

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Executive Summary

The Bureau of Land Management Las Vegas Field Office (BLM) has prepared a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area (CTA). The Draft SEIS describes and analyzes possible boundary adjustments to the Upper Las Vegas Wash CTA referenced in the 2004 Final Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision. The CTA Draft SEIS supplements the analysis contained in the Final Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Environmental Impact Statement. Because of the significance of paleontological, botanical, hydrological, and cultural resources present within the CTA study area and the need for additional analysis and public input, the BLM is preparing this SEIS. The BLM proposes to establish a final boundary for the CTA. This decision was not made in the Final Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision. The CTA study area is located in the northern portion of the Las Vegas Valley. A defined final boundary is needed to ensure protection of sensitive resources, including fossils, cultural resources, the natural functioning of the wash, and endemic plants on public lands available for disposal within the CTA study area, in accordance with applicable laws.

This Draft SEIS has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and its implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality. The SEIS identifies the environmental consequences that may result from identifying different final boundaries for the Upper Las Vegas Wash CTA. This document also presents a record of consultation, coordination, and cooperation with other interested parties during the SEIS preparation. To assist the public and decision makers review, this SEIS is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 discusses the purpose and need for action.
- Chapter 2 describes the alternative CTA boundaries including the BLM Preferred Alternative and No-Action Alternative. A discussion of the alternatives considered but eliminated is also provided in this chapter.
- Chapter 3 provides an overview of the existing environmental conditions within the CTA study area and the potentially affected environment.
- Chapter 4 addresses the potential environmental consequences of implementing the alternatives described in Chapter 2 when compared with the existing conditions presented in Chapter 3. Cumulative impacts and mitigation measures are also discussed in Chapter 4.
- Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 present Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitment of Resources, Consultation and Coordination, List of Preparers, Literature Cited, Glossary, and Index, respectively.
- Appendices provide additional technical support data.

Purpose and Need

BLM needs to determine a final boundary for the CTA that is based on best science to protect sensitive resources. The purpose of BLM's proposed action is to protect the natural functioning of the Upper Las Vegas Wash and the sensitive botanical, cultural, and paleontological resources. The ultimate boundary of the CTA is critically important to local municipalities that

must manage for the growth of their communities. Because the Upper Las Vegas Wash is an incised ephemeral wash, it intercepts runoff from adjacent lands. Thus, land uses could alter its natural hydrology and water quality. As a result, the Upper Las Vegas Wash and the resources it contains could be subject to impacts caused by land uses both inside and outside its immediate ordinary high-water mark.

Decisions to be Made

Selection of the final CTA boundary is the first step in a process for protection of sensitive resources in the CTA. Although stakeholders have provided input on a variety of planning and management actions that go beyond defining a final CTA boundary, the BLM is not making a decision on those planning and management actions through this SEIS. Additionally, although the Final Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision directed the BLM to transfer land in the CTA to another entity pursuant to an approved and signed conservation strategy agreement, the BLM is not making a decision on different managing entities through this process and would continue to manage resources within the final established boundary until such time as an outside entity meets the requirements of a BLM-approved conservation strategy agreement.

Description of Alternatives

From extensive public input, BLM identified six alternative CTA boundaries for analysis ranging from approximately 1,500 acres for the No-Action Alternative to almost 13,000 acres. These are each summarized below in Table ES-1, and described in detail in Chapter 2 of the Draft SEIS.

Table ES-1. Summary of Alternative Boundaries

Alternative	Alternative Boundary (acres)	Lands outside Alternative Boundary (acres)	Tule Springs (state lands)—outside Alternative Boundary (not available for disposal)	Eglington Preserve—outside Alternative Boundary (not available for disposal)	Lands Available for Disposal (acres)*
Alternative A	12,9523	670	299	0	370
Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	11,008	2,615	299	0	2,315
Alternative C	6,362	7,260	299	0	6,961
Alternative D	5,301	8,321	0	298	8,022
Alternative E	3,314	10,308	0	298	10,010
No-Action Alternative	1,448	12,174	24	0	12,150

* Lands available for disposal = (Total acres outside alternative boundary) – (Eglington Preserve and Tule Springs State Lands if outside the alternative boundary).

