

Ludwig Mine Access Right-of-Way Project

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0012-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

November 2014



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-C020-2014-0012-EA

Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Background	2
1.2	Purpose and Need.....	2
1.3	Scoping and Issues Identification.....	2
1.4	Decision to be Made.....	3
1.5	Land Use Plan Conformance Statement.....	3
1.6	Relationships to Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans.....	3
2.0	ALTERNATIVES.....	4
2.1	Description of Alternatives	4
2.1.1	Alternative A: Proposed Action	4
2.1.1.2	Resource Commitments.....	5
2.1.1.3	Schedule.....	5
2.1.1.4	Maintenance.....	5
2.1.2	Alternative B: No Action	5
2.1.3	Alternative Considered but Dismissed from Further Analysis	5
3.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	6
3.1	Setting.....	6
3.1.1	Resources Considered for Analysis.....	6
3.2	Land and Realty	8
3.3	General Wildlife, Migratory Birds, BLM Sensitive Species (Animals)	9
3.4	Vegetation	9
3.5	Travel Management	9
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	10
4.1	Introduction	10
4.2	Land and Realty	10
4.3	General Wildlife, Migratory Birds, BLM Sensitive Species (Animals)	10
4.4	Vegetation	11
4.5	Travel Management	11
4.6	Residual Effects	11
5.0	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	12
6.0	CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION	14

6.1	Public Review and Comment.....	14
6.2	Individuals, Tribes, Organizations and Agencies Consulted	14
6.2.1	Individuals.....	14
6.2.2	Tribes.....	14
6.2.3	Organizations	14
6.3	List of Preparers	14
7.0	REFERENCES	15

List of Figures

[Note: maps are not embedded in this document in order to maintain a small file size, maps are available on the Project website. Look under the navigation pane for “Maps.”]

Figure 1	Vicinity Map
Figure 2	Project Area

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Table of BLM Sensitive Animals and Migratory Birds That May be Present of Their Habitat May be Present in the Project Area
Appendix B	Vegetation Observed in the Project Area

List of Attachments

Attachment A	Draft Plan of Development
Attachment B	Access and ROW Planning (A-1) Map
Attachment C	Access and ROW Planning (A-2) Map
Attachment D	Road Design Drawing

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Art Wilson Company proposes to develop a mine for the extraction and sale of gypsum, anhydrite, and limestone at the site of former Ludwig copper and gypsum mine, located in Lyon County, Nevada. The Proposed Action would connect two privately held parcels to allow material to be transported for processing and sale. The Ludwig Mine Access Haul Road (Project) would connect to Delphi Road on the west (Figure 1). In order to evaluate this Proposed Action, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this final environmental assessment (EA) to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and National Historic Preservation Act.

1.1 Background

The Art Wilson Company has need of a right-of-way (ROW) across public lands in order to connect two private parcels owned by it and allow access to Delphi Road. One of the private parcels includes an existing open pit mine which would be reactivated, with the mineral materials produced being moved in off-highway haul trucks across the ROW to the other private parcel. Materials would be processed there and shipped out via highway trucks via the haul road connection to the Delphi Road.

1.2 Purpose and Need

The BLM's need is to respond to the Art Wilson Company's SF-299 application to grant a ROW, submitted to the BLM's Sierra Front Field Office along with a draft POD in September 2014. The ROW grant would allow the construction, maintenance, and use of the Ludwig Mine Access Haul Road (Project) across public land administered by the BLM between the two privately-owned parcels near the historic Ludwig Mine.

The purpose of the Project is to: (1) provide a safe roadway that can accommodate oversized haul trucks; and (2) deliver material from the proposed mine to the processing facility, both located on private land.

The BLM must ensure that authorization of the Project avoids undue or unnecessary degradation of public land and has prepared this final EA as part of the decision-making process in consideration of the requested ROW. Based on this environmental documentation, the BLM would determine whether a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) can be signed or whether an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared for the Project. Through this process, BLM would meet obligations under the NEPA, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), and other Public Land Acts.

