

Boundary


- Alternative one encompasses jurisdictional waters on the western side of the R&PP leases.
- It is approximately 2,940 acres, a reduction of 2,060 acres from the no action alternative.
- Alternative one includes Tule Springs, all surface paleontological sites, and sensitive plant habitat. It excludes the Floyd Lamb R&PP and the Eglington Preserve.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglington Preserve would not be available for disposal.
- Some infrastructure needs would be permitted.
- Some modifications for flood control would be permitted including the northwest detention basin, and all flood control facilities for the City of North Las Vegas.
- Recreation infrastructure developments in the R&PP leased lands.
- Connections to regional parks and trails.
- A number of paleontological sites would occur outside of the boundary.

Management

- Management may be by the BLM, City, County, or a Private Conservation Group.



Boundary


- Alternative two encompasses jurisdictional waters, flood terrace, and portions of the uplands as a buffer.
- It is approximately 6,323 acres, an increase of approximately 1,323 acres from the no action alternative.
- Alternative two includes the Eglington Preserve and the R&PP leased lands.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglington Preserve would not be available for disposal.
- Some infrastructure needs would be permitted.
- Some modifications for flood control would be permitted.
- Recreation would be managed the same as Alternative one with the potential for increased trails.
- All paleontological sites would occur inside the boundary.

Management

- Management may be by the BLM, City, County, or a Private Conservation Group.



Boundary


- Include ½ mile buffer east of the Las Vegas Paiute Reservation and a one mile buffer north of the reservation.
- It is approximately 9,000 acres, an increase of approximately 4,000 acres from the no action alternative.
- Increases the bajada on the northeast side.
- Includes the Eglington Preserve.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglington Preserve and Tule Springs NHS would not be available for disposal.
- Infrastructure permitted would include the Beltway.
- Some modifications to the natural channel for flood control would be permitted.
- Recreation would be managed same as Alternative 1 with the potential for additional trails.
- All paleontological sites would occur inside the boundary with a larger buffer than Alternative 2.

Management

- Management may be by the BLM, City, County, or a Private Conservation Group.



Boundary


- Includes lands between the reservation and the Desert National Wildlife Refuge (DNWR).
- It is approximately 10,600 acres, an increase of approximately 5,600 acres from the no action alternative.
- Moves boundary approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ miles east of Highway 95, north of the reservation.
- Moves boundary 1 mile north of Mocassin on east side of reservation.
- Includes Eglinton Preserve.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglinton Preserve would not be available for disposal.
- Some infrastructure needs would be permitted.
- Flood control would be accomplished with the natural wash with no modifications.
- Recreation would be managed same as Alternative 1 with greater potential for additional trails than alternative 3.
- All paleontological sites would occur inside the boundary with a larger buffer than alternative 3.

Management

- Management may be by the BLM, City, County, or a Private Conservation Group.



Boundary


- This is the entire study area as defined in the SEIS.
- It is approximately 12,800 acres, an increase of approximately 7,800 acres from the no action alternative.
- Follows the DNWR as the north boundary.
- Includes a 1 mile buffer north and east of the Las Vegas Paiute Reservation.
- Includes the area east of North 5th street to the DNWR boundary.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglington Preserve would not be available for disposal.
- Only infrastructure needs common to all alternatives would be permitted.
- Flood control would be accomplished with the natural wash with no modifications.
- Recreation would be managed same as Alternative 1 with the maximum potential for additional trails.
- All paleontological sites would occur inside the boundary with the maximum buffer.

Management

- Management may be by the BLM, City, County, or a Private Conservation Group.



Boundary


- The boundary is the same as the original Conservation Transfer Alternative Boundary.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglinton Preserve would not be available for disposal.
- Some infrastructure needs would be permitted.
- Some modifications to the natural channel for flood control may be permitted.
- Recreation would include R&PP, parks, open space, and fewer potential for trails.
- Most paleontological sites would occur inside the boundary.

Management

- Management may be by the BLM, City, County, or a Private Conservation Group.



Boundary

- The No Action Alternative represents the original Conservation Transfer Alternative Boundary.
- It is approximately 5,000 acres and would be available for disposal in accordance with SNPLMA, FLPMA, and other applicable laws subject to valid existing rights.

Allowable Uses

- The Eglinton Preserve and Tule Springs National Historic Site would not be available for disposal.
- The maximum amount of infrastructure needs would be permitted.
- The maximum modifications for flood control would be permitted.
- Recreation would be managed according to City Master Plans and R&PP leases.
- The Eglinton Preserve and Tule Springs would be managed for recreation by the BLM.
- Paleontological sites would be mitigated.

Management

- It would be managed by the BLM until sold.

Actions that would be common to all action alternatives

- Management responsibility
- Protection of the Tule Springs National Historic Site
- Non-motorized trails
- Treatment of eligible cultural sites
- Mitigate surface paleontological sites and sensitive plant habitat
- Decatur and Grand Teton alignments
- Aliante Parkway between Grand Teton and Horse Drive alignment
- No roads north of Grand Teton and east of Decatur
- Expansion of the Decatur Detention Basin if necessary
- Removal of southern half of McCool Park R&PP
- Any land within the ULVW – CTA boundary originally defined as available for disposal would now be potentially available for disposal with some type of conservation restrictions included
- Utilities shall be co-located with road alignments to prevent additional disturbance.
- Grand Teton Substation removed from boundary.