Alternative A, at 12,953 acres, includes the fossil formation, sensitive cultural and plant resources, active wash and 100-year floodplain, the adjacent upper alluvial fan, and a one-mile resource protection zone around northern and eastern boundaries of the Las Vegas Paiute reservation. Alternative A includes the Eglington Preserve, but does not include the Tule Springs State Lands.

Alternative B, at 11,008 acres, includes the fossil formation, sensitive cultural and plant resources, active wash and 100-year floodplain, and the adjacent upper alluvial fan. Alternative B includes the Eglington Preserve, but does not include the Tule Springs State Lands. Alternative B is the BLM's Preferred Alternative.

Alternative C, at 6,362 acres, includes the fossil formation, sensitive cultural and plant resources, the active wash and 100-year floodplain, and a portion of the adjacent upper alluvial fan. Alternative C includes the Eglington Preserve, but does not include the Tule Springs State Lands.

Alternative D, at 5,301 acres, includes most of the fossil formation, the sensitive cultural and rare plant resources, and the active wash. Alternative D does not include the Eglington Preserve, but does include the Tule Springs State Lands.

Alternative E, at 3,314 acres, includes some of the fossil formation, the sensitive cultural and rare plant resources, and part of the active wash. Alternative E does not include the Eglington Preserve, but does include the Tule Springs State Lands.

The No Action Alternative is 1,448 acres and only includes the BLM portion of the Tule Springs National Register Site and the Eglington Preserve. Under the No-Action Alternative, the remaining lands in the CTA study area would be available for disposal in accordance with the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act, Federal Land Policy Management Act, other applicable laws subject to valid existing rights, and stipulations established by the conservation strategy agreement.

Summary of Environmental Consequences

The environmental consequences the alternatives could have on the various natural, socioeconomic, and land use resources were identified. The analysis of the different alternatives focuses on identifying types of impacts and their potential significance. The BLM has received input on a variety of new facilities, utilities, roads, and recreation infrastructure by various stakeholders for lands within the study area. The BLM is not making decisions about these actions as part of this process; however, in order to determine the direct and indirect impacts, BLM has made several assumptions regarding the location and size of potential actions under each alternative. These assumptions are based on detailed information provided by the stakeholders and on different development scenarios that may occur under each alternative. A brief summary of the major conclusions of the analysis is presented in Table ES-1. A detailed analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on these resources from each alternative boundary is presented in Chapter 4 of the Draft SEIS.

