

Chimney Road Recreational Access Project

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0026-EA

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District
Sierra Front Field Office
5665 Morgan Mill Road
Carson City, NV 89701
775-885-6000

December 2013



It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0026-EA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose and Need.....	1
1.2 Scoping and Issues Identification.....	1
1.3 Land Use Plan Conformance Statement.....	2
1.4 Decision To Be Made.....	2
1.5 Relationship Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans	2
2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES.....	3
2.1 Alternative A: Proposed Action	3
2.2 Alternative B: No Action	4
2.2 Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Evaluation	4
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT.....	5
3.1 Setting.....	5
3.1.1 Resources Considered for Analysis	5
3.1.2 Resources or Uses Other Than Supplemental Authorities	6
3.2 Recreation.....	7
3.3 General Wildlife.....	7
3.4 Vegetation	7
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	8
4.1 Introduction	8
4.1.1 Types of Effects.....	8
4.2 Recreation.....	8
4.3 General Wildlife.....	8
4.4 Vegetation	9
5.0 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	10
6.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION	12
6.1 Public Review and Comment.....	12
6.2 Individuals, Tribes, Organizations and Agencies Consulted	12
6.2.1 Individuals	13

6.2.2	Tribes	15
6.2.3	Agencies	15
6.3	List of Preparers	15
7.0	REFERENCES	16

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Project Area
Figure 2	Site Map
Figure 3	Cumulative Effects Study Area
Figure 4	Photos

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Sierra Front Field Office is proposing, in coordination with the Great Basin Institute (GBI), Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space (County), and the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID), to construct and maintain the *Chimney Road Recreational Access Project* (Project) in Washoe County, Nevada (Figures 1 & 2). In order to evaluate this proposal, the BLM has prepared this final environmental assessment (EA) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Key elements of this Project include:

- Construct and maintain a ¼ acre recreational staging area (Figure 4);
- Install informational signage;
- Install directional signage on Chimney Road to the new recreational staging area; and
- Evaluate the need for all weather surfacing (gravel) from the end of the gravel on Chimney Drive to the new recreational staging area (approximately 1,250 feet).

The need for this Project is to provide the public with a safe and designated recreational staging area. In an effort to protect Sun Valley's drinking water and reduce impacts to Sun Valley Regional Park, the existing unapproved staging area adjacent to the SVGID water tanks on Chimney Road will no longer be available for recreational purposes in 2014 (Figure 4). This effort is being completed under a separate BLM/SVGID action. Without the construction of a new recreational staging area, users are likely to create new staging areas which would result in damage to resources.

1.1 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Project is for the BLM to authorize the construction and maintenance of the recreational staging area and install signage. The need for the Project is to meet the BLM's requirement to provide for a wide variety of recreational opportunities.

1.2 Scoping and Issues Identification

On May 20, 2013, the Project was evaluated by the BLM's interdisciplinary team. Issues that were raised during the review included:

- Are there BLM sensitive plant species in the Project area?
- Are there nesting raptors in the vicinity of the Project area?

On June 10, 2013, the BLM initiated a 30-day public scoping period. A news release was published issued on June 10, 2013. Articles on the Project were printed on *KTVN Channel 2* (web version) on June 10, 2013 and *This is Reno* on June 12, 2013. Letters were mailed to 318 residences in the vicinity of the Project area. Notification was also provided to the Nevada State Clearinghouse. On June 20, 2013 a workshop was held at the Sun Valley Neighborhood Center, in Sun Valley. A presentation on the Project was made by the BLM. Thirteen people attended the two-hour workshop. Representatives from the BLM, SVGID and County were available to answer questions. The BLM received seven written comments, one commentor proposed a new location for the staging area. The public scoping period closed on July 9, 2013. Outside of the

scoping period, the BLM received one comment submitted to the County concerning a nuisance ordinance.

1.3 Land Use Plan Conformance Statement

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (CRMP), May 2001, page REC-2, RMP Level Decisions, Desired Outcomes #1:

- “Provide a wide range of quality recreation opportunities on public lands under management by the Carson City Field Office [now known as the Carson City District Office].”

1.4 Decision To Be Made

The Authorized Officer would decide whether to authorize the construction and maintenance of a recreational staging area and associated signs on BLM-managed lands.

