

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
<b>4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CONTINUED FROM VOLUME 2)</b>	<b>4-361</b>
4.2 Resources (continued from Volume 2)	4-361
4.2.11 Wild Horses and Burros (continued from Volume 2)	4-361
4.2.12 Wildland Fire Management	4-382
4.2.13 Cultural Resources	4-407
4.2.14 Paleontological Resources	4-443
4.2.15 Visual Resources	4-458
4.2.16 Cave and Karst	4-488
4.3 Resource Uses	4-498
4.3.1 Livestock Grazing	4-498
4.3.2 Minerals—Leasable, Locatable, and Saleable	4-541
4.3.3 Recreation and Facilities	4-576
4.3.4 Renewable Energy	4-601
4.3.5 Transportation and Access	4-619
4.3.6 Lands and Realty	4-631
4.4 Special Designations	4-655
4.4.1 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	4-656
4.4.2 Wild and Scenic Rivers	4-676
4.4.3 Backcountry Byways	4-689
4.4.4 Wilderness Study Areas and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	4-703
4.4.5 Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites	4-751
4.5 Social and Economic	4-770
4.5.1 Tribal Interests	4-770
4.5.2 Public Health and Safety	4-776
4.5.3 Social and Economic Conditions and Environmental Justice	4-791
4.6 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-826
4.7 Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources	4-828
4.8 Relationship of Short-Term Uses of the Environment to Long-Term Productivity	4-829
<b>5. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1 Introduction	5-1
5.2 Public Collaboration and Outreach	5-1
5.2.1 Scoping Process	5-1
5.2.2 Project Web Site	5-2
5.2.3 Newsletters	5-2
5.3 Consultation and Coordination	5-3
5.3.1 Cooperating Agencies	5-3
5.3.2 Native American Consultation	5-3
5.3.3 Cultural Resource Consultation	5-4
5.3.4 Endangered Species Act Consultation	5-5
5.3.5 Resource Advisory Council	5-5
5.4 Distribution and Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS	5-6
5.5 Comments Received on the Draft RMP/EIS	5-7
5.5.1 Method of Comment Collection and Analysis	5-7

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS *(continued)*

Section	Page
5.5.2	Summary of Written Comments Received.....5-7
5.5.3	Comment Letters and BLM Responses.....5-10
5.6	Distribution and Availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.....5-10
5.7	List of Preparers .....5-10
<b>6.</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....6-1</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>GLOSSARY AND INDEX .....7-1</b>
7.1	Glossary .....7-2
7.2	Index.....7-21

---

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
4-8	Cumulative Impacts on Wildfires (Number and Size of Wildfires) by Alternative ..... 4-407
4-9	Cumulative Impacts on Cultural Resources by Alternative..... 4-442
4-10	Cumulative Impacts of OHV Travel Management on OHV Users by Alternative ..... 4-601
4-11	Cumulative Impacts on Cost to Provide Forage by Alternative ..... 4-825
4-12	Cumulative Adverse Impacts on Project (Minerals, Energy, Rights-of-Way) Feasibility and Increased Costs of Development from Proposed Use Restrictions by Alternative ..... 4-826

---

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4-11	VRI Classes for Land Designations—Alternative B ..... 4-464
4-12	VRI Classes for Land Designations—Alternative C ..... 4-464
4-13	VRI Classes for Land Designations—Alternative D ..... 4-465
4-14	VRI Classes for Fire Use—Alternatives B and D ..... 4-466
4-15	Comparison of Existing VRM Classes with VRI Classes—Alternative A ..... 4-469
4-16	Comparison of VRM Classes with VRI Classes—Alternative B ..... 4-469
4-17	Comparison of VRM Classes with VRI Classes—Alternative C ..... 4-469
4-18	Comparison of VRM Classes with VRI Classes—Alternative D ..... 4-470
4-19	VRI Classes for Land Open for Mineral Material (Saleable) Actions—Alternative A ..... 4-472
4-20	VRI Classes for Land Open for Fluid Mineral Actions—Alternative A ..... 4-472
4-21	VRI Classes for Land Open for Solid Leasable Mineral Actions—Alternative A ..... 4-472
4-22	VRI Classes for Land Open for LocaMineral Actions—Alternative A ..... 4-473
4-23	VRI Classes for Land Open for Mineral Material (Saleable) Actions—Alternative B ..... 4-473
4-24	VRI Classes for Land Open for Fluid Mineral Actions—Alternative B ..... 4-474
4-25	VRI Classes for Land Open for Solid Leasable Mineral Actions—Alternative B ..... 4-474
4-26	VRI Classes for Land Open for LocaMineral Actions—Alternative B ..... 4-475
4-27	VRI Classes for Land Open for Mineral Material (Saleable) Actions—Alternative C ..... 4-475
4-28	VRI Classes for Land Open for Fluid Mineral Actions—Alternative C ..... 4-476
4-29	VRI Classes for Land Open for Solid Leasable Mineral Actions—Alternative C ..... 4-476
4-30	VRI Classes for Land Open for LocaMineral Actions—Alternative C ..... 4-476
4-31	VRI Classes for Land Open for Mineral Material (Saleable) Actions—Alternative D ..... 4-477
4-32	VRI Classes for Land Open for Fluid Mineral Actions—Alternative D ..... 4-477
4-33	VRI Classes for Land Open for Solid Leasable Mineral Actions—Alternative D ..... 4-478
4-34	VRI Classes for Land Open for LocaMineral Actions—Alternative D ..... 4-478
4-35	VRI Classes for OHV Use—Alternative A ..... 4-479
4-36	VRI Classes for OHV Use—Alternative B ..... 4-479
4-37	VRI Classes for OHV Use—Alternative C ..... 4-479
4-38	VRI Classes for OHV Use—Alternative D ..... 4-480
4-39	VRI Classes for Land Tenure Adjustments—Alternative A ..... 4-483
4-40	VRI Classes for Land Tenure Adjustments—Alternative B ..... 4-483
4-41	VRI Classes for Land Tenure Adjustments—Alternative C ..... 4-483
4-42	Change in Area Permitted for Grazing ..... 4-499
4-43	VRM Designations within Grazing Allotments ..... 4-518
4-44	OHV Designations within Grazing Allotments ..... 4-528
4-45	Land Tenure within Grazing Allotments ..... 4-532
4-46	Summary of Effects on Minerals—Alternatives A, B, C, and D ..... 4-542
4-47	Summary of Effects on Recreation—Alternatives A, B, C, and D ..... 4-577
4-48	Summary of Effects on Renewable Energy—Alternatives A, B, C, and D ..... 4-602

