains [###] acres of federal forest lands and [###] total acres of federal public lands. Reforming federal forest management and federal wildfire suppression funding would [describe how improving the health of federal forests and reforming wildfire suppression funding would positively impact your community]. *Example: For forest counties like mine, the health of our federal forests has a direct impact on the health and safety of county residents. Healthy forests are less prone to disease, infestation and wildfire. Present forest conditions now present the greatest risk to both communities and the environment. According to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), 58 million acres of National Forest lands are at a high risk for catastrophic wildfire. Additionally, improving forest health through active management will generate more revenue for the federal treasury and for the critical services counties provide, including planning and zoning, road and bridge maintenance, solid waste disposal, law enforcement, emergency management, fire protection, search and rescue, and economic development and promote job creation, tourism and economic growth. Reforming federal wildfire suppression funding will*

give federal land managers additional resources to invest in long awaited forest health and restoration projects, such as [specific examples] in my county.]

As wildfires continue to burn and threaten communities across the United States, the time to enact comprehensive legislation that improves federal forest health and reforms wildfire suppression funding. Counties across the United States stand ready to work with you in support of this goal.

Sincerely,



September 18, 2015

The Honorable Pat Roberts
Chairman
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Debbie Stabenow
Ranking Member
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Roberts and Ranking Member Stabenow:

On behalf of the National Association of Counties (NACo), the only national organization that represents the 3,069 counties across the United States, I am writing to express support for quick action in the U.S. Senate to reform federal forest management practices and address the wild fire funding crisis, like what was included in the House passed legislation, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015 (H.R. 2647).

This year's record breaking fire season has already consumed more than eight million acres of land, most of which is federal public land, and continues to threaten counties across the United States. While we applaud efforts to address funding for wildfire suppression, we urge Congress to move comprehensive legislation that addresses both fire borrowing and federal forest management reform.

The health of our federal forests has a direct impact on the public health, safety and economic wellbeing of counties across the United States. Not only do unhealthy forests increase community wildfire risk, they can also negatively impact community access to clean water and air, threaten wildlife habitats and reduce community opportunities for forest related tourism and jobs. H.R. 2647 will improve the health and wellbeing of forest lands and forest communities by promoting collaboration and streamlining regulations for forest health projects, protecting communities through wildfire risk reduction and improving flexibility and fairness in forest revenue sharing.

Promoting Collaboration and Streamlining Regulations for Forest Health Projects

Counties believe that the active management of federal lands and forests must be done in a sustainable manner to ensure the health of our federal lands for generations to come. One way to help ensure a balanced approach to address natural resource management challenges is by promoting locally driven collaborative processes that promote consensus driven decision making. Counties across the United States have engaged in collaborative efforts to address their natural resources challenges. By bringing together a broad cross section of local stakeholders into collaborative processes, counties, industry, outdoorsmen, conservationists and federal and state land managers have built consensus on some of the most complex natural resource management challenges.

By authorizing limited and reasonable categorical exclusions for projects that improve forest health and have been developed through consensus based collaborative processes, H.R. 2647 builds upon these successes and provides additional tools to help ensure that collaborative efforts continue to work, accelerate and expand. Streamlining the regulatory review of proposed forestry projects will increase project implementation and the number of acres that are treated.

Protecting Communities through Wildfire Risk Reduction

For the 26 percent of counties across the United States that are home to federal forest lands, the health of our federal forests has a direct impact on the health and safety of county residents. Healthy forests are less prone to disease, insect infestation and wildfire. While the causes of catastrophic wildfire are complex, the *status quo* of inaction has exacerbated present forest

conditions, which now present a great risk to both communities and the environment. The legislation recognizes this fact by requiring the costs and benefits of a proposed forest project be weighed against the costs and benefits of doing nothing to address wildfire threats, disease and insect infestation, and their impacts on local water supply and wildlife habitat.

Provisions of the legislation expediting regulatory analysis for timber salvage after major wildfires are also crucial and will provide the Forest Service with the revenue it needs to execute critical and time-sensitive post-fire reforestation work.

Providing Flexibility and Equitable Sharing of Forest Revenues

In addition to improving forest health and reducing wildfire risk for forest communities, increased active management will generate more revenue for the treasury and for the critical services counties provide, as well as promote job creation and economic growth in counties across the nation. Forest related industries provide over \$50 billion annually in wages for nearly one million employees nationwide. These jobs provide a direct positive economic impact to many rural and forest counties across the country.

The growth in stewardship contracting in recent years has shown that a market driven approach to forest management projects can work to achieve both forest management goals and increased forest production. Counties support and are active partners in stewardship contracting initiatives across the United States, and we support provisions of H.R. 2647 that authorize the equitable sharing of stewardship contracting revenues with counties consistent with historic forestry practices. Forest revenue sharing payments support critical county services such as transportation infrastructure and education. America's counties look forward to working with Congress to further strengthen forest revenue sharing between counties and the federal government.

Since 2000, due to sharp declines in forest revenues, the federal government has provided payments to forest counties through the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program. The SRS program provides a critical safety-net for forest counties impacted by declines in forest production and the loss of forest jobs and it will continue to be a critical program until the declines in forest production can be fully addressed. H.R. 2647 reforms Title III of SRS and provides much needed flexibility for counties to use a portion of SRS funding to support law enforcement patrols and ensure county first-responders have the equipment and training they need to provide high-quality emergency services on federal public lands to county residents and the millions of federal public lands visitors each year.

NACo urges the Committee to hold a hearing on this important topic and pass legislation to address both the health of our federal forests and funding for wildfire suppression. We stand ready to work with you to promote locally supported, consensus driven solutions to address management challenges, reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire and increase economic activity on our federal lands.

Sincerely,



Matthew D. Chase
Executive Director