

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position   |   | State Position  |   | Federal Agency Position  |  |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
|  | Benefit   | Detriment   | Benefit   | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment  |
| Federal lands continue to be managed by Federal Agencies.  | Pilt funds. BLM has access to federal budget to manage the land.                            | May cause less economic opportunities.  | Pilt funds. BLM has access to federal budget to manage the land.                | Less control for the state to benefit economic benefits.  | BLM has programs and budget in place to manage all of the resources. Would continue with current plicies for managing for multiple use on Public Lands. WH&B and fire programs are expensive to manage and Federal agencies have processes in place to manage. |  |
| Federal lands be managed by the State.   | County would just have to coordinate with the state.  | Rural counties could be at the mercy of clark and Washoe counties.  | State would have more control and could benefit by managing the land their way. | The cost of managing WH&B and wildland fire may cause serious consequences to the state budget. All the records associated with the Public Lands are federal records. The cost of copying or scanning would be prohibitive. The transfer would take years. All of the transfers would have to have patents issued and legal descriptions written. The state would have to hire more staff and set up more offices. The state constitution will have to amended. | WH&B and wild land fire would not be their responsibility or a part of their budget. More staff and offices would have to be added to manage the land.   | It would be hard to manage split estate and isolated parcels of Public Land. |
| Federal lands be managed by the County.  | The County would be able to sell the land faster and provide more economic benefits faster. | The county does not have the budget, personnel or the means to manage all the resources. The county really doesn't have the experience to manage all the resources. |   | This may not work very well for the state if the counties have that much power.   |  | It would be hard to manage split estate and isolated parcels of Public Land. |
| NEPA processes in place per US Congress.   | NEPA would only be required if federal funds are involved.                                  | NEPA would still be a huge part of their lives as it would be hard to get away from using federal funds.  | NEPA would only be required if federal funds are involved.                      | NEPA would still be a huge part of their lives as it would be hard to get away from using federal funds.  | Painful as it is Federal Agencies have processes in place and the experience to do it.   |  |
| Western Watershed Project and Sierra Club present and future lawsuits against proposed land use. |   | Their process may have to change but they will not go away.   |   | Their process may have to change but they will not go away.   |  |  |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position   |  | State Position  |  | Federal Agency Position   |   |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
|  | Benefit   | Detriment  | Benefit   | Detriment  | Benefit   | Detriment   |
| Federal agencies reducing access to public lands.                                    | This would not be an issue.   | All the roads in the county will not be their responsibility. No federal agencies maintaining their roads.   | This would not be an issue.   | All the roads in the county will not be their responsibility. No federal agencies maintaining their roads. The state is probably going to pass on the responsibility of maintenance to the counties with some kind of budget.                              | Transportation plans and closing roads is a public process that unfortunately the county and members of the public have not bothered to participate in much. There needs to be more coordination. |   |
| Job position currently in place to manage natural resources.                         | Federal employees are already in place and contribute to the local economy as they are well paid positions.   | County does not have the staff to manage the Public Lands. It would take them years to acquire them and get some kind of order. Even if they had them the wage scale of county employees is much lower than federal employees. Federal employees may stick around for lower pay. | The state has most of the departments to manage the land but would have to hire 100's more people and set up offices around the state.                                      | The state does not have the budget to manage the cost of managing the Public Lands or the budget to make the transfer happen. The wage scale of state employees is lower than federal employees. Federal employees may not stick around for the lower pay. |   | Displaced employees that would be looking for jobs elsewhere. |
| Funding required to manage natural resources.  |   | County does not have the budget.   |   | State does not have the budget.  | Federal Agencies already have a budget process and access to federal funds.   |   |
| Investing and protecting natural resources.  | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. |  | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. |  | Painful as it can be sometimes Federal Agencies have the personnel, offices, laws and processes in place to do so.  |   |
| Taking care of Sage Grouse habitats and other wildlife species identified or listed. | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. | County is not equipped to do so. It would fall to the state.   | There are state agencies to do so. They would just have to have more people and offices to do so.   |  | Painful as it can be sometimes Federal Agencies have the personnel, offices, laws and processes in place to do so.  |   |
| Continuing the extraordinary wealth of scenery, experience and wildlife.             | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. |  |   |  | The federal budget and protection provides better security.   |   |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:   | County Position   |   | State Position   |   | Federal Agency Position  |           |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|-----------|
|   | Benefit   | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment |
| Continuation of eco-tourism dollars into the communities.   | Tourism is one of White Pine Counties greatest assets. Protecting our resources will ensure that tourism continues to pump dollars into the communities.                    |   | Tourism is one of White Pine Counties greatest assets. Protecting our resources will ensure that tourism continues to pump dollars into the communities. Any tourism benefits the whole state. |   | Federal dollars ensure greater protection of the resources and will help the county and state promote tourism in Nevada. |           |