---

**LIST OF TABLES** *(continued)*

Table	Page
4-49	Summary of Effects on Tribal Interests—Alternatives A, B, C, and D .....4-770
4-50	Summary of Effects on Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice—Alternatives A, B, C, and D.....4-791
5-1	Summary of Comments .....5-8
5-2	List of Preparers – BLM (Current).....5-10
5-3	List of Preparers – BLM (Prior to 2010) .....5-11
5-4	List of Preparers – Contractor.....5-12

---

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
ACEC	area of critical environmental concern
AFY	acre-feet per year
AML	appropriate management level
AMP	allotment management plan
AMSL	above mean sea level
APHIS	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
APHIS-WS	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service-Wildlife Services
AQ	air quality
ASPCA	American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
ATV	all-terrain vehicle
AUM	animal unit month
BA	Biological Assessment
BCB	Backcountry Byways
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
BIA	US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs
BLM	US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	best management practices
BO	Biological Opinion
BPS	budget planning system
BRDHCET	Black Rock Desert High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails
CA	common to all alternatives
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH <sub>4</sub>	methane
CHP	cultural/historic/paleontological
CK	cave and karst resources
CNHT	California National Historic Trail
CNIDC	Central Nevada Interagency Dispatch Center
CO	carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2e</sub>	carbon dioxide equivalents
CSP	concentrated solar power
CR	cultural resources
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWPP	Community Wildfire Protection Plan
CWMA	Cooperative Weed Management Area
DFC	desired future condition
DM	Departmental Manual
DOE	Department of Energy
DOI	Department of Interior
EA	environmental assessment
EIS	environmental impact statement
EO	Executive Order
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
ERMA	extensive recreation management area
ES	Executive Summary
ESA	Endangered Species Act of 1973

---

## LIST OF ACRONYMS *(continued)*

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
ES&R	emergency stabilization and rehabilitation
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FIP	Federal Implementation Plan
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FLTFA	Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act
FMU	Fire Management Unit
FMUD	final multiple use decision
FOFEM	First Order Fire Effects Model
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FPA	fire program analysis
FR	Federal Register
FRCC	fire regime condition class
FW	fish and wildlife
G	geology
GAWS	general aquatic wildlife survey
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	geographical information system
GWP	global warming potential as carbon dioxide equivalents
HA	herd area
HAP	hazardous air pollution
HMA	herd management area
HMAP	herd management area plan
HMP	habitat management plan
HUA	herd use area
HVH	high value habitat
IBLA	Interior Board of Land Appeals
IDT	interdisciplinary team
IMP	interim management policy or plan
IOP	interagency operation plan
IPC	integrated pest control
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
ISA	instant study area
ITAs	Indian Trust Assets
KGRA	known geothermal resource area
LCT	Lahontan cutthroat trout
LG	livestock grazing
LR	lands and realty
LUP	land use plan
LWC	lands with Wilderness characteristics
MACT	maximum available control technology
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MFP	management framework plan
MIST	minimum impact suppression tactics

---

**LIST OF ACRONYMS** *(continued)*

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
MOU	memorandum of understanding
MR	mineral resources: leasable, locatable, salable
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAC	Nevada Administrative Code
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NCA	National Conservation Area
NDEP	Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
NDOA	Nevada Department of Agriculture
NDOM	Nevada Division of Minerals
NDOT	Nevada Department of Transportation
NDOW	Nevada Department of Wildlife
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index
NDWR	Nevada Division of Water Resources
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NESHAPS	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NGO	non-government organizations
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NHT	National Historic Trail
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOI	Notice of Intent
N <sub>2</sub> O	Nitrous oxide
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen oxides
NPS	National Park System
NRCS	US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSR	new source review
NSO	no surface occupancy
Sierra Front/NW RAC	Sierra Front Northwestern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council
NWSRS	National Wild and Scenic River Systems
NV	Nevada
OCTA	Oregon-California Trail Association
OHV	off-highway vehicle
ORV	Outstanding Remarkable Value
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCPI	per capita personal income
PD	Paradise-Denio
PE	chemical and biological control
PFC	proper functioning condition
pH	the symbol for the logarithm of the reciprocal of hydrogen ion concentration in gram atoms per liter, measuring the acidity or alkalinity of a solution
PL	public law
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter smaller than 10 microns in diameter
PMU	population management unit
ppm	part per million