1.3 Scoping and Issues Identification

On January 27, 2014 this Project was considered during an interdisciplinary team meeting. On February 6, 2014 BLM staff attended a site visit. Issues discussed included:

- Are there existing alternative routes available to access the private lands?
- How would the mine access road affect a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) event?

On July 30, 2014 the BLM provided an overview of this Project to the Yerington Paiute Tribe council meeting. On August 19, 2014 the BLM sent a letter and map to the Yerington Paiute

Tribe to inform them of this Project. No issues have been identified to date. Coordination with the Yerington Paiute Tribe is on-going.

1.4 Decision to be Made

The BLM has received an application for a ROW and draft POD from the Art Wilson Company. The Authorized Officer would decide whether to grant or deny the ROW, and whether to add terms and conditions (stipulations).

1.5 Land Use Plan Conformance Statement

The Project is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (CRMP) (2001). The applicable section of the CRMP includes LND 7 #6:

- “Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates that are beneficial to the public.”

1.6 Relationships to Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans

The Project is in compliance with the following:

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;
- Federal Land Management Policy Act of 1976;
- National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f); and
- Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments (E.O. 13175).

2.0 ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Description of Alternatives

2.1.1 Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, the Art Wilson Company would construct and maintain a cut-and-fill earthen haul road with all-weather surface across two private parcels and a portion of public land managed by the BLM. One private parcel would contain an open-pit mine, while the other would allow access to Delphi Road in northeastern Smith Valley, Lyon County, Nevada (Figure 1).

The Project area is approximately 4,098 feet in length by 200 feet in width (approximately 18.8 acres). The Project area terminates at Delphi Road to the west and the eastern extent of the proposed ROW on public lands (Figure 2). Although the Project area consists of a mine access haul road across private and public lands, the BLM decision-making authority for a ROW is limited to public lands.

The road would be constructed within a 200-foot wide ROW on public land, and would consist of two 30-foot wide traffic lanes with additional cut-and-fill disturbance and Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA)-compliant safety berms for a total maximum width of disturbance of 90 feet. Total ROW length on BLM-managed land would be approximately 400 feet. A culvert and drainage blading would be included as required. The ROW would be for exclusive use for haul-through purposes by the Art Wilson Company. The total area of the ROW on public land would be approximately 1.6 acres. The ROW could be issued by the BLM for up to 30-years.

A minimum 4-strand wire fence to BLM Antelope Type B standards with warning signs posted at 100-foot intervals along the ROW boundaries would also be built along the perimeter of the ROW on public land and would connect into the existing fencing on private land. Approximately 800 feet of fencing would be constructed on public land.

The primary traffic on the mine access haul road would be open bed semi-trucks and 50 ton haul trucks. Mine support vehicles would include water trucks, heavy equipment, pickup trucks. Overall traffic volume is expected to be less than 125 truck roundtrips per day.

2.1.1.1 Method of Construction

A cut-and fill earthen haul road with all-weather surface would be constructed. The Proposed Action is to construct, maintain, and terminate an access/haul road across public and private land and between two private parcels. One private parcel contains an open pit mine, with a primary resource of gypsum and anhydrite and a secondary resource of high grade marble. The other private parcel allows access to Delphi Road in northeastern Smith Valley.

Access road earthwork would consist of approximately 2,700 cubic yards of cut, and 3,800 cubic yards of fill, net 1,100 cubic yards imported from the easterly adjacent private parcel. At 1.5 tons per cubic yard, the import would be about 50 CAT 735B 36-ton haul truckloads of colluvium, including at least three truckloads of select all-weather gravel surfacing material.

One grader [Champion 740A or equivalent] would be utilized to construct the grade and cross slope for road improvements. One 4,000 gallon water truck would be utilized to control dust during construction. One loader [Cat 966 or equivalent] and one dozer [Cat D-7 or equivalent] might supplement this equipment. A CS563E vibratory roller or equivalent would be used to compact fill. Articulated haul trucks [Cat 735B] would be used to import material. Work would be carried out by three to four MSHA-trained and task-trained personnel. Vehicles would include the heavy equipment described in part A, and associated fuel/service trucks and pickup trucks.

