3) *Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.* Although the area is highly diversified and a exceptional setting for environmental interpretation, there are no unique characteristics in proximity to the project area.

4) *The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.* The effects of the proposed action on the human or natural environment were determined to be negligible. The construction of recreation based facilities within designated recreation lands is not expected to be highly controversial.

5) *The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.* The proposed action is not unique nor does it involve unknown risks. A similar interpretive facility has existed and functioned adequately at Curtz Lake since the mid 1970's.

6) *The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or presents a decision in principle about a future consideration.* The desire to enhance and protect recreation values and natural resources has guided management actions on BLM lands in Alpine County since the late 1960's. The proposed action is to re-develop and improve existing recreation facilities within an established recreation area.

7) *Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.* All resource values were evaluated for cumulative impacts and determined that cumulative impacts would be negligible.

8) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.* There are no known resources within the project area that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. There would be no loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.

9) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under ESA of 1973.* As described in the EA, no known threatened or endangered species (plant or animal), or critical habitat has been identified in the project area as considered in the EA.

10) *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.* As described in the EA, the proposed action does not violate any known Federal, State, or local law or requirement for protection of the environment. Officials from the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California were consulted on this proposal.

Linda J. Kelly
Manager,
Sierra Front Field Office

November 22, 2009
Date