---

## LIST OF ACRONYMS *(continued)*

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
PR	paleontological resources
PRMP	Proposed Resource Management Plan
PS	public health and safety
PSD	prevention of significant deterioration
PV	photovoltaics
PVA	prospectively valuable area
PWR	Public Water Reserve
PYFC	Potential Fossil Yield Classification
R	recreation
R&PP	Recreation and Public Purposes Act
RAC	resource advisory council
RAS	Range Administration System
RAMS	risk assessment and mitigation strategy
RE	renewable energy
RFD	reasonably foreseeable development
RFDS	Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario
RFFA	reasonably foreseeable future action
RIP	range improvement project
RMIS	Recreation Management Information System
RMP	resource management plan
RMZ	recreation management zone
RNA	Research Natural Area
ROD	record of decision
ROG	reactive organic compounds
ROI	region of influence
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
ROW	right-of-way
S	soils
SG	Sonoma-Gerlach SASEM Simple Approach Smoke Estimation Model
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMA	Special Management Area
SNPLMA	Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
SOG	standard operating guideline
SOP	standard operating procedure
SO <sub>x</sub>	sulphur oxides
SRH	standards for rangeland health
SRMA	special recreation management area
SRP	special recreation permit
SSS	special status species
T&E	threatened and endangered
TA	transportation and access
TC	tribal consultation
TCP	traditional cultural property
TDS	total dissolved solids
TIP	Tribal Implementation Plan
TM	transportation and travel management

---

## LIST OF ACRONYMS *(continued)*

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TNEB	thriving natural ecological balance
TNR	temporary nonrenewable
TSP	total suspended particles
TSS	total suspended solids
US	United States
USC	United States Code
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDI	United States Department of the Interior
USFS	United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
USFWS	US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	US Geological Survey
VF	vegetation forest and woodland products
VOC	volatile organic compounds
VR	vegetation rangelands
VRI	visual resource inventory
VRM	visual resource management
VRW	vegetation riparian and wetlands
VW	vegetation weeds
WA	wilderness area
WAFWA	Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
WAPT	Wildlife Action Plan Team
WD	Winnemucca District
WDM	wildlife damage management
WDO	Winnemucca District Office
WFDSS	Wildland Fire Decision Support System
WFM	wildland fire ecology management
WFRHBA	Wild Free Roaming Horses and Burros Act
WFSA	wildland fire situation analysis
WHB	wild horses and burros
WR	water resources
WSA	wilderness study area
WSR	wild and scenic river
WUG	Western Utility Group
WUI	wildland urban interface
WWV	watchable wildlife viewing site

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## CHAPTER 5 – CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the public outreach and participation opportunities that have occurred throughout the development of this Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS), and the coordination and consultation efforts with tribes, government agencies, and other stakeholders that have transpired to date. It includes a list of preparers of the document and the agencies, organizations, and individuals that have been involved in the development of the RMP/EIS.

### 5.2 PUBLIC COLLABORATION AND OUTREACH

#### 5.2.1 Scoping Process

Scoping is the term used in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Part 1500 et seq.) to define the early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in the planning process. The scoping process gets the public involved in identifying significant issues of land use management actions. The process also helps identify any issues that are not significant and that can thereby be eliminated from detailed analysis. The list of stakeholders and other interested parties is also confirmed and augmented during the scoping process.

#### **Notice of Intent**

The Notice of Intent (NOI) is the legal document notifying the public of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) intent to initiate the planning process and to prepare an EIS for a major federal action. The NOI initiated the scoping process and invited the participation of the affected and interested agencies, organizations, and members of the general public to participate in the process in order to develop the scope and significant issues to be addressed in the planning alternatives and analyzed in the EIS. The NOI for the RMP/EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on March 25, 2005.<sup>1</sup> The scoping period for receipt of public comments ended on May 24, 2005.

#### **Press Releases**

The BLM used local and regional newspapers, throughout the planning area, to disseminate information on the RMP scoping and planning process. The BLM prepared press releases to notify the public of the project, to announce the open houses, to request public comments, and to provide contact information. Press releases were printed in the following newspapers during the week of April 25, 2005:

- *This & That* (Gerlach, Nevada);
- *The Humboldt Sun* (Winnemucca, Nevada);
- *Lovelock Review-Miner* (Lovelock, Nevada); and

---

<sup>1</sup>"Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and to Initiate the Public Scoping Process." *Federal Register* 70, no. 57 (March 2005): 15,348-15,349.

- *Reno Gazette-Journal* (Reno, Nevada).

Additional press releases were issued to announce availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and Proposed Final RMP/EIS<sup>2</sup>.

### **Scoping Meetings**

The BLM held public scoping meetings in Winnemucca on May 2, in Lovelock on May 3, in Gerlach on May 4, and in Reno on May 5, 2005. The BLM provided the local media with press releases announcing the time, location, and purpose of these meetings as described above.