Work would commence from a single-lane equipment access within private land. A safe 90 degree intersection, including signage, would be constructed at Delphi Road. Heavy equipment clearing and grubbing would occur the within proposed disturbance limits. Cut from weak rock or colluvium ridge within the ROW would be performed to fill the shallow valley within the ROW. Material would be imported, segregating general fill (moisture conditioned and compacted), slope armoring (small rip-rap ~D50=4”), and gravel all-weather surfacing within the ROW proposed disturbance limits.

2.1.1.2 Resource Commitments

Dust would be controlled by watering during the construction phase. To reduce the potential for the introduction of weeds, equipment would be inspected to ensure that it is free of caked dirt and debris prior to being brought onsite.

2.1.1.3 Schedule:

The construction of the haul road would take approximately three weeks and would begin upon approval of the ROW. Weather conditions may delay this, however. No construction is anticipated during migratory bird nesting season (April 15 to June 15). If construction was required at that time, a migratory nesting bird survey would be conducted immediately prior to initiation of construction. Construction would not occur during any period in which weather forecasts or local observations predict rainfall in excess of 0.25 inches within a 24-hour period.

2.1.1.4 Maintenance:

The haul road would be maintained by the Art Wilson Company. Dust suppression would be ongoing by means of water application by truck as required.

2.1.2 Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the ROW. The result that the Project would not be authorized would mean the applicant would need to seek an alternative means to access their privately-owned lands. This alternative would not meet the purpose and need described in Section 1.2.

2.1.3 Alternative Considered but Dismissed from Further Analysis

Improve an Existing Road. The BLM and applicant considered the use of an existing road that connects Delphi Road to the Ludwig claim area. To meet MSHA requirements, the road would require substantial improvements (widening, construction of berms etc.). This alternative was dismissed because of the occurrence of sensitive resources that would likely be adversely affected by these improvements.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This chapter identifies and describes the current condition and trend of elements or resources in the human environment which may be affected by the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action. The Affected Environment is the same for all alternatives.

3.1 Setting

The Project area is located on the west side of the Singatse Range at 5,000 feet in elevation, approximately six air miles southwest of Yerington. The vegetation is a typical upland salt desert shrub community with relatively few grasses and forbs, and no noxious weeds.

3.1.1 Resources Considered for Analysis

The BLM is required to address specific elements of the environment that are subject to requirements in statute or regulation or by executive order (BLM 2008). Table 1 lists the elements that must be addressed in all environmental analysis and indicates whether the Proposed Action and Alternatives affect those elements. Other resources of the human environment that have been considered for analysis are listed in Table 2.

Table 1. Supplemental Authorities*.

Resource	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
Air Quality	Y	N	The Project area is located within an attainment air basin. Although the Proposed Action would create emissions from vehicles and equipment, and fugitive dust from use of roads, the amount emitted would not result in a change to the air basin status and best management practices would be implemented to limit fugitive dust.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	N		Resource not present.
Cultural Resources	Y	N	The Proposed Action would have no effect on sites eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (CRR 3-2689).
Environmental Justice	N		Resource not present.
Farm Lands (prime or unique)	N		Resource not present.
Floodplains	N		Resource not present
Invasive, Non-Native Plant Species	Y	N	Cheatgrass (<i>Bromus tectorum</i>) is present in the Project area. Noxious weeds are not known to occur in the Project area.
Migratory Birds	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Native American Religious Concerns	N		The BLM is coordinating with the Yerington Paiute Tribe on the Proposed Action. To date no religious concerns have been identified.
Threatened or Endangered Species (animals)	N		Resource not present.
Threatened or Endangered Species (plants)	N		Resource not present.
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	Y	N	Best management practices would be implemented to minimize potential for spills from equipment or vehicles.
Water Quality (Surface/Ground)	Y	N	Although ephemeral streams are present, best management practices would be implemented to minimize potential impacts to surface water resources.
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 I 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.

Table 2. Resources or Uses Other Than Supplemental Authorities.