Table ES-2. Summary of Environmental Impacts

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Earth Resources	The primary impact to earth resources would result from hydrologic changes in the Upper Las Vegas Wash. Increased erosion and sedimentation would occur as a result of increased land uses. Changes in surface erosion are comparative and are based on assumptions described in Chapter 4 of the Draft SEIS.	Implementation of standard engineering and construction practices would reduce impacts.
Alternative A	Private development would yield up to 1,340 tons of sediment loss annually as a result of surface erosion and up to 1,030 tons of total stream bank erosion.	Preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan for construction projects that disturb more than one acre is required and would reduce impacts of construction-induced soil erosion and sedimentation.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Private development would yield up to 1,440 tons of sediment loss annually as a result of surface erosion and up to 1,150 tons of total stream bank erosion.	See above mitigation.
Alternative C	Private development would yield up to 1,630 tons of sediment loss annually as a result of surface erosion and up to 1,380 tons of total stream bank erosion.	See above mitigation.
Alternative D	Private development would yield up to 1,700 tons of sediment loss annually as a result of surface erosion and up to 1,460 tons of total stream bank erosion.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	Private development would yield up to 1,780 tons of sediment loss annually as a result of surface erosion and up to 1,550 tons of total stream bank erosion.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Private development would yield up to 1,890 tons of sediment loss annually as a result of surface erosion and up to 1,680 tons of total stream bank erosion.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Surface Water/Hydrology	The primary impact to surface water/hydrology would result from increased land uses. Increases in surface water flows and sedimentation would result in changes in the hydrologic and erosive processes in the Upper Las Vegas Wash and would occur as a result of increased land uses. These changes are described in comparison with a baseline condition described in section 4.3.1 of the Draft SEIS. Additionally, construction of additional flood control facilities, and the implementation of any Best Management Practices or mitigation measures for these impacts may conflict with the BLM goals and objectives to protect the natural wash system.	Implementation of standard engineering and construction practices would reduce impacts.
Alternative A	There would be 2% increase in annual sediment loss from the baseline condition. The hydrologic and erosive process in the CTA study area would behave in a manner that is similar to existing conditions.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	There would be 9% increase in annual sediment loss from the baseline condition. Over time, the changing hydrologic and erosive process in the CTA study area would alter aspects of the natural wash. New private development would be subject to engineering analysis to determine appropriate stability and setback distances from the Upper Las Vegas Wash.	Preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan for construction projects that disturb more than one acre is required and would reduce impacts of construction-induced soil erosion and sedimentation.
Alternative C	There would be 23% increase in annual sediment loss from the baseline condition. Over time, the larger flows and greater stream bank erosion resulting from Alternative C would have a greater potential to alter the natural wash. There would be a greater need for additional erosion control measures and additional flood control facilities to protect sensitive areas.	Within their municipal boundaries, the cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas would coordinate with the Clark County Regional Flood Control District to implement flood control measures, as appropriate, to address higher peak flows and erosion within the Upper Las Vegas Wash. Best Management Practices identified in Appendix A of the Draft SEIS may be applied at the design stage for new flood control facilities.
Alternative D	There would be 29% increase in annual sediment loss from the baseline condition. Over time, the larger flows and greater stream bank erosion resulting from Alternative D would have a greater potential to alter the natural wash. There would be a greater need for additional erosion control measures and additional flood control facilities to protect sensitive areas.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative E	There would be 35% increase in annual sediment loss from the baseline condition. Over time, the larger flows and greater stream bank erosion resulting from Alternative E would have a greater potential to alter the natural wash. There would be a greater need for additional erosion control measures and additional flood control facilities to protect sensitive areas.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	There would be 43% increase in annual sediment loss from the baseline condition. Over time, the larger flows and greater stream bank erosion resulting from the No-Action alternative would have a greater potential to alter the natural wash. There would be a greater need for additional erosion control measures and additional flood control facilities to protect sensitive areas.	See above mitigation.
Special-Status Plant Species	Increased land uses including land disposal would result in loss of occupied, high-potential, and moderate-potential Las Vegas buckwheat and Las Vegas bearpoppy, and Merriam's bearpoppy habitat.	
Alternative A	Private development on lands outside the alternative A boundary would result in no loss of Las Vegas Buckwheat habitat. Additionally, there would be a removal of 10.2 acres of moderate potential bearpoppy habitat.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Private development on lands outside the alternative B boundary would result in no loss of Las Vegas buckwheat habitat. Additionally, there would be a removal of 5.4 acres of occupied, 266.6 acres of high-potential, and 0.1 acre of moderate potential bearpoppy habitat.	Measures to reduce or eliminate impacts to special status plant species include relocating facilities outside of habitat, reducing the project footprint to the maximum extent possible, collecting seeds, salvaging topsoil, and propagating and planting native materials. Identify areas that should be avoided for activities or land uses to protect special state plant resources.
