

DATE	METHOD RECEIVED	COMMENTS	TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
7/14/2015	E-mail	Hermi Hiatt	2-way alternative	In this Environment Assessment (EA), only one alternative was considered beside the No Action alternative. Building a new route from the Sandstone Quarry for returning vehicles to the visitor center was evaluated as the only alternative. I question why no detailed alternatives were considered like a 2-way route from the visitor center to the quarry and back. This should have been significantly addressed and analyzed. It seems that there is far more disturbance of undisturbed habitat with a newly created return route than if the existing road would be expanded to allow traffic to go both ways. If this alternative was not considered because of excessive fill, or excessive disturbance to the public, and excessive cost, that should have been spelled out in this EA.	The 'Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail' section of the final EA in Chapter 2 will provide more detail on specific alternatives and why they were not selected to be analyzed.
7/9/2015	E-mail	Algirdas Leskys	Air quality	The proposed project is located within Hydrographic Area 212 (Las Vegas Valley), which is a maintenance area for carbon monoxide, ozone, and PM10 pollutants. As noted in Section 2.3.1 of the EA, the proposed action must comply with all applicable AQRs. PM10 is the pollutant primarily associated with construction activities and there are several specific provisions of the Clark County Air Quality Regulations (AQRs) that regulate proposed construction within the Las Vegas Valley. Section 94 of the AQRs that a dust control permit be obtained when there is soil disturbing or construction activities impacting 0.25 acres or more in overall area or mechanized trenching of 100 feet or more in length. When construction activities exist, Best Available Control measures must be employed. These measures are described in a Construction Activities Dust Control Handbook available at: http://www.clarkcountynv.gov/Depts/AirQuality/Documents/DustControl/DustForms/DUST_CONTROL_HANDBOOK.pdf . Construction activities include, but are not limited to, the following practices: land clearing, soil and rock excavation	This project will be in compliance with all required air quality regulations and all necessary permits will be acquired before construction begins.

				or removal, soil or rock hauling, soil or rock crushing or screening, initial landscaping, or establishing and/or using staging areas, parking areas, material storage areas, or access routes to or from a construction site. Additionally, if the proposed project involves construction activities of ten (10) or more acres, a detailed supplement to the Dust Mitigation Plan will be required. If you have any further questions, please contact Robert Tekniepe at (702) 455-4063.	
7/14/2015	E-mail	Jerald Newmann	Air quality	Several places discuss Greenhouse Gas Emissions and how the EA will reduce these emissions. Later in the EA the statement is made that no technically defensible method for determining potential climate change from Greenhouse Gas Emissions is available. Which is it?	This is stated correctly in the EA. There are currently no methods of predicting climate changes from greenhouse gas emissions that can be used for this project. Regardless, project emissions are temporary in nature, should not create any lasting impacts on the environment, and minimization measures will be followed to reduce impacts to air quality.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Peter Perazzo	2-way from Sandstone	Make the Loop 2-way from Sandstone Quarry – widen the existing road to “accommodate” the return ‘loopers’. Some have already proposed this – with marginal success – as to create 2-way traffic in an area already saturated with gawkers, climbers, walkers, and bicycles. Effect? NO NEW ROADS. NO compromised vistas. Modifying the existing road is also MUCH preferred to creating a new road – just ask the DOT for some examples. [SR159 widening to accommodate bicyclers!]	The alternative of expanding the road from the Visitor Center to Sandstone with 2-way traffic was considered but not analyzed in detail. The details behind this decision can be found in Chapter 2 of the final EA, Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Hermi Hiatt	2-way from Sandstone	How much more area is actually going to be disturbed with that return route than if you would have just created a two-lane road, and you know, including a bicycle road and the parking and all that?	Twice as many acres will be disturbed creating the new return route than by creating a 2-way road from the visitor's center to Sandstone Quarry. Because of the topography between the visitor's center and Sandstone, a 2-way road would require extensive fill and retaining walls that would not be acceptable for visual resources.

6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Elizabeth Marue	Anti Return Route / Noise	I really object to putting in a whole new road for the return. If you do want to have a return, I would suggest it be parallel to the road close to it. And in the future, you could make turnarounds at - like at each of the Calico 1 and 2. But one of the things is noise levels. and you're making it noisy in a whole lot larger area. And by confining the traffic to where the road is now, at least it doesn't make a whole lot more noise.	The alternative of expanding the road from the Visitor Center to Sandstone with 2-way traffic was considered but not analyzed in detail. The details behind this decision can be found in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail. The greatest increase in noise levels would occur during construction. These impacts are discussed under the wildlife section.
7/13/2015	E-mail	Susanne Rowe	Cultural Resources	5) Cultural Resources. Section 4.9.1 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) states, "The return route would make adjacent areas more accessible, which would increase options for commercial uses and could result in an increase in the number of requests for Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) in this area of [Red Rock]." Making areas more accessible has the potential to impact cultural resources. The Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance conducted multiple site surveys in Utah from 2006 to 2008. The Alliance found that most sites visible from an existing road had suffered looting and/or vandalism. A high percentage of less visible sites located with 200 meters of an existing road also had been impacted. While the EA mentions there are cultural sites eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places within the development footprint of the new route, the number or types of cultural sites are not discussed further. The EA does not provide an analysis of potential direct and indirect impacts to these sites. The proposed return route should be realigned to avoid cultural sites and preferably eliminated and another alternative considered to avoid impacting wildlife and pristine habitat.	The return route will not make adjacent areas more accessible, since there will be no new trailheads and no long-term parking along the route. The archaeologist has noted that there are cultural resources present, but not affected. Due to this determination, further analysis in the EA is not required. The project is, however, being evaluated under the new Protocol Agreement between the Nevada SHPO and BLM.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Peter Perazzo	Different return route	Make the return loop cross the Red Rock wash to intersect the Loop near the hairpin curve south-east of the RR Overlook. This would shorten the Loop, eliminating the "upper" areas, and cut the Loop in half for those unwilling to have a full experience. Bicycles could also 'half' their experience. This would involve crossing the wash – a	This proposed alternative does not meet the health and safety need of the project, in that it does not return emergency vehicles quickly out of the NCA after Sandstone. This route would also go through pristine habitat (not through the burn scar) and additional large bridges