The scoping meetings were presented in an open house format, allowing the public to receive information, ask questions, and provide input. Fact sheets and handouts about the project and a map of the planning area were provided, as was a list of the preliminary planning criteria and anticipated key issues related to the project. Single-page summaries of each resource issue were provided as convenient references to take from the meetings. Site and resource maps were displayed illustrating the current situation and management techniques practiced among different resources and land areas. A slide presentation highlighted key issues and summarized the planning process. Prominent, handicapped-accessible local facilities in informal settings were chosen as venues to encourage broad participation.

Attendees were encouraged to mail in written comments and questions or to fill out comment cards. Copies of the briefing package and planning criteria were also made available at the comment table.

### **5.2.2 Project Web Site**

The BLM has posted information about the planning process and various documents on the Web at [http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm\\_information/rmp.html](http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html). The BLM continuously updates the Web site with information, documents, and announcements.

### **5.2.3 Newsletters**

The BLM has published newsletters throughout the course of the RMP/EIS process and are posted on the BLM Web site. Participants also may request to receive newsletters through e-mail. The newsletters remind the public of how they can comment and get involved and includes a calendar of events. Each edition addresses in detail issues of concern identified during the scoping process. On March 23, 2005, the first project newsletter was mailed to over 1,600 individuals and organizations that had been interested in or participated in other activities hosted by the Winnemucca District (WD). The purpose of this newsletter was to inform them of the WD RMP planning effort, the location of the open houses, and the opportunity to comment. In addition, the newsletter gave the public various methods to submit their comments, including a dedicated e-mail address ([wdrmp@blm.gov](mailto:wdrmp@blm.gov)<sup>3</sup>), a fax line ([775] 623-1503), and the BLM WD address to mail comments. A second newsletter was distributed in March 2007 that provided a project update. A third newsletter was distributed in September 2011. This newsletter provided a project update and information applicable to the development of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

<sup>2</sup> “Notice of Availability of the Draft Winnemucca District Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. Federal Register Vol 75, No. 122 (June 2010): FR Doc 2010-15326.

<sup>3</sup> Formerly “[comments@wformp.com](mailto:comments@wformp.com)”

### 5.3 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The WD RMP will provide guidance for a vast area of public land in Nevada and necessarily requires the coordination of a wide variety of organizations with interests in the area. Among those are governmental bodies that create, administer, and monitor policy for these, as well as adjacent, lands. The BLM established a coordinated effort in developing the RMP by seeking the active participation of these parties. The following sections document the BLM's consultation and coordination efforts during the preparation of the RMP/EIS. Consultation is an ongoing effort throughout the entire RMP process.

#### 5.3.1 Cooperating Agencies

On February 16, 2005, the BLM invited 33 local, state, federal, and tribal representatives to participate as cooperating agencies for the RMP. Of these, nine agencies accepted this offer to participate in the RMP planning process as cooperating agencies:

- Humboldt County;
- City of Winnemucca;
- Washoe County;
- Pershing County;
- N-2 Grazing Board;
- Nevada Department of Agriculture;
- Nevada Department of Wildlife;
- US Fish and Wildlife Service; and
- US Bureau of Reclamation.

These entities worked with the BLM, sharing special expertise, resources, and provided comment and review of various preliminary draft documents to help forge the development of the Draft and Proposed RMP. Throughout the planning process BLM met and coordinated individually with the cooperating agencies. In addition, combined meetings with all cooperators were held in July 2005, July 2010, and December 2011.

#### 5.3.2 Native American Consultation

Federally recognized Native American tribes have a unique legal and political relationship with the government of the United States (US). Executive Order (EO) 13175 requires federal agencies to coordinate and consult on a government-to-government basis with sovereign Native American tribal governments whose interests may be directly and substantially affected by activities on federally administered lands. Other laws, regulations, guidance, and executive orders require consultation to identify the cultural values, the religious beliefs, the traditional practices, and the legal rights of Native American people, which could be affected by BLM actions on federal lands. These include the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended), American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Department of the Interior (DOI) Secretarial Order No. 3215 (USDI 2000), 512 Department Manual Chapter 2 (USDI 1995), and BLM Manual H-8160-1 (USDI 1994), and EO 13007 Indian Sacred sites.

All Native American tribes and organizations with interests in the WD planning area were contacted by mail and encouraged to be cooperating agencies. Tribes have been participating in the RMP/EIS process through meetings and other contacts. During follow-up telephone calls to the tribes, each was offered the opportunity to meet with WD representatives or to visit the study area. The BLM met with Native American organizations on May 24, 2005, and May 26, 2005, in Winnemucca and Reno, respectively. During the first meeting, representatives from the BLM met with four tribal representatives from the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe, Battle Mountain Band, and Lovelock Paiute Tribe to offer information on developing the RMP and to discuss tribal concerns to be addressed. Similarly, BLM staff met with tribal representatives from the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe, Cedarville Rancheria, Susanville Indian Rancheria, and Pyramid Lake Tribe on May 26, 2005. The BLM has continued the Native American consultation process throughout the preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS and Proposed RMP/Final EIS,

With the assistance of a contractor, BLM conducted a confidential ethnographic assessment (Bengston 2006) of the WD planning area. The primary objectives of this study were as follows:

- Conduct a thorough archival and literature review to identify and document Native American traditional occupancy and use of lands and resources, as well as previously recorded Native American places of cultural and religious importance, within the study area;
- Elicit contemporary concerns and recommendations for managing traditional resources and cultural and religious values from tribal leaders, elders, or representatives;
- Document the WD's Native American consultation efforts; and
- Elicit tribal recommendations for managing the lands administered by the WD.