Alternative C	Private development on lands outside the alternative C boundary would result in the removal of 142.1 acres of moderate potential Las Vegas buckwheat habitat. Additionally, there would be a removal of 7.1 acres of high-potential, and 779.7 acres of moderate potential bearpoppy habitat.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative D	Private development on lands outside the alternative D boundary would result in the removal of 1.3 acres of moderate potential Las Vegas buckwheat habitat. Additionally, there would be a removal of 3.2 acres of high-potential, and 282.7 acres of moderate potential bearpoppy habitat.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	Private development on lands outside the alternative E boundary would result in the removal of 3.1 acres of high-potential, and 32.7 acres of moderate potential Las Vegas buckwheat habitat. Additionally, there would be a removal of 3.2 acres of high-potential, and 282.7 acres of moderate potential bearpoppy habitat.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Private development on lands outside the No-Action alternative boundary would result in the removal of 0.2 acres occupied, 4.1 acres of high-potential, and 1.6 acres of moderate potential Las Vegas buckwheat habitat. Additionally, there would be a removal of 39.8 acres of high-potential, and 684.9 acres of moderate potential bearpoppy habitat.	See above mitigation.
Cultural Resources	Increases in land uses would result in increased opportunities for discovery and direct loss of undocumented cultural resources.	Cultural resource mitigation and treatment. Development of public interpretive displays and educational materials would encourage public stewardship and protection of cultural resources.
Alternative A	There would a low probability of vandalism and destruction of undocumented cultural resources from people attracted to CTA as a result of private development on up to 370 acres. Indirect impacts from people attracted to the area would result from increased trail development and educational programs.	See above mitigation.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	There would a low to moderate probability of vandalism and destruction of undocumented cultural resources from people attracted to CTA as a result of private development on up to 2,315 acres. Indirect impacts from people attracted to the area would result from increased trail development and educational programs.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative C	There would a moderate probability of vandalism and destruction of undocumented cultural resources from people attracted to CTA as a result of private development on up to 6,961 acres. Indirect impacts from people attracted to the area would result from increased trail development and educational programs.	See above mitigation.
Alternative D	There would a moderate probability of vandalism and destruction of undocumented cultural resources from people attracted to CTA as a result of private development on up to 8,022 acres. Indirect impacts from people attracted to the area would result from increased trail development and educational programs.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	There would a moderate probability of vandalism and destruction of undocumented cultural resources from people attracted to CTA as a result of private development on up to 10,010 acres. Indirect impacts from people attracted to the area would result from increased trail development and educational programs.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	The highest probability of the alternatives for vandalism and destruction of undocumented cultural resources from people attracted to CTA as a result of private development on up to 12,150 acres. Indirect impacts from people attracted to the area would result from increased trail development and educational programs.	See above mitigation.
Native American Religious Concerns	Increases in land uses surrounding the Upper Las Vegas Wash would affect resources of cultural and traditional importance to the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe.	Involving the tribe in planned developments early in the process could reduce impacts.
Alternative A	Alternative A would provide greatest protection of traditional use areas.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Provides adequate protection of traditional use area. Development would result in alterations to cultural landscape.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative C	Development would result in alterations to cultural landscape.	Involving the tribe in planned developments early in the process could reduce impacts.
Alternative D	Development would result in alterations to cultural landscape.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative E	Development would result in alterations to cultural landscape.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Development would result in alterations to cultural landscape.	See above mitigation.
Paleontology	Increases in land uses within the Las Vegas Formation would result in destruction of surface and subsurface paleontological resources as a result of breakage and crushing from surface disturbing construction activities.	Impacts can be reduced through implementation of a paleontological survey and monitoring program and increasing public awareness.