				potential major issue – but the other alternative now proposed crosses 2 smaller washes. If the Route began west of the Sandstone wash, it could eliminate some problems with drainage crossings.	would be needed for crossing washes compared to the two small washes that are crossed for the new return route.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Peter Perazzo	Different return route	Same as above, only begin the return loop west of the Sandstone wash to intersect the old gravel road on the north side of the Red Rock wash, and follow the old gravel road back to the Visitors Center. It already exists, it's already a scar, and it returns back to your proposed return route destination. It does eventually cross the Sandstone wash at a point lower related to the intersection with the Red Rock wash, but either way that can't be helped. Perhaps an interpretive display about washes could be installed to explain the whole concept.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. From your description, this sounds like the proposed action.
7/8/2015	E-mail	Jane Reyling	Different return route	I propose that rather than a return road from approximately Sandstone Quarry to the Visitor Center, a two-way road be constructed at the short point from Sandstone Quarry across to approximately the location of the new bridge near Icebox. Although I drew the route as a straight line across, if the features of the land suggest an altered route to achieve the same goal for less cost and reduced environmental impact, I would be in favor of it. I do realize the cost of this location and route would be greater, but I believe the benefits of relieving traffic congestion while improving access is worth the difference. It is also less expensive over time to obtain greater value for the money spent. Approximate end locations near or at the current construction of the bridges.	This proposed alternative does not meet the health and safety need of the project, in that it does not return emergency vehicles quickly out of the NCA after Sandstone. This route would also go through pristine habitat (not through the burn scar) and additional large bridges would be needed for crossing washes compared to the two small washes that are crossed for the new return route. There would also be a large cost increase for 2-way traffic, since design standards require a much wider road for 2-way traffic than one-way.

7/8/2015	E-mail	Jane Reyling	Different return route	Providing a two-way vehicle road with 5' wide bike lane and 5' wide pedestrian lane would improve the use and safety within the conservation area. a. Disabled persons would have greater use and enjoyment of the area with a lane on the crossover road, wide enough to allow two motorized wheelchairs to pass safely, while sharing the path with pedestrians. b. Bicycles could pass each other in their own lane, improving the safety of the riders and everyone else. c. The crossover would allow bicycles to ride only about half the loop, so fewer exhausted riders are sharing the road with motorized vehicles. d. The crossover would also serve as a viewing platform for pedestrians, which should remove some of the photographers from the roadway of the scenic loop. e. The crossover would allow a vehicle to be staged at one end of the cross so bikes and runners can exit more readily if the entire loop road is too strenuous. f. The cross-over would allow traffic to loop to find parking at either end of the conservation area, without having to drive the entire 13-mile road.	The final EA wil include details on markings and sign improvements for bicycles along the loop and return road. The return route will be designated for motorized vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian use.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Entrance	Bicycle lane- It was not clear to me what the plan is for a designated lane at the loop road entrance/exit. From a safety perspective, the 159/loop road entrance needs careful thought since more riders continue on 159 than enter the loop. An underpass for bicycles would be ideal. Caution markings on 159 road surface and the bike lane might help.	The EA contains details on the SR159 improvements, which includes new signage and striping to better facilitate vehicle and bicycle movement.
12/26/2014	Public Meeting	Mary Sue Kunz	Equestrian	As an equestrian, a concern is for horse-safe road crossings along the loop road when it is repaved. The surface must be non-slippery for horseshoes. Locations would be inside the fence at the end of the loop road, near Pine Creek trailhead, and near Willow Springs.	A safe horse-crossing will be placed on the scenic loop road at the White Rock equestrian parking.

6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Keith Wheeler	Equestrian	<p>On the trail alignment from White Rock Loop, with the parking, you're eliminating all equestrian parking at Willow Springs? You're not allowing for any equestrian parking. And the trail alignment that comes along there, from what I can see on the maps, actually encroach upon to the White Rock Loop trail, the equestrian section of that trail. Are we realigning that White Rock Loop by Willow Springs? Are we accommodating any equestrian parking at Willow Springs now? Are we eliminating - if we eliminate all the parking there, then you've got to give us a much larger - than what you're showing us at White Rock. But right now from talking to staff, they're going to allow car parking there. And actually, the size that they're showing is not going - we're losing ground. If we now also use Willow right here, this is where we park at Willow Springs right now. Now, that's going to become a paved parking area. And a designated trail, as far as I understand from GPSing it and then working with staff a couple of years ago, is along this line right here. So now if you're going to encroach into the trail, the designated equestrian trail, then you'll eliminate this equestrian parking because it's a natural service, where is our equestrian parking at Willow? And if you're going to include car parking here, that actually will bring those vehicles out to about here which cuts our footprint down, and we can't get in there already. If you want to eliminate equestrians from Red Rock, don't give us a parking space.</p>	<p>There will be no official designated equestrian parking at Willow, but designated parking at White Rock will be expanded to accommodate for this loss. There will be 6 designated equestrian spaces. The White Rock Loop realignment will not be addressed in this EA, but will be at a later date.</p>
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Keith Wheeler	Equestrian	<p>Also as an equestrian, we badly need horse trailer parking (not paved) at White Rock. Such a location needs strict "horses only" signage and needs to be enforced. If we can't stage and park there, we have no access to trails.</p>	<p>The White Rock lot has been redesigned to accommodate 6 vehicles with trailers in this EA and will be unpaved. There will be separate designated parking for passenger vehicles.</p>
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Exit to return route	<p>5) The turn to take the shortcut back from the Sandstone Quarry appears to be on a curving descent. This location could be hazardous as cyclists are generally traveling quickly around this corner and could encounter vehicles that have slowed for the turn. We suggest having a striped turn lane, make sure the visibility is sufficient, or move the</p>	<p>There will be a striped left turn lane for the new return route. Details will be included in the final EA.</p>