1.5 Relationship Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans

The Proposed Action and Alternatives are consistent with the following documents:

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976;
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;
- National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470f), implemented through the State Protocol Agreement between BLM Nevada and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office for Implementing the National Historic Preservation Act (2012) under the provisions of the National Programmatic Agreement between the BLM and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and
- Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments – EO 13175.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, the BLM, GBI, and SVGID would:

- Construct and maintain a ¼ acre recreational staging area;
- Install informational signage;
- Install directional signage on Chimney Road to the new recreational staging area; and
- When BLM funding becomes available, make improvements to Chimney Road by installing all weather surfacing (gravel) from the end of gravel on Chimney Drive to the new recreational staging area (approximately 1,250 feet).

The preferred location for the staging area was presented to the BLM by a member of the public during scoping in June 2013 (Figure 2).

Funding for materials such as signs would come from a Recreational Trails Program grant, an assistance program managed by the Federal Highway Administration to fund the States to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both non-motorized and motorized uses. Labor and equipment needed for construction would be in-kind services provided by SVGID.

Staging Area.

A staging area would be constructed to accommodate 12-15 vehicles or 6-8 vehicle and trailer combinations. The staging area would be designed in a circular pattern to allow for traffic flow and would occupy less than ¼ acre. Removal of trees would be minimized by the design of the staging area. Some vegetative cover including annual grasses (*Poaceae* sp.) and sagebrush (*Artemisia* sp.) may be removed. There would be ¼ acre of surface disturbance, but less than 1/6 acre of vegetative cover would be removed. Staging area construction would include the use of heavy equipment such as front end loader, bulldozer or grader. No soil fill materials would need to be imported; however, an all-weather surface such as a ¾ inch minus Type II road base may be used to stabilize the staging area, and to minimize opportunities for dust and soil erosion.

Signage.

A kiosk with regulatory, educational and directional signage would be installed and would be an important feature of the staging area. Along the paved and dirt portions of Chimney Road, directional signage would be installed. Any easement that may be necessary for the placement of signs along Chimney Road would be the responsibility of GBI to obtain.

Road Improvements.

No soil fill materials would need to be imported; however, the parent road tread material may need to be bladed to minimum BLM road standards then covered with an all-weather surface such as a ¾ inch minus Type II road base. The road base would stabilize the staging areas main access road to minimize opportunities for dust and soil erosion. Culverts and additional grading along the road shoulder may also be necessary.

Schedule.

Construction of the staging area would be expected to take approximately two weeks. Implementation of the Proposed Action may occur in the spring or summer of 2014. Road improvements are dependent on additional funding and would be completed in two to three days in late winter (January-February) to take advantage of soil moisture.

2.2 Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the construction and maintenance of the ¼ acre recreational staging area and associated signs. The need for the Project would not be met.

2.2 Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Evaluation

Option 1 and 2 Identified in Scoping.

During scoping, the BLM presented two locations under consideration for the new staging area (Figures 1 & 2). “Option 1” had been the BLM preferred location during scoping. This location was considered but was dismissed for the following reasons: 1) the site was closest to a residential area, there were concerns raised during scoping about noise and dust; and 2) the site was within 1,000 of occupied residents. Under Washoe County Ordinance No. 1426, Section 1, Part 50.224 (1) Unlawful acts, “It is unlawful to operate a motorcycle or an off-road vehicle on public or private land within 1,000 feet of any residence owned or occupied for another...” Although this is a Washoe County ordinance and not BLM regulation, the concern about the proximity of a staging area to residential neighborhood is warranted. “Option 2” had been considered but was dismissed for the following reason: 1) the access road to the site is in poor condition and would require major improvements.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Setting

The Project area is located within the urban interface of Sun Valley. The elevation in the Project area is approximately 5,100 above sea level (asl) (Figure 1). Major plant types in the Project area include annual grasses, sagebrush and pinyon-juniper trees (*Pinus monophylla-Juniperus osteosperma*).

3.1.1 Resources Considered for Analysis

Appendix 1 of BLM’s NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1) identifies supplemental authorities that are subject to requirements specified by statute or executive order and must be considered in all BLM environmental documents (BLM 2008). Table 1 lists the Supplemental Authorities and their status. Supplemental authorities that may be affected by the Proposed Action or Alternative are further described in this final EA.