A request for a consultation meeting and copies of the RMP were sent to the following tribes and reservations on July 12, 2010: Battle Mountain Band, Burns Paiute Tribe, Cedarville Rancheria, Confederate Tribes of Warm Springs, Fallon Paiute Shoshone Paiute Tribe, Fort Bidwell Tribe, Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe, Klamath Indian Tribe, Lovelock Paiute Tribe, Pit River Tribe, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of Duck Valley, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, Walker River Paiute Tribe, Washo Tribe, Winnemucca Indian Colony, Yerrington Paiute Tribe, and Yomba Reservation. A copy was also sent to the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada.

Consultation meetings to discuss the RMP occurred with the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe in September and December 2010, and Summit lake Paiute Tribe in October 2010. Other tribes declined or did not respond to BLM requests for consultation on the RMP. An additional Native American consultation meeting was held in July 2012.

### **5.3.3 Cultural Resource Consultation**

The BLM has specific responsibilities and authorities to consider, plan for, protect, and enhance historic properties and other cultural properties that may be affected by its actions or actions it permits. The principal federal law addressing cultural resources is the NHPA (16 USC Section 470), and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). These regulations, commonly referred to as the Section 106 process, describe the procedures for identifying and evaluating historic properties, for assessing the effects of federal actions on historic properties, and for guiding project proponents

consulting with appropriate agencies to avoid, reduce, or minimize adverse effects. The BLM in Nevada meets its responsibilities under Section 106 and other provisions of the NHPA through a state protocol agreement with the Nevada State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO). Using authorities developed under a nationwide BLM programmatic agreement, the BLM follows an alternate procedure to the 36 CFR 800 regulations to meet its historic preservation responsibilities. Cultural resource consultation with the SHPO, Native American tribes and interested parties is required under the NHPA and a variety of laws, regulations, guidance, and departmental and executive orders.

The state protocol agreement requires that the BLM invite the SHPO to participate early in the process of preparing or amending land use plans in order to identify cultural resource issues that should be addressed. The BLM met with Alice Baldrice of the Nevada SHPO on February 16, 2007 to present the proposed alternatives. The SHPO was invited but declined to be a cooperating agency for the RMP/EIS. The SHPO has also received copies of consultation correspondence with the Native American tribes. Additional consultations with the SHPO and Indian Tribes also may be required during implementation of individual projects. The BLM met with the SHPO on May 15, 2012 to continue the consultation process in accordance with the state protocol between the BLM and the SHPO. Consultations with the SHPO are ongoing and will be completed before the Record of Decision is signed.

#### **5.3.4 Endangered Species Act Consultation**

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended, directs every federal agency to ensure that any action it authorizes, funds or carries out is not likely to jeopardize the existence of any listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat. The ESA authorizes federal agencies to enter into early consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) to make those determinations. BLM requested a species list from USFWS of any federally listed, federally proposed, or current federal candidate species that may be present in the RMP planning area on February 8, 2005. Updated species lists were requested on August 27, 2007, March 25, 2010, and January 26, 2012. The most recent list (USFWS 2012) can be found in Appendix D. The BLM initiated formal consultation with the USFWS under Section 7 of the ESA on March 9, 2012. Formal Section 7 consultation was completed on July 27, 2012, when the USFWS provided a Biological Opinion.

#### **5.3.5 Resource Advisory Council**

A resource advisory council (RAC) is a committee established by the Secretary of Interior to provide advice or recommendations to BLM management (BLM 2005a). A RAC is generally composed of 15 members of the public representing different facets. The Sierra Front-Northwestern Great Basin RAC includes a panel of mixed expertise ranging from natural resources and Native American culture to mining, transportation, and politics. The group is facilitated by the public affairs officer from the BLM. In March 2005, five new members were incorporated into the WD RAC to replace previous members. The first meeting with the new RAC was held on April 28, 2005 at the WD office. After a presentation of the RMP process highlighting the components and issues of the planning area, preliminary planning criteria, and project status, the RAC elected to form a subgroup to provide assistance and input. The RAC subgroup assisted in developing the alternatives at the following meetings:

- Fernley Nevada on July 11, 2005;
- BLM Carson City District Office on July 29, 2005;
- Winnemucca District Office from September 17-18, 2005;
- Winnemucca District Office from November 11-13, 2005;
- Winnemucca District Office from January 17-18, 2006;
- Winnemucca District Office on March 15, 2006;
- Winnemucca District Office from June 8-9, 2006;
- Winnemucca District Office on November 30, 2006; and
- Winnemucca District Office on January 11, 2008.

BLM continued collaboration among cooperating agencies, the RAC subgroup, and Tribal governments during the preparation of the Proposed RMP. Following issuance of the Draft RMP/EIS, the WD hosted a cooperating agency meeting on December 1, 2011 inviting all cooperating agencies to meet and follow-up individual meetings for cooperators who missed the combined meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to provide agencies with the status of the planning effort, an overview of public comments, and distribute preliminary proposed management actions for review and comment. The BLM also provided the RAC subgroup with the opportunity to review the preliminary proposed management actions for the RMP because they were instrumental in providing information for development of the Draft RMP/EIS. The BLM has continued coordination with Tribal governments through the Native American consultation process.