				turn to an uphill location. At the meeting, representatives from the BLM said they still needed to do a safety assessment to determine the final location and design elements.	
7/13/2015	E-mail	Susanne Rowe	Fires and Fuels	4) Fuels/Fire. The potential for fires along the (new return) route will increase from the combination of introduced weeds and discarded cigarette butts.	The temporary disturbance areas surrounding the new return route will be restored to prevent weed occurrences. Trash and discarded cigarette butts are a matter of public responsibility. Volunteer groups will continue to pick up trash in all areas of the NCA. The new return route will act as firebreak should another large fire ever occur.
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Include more data	2) Include annual use statistics (e.g. How many total visitors, and a breakdown by user types, motor vehicles, buses, motorcycles, other motorized vehicles, bicycles, pedestrian/hikers, and equestrian) for the Loop, as well as number and type of accidents, incidents, collisions, and rescues per year in the “project need” section of the EA. Providing this information will more clearly link the need for particular elements of the project and demonstrate BLM’s decision making process. If this information is not tracked currently, we strongly urge initiating this practice moving forward to help BLM make more informed decisions.	A study was conducted for capacity and safety at Red Rock NCA that includes much of this information. This study will be an appendix to the EA.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Peter Perazzo	Limit access	Limit the access altogether – once the number is reached [however the number is attained] access is then CLOSED. Similar to theaters with volume restrictions, LIMIT the amount of people on the Loop at any given time. Exit counter loops can be wired into real-time systems to show the number of vehicles leaving the Loop. Restrict everyone equally [Permits?]: climbers can have only so many climbers at any given location; the hikers need to adjust how many vehicles they need, and the Tour operators, too. Why “restriction” has come to mean “loss of freedom” is nonsense – loving the park to death MUST come with a comprehensive plan to limit the destruction	The destruction that you mention comes from people parking in areas that are not designated (e.g., pulling off of the road to park and crushing vegetation). The redesign and expansion of parking areas, as well as the enforcement of parking in designated areas, will prevent this destruction. When parking areas are full, people will have no choice but to move to the next parking area. At this time, we will not be limiting access to the NCA, but promoting the best use through the proposed improvements.

				that comes with people. People ARE destructive – limit their ability to destroy by limiting the amount of people.	
7/13/2015	E-mail	Susanne Rowe	Litter and foot traffic	2) Dumping. Introducing vehicle and foot traffic in pristine areas (along the new return route) will result in accumulations of discarded trash including paper, plastic, cans, and cigarette butts.	People discarding trash within the NCA will always occur. We will continue to have volunteer groups pick up trash along the return route as they do in the rest of the NCA.
7/14/2015	E-mail	Jerald Newman	NEPA	The new return route proposed is across “previously undisturbed land”. How is building a road across this area mitigated to a level of “not significant”? This roadway will cross several floodplains, which is identified. However, what is the cost to clear this roadway after every flash flood event? If this roadway is closed for several day, that will force all traffic to use the entire loop, increasing the traffic load and shortening the lifespan of the roadway.	The return route is within an existing burn scar and along an existing old road, but is still considered tortoise habitat. The acres of disturbance for the new return route comprise less than 0.05% of the entire tortoise habitat within RRCNCA. There will be low water crossings at 2 washes that are not significant and should not close the road after storms.
7/14/2015	E-mail	Jerald Newman	No alternatives	Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA). The DOPAA should include a “Proposal”, “Alternatives Considered”, and a “No Action Alternative”. In this EA, there are no alternatives considered. Great lengths have been taken to identify and justify the need for the action, however, no alternatives have been listed and justification provided as to why they are not viable. Therefore, only the proposed action and the no action alternative are provided. A fundamental portion of the EA has been left out and therefore under strict review, nullifies the EA due to procedural omission.	There currently is an 'Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail' section in Chapter 2 of the draft EA. This section in the final EA will provide thorough details of the alternatives considered and why they were not selected for analysis.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Paving	Pave roads to White Rock and Oak Creek. This will improve distribution of visitors among resources, reducing local overcrowding.	While White Rock and Oak Creek roads will not be paved, they are being analyzed for improvements through roadway grade raises and roadway ditching to drain the roadway surfaces. These improvements would allow for better access and less maintenance.
6/24/2015	NEPA Register	Anonymous	Pro bike lane striping	Please, please, please add a bike lane the entire length of the loop road. As it is right now, it is very dangerous riding a bike through the park. Cars hug the right side on some of the blind bends and most drivers are looking more at the scenery than the road. I’m amazed bikers aren’t hit by cars weekly. This doesn’t even require extra road. I feel the	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. All bicycle improvements within the NCA will be described in the final EA.

				best solution is putting raised pavement markers on the road to define a bike lane. This way if cars start to invade the lane they will hear and feel it.	
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Laurie Marker	Pro bike lane striping	I really think we need designated bicycle lanes throughout the whole park. And that's my point of view as a licensed bicycle instructor.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. All bicycle improvements within the NCA will be described in the final EA.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Jeff Botsford	Pro bike lane striping	Please add a cycling/running lane to the Red Rock Loop.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. All bicycle improvements within the NCA will be described in the final EA.
6/24/2015	E-mail	Linda James-Smith	Pro bike lane striping	Upon reading about the possible upgrades for Red Rock Loop, I was wondering if it was possible to put in a bike lane. My husband and I are avid bicycle riders and have on several occasions come close to having a car hit us. The drivers tend to ride far right, even though knowing, it is one-way.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. All bicycle improvements within the NCA will be described in the final EA.
6/27/2015	E-mail	Pam Chadwick	Pro Return Route	While I am in favor of another exit from the scenic drive at Red Rock Canyon, I would like to see a route which enables one to return to the visitor center without exiting onto state highway 159. I often bring visitors to Red Rock, and we prefer driving the scenic route before we go to the visitor center. It would be very helpful (and less traffic congestion at the Ranger station) to provide a means to return to the visitor center without going through the guard entrance again.	The new return route will end below the visitor center parking lots in order to prevent people from turning left (wrong way) toward oncoming traffic. Once turning right onto the visitor center exit road, you come to a Y in the road. If you go right, you exit onto Hwy 159. If you go left, you get back onto the start of the loop and can go back to the visitor center without having to go through the fee station again.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Return route pullouts	Add pullouts on the new road.	The new return route will have 3 paved photo pullouts with a sign designating 10-minute parking.

6/30/2015	Court Reporter	Keith Wheeler	Return route pullouts	On the pullout for the photo areas along the return route, is there actually going to be designated parking on that, or is it just going to be pullouts, or what are you going to be doing on that?	These will be paved pullouts that will accommodate one bus or 3 passenger cars. There will be signs at these pullouts for designated 10-minute parking, since they are designed for taking photos on the way out.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Return route	Make sure that the new road is not going to need expensive rehab later with bridge construction as is happening now at 2 locations on the 13-mile drive.	The new return route will go through two washes that should not have a significant impact. Both of these washes will have low water crossings.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Return route	Make sure that the new road does not have huge visual impact on the area.	Visual resources have been assessed in the EA.
6/30/2015	Court Reporter	Unidentified speaker	Return route exit	The problem is with the bicycles they're now going downhill, picking up speed. And typically, motorists don't have bicyclists on their [mind]. So, you know, they're coming out, and it's like they're looking for cars. They don't see a car. It's no problem. And now they just sort of drift across the road only doing a couple hundred yards, so they don't go very fast. And it's like where the hell did this bicyclist come from? I see a potential hazard there in that design.	There will be a stop sign at the end of the return route at a T intersection before you can turn right to exit.
7/12/2015	E-mail	Ida Hester	Separate walking path	I am writing you to inquire as to whether improvements are being considered as part of the BLM's proposed changes to the Red Rock scenic drive to more effectively separate pedestrians from motor vehicles along the entirety of the 13-mile scenic loop. There are many individuals (myself included) who periodically walk or run the entire loop; this is the most environmentally-friendly way of enjoying the natural beauty of the park. Nonetheless, there is currently inadequate protection for walkers and runners from motor vehicle traffic, or, for that matter, bicyclists. The BLM should strongly consider establishing a separate (13-mile) "walking path" that parallels the scenic loop as part of its upcoming enhancements to the park. A walking path will increase the public safety for those who choose the most environmentally sound method of transportation in the park: walking or running. It would also likely represent a	A separate walking path is outside the scope of the project. The improvements in the proposed action do take into account the safety of all NCA users.