Table 1. Supplemental Authorities*.

Resource	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
Air Quality	Y	N	The Project area is in a non-attainment area for pollutants. During construction activities there would be a negligible increase in particulates (dust), but this would not change the overall air quality of the Project area.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	N		Resource not present.
Cultural Resources	N		The Project area was previously subject to a Class III cultural resources inventory in 2008 as documented in CRR 3-2404. No cultural resources are present at, or in the vicinity of, the Project area.
Environmental Justice	N		Resource not present.
Farm Lands (prime or unique)	N		Resource not present.
Floodplains	N		Resource not present.
Invasive, Nonnative Species	Y	N	Best management practices would be incorporated into the project design to minimize potential spread of invasive, non-native species.
Migratory Birds	Y	N	The Project area is in the urban interface and is highly disturbed. Nesting in the Project vicinity is highly unlikely.
Native American Religious Concerns	N		On May 15, 2013 a letter was sent to the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC) with information on this Project. On August 15, 2013 the BLM met with RSIC and no issues of concern were raised.
Threatened or Endangered Species (animals)	N		Resource not present.
Threatened or Endangered Species (plants)	N		Resource not present.
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	N		Resource not present.
Water Quality (Surface/Ground)	N		Resource not present.

Wetlands/Riparian Zones	N		Resource not present.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	N		Resource not present.
Wilderness/WSA	N		Resource not present.

*See H-1790-1 (January 2008) Appendix 1 Supplemental Authorities to be Considered.

Supplemental Authorities determined to be Not Present or Present/Not Affected need not be carried forward or discussed further in the document.

Supplemental Authorities determined to be Present/May Be Affected may be carried forward in the document.

3.1.2 Resources or Uses Other Than Supplemental Authorities

BLM specialists have evaluated the potential impact of the Proposed Action or Alternative on these resources and documented their findings Table 2. Resources or uses that may be affected by the Proposed Action or Alternative are further described in this final EA (BLM 2008).

Table 2. Resources or Uses Other Than Supplemental Authorities.

Resource or Issue**	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
BLM Sensitive Species (animals)	Y	N	Based on a review of existing data, no active or historic nests for raptors occur within a three mile radius of the Project area. The Project area is in the urban interface and is highly disturbed. Nesting in the Project vicinity is highly unlikely. The Project area is not within greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>) preliminary general or priority habitat.
BLM Sensitive Species (plants)	N		Resource not present.
Fire Management/Vegetation	N		Resource not present.
Forest Resources	N		Resource not present.
General Wildlife	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Global Climate Change	Y	N	Although there is public and scientific debate about human-cause global climate change, no methodology currently exists to analyze to what extent the negligible contributions of greenhouse gases (GHG) from vehicle emissions would contribute to global climate change from the Proposed Action.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Y	N	Although under the alternatives there would be negligible contributions of GHG from vehicle emissions, no methodology exists to assess resource impacts within the Project area from such contributions of GHG.
Land Use Authorization	N		Resource not present.
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	N		Resource not present.
Livestock Grazing	Y	N	Although the Wedekind Grazing Allotment overlaps the Project area, the Allotment is in non-use due to the urbanization adjacent to public lands. Therefore this resource would not be affected.
Minerals	N		Resource not present.
Paleontological	N		Resource not present.
Recreation	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Socioeconomics	N		Resource not present.
Soils	Y	N	Best management practices would be incorporated into the Project to ensure that soil is not affected.
Travel Management	N		Resource not present.
Vegetation	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.

Visual Resources	Y	N	The Project area is within Visual Resource Management Class IV which allows major modification of the character of the landscape. The Project is consistent with Class IV.
Wild Horses and Burros	N		Resource not present.

***Resources or uses determined to be Not Present or Present/Not Affected need not be carried forward or discussed further in the document.*

Resources or uses determined to be Present/May Be Affected may be carried forward in the document.

3.2 Recreation

Chimney Drive is a paved residential street located off Sun Valley Boulevard that provides local motorized and non-motorized access to public lands in the area. The paved section of Chimney Drive terminates at the end of the residential area and proceeds in a northerly direction onto county and public lands. The road transitions to a gravel road based for about a ¼ mile before turning to dirt. The Chimney Drive access point provides road connectivity to Golden and Lemmon Valleys to the west and Hungry Valley to the north.