#### **5.4 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS**

Scoping for the Draft RMP/EIS began in March 2005. The first newsletter for the WD RMP was mailed on March 23, 2005, to more than 1,600 individuals from the public, agencies, and organizations that have participated in past BLM projects or requested to be on the mailing list. Recipients of the newsletter and visitors to the scoping open houses were asked to specifically request to stay on the official RMP project mailing list to receive future mailings. In addition, the distribution list was updated throughout the development of the Draft RMP/EIS. The distribution list of agencies, organizations, and individuals who have been a part of the RMP is available in the administrative record.

A Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft RMP/EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on June 25, 2010. The NOA initiated a 90-day public comment period. Due to public interest, the BLM extended the comment period an additional 30 days until October 25, 2010. The BLM notified the public of open house meetings via the project Web site and a news release to 33 media sites including newspapers, radio, and television.

The BLM held public comment open houses for the Draft RMP/EIS on four consecutive afternoons and evenings in late July 2010: Monday, July 26 in Winnemucca, Tuesday, July 27 in Lovelock, Wednesday, July 28 in Gerlach, and Friday, July 29 in Reno. All meetings were from 5:00 to 7:00 PM. The goal of the open houses was to inform the public about the Draft RMP/EIS and to obtain further public input on the alternatives that were developed and analyzed. In addition, the WD sought comments on potential impacts resulting from the four alternatives.

At the open houses, displays introduced the various resource topics and presented the four alternatives for the resource topics. Other displays explained the NEPA process and the methods for submitting comments. A slide show looped throughout the open house describing the WD RMP/EIS preparation process.

Public comments were solicited at the open houses, where comment sheets were provided.

## **5.5 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT RMP/EIS**

### **5.5.1 Method of Comment Collection and Analysis**

The WD Draft RMP/EIS public comment period lasted 120 days and ended October 25, 2010. Individuals were encouraged to submit written comments. Methods of submitting comments included comment forms, letters, facsimiles, and e-mail.

To ensure that public comments were properly registered and not overlooked, the BLM collected all submitted comments and input them into a database. Each comment submission source was categorized as one of the following:

- Federal agencies;
- Local and state agencies;
- Nongovernment agency;
- Business;
- Individual; and
- Tribal.

Each individual substantive comment was labeled and placed into a subcategory based on the subject matter of the comment (e.g., wild horses and burros, water resources). BLM guidance was used in identifying substantive comments. Finally, the BLM's interdisciplinary team responded to the labeled individual substantive comments. These comments and the BLM's responses can be found in Appendix M.

These comments were incorporated into a Draft RMP/EIS Public Comment Summary Report, and the BLM considered them in refining the alternatives, affected environment, and impact assessment for this Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

### **5.5.2 Summary of Written Comments Received**

By the end of the review period, 1,348 comments had been submitted (Table 5-1). These comments were reviewed, summarized in a comment summary report, and considered in preparing this Proposed RMP/Final EIS. It is noteworthy that 30,617 form letters were submitted pertaining to wild horses and burros. These were generated by three separate organizations. Individuals from all over the world were given access to the form and were allowed to submit the form letter from the organizations' web sites through an e-mail link. There were 22,467 submissions through the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), 73 of which were received after the final date to submit comments of October 25, 2010. The form published by the ASPCA

**Table 5-1  
Summary of Comments**

<b>Issue Category</b>	<b>Number of Individual Comments</b>	<b>Percentage of Comments</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
Area of critical environmental concern (ACEC)	14	1.04	Expansion of ACEC nominations and designating ACECs for specific species habitat.
Air quality	57	4.23	Air quality and BLM permitted actions. Lack of information on climate change.
Alternatives	62	4.60	Comments on the range of alternatives.
Biology	5	0.37	Managing for biological crusts and salt desert shrub communities.
Cave and karst	1	0.07	Access to cave and karst resources.
Climate change	9	0.67	More details on climate change.
Chapter 1	1	0.07	RMP plan consistency with local and state plans.
Cultural resources	17	1.26	Traditional Cultural Properties and their management.
Cumulative	4	0.30	Level of cumulative impact analysis.
Fish and wildlife	74	5.49	Management of priority habitats.
General	74	5.49	Quality document control of the RMP document.
Geology	10	0.74	Management of unique geologic formations.
Lands and realty	33	2.45	Lands and realty management, including land tenure adjustments and use restrictions.
Livestock grazing	90	6.68	Lands available for grazing, consistency with other local and state plans and the Taylor Grazing Act.
Minerals	97	7.20	Areas open for mineral development and use restrictions.
Paleontological resources	1	0.07	Protection of paleontological resources.
Public health	4	0.30	Public health safety and coordination with local law enforcement.
Purpose and need	2	0.15	Suggestions that section should be clarified with regard to management direction and current ecological status.
Recreation	92	6.82	Off-highway vehicle management and designation of off-highway vehicle routes.
Renewable energy	46	3.41	Recommendations on where to locate renewable energy structures and identification of zones suitable for renewable energy projects.
Sustainable development	1	0.07	Clarification of sustainable development wording.
Scoping process	7	0.52	Relevance of scoping and purpose and need due to time lapse in the RMP process.
Special recreation management area (SRMA)	7	0.52	Management of SRMAs and need for future public involvement.