				relatively small portion of the total costs that will be incurred under the BLM's plan. While I was able to review the BLM's environmental assessment online, I could not find the specific traffic or pavement enhancements referenced in the EA. Are such enhancements providing increased safety for park pedestrians? If not, how can I participate in the BLM's planning process to advocate for such enhancements?	
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Signage	3) SNVBC's recommendation to address safety and flow of traffic concerns along SR 159 and within the Loop is to develop a multi-use trail that parallels the road for non-motorized vehicles. We understand from BLM there isn't money for a multi use trail on the Loop at this time; therefore we feel the next safest option based on cyclist feedback (see attached doodle survey results) would be the 24' roadway with sharrows (bike markings with arrow). Multiple bike markings should be distributed throughout the Loop and especially at high conflict areas such as parking area driveways (one time upon entering the loop is not enough) to remind motorized vehicles they are sharing the road with cyclists (and other non-motorized users). Additionally, we strongly urge BLM to construct a paved multi-use trail along SR 159. This is a high priority area given the increasing vehicle, runner and cyclist traffic on this road.	Sharrows and signs will be utilized in the proposed action and will be discussed in the final EA. A paved multi-use trail along SR159 is outside the scope of the project.
7/16/2015	E-mail	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Signage	in addition to the sharrow bike markings, cyclists suggested adding "share the road" and "give cyclists 3 ft when passing" signs both on SR 159 and within the Scenic Loop. These would be valuable safety measures to add.	Sharrows and signs will be utilized in the proposed action and will be discussed in the final EA.
7/6/2015	E-mail	Tracy Martin	Signage	I would like to propose a sign (I agree we all want to limit the number of signs) stating something like "slower drivers move to the right" or "please allow cars to pass on left". Or possibly have it in a visible location on the front page of the visitor brochure.	Sharrows and signs will be utilized in the proposed action and will be discussed in the final EA.

7/16/2015	E-mail	Mike Galizio	Sharrows	The Bicycle Coalition's recommendation for shared lane markings (sharrows) is consistent with federal policy (USDOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation) and is consistent other nationally recognized publications such as the AASHTO Bicycle Facilities Guide and the FHWA Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUCTD). Given the increasing vehicle and bicycle demand on this roadway facility, the use of sharrow markings would serve as a cost effective treatment for addressing safety and should have less costs than installing and maintaining striped shoulders or marked/signed bicycle lanes. I hope your agency will include this safety treatment as part of this current project instead of deferring it to a future phase.	Sharrows and signs will be utilized in the proposed action and will be discussed in the final EA.
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Toilet	For the same reason (increased visitor volume) we recommend adding new bathroom facilities and replacing the outhouse at mile two of the scenic Loop. This particular bathroom is overpowering in its aroma- and cannot leave a good impression with visitors.	Calico 2 will be getting a remodel and Calico 1 will get a new restroom. These improvements will be included in the final EA.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Toilet	Install a toilet at first pullout.	A new toilet will be installed at Calico 1 due to the increase in parking.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Toilet	Relocate the toilet at Icebox to the other side of the road (same side as parking).	The toilet at Ice Box will be placed on the other side (right) of the road where all parking will occur. The left side of the road will be restored, and the public will no longer need to cross the road.
7/11/2015	E-mail	Brent Nielson	Toilet	got a note from a cycling group asking for input concerning the parking lot area I'm guessing next to the fee booths?. I ride there often last couple of times I had to use the outhouse the thing was locked, in addition that secondary area next to the fee booths is chained off I suppose to keep cars out, meanwhile there's no bathroom or rest area until you go another 2 miles to the scenic landing.	There is not supposed to be a restroom at the lower parking lot near the fee booths. The current well is in need of repair and not functional. Since there is no water for the restroom in the fee station, a temporary restroom needed to be placed in the parking area for the employees to use. There are easy-access restrooms at the Visitor Center right up to the road.

7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Anonymous	Tortoise	<p>The document states that there are live tortoises and burrows with the project area. During construction tortoises may be removed to avoid harm. I was wondering where the tortoises will be taken and if any tortoises will be returned to the area after construction?</p>	<p>All construction areas will be have a full clearance of any tortoises completed by an authorized desert tortoise biologist. Surveys were conducted of the construction and surrounding areas and only one burrow was located. The clearance surveys will be completed after temporary tortoise fencing is up along the entire return route. If a tortoise is found within the area being cleared, it will be placed outside of the construction zone in the shade of a shrub. Tortoises will not be placed any farther than 1640 feet from the location they are found. Doing so would require a translocation plan through US Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>
7/11/2015	NEPA Register	Anonymous	Transit system	<p>The central purpose of NEPA is to present a range of alternatives to a proposed federal action so that the range of alternatives can be evaluated against environmental impacts, leading to good decisions, better public policy, and protection of the environment. This EA has not considered an important alternative to increased road building and related improvements to the Scenic Loop, namely the removal of private vehicles on the Scenic Loop and the substitution of a transit system operated by BLM. All the alternatives presented, except for the No Action Alternative, will involve great cost and significant adverse environmental impacts. Constructing new parking areas, improving road beds, and building a completely new return flow road, to manage traffic where no such road currently exists, are high environmental prices to pay simply to put more cars on the Scenic Loop. All these improvements are intended to fulfill a single purpose: to make the Scenic Loop more accessible to more visitors in motorized vehicles. The RRCNCA already hosts more than a million visitors a year, most of whom drive the Scenic Loop. These numbers are likely to increase in the years ahead. This situation is not sustainable. Rather than</p>	<p>A study of RRCNCA capacity and safety was conducted (Volpe Study) that included the option for mass transit. This study will be an appendix to the EA. This alternative and the reasoning behind why it was not analyzed will be in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail.</p>