| Wildlife viewing and learning opportunities.  | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. |   |  |   |  |           |
| Emigrant trails as historical landmarks being enjoyed.  | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. |   |  |   | It would be best if anything with a National designation remained so it has federal protection.                          |           |
| National Conservation Lands Plan and what it protects.  | It goes without saying that the county and state would want to protect the natural resources. Whether or not they would be able to have the funds to do it is the question. |   |  |   | It would be best if anything with a National designation remained so it has federal protection.                          |           |
| Freedom to hunt and trap on public lands with conditions (tags, etc.)                                     | I don't see this changing even with the state owning the land.  |   | I don't see this changing even with the state owning the land. The state may even make more money by charging more.  |   |  |           |
| Large acres of land being designated to habitat issues that limit land access and economic development.   |   |   | The state still protects threatened and endangered species. Don't think this would change much.  |   |  |           |
| Eliminating wildlife areas, national monuments, national parks, native american lands, DOD managed lands. |   | National monuments and national parks bring a lot of tourists in from all over the world. Without a national designation they may not be as attractive to foreigners. |  | National monuments and national parks bring a lot of tourists in from all over the world. Without a national designation they may not be as attractive to foreigners. | Federal designation and protection keep these maintained and attractive to tourists.                                     |           |
| Allowing wholesale sell of public lands to local government parties.                                      | Would give the county a free hand to manage or sell the land as they please.  | This opens the door to too many politicians with their own agendas.   | Would give the state a free hand to manage or sell the land as they please.  | This opens the door to too many politicians and entrepreneurs with their own agendas.   |  |           |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position  |  | State Position   |   | Federal Agency Position   |           |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|-----------|
|  | Benefit  | Detriment  | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit   | Detriment |
| Current Public Lands Acts adopted by certain counties.   | Gives the county the opportunity to work close with federal agencies to plan for the greatest benefits and growth.   |  |  |   |   |           |
| Current Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act SNPLMA in place now.   | This act has provided a lot of money for many public improvements in the counties. The land sold in Clark County gave them the land they needed for economic benefits. |  | This act has provided a lot of money for many public improvements in the counties. The land sold in Clark County gave them the land they needed for economic benefits. It brought a lot of benefits to Nevada. |   | Enabled the BLM to dispose of land that was better in the private sector and provided economic benefits to the whole state. |           |
| Currently executed and upholding Right of Ways permits, unpatented and patented mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing permits, etc on public lands. | The land would be patented subject to all valid existing rights. Some of them do have expiration dates that the state would have to deal with.                         |  | The land would be patented subject to all valid existing rights. Some of them do have expiration dates that the state would have to deal with.   | All the records associated with the Public Lands are federal records. The cost of copying or scanning would be prohibitive. The transfer would take years. All of the transfers would have to have patents issued and legal descriptions written. The BLM issues all patents.   |   |           |
| Cost associated with land transfers, federal land patents, surveys, etc.   |  |  |  | It would take years to write legal descriptions and issue patents for the land. The records for existing rights are all federal records and somehow they would have to be copied or scanned. There are thousands of them. The state does not have the budget to do this and I doubt the rest of the nation is going to want to foot the bill. |   |           |
| PILT, Net Proceeds of Mines, and public land use royalties paid to local municipalities.   |  | This would hurt but the county and state would figure out other ways to get the money since they would control the land. |  | This would hurt but the county and state would figure out other ways to get the money since they would control the land.  |   |           |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:   | County Position  |   | State Position   |   | Federal Agency Position  |           |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|-----------|
|   | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to the State.  |  | This opens the doors for speculators, foreigners and the very wealthy to acquire large tracts of land. I don't have that kind of faith in our politicians that this won't happen. We have a few politicians now that say this won't happen but what about future generations. | Since the land would be conveyed to the state it would go in state coffers   | This opens the doors for speculators, foreigners and the very wealthy to acquire large tracts of land. I don't have that kind of faith in our politicians that this won't happen. We have a few politicians now that say this won't happen but what about future generations. |  |           |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to local municipalities.   |  | Since the land would be conveyed to the state it would go in state coffers unless counties can get the state to spend the money in the county where the land was sold.  |  |   |  |           |
| Firefighting costs to manage the lands.   |  | The county does not have the budget, personnel or the resources to fight wildland fires.  |  | Unlike some states Nevada has a lot of open country and one bad fire year could destroy the state budget.   | The federal agencies have federal money, the trained personnel and resources to manage wildland fires.   |           |
| Maintenance and enhancement of recreational parks and trails.   |  |   | the state could manage them just as well as the federal agencies. They could create more if they have the budget to do so. |   | the federal agencies have the personnel and resources to manage them. They also have access to federal money.  |           |