**Table 5-1  
Summary of Comments**

<b>Issue Category</b>	<b>Number of Individual Comments</b>	<b>Percentage of Comments</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>
Socioeconomic and environmental justice	2	0.15	Changes in socioeconomic conditions.
Soil	20	1.48	Impacts on soils.
Special status species	33	2.45	Sage-grouse habitat management, surveys, and habitat restoration.
Transportation and access	27	2.00	Road maintenance and access.
Tribal interests	8	0.59	Native American consultation.
Vegetation	76	5.64	Management of vegetation.
Vegetation forest woodlands	13	0.96	Forest health management, protection, and fire suppression priorities.
Vegetation rangelands	15	1.11	Management of fuels, types of vegetation treatments, and coordination.
Vegetation riparian habitat	8	0.59	Riparian vegetation management.
Vegetation weeds	16	1.19	Weed control and integrated pest management.
Visual resources	37	2.74	Visual resource management classification.
Water	58	4.30	Protection of water resources, including quality and availability.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	5	0.37	Protecting Wild and Scenic River values.
Wildland fire management	21	1.56	Wildland fire management, multiple objectives, and suppression priorities
Wild horses and burros	244	18.10	Wild horses and burros management, gathers, and adoption.
Wilderness Study Areas and Characteristics	57	4.23	Identifying and protecting lands with wilderness characteristics.
	<b>1,348</b>	<b>100</b>	

allowed submitters to add additional comments, and 3,837 individuals did so, bringing the number of submissions through the ASPCA to 26,304. In Defense of Animals generated 3,814 letters. Of these, 59 individuals included additional comments, and 143 submissions were received after the final date. An unknown organization generated 499 form comment submissions, 13 of which contained additional comments by the sender, and 66 were received after the final date. Identical form letters were not counted as separate comment submissions. Because of the duplicative nature of these types of comments, they represent one opinion that was mass solicited. Each organization's form allowed individuals to add text to the existing form. Added comments on the forms ranged from concern over the ranching/mining industry and development, concern over how horses are treated during gathering operations, the desire to protect horses and burros, to be kind to wild horses and burros, and to leave them alone. Many of the added comments were in disagreement

with the BLM and its Wild Horses and Burros Program and the use of tax dollars to gather the animals. A few commenters showed support for different aspects of the program.

### 5.5.3 Comment Letters and BLM Responses

Written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS are contained in Appendix M. This appendix contains public and agency comments and the BLM's responses. Each comment is outlined and coded by affiliation, affiliation type, and the comment number within the letter. A vertical line and the comment code note each separate comment within each letter. The BLM's response to each comment is printed to the right of each comment.

## 5.6 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

An NOA will be published in the *Federal Register* to notify the public of the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The NOA will also outline protest procedures during the 30-calendar-day protest period. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be available for downloading from the project Web site at: [http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm\\_information/rmp.html](http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/wfo/blm_information/rmp.html). The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will also be available for review at the BLM WD office. Press releases will be issued to notify the public of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS availability. All recipients of the Draft RMP/EIS and all parties who submitted written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS will receive the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in either a hard copy or CD, or they will be able to download it from the Web site. The WD will notify those who previously received the Draft RMP/EIS electronically. The WD maintains the distribution list for the Proposed RMP/EIS, which is available on request.

## 5.7 LIST OF PREPARERS

An interdisciplinary team (IDT) of resource specialists from the BLM WD prepared this RMP/EIS (Tables 5-2, 5-3). Tetra Tech, Inc. assisted the BLM in preparing these documents and in the planning process (Table 5-4).

**Table 5-2**  
**List of Preparers – BLM (Current)**

Name	Years of Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Robert Burton	10	Soils and Vegetation	BS, Environmental Science
Joey Carmosino	12	Recreation/VRM	MA, Recreation Administration
Amanda DeForest	20	Livestock Grazing, WH&B and Wildlife	BS, Wildlife/Rangeland Management
Mark Hall	20	Native American Concerns/Consultation	PhD, Anthropology MS, Engineering MA, Anthropology BS, Engineering
Jeff Johnson	23	Project Manager – 2003-2006 Project Manager – 2011-2013 Fire Ecology	BS, Conservation of Natural Resources
Marla Kirschbaum	5	GIS	BS, Biology

**Table 5-2  
List of Preparers – BLM (Current)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Daniel Kozar	2	GIS	BS, Geography
Whitney Kroschel	1	NEPA Technician	MS, Biological Sciences
Ken Loda	29	Minerals and Geology	BS, Geology
Greg Lynch	12	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Agriculture/Fishery Science
John McCann	2	Water Resources/Riparian Habitat, Wild and Scenic Rivers	BA, Environmental Studies, BS Geology
Peggy McGuckian	37	Cultural Resources	BA, Anthropology, MA Anthropology
Julie McKinnon	2	Lands and Realty	Lands School
Derek Messmer	18	Livestock Grazing	BS, Resource Management/Forestry and Range Management
Celeste R. Mimnaugh	8	Special Status Species/Wildlife	BS, Environmental Resources in Agriculture
Zwaantje Rorex	5	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BA, Geography
Gene Seidlitz	21	District Manager	BS, Rangeland Management
Kristine Struck	10	Wilderness/WSA/Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	BS, Outdoor Recreation Management