			<p>accommodate more people in more cars with the inevitable degradation of the resources (even with the proposed improvements), BLM should consider establishing a transit system to move people around the loop. By removing motorized vehicles from the loop via a transit system, the purpose and need for action under this EA would be met: traffic flow and safety for vehicles, bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians would be improved; operations and maintenance costs would be reduced; resources would be protected and conserved; and the visitor experience would be vastly improved. I offer three examples where public land management agencies have substituted private transportation with a transit system with great success, and where visitors now enjoy an enhanced experience free of the distractions and dangers of motorized vehicles. Zion National Park was facing many of the same challenges BLM faces at RRCNCA, with overflow parking on fragile terrain, overcrowded roadways, and increasingly poor visitor experience. Zion solved the problem by substituting private vehicle access to the 13-mile Zion Canyon area with a much-beloved system of trams that provide frequent on-off stopping points. Yosemite National Park has a similar system which has been hugely successful and popular for decades. Finally, the U.S. Forest Service's Sabino Canyon in southern Arizona many years ago removed private vehicles from that fragile desert canyon and now operates a transit system -- to great public acclaim. It's time that BLM seriously consider an alternative to accommodating ever increasing environmental pressures from motorized vehicles on the most remote and beautiful corners of public lands such as Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. Let's get a transit system in place. The public and the environment would benefit in the long term.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Transit system	7) We anticipate as does the BLM, that visitor volume on the Loop will continue to increase in the future- especially in the first three miles, if the proposed shortcut is implemented. We feel that even at current visitor volumes the proposed number of added parking spots for the first three pull outs will not be sufficient to address the safety and congestion issues. Therefore we strongly recommend closing the loop to motorized vehicles during the two peak visitor months and retaining a bus service to transport visitors through, as is done in Zion National Park.	A study of RRCNCA capacity and safety was conducted (Volpe Study) that included the option for mass transit. This study will be an appendix to the EA. This alternative and the reasoning behind why it was not analyzed will be in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail.
6/24/2015	E-mail	David Klein	Transit system	Good morning, even with bridges, cut off points the access to the park is overloaded. Develop a remote parking lot and allow access to the loop via approved tour busses and similar. As a life long Las Vegas resident and cyclist, the state highway gets backed up and create a dangerous situation.	A study of RRCNCA capacity and safety was conducted (Volpe Study) that included the option for mass transit. This study will be an appendix to the EA. This alternative and the reasoning behind why it was not analyzed will be in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Peter Perazzo	Transit system	Create a bus system or tram system. This limits altogether the amount of autos & vehicles on the Loop. This solution is already in place during peak times at Zion National Park with much success. It is expected to lessen the impact on the infrastructure – that’s the whole point! This would negate the expansion of the parking lots, the return route, and much of the issues with the driving public. Tour bus operators might be allowed a special pass, but NO vehicles between peak days/hours would be allowed. This would free the entire Loop for emergency vehicles to pass either way, as they would be linked to the bus/tram operators by radios. Parking outside the park, or an expansion of the Visitors Center parking to accommodate the people wishing to “tram” around the Loop would have to be considered. People could get on/off at approved sites, just like Zion, and the pollution, noise, and traffic would be gone! Trash would also exponentially diminish – you can carry only so much!	A study of RRCNCA capacity and safety was conducted (Volpe Study) that included the option for mass transit. This study will be an appendix to the EA. This alternative and the reasoning behind why it was not analyzed will be in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail.

7/14/2015	E-mail	Hermi Hiatt	Vegetation	As a plant ecologist, I am concerned about losing another population of BLM's sensitive <i>Penstemon bicolor bicolor</i> (yellow two-tone penstemon) that appears to occur in the area of the proposed return route alignment. Although I personally have re-seeded this species with success, I concur with the EA on page 54 that other mitigation measures should be applied because of recent hybridization of this species in the Red Rock Scenic Loop area and other areas of the RRCNCA. Offsite conservation measures with long-term storage of seeds seems to be appropriate to save the pure populations, but seed collections should be done over several years to increase the genetic diversity.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. Mitigation measures for yellow two-tone penstemon will be followed as addressed in the EA.
7/14/2015	E-mail	Hermi Hiatt	Vegetation	The EA states on page 34 that in areas with squamulose lichens disturbance would be minimized. It did not explain how this would be accomplished and who would be watching to see it done. Generally with this kind of projects, only tortoise biologists are present, and plants and lichens suffer.	All large rocks and boulders will be saved from the construction areas to use as barriers along roads and parking areas to prevent habitat disturbance from vehicles. All rocks/boulders will be placed in the same way that they were found in order to preserve any lichens that may be growing on them. Topsoil from areas of the new return route may be used for the new landscaping areas in the parking lots, etc. This would allow other lichens on the topsoil to be saved and used in the natural landscaping.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Hermi Hiatt	Vegetation	Maybe this is more like a comment as a plant ecologist. I see problems there with having this return route to creating more islands. There's also the edge effect for fire, you know, regrowth of the area. I just see that as a problem.	The new return route should not create an island effect of isolated populations, since seed dispersal can still occur over the 24-foot road. The effects of fire along the new return route have been addressed in the Fuels/Fire Management sections of the EA.

1/20/2015	Public Meeting	Ed Rothfuss	Visual Resources	<p>What will be the visual impact from the existing loop road? Can the final alignment reduce this to a minimum, i.e. going through low areas (not subject to flooding)? The area of the potential route offers some pretty spectacular views of the red rocks- what about adding a few small pullouts - for one to three cars, not associated with trail connections for photographers and provide opportunities for slower moving cars to pass?. The Moenkopi Trail is very popular, can the alignment be adjusted so as not to impact views from the trail? What will be the impact to the Grand Circle trail? Consider letting that trail join the Moenkopi trail for the final approach to the Visitor Center.</p>	<p>Visual resources have been assessed in the EA. There will be three paved pullouts along the new return for 10-minute parking to take photos. The Moenkopi/Grand Circle trail(s) will be realigned in the affected areas.</p>
7/13/2015	E-mail	Susanne Rowe	Weeds	<p>3) Weeds. Vehicles and foot traffic will disperse non-native invasive species and noxious weeds into pristine areas (along the new return route).</p>	<p>Weeds and restoration of disturbed areas are discussed in the EA in the Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds and Vegetation sections.</p>
6/26/2015	E-mail	Hanna Sweis	Widen road	<p>However the only thing that annoys and inconveniences drivers on the scenic drive is that it is narrow and it is very dangerous to pass slow cars unless they are considerate and move to the far right. In many cases the slow drivers are inconsiderate of others behind them who might be in a little more hurry to get out of the loop for whatever reason. It would be great if widening the road is considered seriously in the improvement plans and also placing signs that encourages slow drivers to allow others to pass them when it is safe to do so. Another way to do that is to add passing lanes every mile or so throughout the scenic drive.</p>	<p>Widening of the road is outside the scope of this project. Safety along the loop will be addressed and improved based on a capacity and safety study that was conducted for the NCA (Volpe study will be an appendix to the EA).</p>