Resource or Issue**	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
BLM Sensitive Species (animals)	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
BLM Sensitive Species (plants)	N		Resource not present.
Fire Management	Y	N	Access into the Project area during wildfire suppression activities would not be affected by the Project.
Forest Resources	Y	N	The Project would not affect the availability of forest products such as firewood for personal use on public lands.
General Wildlife	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Global Climate Change	Y	N	Although there is public and scientific debate about human-caused global climate change, no methodology currently exists to analyze to what extent the negligible contributions of greenhouse gases (GHG) would contribute to climate change from implementation of the Proposed Action.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Y	N	Although under the Proposed Action there would be negligible contribution of GHG from vehicle/equipment emissions, no methodology exists to assess resource impacts within the Project area from such contributions of GHG.
Land and Realty	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	N		Pursuant to Sections 101, 201 and 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, GIS spatial imagery was reviewed by the BLM. No LWCs were identified within the Project area.
Livestock Grazing	Y	N	The Project area is in the Hudson Hills Grazing Allotment; the Proposed Action would not affect grazing operations on public lands.
Minerals	N		Resource not present.
Paleontological	N		Resource not present.
Recreation	Y	N	Although dispersed recreation is present in the Project area, none of the alternatives would affect recreational activities on public lands.
Socioeconomics	N		Resource not present.
Soils	Y	N	Best management practices would be implemented to minimize potential for increased soil erosion from the Proposed Action.
Travel Management	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Vegetation	Y	Y	Carried forward for analysis.
Visual Resources	Y	N	The Project area is within Visual Resource Management Class III, which allow for moderate changes to the visual character of the project area. This Proposed Action is consistent with VRM Class III.
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 Land and Realty

The public lands involved in the Proposed Action are available for ROWs. There are no existing ROWs on the public lands within the Project area.

3.3 General Wildlife, Migratory Birds, BLM Sensitive Species (Animals)

The fauna of the Project area consists of small mammals (black-tailed jack rabbit [*Lepus californicus*], ground squirrels), and large mammals including coyotes (*Canis latrans*), bobcats (*Lynx rufus*), pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana*) and mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), (although no sign of these has been noted), various reptiles (snake and lizard species), and migratory birds (mostly ground nesting species). There is no suitable raptor nesting habitat (outcrops, cliffs, or trees) within the Project area. There is potential burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) habitat, although no burrowing owls or burrows have been observed.

Based on a review of existing data, there are no known active raptor nests within a five mile radius of the Project area. The Project area does not include preliminary general or preliminary priority habitat for the greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) and this species is not discussed any further. The BLM and Nevada Department of Wildlife have not documented pygmy rabbit (*Brachylagus idahoensis*) habitat or their occurrence in the Project area. According to the Nevada Natural Heritage Program, the Project area is not within the range of this species (NNHP 2001), and there are no records for or known occurrences of pygmy rabbit within Lyon County (FWS 2010). This species is not discussed any further.

A list of BLM Sensitive Animals and Migratory Birds That May be Present or Their Habitat May be Present in the Project area can be found in Appendix A.

3.4 Vegetation

The Project area lies on alluvial fan remnants which deposit into the Smith Valley. Floristically, the site can be characterized by shadscale desert scrub, which is typical of the Great Basin. The dominant shrub species onsite include shadscale (*Atriplex confertifolia*), four-wing salt bush (*A. canescens*) and desert pepperweed (*Lepidium fremontii*). Forbs and grasses are also present on site, however trees are absent. Plant species observed during a site visit on May 7, 2014 are listed in Appendix B.

3.5 Travel Management

The vicinity of the Project area is used by the public for dispersed recreation, including hiking, camping, rock hounding, prospecting and hunting. A number of roads and single and two-track trails provide access to public and private lands in the area. A competitive motorcycle race event under a BLM Special Recreation Permit occurs in the Project area.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 Introduction

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 terms “effect” and “impact” are used synonymously. In this document the term “beneficial effect” refers to a positive effect on a resource. The terms “adverse” and “negligible” refer to detrimental effects to a resource.