| Continued economic activities such as mining, grazing, and energy production.                             | This would continue in coordination with state government. Maybe even more so. | Some of the activities such as energy production will probably involve federal money and would require NEPA.  | This would continue in coordination with the county governments.   | Some of the activities such as energy production will probably involve federal money and would require NEPA.  | This would continue with the federal agencies. They would have access to federal budgets to do so.   |           |
| State of Nevada held 4 million acres in Trust for Schools.  |  |   |  |   |  |           |
| Do public lands belong to the people of the United States or the State of Nevada.                         |  |   |  |   | The Public Lands are just that "Public". The thousands of visitors every year from the rest of the nation and world show how valuable they are. It is important to preserve them for future generations. Once they are gone they can't be replaced. It is no different than the National Parks we visit in other states. |           |
| Federal boots on the ground compared to state or local government administrative positions behind a desk. | Irrelevant as it would involve the same kinds of jobs only on a county level.  |   | Irrelevant as it would involve the same kinds of jobs only on a state level.   |   |  |           |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position   |   | State Position  |   | Federal Agency Position |  |
|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|
|  | Benefit   | Detriment   | Benefit   | Detriment   | Benefit                 | Detriment  |
| The Endangered Species Act remains in place regardless of land transfer.                     |   |   |   |   |                         |  |
| Manged wild fire burns to implement fuel reduction initiatives.                              |   |   | This is just another program the state would have to take over.   | Could they do it without federal funds  |                         |  |
| Managing wild horse populations per Codes of Federal Regulations.                            |   |   |   | The state is not ready to handle such a controversial program.  |                         |  |
| Large wildlife management and reintroduction into are if animal numbers become reduced.      |   |   |   |   |                         |  |
| Costs related to paying to hunt on private lands compared to paying to hunt on public lands. |   |   |   | Other states do this very successfully.   |                         | Unfortunately this would do away with a way of life in Nevada. Hunting brings in a lot of out of state money because of the freedom of the Public Lands. The state could make a lot of money but only the wealthy will be able to afford it. The state would lose money in the long run. |
| Wholesale sale of large tracts of land to private parties.                                   |   | The money would go into state coffers with clark and Washoe counties benefitting the most. This could also allow speculators and the very wealthy to tie up large tracts of land that would be closed to all. |   | This opens the doors for speculators, foreigners and the very wealthy to acquire large tracts of land. I don't have that kind of faith in our politicians that this won't happen. We have a few politicians now that say this won't happen but what about future generations. |                         |  |
| Funding not available with State holding onto public lands.                                  |   | The state doesn't have the budget and it could put an even bigger strain on county budgets.   | This would have to have a plan on how to make enough money to manage the lands. Sale of large tracts would probably the answer. | The state does not have the budge to manage the land and may sell large tracts of land to get the money they need.  |                         |  |
| How to address railroad checkboard land ownership.   | This could be addressed in county land use bills before Congress. | Are the counties prepared to acquire this land?   |   |   |                         |  |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position  |   | State Position   |  | Federal Agency Position   |           |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|-----------|
|  | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment  | Benefit   | Detriment |
| Large amounts of State controlled land sold to help balance State budgets.   |  | Large amounts of land could flood the market and have a negative effect on real estate prices. It will end up being sold to foreigners and the very rich and have a devastating effect on the locals. |  | Large amounts of land could flood the market and have a negative effect on real estate prices. It will end up being sold to foreigners and the very rich and have a devastating effect on the locals. The market can only handle so much.                |   |           |
| Is the State currently financially sound to manage public lands?   |  |   |  | The state is not in any way financially sound enough to manage public lands. It would be a huge strain on Nevada financially to take them on. It have taken them years to come up with money to finish acquiring state parks land identified in WPCCRDA. |   |           |
| Has the State demonstrated the capacity and willingness to manage public lands?  |  |   |  |  |   |           |
| How will invasive species be handled? Insects, reptiles, mammals, etc.   |  |   | The state has an agency that could handle this. They would need more people and offices. |  |   |           |
| Land conservation being a high priority for the State or Local Government.   |  | Land conservation is a high priority for the local governments but is probably not the highest priority. Dimishing budgets is the highest.  |  | Land conservation is a high priority for the state government but but whether or not they have the budget and the resources to manage it is another question.  |   |           |
| Will the local governments have the same issues working with the State as they do now working with the federal agencies? |  | the county would have to deal with state lands and they have issues of their own.   |  | The state needs to amend their constitution to deal with the issues that would arise.  |   |           |
| Identifying specific lands wanted by local governments.  | The county could identify the lands they feel they need. | The county would have a lot of planning and zoning to do to figure this out.  |  |  | This was addressed in the Public Lands bills passed by congress. White Pine County got the land they identified. They got the railroad, airport and industrial park as requested. |           |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #1