7/13/2015	E-mail	Susanne Rowe	Wildlife	The following comments pertain to the construction of a 2.4-mile return route on a new alignment that will connect Sandstone Quarry to the Visitor Center south of the existing Scenic Loop Drive. The return route is proposed to alleviate safety concerns; however, it will negatively impact pristine habitat and entice more visitors to Red Rock. Project engineers have chosen the location of the return route to minimize costs by reducing the amount of cut-and-fill needed for the new roadbed. Other alternatives have been considered but dropped from further analysis although adequate justification is not provided. This return route will provide easy access to a currently pristine portion of Red Rock and impact the natural and cultural environment. It is reasonable to assume the following direct and indirect project-related impacts will occur: (1) Wildlife. The proposed return route will introduce vehicle traffic into pristine habitat and impact the threatened Desert Tortoise, reptiles, and mammals through permanent loss and fragmentation of habitat; killing or maiming; displacement and loss of connectivity. Animals crossing the new road will be at risk especially snakes and other reptiles seeking warmth by basking on the road surface.	The Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail will be explained in further detail in the final EA. The new return route was placed within the existing burned scar and along an old existing road in order to prevent disturbance in pristine habitat. Yes, this is still wildlife habitat, and there will be impacts due to its loss. The tortoise density in the center of the loop is very low. Only one burrow was found outside of the construction areas when surveys were completed for the new return route. Adequate measures will be in place to ensure that no tortoise is harmed/killed during the construction of the road. Also, tortoise mitigation fees must be paid prior to construction for the loss of habitat. Reptiles in the general area are common and widely distributed throughout the area and the loss of some individuals and/or their habitat should have a negligible impact on populations of the species.
7/11/2015	NEPA Register	Donald Bittle	Anti Return Route	Just a general comment. I support the proposed parking area and access road improvements. these will be valuable additions to the scenic drive. In regard to the Return route proposed, I see no need for this addition. Requiring visitors to complete the 10 miles of the loop to exit the scenic drive is not a burden. The money required to construct this route could be used for more valuable improvements to the RRC area.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	BLM volunteer	Anti Return Route	Another option: use funds for new lots, spaces, signage, restrooms and NO new road at all. "smiley face"	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Peter Perazzo	Anti Return Route	NO return Loop road. Too bad for those not willing to complete the Loop. Indulging those habits will eventually backfire into more indulgence, not less. The return route	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.

				scars even more land already scarred – the vistas already compromised by the constant traffic. NO MORE ROADS. PERIOD.	
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Southern Nevada Bicycle Coalition	Bicycle lane options	A doodle poll was created by the President in order to receive feedback on what option members preferred to see occur along the Scenic Loop. The poll results are as follows: 1 vote for 16' road with 8' shoulder with stripe, 13 votes for 24' wide road with no striping, 27 votes for 18' road with 6' striped bike lane, and 141 votes for 24' road with shared lane markings (sharrows)	Thank you for taking the time to provide numerous comments on this project. They have been logged into our administrative record.
7/16/2015	E-mail	Mike Galizio	SNBC Support	I applaud the Bicycle Coalition's efforts for taking the extra time and effort to perform a survey of their members in order to provide your agency with additional public input. I also concur with their suggestion regarding the need for future project consultation between the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada and local jurisdictions. I have copied Clark County staff on this message.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/16/2015	E-mail	Mike Galizio	SNBC Support	I want to convey my support for the comment letter from the Southern Nevada Bicycle Coalition and to supplement the verbal comments that RTC staff made at the June 30 public meeting. I was hoping that you could e-mail to me a copy of the summary or transcripts from that public meeting. Also, I would like to find if your agency will be responding to the comments made at that public meeting.	Thank you for taking the time to provide numerous comments on this project. They have been logged into our administrative record. Yes, we will be responding to comments.
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Bike amenities	4) Given that cyclists are likely the biggest paying user group to enter the Loop, second only to vehicles, the SNVBC suggests that investment in some amenities—mainly bike parking, a repair stand, and water stations, would be warranted. A water station is desperately needed by multiple user groups, and ideally, would be located at the top of the loop, but alternatively at the entrance station or the overlook on SR159.	The current proposed project is for capital improvements that coincide with the purpose and need. Additional bike amenities may be addressed as a separate project with separate funding.

7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Bike event or meeting with BLM	8) Finally, having a bike ride event along the proposed shortened loop before it was opened to the public would improve the dialogue and communication between the BLM and the bike community. We could use the event as a fund raiser for the bike tool stand and donate the funds through the "Friends of Red Rock". If BLM does not allow this type of event – even if SNVBC submitted required permitting paperwork and an action plan to mitigate impacts, we respectfully request meeting with BLM to discuss possible mutually beneficial solutions.	BLM would definitely like to keep an open dialogue with the bicycle community. The scenic loop will be open at all times during construction of the improvements. If you would like to have an event on the loop, you should apply for a special recreation permit.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Entrance	Move the gate at the entrance up the road (toward the fee booth) to allow a few more cars to get off of Hwy 159 while waiting for the gate to open in the morning.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Fee booth	6) During heavy use, motorists become backed up at the entrance to the Loop and on SR 159. The SNVBC suggests the BLM dedicate one of the three toll-booths to a "current pass-holders only" lane. This strategy might alleviate some of the congestion during peak use.	Depending upon how many current pass holders are in line at a given time, the other lane(s) may become even more backed up than they currently do.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Fencing	High Point Overlook – Suggest not adding fencing. Not needed from a safety perspective, and doubt it would deter individuals from going beyond the fence. The fence would be obtrusive and lead to "social" trails skirting the ends.	Fencing is not being installed at High Point. Due to the installation of a new retaining wall, there will need to be a railing installed on top of the wall for visitor safety.
7/14/2015	NEPA Register	Keely Brooks / SNBC	Improve communication	The SNVBC's main comments and recommendations are presented below. 1) For future planned BLM actions, we suggest identifying the stakeholder groups and local entities such as Regional Transportation Commission and the local jurisdiction (Clark County) that may be impacted by the project, notify and invite them to attend the initial Public scoping meeting and all other related public meetings. Traditional approaches to post public announcements, such as through newspapers or on federal agency websites may not reach the key stakeholders. Early and direct notice will give key user groups the opportunity to communicate needs and concerns to BLM and BLM to communicate to users their project objectives and limitations. In an effort to improve	We acknowledge your request to reach all key stakeholders for public meetings and will address this for future meetings.