4.2 Land and Realty

Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, the BLM would authorize the ROW. The Art Wilson Company would construct and maintain an exclusive use haul road across public lands to connect their privately-owned lands on the east and Delphi Road on the west. Fencing along the perimeter of the ROW would also be constructed and maintained. Upon the expiration of the ROW, the road and fencing would be removed and the public land reclaimed.

Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the ROW. Although there would be no impacts because the ROW would not be approved, other uses in the Project area would continue on public and private lands.

4.3 General Wildlife, Migratory Birds, BLM Sensitive Species (Animals)

Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, construction activities would temporarily disturb and displace wildlife for less than one month. Less than one acre of low quality habitat would be permanently removed by the construction of the haul road. Wildlife that may infrequently forage at the site would move into adjacent areas, a negligible effect.

Road construction would be timed to avoid the migratory bird season (April 15 – June 15). If this is not feasible, the Project area including a 300-foot buffer would be surveyed by a qualified biologist to identify any nests. Surveys would be conducted a maximum of two weeks prior to disturbance and would then be adequate for a maximum of 14 days. Additional surveys would need to be done after 14 days if road construction has not been initiated. If a nest(s) are found, road construction would not occur until after young birds have fledged or nests are abandoned unless a 300-foot buffer could be provided around nest(s). In any case, there would be a negligible effect on migratory birds.

The proposed haul road would be fenced at the outer margin of the berm with a wire fence constructed to BLM Antelope Type B specifications, to allow passage of wildlife through the Project Area. This fence would be only on the public land portion of the proposed ROW, and would adjoin the existing fences on private lands to the east and west of the public land portion. There is a low potential for collisions with wildlife by motorized vehicles and equipment. The speed on the mine access road would be limited to no more than 20 miles per hour.

Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction on public lands because the ROW would not be authorized, and thus no impacts to migratory birds or other wildlife. Other uses on public and private lands in the Project area would continue and would potentially impact wildlife.

4.4 Vegetation

Alternative A: Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, approximately 8.4 acres of vegetation would be removed (0.8 acres on public land), a negligible effect. The vegetation type is common regionally. Cut and fill slopes, berms, and associated disturbed areas would be seeded with a BLM-approved seed mix as soon as possible after disturbance.

Following cessation of the ROW, the proposed haul road would be reclaimed with a BLM-approved mixture of native species common to the Project area.

Alternative B: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction on public lands because the ROW would not be authorized, and thus no impact to vegetation. Other uses on public and private lands in the Project area may continue to impact vegetation from motorized vehicle or equipment use.

4.5 Travel Management

Alternative A: Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would have negligible impact to access to public lands in the vicinity. While the private lands have been fenced and would be gated, there are sufficient alternative access routes available for the public to access public lands. There is an existing SRP which uses routes in Project area for the annual Valley Off-Road Racing Association (VORRA) competitive motorcycle race event. The Project proponent would coordinate with the organizers of the event to permit the event to continue to cross their private lands.

Alternative B: No Action

Under this alternative there would be no construction on public lands because the ROW would not be authorized, and thus no impact to access to public lands in the Project area. Activities on private lands, not subject to BLM decision-making, would limit recreational activities to public lands. Users would need to find alternative routes to bypass private lands that are fenced, an adverse effect.

4.6 Residual Effects

“Residual effects” are those adverse effects that remain after implementation of mitigation measures. No major adverse effects (“significant” per 43 CFR 1508.27) have been identified in this final EA that warrant mitigation. Measures have been incorporated into the elements of the Proposed Action to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects. No mitigation after implementation of these measures is required, there would be no residual effects.

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 and/or Alternatives may have an additive and significant relationship to those effects.

Cumulative Effects Geographic Area.

The cumulative effects area (CESA) is the Project area, approximately 18.8 acres that includes the public and private land portions of the haul road (Figure 2).

Timeframe for Effects Analysis.

Short-term cumulative effects would occur during Project implementation, expected to take less than one month. Long-term cumulative effects would occur after the construction of the haul road and during the lifetime of the haul road. Although the BLM could issue the ROW for up to 30 years, the timeframe considered in this analysis is for 10-years.

Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.

Past and Present Actions.

Past and present actions in the CESA include dispersed recreation. The Project area is crossed by several roads, and recreationists have in the past accessed the Ludwig Mine area, located on private lands. Use is generally low in intensity and dispersed. VORRA conducts an annual competitive motorcycle race using roads in the CESA. The CESA is a part of the Hudson Hills Grazing Allotment, permitted by the BLM. The type of use is cattle and sheep. The BLM does not have permitting responsibility for the non-public lands in the CESA. There is an existing overhead transmission line (owned by Sierra Pacific Power Company) that crosses through the private land portion of the CESA.

Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.

There are no requests before the BLM for ROW authorizations. The VORRA event occurs under BLM permitting and is a multi-year permit. These annual events are anticipated to continue to occur in the future. Recreational activities are anticipated to continue to occur in the future, at existing low and dispersed intensity.

Effects Analysis.

Land and Realty

There are no existing ROWs in the CESA. Under the Proposed Action the ROW would be granted, a beneficial cumulative effect. Under the No Action Alternative, the ROW would not be granted and the applicant would be required to locate alternative means to access their private lands, an adverse cumulative effect.

General Wildlife, Migratory Birds, BLM Sensitive Species (Animals)

Under the Proposed Action, 8.4 acres (0.8 acres on public lands) of habitat would be removed for the life of the haul road, a negligible cumulative effect. Migratory birds and general wildlife would be displaced during that time but would find equivalent habitat nearby, a negligible cumulative effect. There is an increased potential for wildlife collisions with motorized vehicles, but that would be minimized with low speed limits, a negligible cumulative effect. At the end of the life of the ROW, the public lands would be reclaimed.

Under the No Action Alternative, there be no effects to public lands because the ROW would not be authorized, although ongoing recreational uses on existing routes would continue, a negligible cumulative effect.

Vegetation

Under the Proposed Action, 8.4 acres (0.8 acres on public lands) of upland salt desert shrub habitat would be removed for the life of the haul road, a negligible cumulative effect. This would be restored to a very similar native community at the end of life of the ROW on public lands.

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no effect to vegetation at the Project site because the road would not be built. Ongoing recreational uses impacting vegetation in the vicinity would continue, a negligible cumulative effect.

Travel Management

Under the Proposed Action there would be no adverse effect to travel in the vicinity of the Project as there is no viable access to the proposed ROW/haul road at this time. Adequate public access to adjacent public lands would not be adversely affected due to the abundance of alternative routes in the area. The proponent would continue to permit access to private lands as needed to ensure the continuance of the annual VORRA event. At the end of the life of the ROW, it would be restored to pre-construction contours and revegetated, a negligible effect.

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no effect to travel management because there would be no change to recreational access on public lands. However, the Art Wilson Company has installed fencing around both parcels and could gate the existing routes at any time, which would eliminate public access to private lands, a negligible cumulative effect.

6.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6.1 Public Review and Comment

The *Ludwig Mine Access Right-of-Way Draft Environmental Assessment* (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0012-EA) had been made available for public review from October 22 until November 5, 2014. A letter was sent to individuals on the project mailing list and this project was posted in ePlanning (a “NEPA Register”). The BLM did not receive any public comments.

6.2 Individuals, Tribes, Organizations and Agencies Consulted

The following individuals, organizations, Tribes and agencies were consulted during the preparation of this EA:

6.2.1 Individuals

Fred Fulstone
Stephen Fulstone

6.2.2 Tribes

Yerington Paiute Tribe

6.2.3 Organizations

Valley Off-Road Racing Association

6.3 List of Preparers

BLM staff that contributed to this document.

Name	Resource
Brian Buttazoni	Project Manager, NEPA Compliance
Perry Wickham	Lands and Realty
Rachel Crews	Cultural Resources and Native American Religious Concerns
Arthur Callan	Travel Management

Art Wilson Company staff or consultants that contributed to this document.