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position  |   | State Position |           | Federal Agency Position  |           |
|--|--|---|----------------|-----------|--|-----------|
|  | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit        | Detriment | Benefit  | Detriment |
| Public Land Bills that exist that have identified public land transfers already. | The county had the opportunity to identify the lands they wanted.  |   |                |           | The lands the county identified for disposal have been identified and are being offered for sale by BLM in coordination with the county. |           |
| Would the timeframe to identify a parcel and have it available for sale improve? | Timeframes could improve as they wouldn't have to deal with Federal Register Notices and all the Washington Office red tape. | May or may not. Depends on how state lands works. They have their own red tape. |                |           |  |           |



Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #2

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position |           | State Position |           | Federal Agency Position |           |
|--|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
|  | Benefit         | Detriment | Benefit        | Detriment | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Current Public Lands Acts adopted by certain counties.   |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Current Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act SNPLMA in place now.   |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Currently executed and upholding Right of Ways permits, unpatented and patented mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing permits, etc on public lands. | y               | nn        | y              | n         | y                       | no        |
| Cost associated with land transfers, federal land patents, surveys, etc.   | no              | yes       | no             | yes       | y                       | no        |
| PILT, Net Proceeds of Mines, and public land use royalties paid to local municipalities.   | y               | n         | maybe          | maybe     | no                      | no        |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to the State.   | maybe           | maybe     | y              | n         | nnn                     | y         |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to local municipalities.  | y               | n         | maybe          | maybe     | nnn                     | maybe     |
| Firefighting costs to manage the lands.  | nn              | yes       | no             | yes       | nnn                     | no        |
| Maintenance and enhancement of recreational parks and trails.  | maybe           | maybe     | maybe          | maybe     | maybe                   | maybe     |
| Continued economic activities such as mining, grazing, and energy production.  | y               | n         | y              | n         | y                       | no        |
| State of Nevada held 4 million acres in Trust for Schools.   |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Do public lands belong to the people of the United States or the State of Nevada.  |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Federal boots on the ground compared to state or local government administrative positions behind a desk.  | maybe           | maybe     | maybe          | maybe     | maybe                   | maybe     |
| The Endangered Species Act remains in place regardless of land transfer.   | y               | n         | y              | n         | y                       | no        |
| Manged wild fire burns to implement fuel reduction initiatives.  | y               | n         | y              | n         | y                       | no        |
| Managing wild horse populations per Codes of Federal Regulations.  | maybe           | maybe     | maybe          | maybe     | y                       | no        |
| Large wildlife management and reintroduction into are if animal numbers become reduced.  |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |

Nevada Public Lands Task Force

Comments From: White Pine County #2

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position |           | State Position |           | Federal Agency Position |           |
|--|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
|  | Benefit         | Detriment | Benefit        | Detriment | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Costs related to paying to hunt on private lands compared to paying to hunt on public lands.                             | nn              | maybe     | no             | maybe     | nnn                     | no        |
| Wholesale sale of large tracts of land to private parties.   | nn              | yes       | no             | yes       | maybe                   | maybe     |
| Funding not available with State holding onto public lands.  | nn              | yes       | n              | maybe     | y                       | no        |
| How to address railroad checkboard land ownership.   |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Large amounts of State controlled land sold to help balance State budgets.   | nn              | maybe     | maybe          | maybe     | nnn                     | no        |
| Is the State currently financially sound to manage public lands?   | nn              |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Has the State demonstrated the capacity and willingness to manage public lands?  | nn              |           |                |           |                         |           |
| How will invasive species be handled? Insects, reptiles, mammals, etc.   |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Land conservation being a high priority for the State or Local Government.   | maybe           | maybe     | maybe          | maybe     | nnn                     | no        |
| Will the local governments have the same issues working with the State as they do now working with the federal agencies? |                 | maybe     |                |           |                         |           |
| Identifying specific lands wanted by local governments.  | maybe           | maybe     | n              | maybe     | maybe                   | maybe     |
| Public Land Bills that exist that have identified public land transfers already.   |                 |           |                |           |                         |           |
| Would the timeframe to identify a parcel and have it available for sale improve?   | maybe           |           |                |           |                         |           |

| Nevada Public Lands Task Force   | Comments From: White Pine County #3  |   |  |   |                         |           |
|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|-----------|
|  | County Position  |   | State Position   |   | Federal Agency Position |           |
| Issue to Analyze:  | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Federal lands continue to be managed by Federal Agencies.  |  |   |  |   |                         |           |
| Federal lands be managed by the State.   | None   | Track record for mining permits shows the State is as slow as, or in some cases, slower than Federal agencies. Likely detriment to Multiple Uses. SHPO and NDEP water quality issues would continue to be major permitting hurdles.   | Management policies more specific to State government needs                          | State poorly experienced with environmental and nationwide concerns. Vulnerable to local special interests. Policies may be dominated by political power of highly populated Counties.  |                         |           |
| Federal lands be managed by the County.  |  |   |  |   |                         |           |
| NEPA processes in place per US Congress.   | Without NEPA, likely quicker processes and more profitable operation for proponents. Decreased opportunity for appeals and protests. | Loosing NEPA would seriously weaken the private parties' and Counties' positions at the planning and Management tables. Resource management would be dominated by economic benefits to any proponent. County may not be included in land decisions. Decreased opportunity for appeals and protests. | Without NEPA, likely quicker processes and more profitable operation for proponents. | Potentially significantly detrimental to other resources.   |                         |           |
| Western Watershed Project and Sierra Club present and future lawsuits against proposed land use. |  | Expensive and frustrating with little experience  |  | Expensive and frustrating with little experience. Cooperative conservation projects and funding through environmental groups may be strained.   |                         |           |
| Federal agencies reducing access to public lands.  |  | Same as State   |  | Unknown. State likely to relax restrictions to the general public for off road and OHV travel to the detriment of resources. Any lands sold would likely be restricted with fees required for hunting, recreation, and other activities. Privatized land could block existing access to pullic lands. |                         |           |