Chimney Drive access receives both motorized and non-motorized recreation uses from local communities. The access point is not known for drawing any regional, destination based recreationists to the area. Motorized uses primarily involve off-highway vehicle (OHV), 4X4 touring and sightseeing, and to a limited degree dirt-bike and all-terrain vehicle (i.e. quads) riding. A segment of motorized users use the area adjacent to the SVGID water tanks for parking and staging. A correlation exists between the public parking adjacent to the SVGID water tanks and vandalism to the SVGID water tanks (Figure 4).

Non-motorized uses typically include walking and targetshooting with limited mountain biking and equestrian opportunities. It is estimated that the Chimney Drive access point receives 6,000 recreation visits per year, with the highest percentage of the recreation use occurring in the spring and fall seasons.

3.3 General Wildlife

The Project area is highly disturbed and is within ¼ mile of a residential area. Targetshooting occurs frequently in the vicinity and the use of OHV's occurs year round. The Project area may be used infrequently by mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) for foraging. Small mammals and birds may periodically forage in the Project area. There are no records of raptor nests within a three mile radius of the site.

3.4 Vegetation

The Project area is a mixture of annual grasses, sparse shrub cover, and scattered pinyon-juniper trees (Figure 4). Vegetative cover also includes cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), an invasive plant species.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes and compares the environmental consequences predicted to result from implementing the Proposed Action or Alternative described in Chapter 2.0. The purpose of this chapter is to present the impact analysis of the alternatives and to disclose the impacts of the actions on affected resources by the Proposed Action or Alternative.

The potential consequences or impacts of each alternative are addressed in the same order of resource topics in Chapter 3.0. This parallel organization allows readers to compare existing resource conditions (Chapter 3.0) with potential impacts (Chapter 4.0).

4.1.1 Types of Effects

This chapter describes the potential direct, indirect, and residual effects to resources that may result from the Proposed Action or Alternatives, as well as identifies the potential monitoring needs associated with the specific resources. In this document, the word “adverse” is used in characterizing minor (non-significant) detrimental effects to a resource, and “negligible” is used in characterizing minor (non-significant) detrimental effects to a resource that are generally undetectable. “Beneficial” effects would have a positive effect on the resource. In this document, the terms “effect” and “impact” are used synonymously.

4.2 Recreation

Alternative A: Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would provide the public a designated recreational staging area with design features that improve resource protection, and public health and safety. The Proposed Action would reduce the risk of vandalism to the SVGID water tanks.

Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, a designated recreational staging area would not be built. Recreational users would continue to park and stage at their discretion, causing resource damage.

4.3 General Wildlife

Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, a recreational staging area would be constructed, causing temporary disturbance and displacement of wildlife for approximately two-weeks. Approximately ¼ acre of low quality habitat would be permanently removed by construction of the recreational staging area. Wildlife that may infrequently forage at the site would move into adjacent areas, a negligible effect.

Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no recreational staging area would be constructed. On-going impacts to wildlife habitat in the Project area would continue without the designated staging area, an negligible effect.

4.4 Vegetation

Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, approximately $\frac{1}{6}$ acre of vegetative cover would be permanently removed, a negligible effect. Removal of trees would be minimized by Project design. Plant species that occur in the Project area are common regionally.

Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no recreational staging area would be constructed. On-going impacts to vegetation in the Project area would continue without the designated staging area, a negligible effect.

5.0 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

A cumulative effect is defined under NEPA as “the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action, decision, or project when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other action”. “Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time” (40 CFR Part 1508.7). Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are analyzed to the extent that they are relevant and useful in analyzing whether the reasonably foreseeable effects of the Proposed Action or Alternative may have an additive and significant relationship to those effects.

Cumulative Effects Geographic Area.

The Cumulative Effects Study Area (CESA) (Figure 3) is a 5½ acre area that includes approximately 1,600 feet of Chimney Road and the new recreational staging area.

Timeframe for Effects Analysis.

Short-term cumulative effects would occur during Project implementation, expected to take two weeks. Long-term cumulative effects would occur after the recreational staging area is constructed and during the life-time of the staging area. Long-term cumulative effects would be for 10-years although the staging area would likely be maintained indefinitely.

Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.

Past and Present Actions.

Within the CESA, past actions include the BLM’s issuance of a right-of-way granting the SVGID authorization to construct and maintain residential water tanks and ancillary facilities. Construction of the water tanks included installation of underground utility lines along Chimney Road and cyclone fencing around the structures. In 2013 the BLM authorized the SVGID to extend the cyclone fencing to close off the unapproved recreational staging that had developed after the installation of the water tanks. As a result of the parking, targetshooting and paintballing of the water tanks occurs, raising concerns about the safety of the public’s drinking water. The SVGID is expected to complete extension of the fencing in the spring or summer 2014.

Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.

Other than those actions described in the Proposed Action in Section 2.1, there are no reasonably foreseeable actions.

Effects Analysis.

Recreation

Under the Proposed Action a new recreational staging would be constructed, a beneficial effect. Under the No Action Alternative, no designated recreational staging area would be constructed. Recreationists would continue to stage at other locations, or at the SVGID water tank site.

General Wildlife

Under the Proposed Action, approximately ¼ acre of low quality wildlife habitat would be permanently removed, a cumulatively negligible effect. Under the No Action Alternative, no designated recreational staging area would be constructed. Although no effects would occur in the Project area because the designated recreational staging area would not be constructed, on-going recreational uses in the vicinity would continue to effect on wildlife and their associated habitats, a negligible cumulative.

Vegetation

Under the Proposed Action, approximately 1/6 acre of vegetative cover would be permanently removed, a negligible cumulative effect. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no effect to vegetation at the Project site, because a recreational staging area would not be constructed. On-going recreational uses that impact vegetation in the vicinity would be a negligible cumulative effect.

6.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6.1 Public Review and Comment

The draft EA had been made available to the public for review and comment for 15-days. Notification of this documents availability was made to 258 residents in the vicinity of the Project area. The comment period closed on December 2, 2013. The BLM received no substantive comments.

6.2 Individuals, Tribes, Organizations and Agencies Consulted

6.2.1 Individuals

Aboud, Michael
Aguilera, Erasmo
Allen, Fred
Allen, Grace
Allen, Margaret
Anderson, Marc
Anderson, Regina
Andrews, David
Armes, Glenda
Armstrong, Michelle
Arny, Paul
Auble, Charles
Avansino, Gary
Alavos, George
Azich, John
Backlund, Wayne
Bague, Juanita
Baker, Harold
Barboli, Ralph
Barlow, John
Barry, Valda
Bapst, David
Bates, Melinda
Beaman, Roger
Beers, Loretta
Begochea, Joseph
Bekker, Anthony
Bennett, Jerry
Bishop, Roger
Biswell, Roger
Boncela, Joe
Borges, Bruce
Borieo, June
Bourget, Judy
Brackett, William
Bragg, John
Bratcher, Randall
Brewster, Dorothy
Brown, Ronald
Burnett, Albertina
Byrne, William
Cannell, James
Carlton, William
Carsten, Albert & Loretta

Catello, Joseph
Caswell, Flora
Charlwood, Daniel
Choate, Roy
Clark, Amy
Clark, Deane
Clark, Tempe
Christensen, Cheri
Close, Steven
Cooney, Mata & Marie
Cooper, Ben
Conlin, Ronald
Conway, Adrian
Cortez, Maria
Crandall, Harold
Crawford, Carolyn
Creveling, William
Cronan, Frank
Croom, Fred
Cushing, Edmund
Cusick, Russell
Dalhstrom, Jaynie
Dallmann, Richard
Darling, David
Davis, Sharon
Dayes, Donald
Deering, William
Deming, Larry
Derby, William
Desnoy, Graeme
Diaz, Maria
Doan, Debra
Doty, Byron
Douglas, Earl
Drew, Judith
Duarte, Matthew
Dyer, Debra
Eccles, SF
Elliott, Garth
Ellis, Alta
Elwell, Russell
Entrekin, Louis
Epper, Paulette
Espinoza, Juan
Estabrook, Michael
Evans, Elaine