				communication about public notices and/or Loop condition reports to frequent visitors, the SNVBC offers to create a Facebook page called "Scenic Loop Cyclists". We request that BLM notify info@snvbc.org and cc: bolomccall@yahoo.com with information to be posted.	
7/14/2015	E-mail	Jerald Newmann	Increased visitation	Several statements discuss the rapid growth of the Las Vegas valley and the tremendous increase of visitor traffic. However, the EA also states the "Visitation would not be expected to increase" even as the population is expected to increase above the two million mark. If the visitor count isn't going to increase, even with "nicer facilities", why build?	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Moenkopi	I'm not convinced that Moenkopi needs pavement rehab, but I'm not an expert on that – as long as it pencils out to a long term savings then it makes sense. Please be sure of that.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/14/2015	E-mail	Jerald Newmann	Moenkopi	Pavement rehab on Moenkopi road. This road has been closed and unavailable for public use for several years. Why rehab this area?	Moenkopi Road is open all year to the employees of the Red Rock fire station and is open to the public for part of the year to the campground. The pavement is in need of rehab and current capital funding allows for this to occur.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	faulkner wright	More picnic/shade areas	It would be wonderful to have more picnic table/shade covering at each of the parking areas like we have at the overlook out on the highway. I would love that because I wouldn't have to put my umbrella up to paint for 2 hours at each of the vistas. The problem is the wind here. I can't use my umbrella if the wind is over 10mph.	The current proposed project is for capital improvements that coincide with the purpose and need. Additional parking area amenities may be addressed as a separate project with separate funding.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	faulkner wright	More viewing areas	I am a painter. I take my easel and other paint equipment into Red Rock weekly. Red Rock is such a beautiful place but it seems to me that there are so many other views to paint but I can't access those vistas because I am restricted to the existing parking areas. I feel that there just aren't enough viewing areas with accompanying parking lots in Red Rock. I would like to see another 3 to 4 areas opened up for this purpose along the loop road. I do hike away from the parking but I really can't go more	Creating additional pullouts / viewing areas along the loop provides places for the public to create new trails and habitat disturbance. We would like to limit any new disturbance as much as possible. There will be 3 new pullouts along the new return route, but all will have 10-minute parking.

				than a quarter mile since my painting gear weighs about 25-30 lbs. I'm small, not that strong, but I do the best I can. Maybe this could be something to happen a few years down the road.	
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Anonymous	Not relevant	And why don't we get the well fixed first before bringing 1000's more into the park?	We have capital improvement funds that can only be used for the proposed alternatives in this EA. Drilling the new well and installing the pipelines will require a new EA and a different pool of funding.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Not relevant	First, I want to commend the BLM team that authored this proposal. A very thorough analysis of the current situation and many needed proposed changes. As background, I'm a rock climber who spends about 45 days a year at Red Rock. I've seen the increase in visitation over the years and the issues created. I'm also a biker, riding the loop road or 159 to Blue Diamond a few times a year. Thinking that there could be some funding limitations, here is my prioritization of the proposed project elements: First priority: - return route for scenic drive, fee station kiosk/car pool lot, Ice Box Canyon, Pine Creek Canyon. Second priority – Calico 1, Calico 2, Lost Creek Canyon, Willow Springs, improvements in secondary roads. Third priority - High Point Overlook, White Rock Trailhead, White Rock Equestrian Parking, Red Rock Wash Overlook.	Not relevant to this project.

6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Not relevant	<p>Bolting in wilderness. From a safety perspective, adding rappel anchors to existing routes needs to be approved immediately. There are many dangerous "temporary" anchors, I'm sometimes amazed that fatalities have not yet occurred. From a capacity perspective, Red Rock needs new routes. Strongly suggest that selected locations (where no new access trails/routes would be required) be identified and bolting permitted. Pristine areas without current access routes could remain "no bolting allowed" areas. As climbers, from my observations, represent 95%+ of the visitors to wilderness canyons, new route bolting will not degrade the wilderness experience for many other users, especially if combined with the below mentioned "permanent cairns".</p> <p>Travel management: Strongly suggest upgrading primary trails outside the wilderness areas to keep people on the trail and eliminate the ever expanding network of social trails that is degrading the environment. Signs should be added. Suggest a Red Rock staffer visit City of Rocks National Recreation Area in Idaho to see the benefit of that approach. Within the wilderness area, strongly suggest adding "permanent cairns" to designate primary trails. The network of social trails on the approaches to many canyons has severely degraded the environment, gets worse every year. Really spoils the wilderness experience.</p>	Not relevant to this project.
1/20/2015	Public Meeting	Ed Rothfuss	Not relevant	<p>A final thought - not related to the road issue except is might affect signing along the road and the issue is the "Children's Discovery Trail". Working at the Information Desk, a frequent question of parents with "toddlers" is "where is the Children's Discovery Trail?". That trail is not for toddlers! I usually suggest taking kids to the Sandstone Quarry. I recommend continuing the Self-Guiding Nature Trail in the Lost Spring area but remove "Children" from the signing and literature. Establish two shorter trails, with signing appropriate to (both in graphics and wording) for younger</p>	Not relevant to this project.