| <b>Nevada Public Lands Task Force</b>  | <b>Comments From: White Pine County #3</b>                   |  |  |  |                                |                  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------|
|  | <b>County Position</b>                                       |  | <b>State Position</b>  |  | <b>Federal Agency Position</b> |                  |
| <b>Issue to Analyze:</b>   | <b>Benefit</b>   | <b>Detriment</b>   | <b>Benefit</b>   | <b>Detriment</b>   | <b>Benefit</b>                 | <b>Detriment</b> |
| Job position currently in place to manage natural resources.                         | County would likely hire a resource conservation specialist. | Increased cost.  | Employment opportunities with State.   | Skeletal current staffing. Increased budget.   |                                |                  |
| Funding required to manage natural resources.  |  | Would lose Funding from National base.                         | Higher user fees and royalties would make some resource exploitation profitable for the State. | Nearly all funding would come from within the State. Revenues from natural resource exploitation are cyclical and unpredictable over budget cycles.              |                                |                  |
| Investing and protecting natural resources.  |  | Non-economic natural resources would likely be weakly managed. |  | Expensive. Or much lower level of management. Likely to manage only royalty or fee based operations.   |                                |                  |
| Taking care of Sage Grouse habitats and other wildlife species identified or listed. |  | ESA listing binding on both the BLM and State.                 |  | State would need to either implement the BLM plan or develop their own equal to or more restrictive than the BLM's. At their cost.                               |                                |                  |
| Continuing the extraordinary wealth of scenery, experience and wildlife.             |  | Compromise   |  | Likely to privatize or exploit for predominately economic benefit to the operator. NDOW would need to manage the Wildlife Habitats to ensure viable populations. |                                |                  |
| Continuation of eco-tourism dollars into the communities.                            | Perhaps increased advertising.                               | State may be more helpful.                                     | Perhaps more State and private recreation areas.   | Funding, maintenance, enforcement likely to decrease under State or private management.  |                                |                  |
| Wildlife viewing and learning opportunities.   |  | Compromise   | Only if profitable to the land owner or manager.   | Funding, maintenance, enforcement likely to decrease under State or private management.  |                                |                  |
| Emigrant trails as historical landmarks being enjoyed.                               |  | Compromise   | Only if profitable to the land owner or manager.   | Funding, maintenance, enforcement likely to decrease under State or private management.  |                                |                  |
| National Conservation Lands Plan and what it protects.                               |  | Compromise   | Only if profitable to the land owner or manager.   | Funding, maintenance, enforcement likely to decrease under State or private management.  |                                |                  |

| Nevada Public Lands Task Force   | Comments From: White Pine County #3  |  |   |   |                         |           |
|--|--|--|---|---|-------------------------|-----------|
|  | County Position  |  | State Position  |   | Federal Agency Position |           |
| Issue to Analyze:  | Benefit  | Detriment  | Benefit   | Detriment   | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Freedom to hunt and trap on public lands with conditions (tags, etc.)  |  | Always State jurisdiction. Just fewer public lands. Likely higher fees and tags.   | More hunting and new fees on privatized lands.                                      | No change. Possible higher fees.  |                         |           |
| Large acres of land being designated to habitat issues that limit land access and economic development.  |  | Little change  |   | Still possible; under Federal laws, EPA, and Treaties.                                    |                         |           |
| Eliminating wildlife areas, national monuments, national parks, native american lands, DOD managed lands.  |  | Bad news   |   | Funding, maintenance, enforcement likely to decrease under State or private management.   |                         |           |
| Allowing wholesale sell of public lands to local government parties.   | Increased tax base if privatized. Unclear if State of County would retain proceeds from sale of the transferred lands. | Major loss of Multiple Use. Major increase in County costs for planning, infrastructure, management, and enforcement. County vulnerable to special interests of Major landowner. | State may share in sales revenue  | Increased costs and oversight.  |                         |           |
| Current Public Lands Acts adopted by certain counties.   | Already done to County requests.   | County already has 48,000?? Acres available.   | Good for other Counties: increased tax base; termination of Wilderness study areas. | Increased management and operation costs.   |                         |           |
| Current Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act SNPLMA in place now.   |  | Probably lost or diluted under State control   |   |   |                         |           |
| Currently executed and upholding Right of Ways permits, unpatented and patented mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing permits, etc on public lands. | Unclear how County would share in these under transfer   |  | State would likely receive a larger proportion of revenues.                         | Increase cost of management, enforcement, and accounting.                                 |                         |           |
| Cost associated with land transfers, federal land patents, surveys, etc.   |  | Will State require County to do or pay for some of this. Lands sold in County.   |   | BLM often requires cost recovery, if they have to do it. Depends on transfer legislation. |                         |           |
| PILT, Net Proceeds of Mines, and public land use royalties paid to local municipalities.   |  | PILT lost. Unknown if State would continue sharing others.   |   | Federal payments unlikely to continue.  |                         |           |

