

Resolution No. _____

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, ESMERALDA COUNTY,
NEVADA IN OPPOSITION TO A COUNTY LANDS BILL THAT REQUIRES
WILDERNESS DESIGNATION

WHEREAS, the citizens of Esmeralda County and the Esmeralda County Board of Commissioners do not feel that compromise is necessary in order to have good legislation, and that good legislation results when our representatives listen to the voice and interests of the majority of the citizens they were elected to represent, not the voice of special interest groups that represent an elite few with unreasonable and untenable demands; and

WHEREAS, the Esmeralda County Board of Commissioners adopted Resolution No. 08-R-04 on April 1, 2008, opposing any further wilderness or roadless area to be designated without the express approval of the citizens and local government; and

WHEREAS, 97% of Esmeralda County consists of Federally Managed Lands which already compromises growth and economic opportunities through mineral and alternative energy resource development, the said federal public lands have already been designated as wilderness study areas that allow no access at all; and

WHEREAS, the majority of the citizens of Esmeralda County oppose any new wilderness designation without multiple use so that we can continue to enjoy the use of the land along with a host of visitors from other areas, including future economic opportunities that may be derived from the land; and

WHEREAS, the negative impacts to the county and its citizens, as listed below, far outweigh the possible benefit that a county lands bill that includes vast amounts of Congressionally designated "Wilderness Areas" will bring.

1. That we do not believe "Cherry stem" roads adjacent to Wilderness will be guaranteed and could be removed on a whim by Interior Management thus denying open access for multiple use that we so highly prize, citing our prior problems with RS2477 roads (also guaranteed by Congress).
2. That the primary purpose of the proposed bill seemingly was not to solve our problems, but instead was intended to create vast amounts of wilderness that would only benefit special interest groups and not the majority of the general population.
3. That the economic benefits from future mining, alternative energy production, etc., which we are being asked to forego by the inclusion of the proposed wilderness areas, far outweigh the small positive economic effect of what has been suggested as a plus for a bill.

4. That we have certain ethical problems with, and objections to, taking money from a fund that is based on overdevelopment in Clark County which in turn drives their need to import water from other counties.
5. That giving a special interest group equal or superior standing over a county and its citizens in the authoring of a bill is not acceptable, especially when it ignores the best interests of the county, its citizens and the public at large.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the citizens of Esmeralda County and the Esmeralda County Board of Commissioners do not support going forward with a county lands bill with the requirement of wilderness designation.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all existing Wilderness Study Areas (WSA) within Esmeralda not suitable for Wilderness should be released.

Adopted this ____ day of June, 2008

William Kirby, Chairman

R. J. Gillum, Vice Chairman

Nancy Boland, Member

Attest: _____
Clerk of the Board