Alternative A	Alternative A includes all 436 recorded fossil localities. There is the potential for exposure and destruction of undocumented fossil localities in the 370 acres of lands available for disposal.	<p>Collection of all previously recorded scientifically significant surface fossils that will not be preserved or displayed in situ from within the boundaries of the CTA as soon as feasible in order to prevent loss from vandalism, theft, and natural weathering processes. Collection would be housed in a BLM-approved repository (i.e., museum).</p> <p>Mitigation monitoring of all surface-disturbing development activities in order to prevent destruction of scientifically significant subsurface fossils contained within strata of the Las Vegas Formation.</p> <p>Development of in situ paleontological interpretive displays, which may include fossil specimens, and in situ preservation of paleontologically sensitive areas and key fossil localities.</p> <p>Under the direction of the CTA management authority, establishment of an ongoing paleontological survey and monitoring program designed to periodically check for newly exposed fossil remains and monitor the status of in situ preserved localities.</p>
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B includes all 436 recorded fossil localities. There is the potential for exposure and destruction of undocumented fossil localities in the 2,315 acres of lands available for disposal.	See above mitigation.
Alternative C	Alternative C includes 434 of the 436 recorded fossil localities. There is the potential for exposure and destruction of undocumented fossil localities in the 6,961 acres of lands available for disposal.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative D	Alternative D includes 422 of the 436 recorded fossil localities. There is the potential for exposure and destruction of undocumented fossil localities in the 8,022 acres of lands available for disposal.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	Alternative E includes 318 of the 436 recorded fossil localities. There is the potential for exposure and destruction of undocumented fossil localities in the 10,010 acres of lands available for disposal.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	The No-Action alternative includes 82 of the 436 recorded fossil localities. There is the potential for exposure and destruction of undocumented fossil localities in the 12,174 acres of lands available for disposal.	See above mitigation.
Visual Resources	The transfer of land ownership would not affect visual resources, but the subsequent private development would result in clearly visible changes to the existing landscape.	Measures can be implemented during planning, design, and construction to reduce the presence of proposed facilities and make them more compatible with the natural elements of the landscape.
Alternative A	The level of change to the landscape was determined to be moderate, and proposed development was determined to be consistent with BLM Visual Resource Management objectives.	See above mitigation.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Private development on 2,315 acres of lands available for disposal would convert predominantly undeveloped landscapes to high-density urban development. Although this is not consistent with Visual Resource Management Class III objectives, private land would not be subject to BLM Visual Resource Management objectives.	See above mitigation.
Alternative C	Private development on 6,961 acres of lands available for disposal would convert predominantly undeveloped landscapes to high-density urban development. Although this is not consistent with Visual Resource Management Class III objectives, private land would not be subject to BLM Visual Resource Management objectives.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative D	Private development on 8,022 acres of lands available for disposal would convert predominantly undeveloped landscapes to high-density urban development. Although this is not consistent with Visual Resource Management Class III objectives, private land would not be subject to BLM Visual Resource Management objectives.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	Private development on 10,010 acres of lands available for disposal would convert predominantly undeveloped landscapes to high-density urban development. Although this is not consistent with Visual Resource Management Class III objectives, private land would not be subject to BLM Visual Resource Management objectives.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Private development on 12,150 acres of lands available for disposal would convert predominantly undeveloped landscapes to high-density urban development. Although this is not consistent with Visual Resource Management Class III objectives, private land would not be subject to BLM Visual Resource Management objectives.	See above mitigation.
Land Uses	There would be no impact to current land uses within the CTA study area under any of the alternatives.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Recreation	The primary impact to recreation would result from a loss of open space that is currently available for passive recreation opportunities. Additionally, current access to the CTA study area would be limited as a result of private development on lands available for disposal.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative A	Alternative A would preserve the open space available for non-motorized passive recreation opportunities.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B would preserve open space and access available for non-motorized passive recreation opportunities.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative C	Private development on 6,961 acres of lands available for disposal would reduce the available open space and access to passive recreation opportunities in the CTA study area	Incorporate plans to establish a non-motorized trail system, compatible with protection of sensitive resources, for the enjoyment of the public in association with private development.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative D	Private development on 8,022 acres of lands available for disposal would reduce the available open space and access to passive recreation opportunities in the CTA study area.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	Private development on 10,010 acres of lands available for disposal would reduce the available open space and access to passive recreation opportunities in the CTA study area.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Private development on 12,150 acres of lands available for disposal would reduce the available open space and access to passive recreation opportunities in the CTA study area	See above mitigation.