Name	Resource
Christopher Ross, Ph.D.	Project Manager, Vegetation, Wildlife, Cumulative Effects
Sara McBee	Vegetation and General Wildlife. Migratory Birds, BLM Sensitive Species.
Nathan Robison, P.E.	Road design and specifications, mapping.

7.0 REFERENCES

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

Fish and Wildlife (FWS) 2010. *Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: 12-Month Finding on a Petition to List the Pygmy Rabbit as Endangered or Threatened; Proposed Rule*. Federal Register notice October 28, 2013. Washington, D.C.

Nevada Natural Heritage Program 2001. *Pygmy Rabbit Fact Sheet*. Carson City, Nevada.

Appendix A - BLM Sensitive Animals and Migratory Birds

BLM Sensitive Animals and Migratory Birds That May be Present or Their Habitat May be Present in the Project Area.

Common Name	Scientific Name	BLM Sensitive	
		Species	BLM Migratory Bird
Big brown bat	<i>Eptesicus fuscus</i>	Y	-
Brazilian free-tailed bat	<i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i>	Y	-
Brewer's sparrow	<i>Spizella breweri</i>	Y	Y
Burrowing owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	Y	N
California myotis	<i>Myotis californicus</i>	Y	-
Dark kangaroo mouse	<i>Microdipodops megacephalus</i>	Y	-
Ferruginous hawk	<i>Buteo regalis</i>	Y	Y
Fringed myotis	<i>Myotis thysanodes</i>	Y	-
Golden eagle	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	Y	Y
Green-tailed towhee	<i>Pipilo chlorurus</i>	N	Y
Hoary bat	<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i>	Y	-
Loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	Y	Y
Long-eared myotis	<i>Myotis evotis</i>	Y	-
Long-legged myotis	<i>Myotis volans</i>	Y	-
Mourning dove	<i>Zenaida macroura</i>	N	Y
Pale kangaroo mouse	<i>Microdipodops pallidus</i>	Y	-
Pallid bat	<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	Y	-
Sage sparrow	<i>Amphispiza belli</i>	N	Y
Sage thrasher	<i>Oreoscoptes montanus</i>	Y	Y
Spotted bat	<i>Euderma maculatum</i>	Y	-
Swainson's hawk	<i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	Y	N
Townsend's big-eared bat	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	Y	-
Western pipistrelle bat	<i>Pipistrellus hesperus</i>	Y	-
Western small-footed myotis	<i>Myotis ciliolabrum</i>	Y	-
Yuma myotis	<i>Myotis yumanensis</i>	Y	-

Appendix B - Vegetation Observed in Project Area.

Shrubs and Subshrubs.

Common name	Scientific Name
Four-wing salt bush	<i>Atriplex canescens</i>
Shadscale	<i>Atriplex confertifolia</i>
Spiny menodora	<i>Menodora spinescens</i>
Upland greasewood	<i>Sarcobatus baileyi</i>
Rubber rabbitbrush	<i>Chrysothamnus nauseosus</i>
Green rabbitbrush	<i>Chrysothamnus viridis</i>
Snowberry	<i>Symphoricarpos oreophilus var. utahensis</i>
Desert pepperweed	<i>Lepidium fremontii</i>
Smooth horsebrush	<i>Tetradymia glabrata</i>
Budsage	<i>Artemisia spinescens</i>
Prince's plume	<i>Stanleya pinnata</i>
Spiny hopsage	<i>Grayia spinosa</i>

Forbs.

Desert globemallow	<i>Sphaeralcea ambigua</i>
Whitestem blazing star	<i>Mentzelia albicaulis</i>
Sand verbena	<i>Abronia sp.</i>
Dusty maiden	<i>Chaenactis sp.</i>
Desert trumpet	<i>Eriogonum inflatum</i>
Halogeton	<i>Halogeton glomeratus</i>

Grasses.

Indian ricegrass	<i>Stipa hymenoides</i>
Bottlebrush squirreltail	<i>Elymus elymoides</i>
Cheatgrass	<i>Bromus tectorum</i>