Felt, Kathleen
Forebush, Kay
Franklin, Ronald
Freeman, Robert
Garcia, Jose
Garcia, Paulino
Gee, Ruth
Gerhart, Louise
Gilliam, Jerre
Goade, Jayson
Gonzalez, Horacio
Gordo, Kenneth
Grider, Kathryn
Griff, Joseph
Grilli, Nicholas
Hacker, Alton
Hager, Susan
Hall, Michael
Halliburton, Royce
Harding, Renate
Harmon, Donald
Hatjopoulos, Despina
Hazen, Bobby
Henderson, William
Hernandez, Adrian
Hernandez, Bartola
Hernandez, Ruperto
Herrera-Hidalgo, Alonso
Hilton, David
Hoffman, Lisa
Holcomb, Richard
Holfcomb, Richard
Horman, Jack
Huerta, Juan
Huff, Elaine
Hughson, Ernest
Ileen, Keith
Isvik, Dale
Jackman, Richard
Jeleneiweiz, Henry
Jerpseth, Sara
Johnson, Joden-Jay
Johnson, Lyann
Johnson, Mary Ann
Kengla, Marisgaret
Kerr, Andrea

Klino, William
Knepper, Al & Katie
Krupp, Gregory
Laird, Owen
Larson, Lynette
Latour, Joseph
Lindsey, Kenneth
Lite, Patricia
Lopez, Edwin
MacDonald, Malcolm
Mann, Kate
Marquez-Moreno, Rodolfo
Martinez, Sylvia
McCall, Ronnie
McCarthy, James
McDonnell, Ronald
McDowell, Gary
McGuigan, Ronald
McMunn, Kelley
Merrill, Rebecca
Mihaescu, Gheorghe
Miller, John
Mitts, Louis
Mize, Ida
Monroe, Connie
Moody, Malcom
Morgan, David
Morgan, Theodore
Morse, Marcia
Moyer, Douglas
Mummert, Phillip
Munoz, Irma
Murphy, James
Murphy, Kevin
Murray, David
Myer, James
Napierski, Francis

Nava, Claudia
Nelson, Bill
Nelson, Kim
Oakes, Magdalena
Ohara, Michael
Onesty, Leonard
Oppmann, Mitchell
Orozco, Pedro
Owns, Stanley
Palacios, Martha
Parry-Powell, Aline
Parsons, Harry
Perez, Victor
Perwein, Roger
Petersdorf, Melvina
Peterson, Daniel
Phelps, Herman
Pizzuto, Dorothy
Price, Donald
Pringle, David
Prohaska, Keith
Rakaczky, Andrew
Ramirez, Raul
Reistetter, Agnes
Rettagliata, Andrew
Reyes, Jorge
Reynolds, Gayle
Richards, Steven
Riley, Joseph
Rosebush, Jerry
Ross, Charles
Rossi, Rudy
Rutherford, Gary
Ryan, Alice
Sanderson, Vancil
Sandau, Ronald
Sargent, Richard

Schenfeld, Charles
Schwab, Lance
Severt, Susan
Sharp, Mary
Shaw, Ike
Shumway, David
Sikorski, Joseph
Smith, Kathleen
Spence, Andrew
Stone, Nancy
Stover, Raymond
Stuart, James
Stull, David
Taelour, Francis
Tallent, Timothy
Taylor, Richard
Tompkins, Vallier
Thomas, Robert
Thurman, Matt
Turnbow, Keith
Vanleer, Pamela
Vargas, Baldomero
Verdugo, Timothy
Vieira, Wesley
Wadsworth, George
Walden, Jay
Walker, David
Walls, Glenda
Walsh, Robert
Weatherhead, Todd
Weitz, James
Wiley, Harry
Wilholt, Donald
Wood, James
Woodard, Donald
Woods, Suzy
Woodward, Lance

6.2.2 Tribes

Reno-Sparks Indian Colony

6.2.3 Agencies

Multiple State agencies through the Nevada State Clearinghouse

6.3 List of Preparers

BLM staff that contributed to this document.

Name	Resource
Brian Buttazoni	NEPA Compliance, Cumulative Effects
Rachel Crews	Cultural Resources, Native American Religious Concerns
Arthur Callan	Recreation, Travel Management

7.0 REFERENCES

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2001. *Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan*. U.S. Department of the Interior. Carson City, Nevada. May.

_____. 2008. *BLM National Environmental Policy Act Handbook (H-1790-1)*. U.S. Department of the Interior. January.