**Table 5-3  
List of Preparers – BLM (Prior to 2010)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Rodger Bryan	32	Project Manager 2009	BS, Wildlife
Bob Edwards	35	Project Manager 2007-2008, 2010, Lands & Realty	BS, Business Management
Mark Ennes	4	Cultural Resource/Paleontology	MA, Anthropology
Ken Detweiler	32	Special Status Species/Wildlife	BS, Wildlife
Craig Drake	19	Water Resources	BS, Resource Management/Hydrology
Glenna Eckel	17	Wild Horses and Burros	BS, Multi-Resource Management
Gerald Gulley	10	Wilderness/WSA	MS, Forest Recreation
Dave Lefevre	5	Recreation	BS, Recreation Management
Matt Varner	5	Fish and Aquatic/Riparian Habitat	BS, Wildlife and Fisheries Management
Mike Zielinski	33	Soils/Vegetation	BS, Resource Management Soils

**Table 5-4  
List of Preparers – Contractor**

<b>Contractor—Tetra Tech, Inc.</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Cindy Adornetto	24	Recreation	MS, Environmental Policy and Mgmt., University of Denver; BS, Natural Resource Mgmt., Colorado State University
Emmy Andrews	8	Document Management, QA/QC	MS, Environmental Management Certificate, GIS, San Francisco State University
Kelly Bayer	17	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species, Transportation and Access	BS, Biology and Marine Science, University of Miami
Mike DaSilva	20	Wild Horses and Burros	BA and MS, Biology, Eastern Washington University
Kevin T. Doyle	27	Cultural Resources, Tribal Interests	BA, University of California, Santa Barbara, Continuing Studies in Anthropology, Historic Preservation, and Cultural Resource Management; California State University, Los Angeles; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Southern California, School of Architecture; and University of Nevada, Reno
Yashekia Evans	14	GIS	Geographic Information Systems Certificate in Environmental Analysis, San Francisco State University
Liz Fagen	4	Public Health and Safety	MS, Environmental Engineering, Colorado State University Fort Collins BS, Civil Engineering, University of Wisconsin Madison
Cameo Flood	25	Wildland Fire Management	BS, Forest Resource Management, University of Montana
Derek Holmgren	12	Project Management, Lands and Realty, Visual Resources, Special Designations	MPA and MSES, Environmental Science, Indiana University; BS and BA, Environmental Science, Oregon State University
Cliff Jarman	25	Soils, Geologic Resources, Cave and Karst Resources, Paleontological Resources, Minerals Resources, QA/QC	MS, Geophysics, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology BS, Geology, University of New Mexico

**Table 5-4  
List of Preparers – Contractor**

<b>Contractor—Tetra Tech, Inc.</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Genevieve Kaiser	23	Socioeconomics, Renewable Energy, GIS	MS, Energy Management and Policy, University of Pennsylvania; BA, Economics, College of William and Mary; Professional Certification: GIS, University of Denver
Shannon Lindquist	6	Document Management Support	MS, Environmental Studies, The Evergreen State College BS, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Sonoma State University
Julia Mates	11	Document Management Support	MA/History/Public History BA/History
Mandi McElroy	10	Document Management Support	MS, Wildlife Ecology and Management/Conservation and Sustainable Development, University of Georgia BS, Wildlife Biology, University of Georgia
Craig Miller	21	Project Management	MS, Wildlife Biology, Clemson University BS, Wildlife & Fisheries Biology, University of Vermont
Cindy Schad	20	Word Processing	BFA, Creative Writing, Emerson College
Bob Sculley	38	Air Resources	MS, Ecology, University of California, Davis BS, Zoology, Michigan State University
Randolph Varney	23	Writer, Editor	MFA, Writing, University of San Francisco BA, Technical and Professional Writing, San Francisco State University
Tom Whitehead	30	Water Resources	MS, University of Arizona BS, California State University Hayward BA, San Francisco State University
Meredith Zaccherio	5	Vegetation, Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species, Wilderness Characteristics	MA, Biology, Boston University BS, Biology, Binghamton University BS, Environmental Science, Binghamton University
Ann Zoidis	21	Document Management Support, QA/QC	MS, Physiology and Behavioral Biology, San Francisco State University BA, Geology, Smith College

**Table 5-4**  
**List of Preparers – Contractor**

<b>Subcontractor—Environmental Management &amp; Planning Solutions, Inc.</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
David Batts	21	Project Management, NEPA Specialist, QA/QC	MS, Natural Resource Planning, Michigan State University BS, International Development, Lewis and Clark College
Holly Prohaska	11	Project Management, Livestock Grazing	MS, Environmental Management, University of San Francisco; BA, Marine Science, Biological Pathway, University of San Diego
Jennifer Whitaker	10	Socioeconomics, Recreation, BMP Development	MSM, Regis University BS, Public Affairs, emphasis in Natural Resource Management, Indiana University
<b>Subcontractor—Far Western Archaeological</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Craig Young	20	Archaeologist	PhD, Anthropology, University of Nevada, Reno MA, Anthropology, University of Texas, Arlington
<b>Subcontractor—Bengston Consulting</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Years of Experience</b>	<b>Role/Responsibility</b>	<b>Education</b>
Ginny Bengston	10	Ethnographer	MA, Anthropology, Northern Arizona University BA, Anthropology, University of Washington