| Nevada Public Lands Task Force  | Comments From: White Pine County #3                                |  |  |   |                         |           |
|---|--|--|--|---|-------------------------|-----------|
|   | County Position  |  | State Position   |   | Federal Agency Position |           |
| Issue to Analyze:   | Benefit  | Detriment  | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to the State.  |  | State likely to defer to amount of sales revenue over wishes of County.      | Probably the State's best source of revenue.                         | Limited resource of attractive lands for urban expansion. |                         |           |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to local municipalities.   | Would be nice  | County still faced with planning, infrastructure, management, and operation. |  |   |                         |           |
| Firefighting costs to manage the lands.   |  |  |  | Probable contract with BLM. Firefighting is expensive.    |                         |           |
| Maintenance and enhancement of recreational parks and trails.   |  |  |  | Additional expense with little income.                    |                         |           |
| Continued economic activities such as mining, grazing, and energy production.                             |  |  | State would likely reinstate the mining claim rental fees.<br>Benefi |   |                         |           |
| State of Nevada held 4 million acres in Trust for Schools.  |  |  |  | Not a factor. Only 3,000 acres remain unsold in Trust.    |                         |           |
| Do public lands belong to the people of the United States or the State of Nevada.                         | People of the US.  |  |  |   |                         |           |
| Federal boots on the ground compared to state or local government administrative positions behind a desk. |  |  |  | Increased staffing and training                           |                         |           |
| The Endangered Species Act remains in place regardless of land transfer.                                  | No change.   | No change.   | No change.   | No change.  |                         |           |
| Managed wild fire burns to implement fuel reduction initiatives.  |  |  |  | Less likely   |                         |           |
| Managing wild horse populations per Codes of Federal Regulations.   | Improvements would have to be a separate Congressional action.     |  |  |   |                         |           |
| reintroduction into are if animal numbers become reduced.   |  |  |  | Costly  |                         |           |
| Costs related to paying to hunt on private lands compared to paying to hunt on public lands.              | Good for the new land owner. More revenues generated within County | Hunting areas decreased without extra fee.                                   |  |   |                         |           |

| Nevada Public Lands Task Force   | Comments From: White Pine County #3                              |   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
|--|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
|  | County Position  |   | State Position       |                                      | Federal Agency Position |           |
| Issue to Analyze:  | Benefit  | Detriment   | Benefit              | Detriment                            | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Wholesale sale of large tracts of land to private parties.   | Increased acres taxed.   | Low tax rate for undeveloped rural lands. Increased need for County services. Fire protection? Use of land may not be desirable or beneficial to County. Need prior planning. |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Funding not available with State holding onto public lands.  |  |   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| How to address railroad checker board land ownership.  |  |   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Large amounts of State controlled land sold to help balance State budgets.   |  | see 41  |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Is the State currently financially sound to manage public lands?   |  |   |                      | no?                                  |                         |           |
| Has the State demonstrated the capacity and willingness to manage public lands?  |  |   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| How will invasive species be handled? Insects, reptiles, mammals, etc.   | Will likely concentrate on agricultural grounds.                 | Increased cost to landowners.   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Land conservation being a high priority for the State or Local Government.   |  |   |                      | Low priority except in popular area. |                         |           |
| Will the local governments have the same issues working with the State as they do now working with the federal agencies? |  | Absolutely.   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Identifying specific lands wanted by local governments.  | Done   |   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Public Land Bills that exist that have identified public land transfers already.   | Yes. With flexibility to add more.                               |   |                      |                                      |                         |           |
| Would the timeframe to identify a parcel and have it available for sale improve?   | BLM could improve with through higher priorities set by Congress |   | Depends on staffing. |                                      |                         |           |

|  |  |                  |                       |  |                                |                  |
|--|--|------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Nevada Public Lands Task Force</b>  | <b>Comments From:</b> White Pine County #3 |                  |                       |  |                                |                  |
|  | <b>County Position</b>                     |                  | <b>State Position</b> |  | <b>Federal Agency Position</b> |                  |
| <b>Issue to Analyze:</b>   | <b>Benefit</b>                             | <b>Detriment</b> | <b>Benefit</b>        | <b>Detriment</b>   | <b>Benefit</b>                 | <b>Detriment</b> |
| Native American Concerns:<br>How would the State manage the non-Reservation lands that |  |                  |                       |  |                                |                  |
|  |  |                  |                       | Low priority. Land sales or ground disturbing projects may be controversial. |                                |                  |