				<p>age children –say up to 10 years old..</p> <p>A Children's Discovery Trail 1 could be in the Visitor Center area and a second, (longer?)</p> <p>Children's Discovery Trail 2 in the Sandstone Quarry area.</p> <p>With two new children's trail and the changing in signing, would not only give a better experience for the youngsters, but also reduce some traffic that now proceeds beyond the Sandstone Quarry.</p>	
6/24/2015	E-mail	Terry Cox	Parking	The route, and the expanding parking, will be a great benefit to everyone that visits the area.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Parking	Why pave part of the White Rock equestrian parking? I don't think any trails leave from that spot – why would non-equestrians stop there? (Maybe I'm missing something.)	There will be no paving of the parking area. Trails are accessible from this parking lot.
6/30/2015	E-mail	Barbara Luke	Parking	Why no additional parking spaces at Calico II? That lot fills frequently.	The Calico 1 expansion accommodates for no parking increase at Calico 2. The Calico 2 expansion would require large amounts of fill and would have a large impact to visual resources.
7/14/2015	E-mail	Jerald Newman	Paving	A broad based assumption is made that visitors to the Calico area will only use the new return route. This assumption is based on what data? Usage and rehab of the rest of the scenic loop is based on Calico visitors using the return loop, therefore, if they don't, the roadway won't last as long as predicted due to the higher than projected usage.	We do not assume that all visitors from Calico will use the return route, and the rehabilitation of the loop road is not based on this assumption. The Scenic Loop is in need of rehabilitation and will be completed to extend the life of the road for many years, whether or not the return route is built.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Anonymous	Pro	I believe that these improvements will go a long way toward improving many areas including the visitor experience and minimizing the environmental impact. It will help alleviate some traffic issues and allow for less delays to visitors.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/30/2015	Public Meeting	Bill Wright	Pro parking expansion	More parking!!	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Pro parking	Calico 1 – Suggest considering limiting parking expansion to about 120 spaces. I've never seen congestion that	The number of parking spaces has been determined through a transportation study

			expansion	would indicate the need for 170 spaces, and suspect that 120 would meet long term needs.	that was completed for the scenic loop parking areas.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Pro parking expansion	Calico 2 – Strongly suggest considering expanding parking to about 40 spaces. There are capacity issues at Calico 2.	The number of parking spaces has been determined through a capacity and safety study that was completed for the scenic loop parking areas. The Volpe Study will be an appendix to the EA.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Pro parking expansion	Willow Springs – It was not clear to me if the proposed changes would accommodate the turn around and parking needs of buses (especially the school buses). Suggest considering expanding parking spaces to at least 80 and designated parking for at least 4 buses.	The number of parking spaces has been determined through a capacity and safety study that was completed for the scenic loop parking areas. The Volpe Study will be an appendix to the EA. There will be designated parking for buses.
6/17/2015	E-mail	Bob Bechaud	Pro parking expansion	Ice Box Canyon – Suggest total of at least 30 spaces.	The number of parking spaces has been determined through a capacity and safety study that was completed for the scenic loop parking areas. The Volpe Study will be an appendix to the EA.
6/24/2015	E-mail	James Hutkin	Pro parking expansion	More parking too is definitely welcome. Hope the proposal gets approved in a timely manner without a lot of political posturing.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/24/2015	E-mail	Tom and Helen	Pro parking expansion	Also, the additional parking spaces being planned will be a welcome addition along with the paving and repaving of roads and trailheads. We wholeheartedly support your plan and commend you for working to make a fantastic destination even better.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/26/2015	E-mail	Hanna Sweis	Pro parking expansion	Red Rock is the most wonderful place in Nevada for me. I visit the scenic drive not less than 25-30 times a year and I take all my guests to see it. The improvements are proposed make a lot of sense especially the additional parking spaces.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/6/2015	E-mail	Tracy Martin	Pro parking expansion	i am also in favor of improving traffic flow, as well as more parking, in the parking areas.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.

1/20/2015	Public Meeting	Ed Rothfuss	Pro parking expansion	I believe your plan has a lot of merit. The modest additions and realignment of the parking lots are well conceived and definitely needed. The proposal of an additional pullout between Calico 1 and the Sandstone Quarry - not associated with a trail connection, is good. The proposed paving of the two areas connecting the loop road with two trail heads, especially at the Over thrust trail also good. I can see the suggestion of doing some realignment in the High Point could be good but just where and to what extent is yet to be evaluated - minimal disturbance needed and great reclamation of any abandoned sections.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
1/20/2015	Public Meeting	Ed Rothfuss	Pro Return Route	I like the concept of an alternate return route from the Sandstone Quarry to the Visitor Center. This will be a benefit to visitors with limited time and reduce the impact on the remainder of the loop.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
12/26/2014	Public Meeting	Mary Sue Kunz	Pro Return Route	I am in favor of the proposed short-out loop road being discussed along the existing scenic loop.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
1/16/2015	Public Meeting	Tracy Martin	Pro Return Route	The return to Visitor Center road option feels like the solution that offers the most options. Such as environmental impact, cost, emergency protocols, safety and efficiency. Plus, the addition of the return one way road could possibly offer needed relief to other seemingly problematic areas around the rest of the loop.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/17/2015	NEPA Register	Steve Gould	Pro Return Route	This is a sensible idea- makes it easier to exit and makes rest of loop less stressful. A similar idea could work at end for those wanting to visit oak creek canyon.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/7/2015	NEPA Register	Robert Morgan	Pro Return Route	the return route does not appear to affect the primary loop, so as a cyclist it is a non issue, I still can ride the 13 mile loop	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/24/2015	E-mail	James Hutkin	Pro return Route	I have been wondering for years why there wasn't an alternate route out of the canyon rather than having to drive the entire loop.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.

6/24/2015	E-mail	Tom and Helen	Pro return Route	Red Rock Canyon has been our favorite place for years and we have enjoyed our many visits there during that time. We are very excited about the improvements being planned as indicated in today's Las Vegas Review paper. Shortening the trail will be great for those times when we don't want to do the entire 13 mile stretch & will also alleviate the congestion in Calico Basin for those looking for a shorter visit.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
6/24/2015	E-mail	Terry Cox	Pro return Route	I would like to say that I am strongly in favor of the proposed alternate exit route at Red Rock Canyon. I am a member of a hiking club and we are in the area at least two days a week except for June through September. The route, and the expanding parking, will be a great benefit to everyone that visits the area. Although we often go depict the park to hike this new route would greatly benefit those that at Calico Vista 1& 2 or Sandstone Quarry by reducing the time it would take them to exit the grounds. I sincerely hope this new route becomes a reality.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/1/2015	E-mail	Bill and Lisa Wright	Pro Return Route	The bypass road is a good idea along with the improved parking. I support the plans for the parking, signage, and the return road	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/2/2015	E-mail	Harold Larson	Pro Return Route	I am very much in favor of theEscape roadway proposed. 1. Provide a safer emergency passage from the three most heavy used sites. 2. relieve the continuing 9 miles of choked exit traffic. 3. Less costly roadbed earth fill following proposed route than trying to widen the cliff hanging existing paved roadway for two way traffic. 4. The exit road alinement construction will not disrupt the existing loop road way traffic.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.
7/6/2015	E-mail	Tracy Martin	Pro Return Route	I am in favor of the return road from the vicinity of the third pullout back to the welcome center.	Thank you for taking the time to provide your comment on this project. It has been logged into our administrative record.