**comments from perspective of  
land being transferred to the White Pine  
State of Nevada County #4**

**Nevada Public Lands Task Force**

| Issue to Analyze:  | County Position   |  | State Position |           | Federal Agency Position |           |
|--|---|--|----------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
|  | Comment   |  | Benefit        | Detriment | Benefit                 | Detriment |
| Federal lands continue to be managed by Federal Agencies.  | no benefit to the county given policy trends                      |  |                |           | none                    |           |
| Federal lands be managed by the State.   | significant County input would be important                       |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Federal lands be managed by the County.  | significant County input would be important                       |  |                |           |                         |           |
| NEPA processes in place per US Congress.   | none  |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Western Watershed Project and Sierra Club present and future lawsuits against proposed land use. | Less likely as taxpayers won't pay for their lawsuits. (EAJA)     |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Access to public lands   | Better access with more local control                             |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Job position currently in place to manage natural resources.                                     | State of Nevada has agencies in place. Need to expand some        |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Funding required to manage natural resources.  | Economic growth and some user fee increases would pay for funding |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Investing and protecting natural resources.  | State mechanisms in place   |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Taking care of Sage Grouse habitats and other wildlife species identified or listed.             | State mechanisms in place   |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Continuing the extraordinary wealth of scenery, experience and wildlife.                         | State mechanisms in place   |  |                |           |                         |           |
| Continuation of eco-tourism dollars into the communities.  | State mechanisms in place   |  |                |           |                         |           |

|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Wildlife viewing and learning opportunities.   | State mechanisms in place   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emigrant trails as historical landmarks being enjoyed.   | State mechanisms in place   |  |  |  |  |  |
| National Conservation Lands Plan and what it protects.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Freedom to hunt and trap on public lands with conditions (tags, etc.)  | Much more likely with local control                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large acres of land being designated to habitat issues that limit land access and economic development.  | locals more likely to understand needs                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eliminating wildlife areas, national monuments, national parks, native american lands, DOD managed lands.  | NA  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allowing wholesale sell of public lands to local government parties.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Public Lands Acts adopted by certain counties.   | Still law   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act SNPLMA in place now.   | Proof that national taxpayer wouldn't mind transfer of land to Nevada |  |  |  |  |  |
| Currently executed and upholding Right of Ways permits, unpatented and patented mining rights, oil and gas leases, grazing permits, etc on public lands. | All rights would be honored   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost associated with land transfers, federal land patents, surveys, etc.   | gathered through fees   |  |  |  |  |  |

|   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| PILT, Net Proceeds of Mines, and public land use royalties paid to local municipalities.                  | pilt should continue for a time to make up for century plus of economic limits  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to the State.  | yes   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Possible new land sales revenue provided to local municipalities.   | yes   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Firefighting costs to manage the lands.   | different management policies   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance and enhancement of recreational parks and trails.   | State mechanisms in place   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Continued economic activities such as mining, grazing, and energy production.                             | yes   |  |  |  |  |  |
| State of Nevada held 4 million acres in Trust for Schools.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do public lands belong to the people of the United States or the State of Nevada.                         | Long term absence of national outcry over federal lands sold to benefit Nevada ( SNPLMA) suggests that the land belongs to Nevada and national population wouldn't mind land transfer |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal boots on the ground compared to state or local government administrative positions behind a desk. |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Endangered Species Act remains in place regardless of land transfer.                                  | Wouldn't change   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manged wild fire burns to implement fuel reduction initiatives.   | good idea   |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Managing wild horse populations per Codes of Federal Regulations.  | land transfer wouldn't change responsibility  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large wildlife management and reintroduction into are if animal numbers become reduced.                                  | Wildlife management currently the State of Nevada responsibility                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Costs related to paying to hunt on private lands compared to paying to hunt on public lands.                             |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholesale sale of large tracts of land to private parties.   | Many land user interests would be considered and protected before this would happen |  |  |  |  |  |
| Funding not available with State holding onto public lands.  | economic opportunity and user fees would make funding                               |  |  |  |  |  |
| How to address railroad checkboard land ownership.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large amounts of State controlled land sold to help balance State budgets.   | Fiscal restraint necessary for the success of any public or private enterprise.     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is the State currently financially sound to manage public lands?   | yes   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Has the State demonstrated the capacity and willingness to manage public lands?  | yes, This process   |  |  |  |  |  |
| How will invasive species be handled? Insects, reptiles, mammals, etc.   | Quicker due to less regulation  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land conservation being a high priority for the State or Local Government.   | yes   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Will the local governments have the same issues working with the State as they do now working with the federal agencies? | some  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |                            |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Identifying specific lands wanted by local governments.                          | easier under local control |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Land Bills that exist that have identified public land transfers already. | yes                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Would the timeframe to identify a parcel and have it available for sale improve? | yes                        |  |  |  |  |  |