Transportation	The primary impact to transportation resources would be increased traffic resulting from limitations on roadways and population growth associated with the private development of disposal lands in the CTA study area.	
Alternative A	Minor increases in average daily traffic on roads surrounding alternative A would result from increased visitation for recreation and educational purposes.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Minor increases in average daily traffic on roads surrounding alternative B would result from increased visitation for recreation and educational purposes. Additionally, population increases as a result of private development combined with only minor increases in road capacity assumed under alternative B would result in increased traffic volume.	Prior to any private development, builders would consult with the NDOT and RTC to develop traffic control plans.
Alternative C	Population increases as a result of private development would result in increased traffic volume. The additional road capacity assumed under alternative C would reduce the effects of increased population.	See above mitigation.
Alternative D	Population increases as a result of private development would result in increased traffic volume. The additional road capacity assumed under alternative D would reduce the effects of increased population.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative E	Population increases as a result of private development would result in increased traffic volume. The additional road capacity assumed under alternative E would reduce the effects of increased population.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Population increases as a result of private development would result in increased traffic volume. The additional road capacity assumed under the No-Action alternative would reduce the effects of increased population on traffic volume.	See above mitigation.
Noise	There would be an increase in ambient noise levels associated with development and construction activities that would be associated with potential future development of disposal lands in the CTA study area.	The implementation of engineering and construction practices would reduce impacts to sensitive noise receptors.
Alternative A	There would be no changes in ambient noise levels as a result of alternative A.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Private development on 2,315 acres would result in increased ambient noise levels.	Best Management Practices would be implemented to minimize potential impacts to sensitive noise receptors during design and construction of all new potential private development.
Alternative C	Private development on 6,961 acres would result in increased ambient noise levels.	See above mitigation.
Alternative D	Private development on 8,022 acres would result in increased ambient noise levels.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	Private development on 10,010 acres would result in increased ambient noise levels.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	Private development on 12,174 acres would result in increased ambient noise levels.	See above mitigation.
Hazardous Materials	Based on the history of mining and unauthorized dumping throughout the CTA study area, there is the potential for discovery of previously unknown hazardous materials on lands available for disposal.	Characterization and appropriate remediation are required in order to ensure that any lands disposed of do not include hazardous materials.
Alternative A	There would be an increased risk of discovery on 370 acres as a result of alternative A.	See above mitigation.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	There would be an increased risk of discovery on 2,315 acres as a result of alternative B.	See above mitigation.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative C	There would be an increased risk of discovery on 6,961 acres as a result of alternative C.	See above mitigation.
Alternative D	There would be an increased risk of discovery on 8,022 acres as a result of alternative D.	See above mitigation.
Alternative E	There would be an increased risk of discovery on 10,010 acres as a result of alternative E.	See above mitigation.
No-Action Alternative	There would be an increased risk of discovery on 12,174 acres as a result of the No-Action alternative.	See above mitigation.
Socioeconomics	The preservation or development of currently undeveloped desert lands in the Las Vegas Valley would directly impact the social and economic resources of the area as a result of potential population increases, employment requirements, capital expenditures, loss or gain of open space as an amenity, and loss or gain of productive land value.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative A	The cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas could experience loss of tax revenue, increased costs for transportation and infrastructure if development is further away; have reduced ability to grow in a more effective and orderly fashion. There would be direct, beneficial impacts to community resource groups who have an interest in the preservation of the entire CTA study area.	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative B (BLM Preferred Alternative)	Under Alternative B, 2,315 acres would be available for disposal and there would be a moderate increase in tax and revenue over Alternative A. There would be direct, beneficial impacts to community resource groups who have an interest in the preservation of the sensitive resources in the CTA study area.	No mitigation measures are identified.

Resource	Impacts	Mitigations
Alternative C	<p>Under Alternative C, 6,961 acres would be available for disposal and private development and would result in a proportionally larger increase in tax and revenues to the cities.</p> <p>Groups who have an interest in preservation of the sensitive resources in the CTA study area would experience impacts to their community's values as a result of more limited protection of these sensitive resources.</p>	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative D	<p>Under Alternative D, 8,022 acres would be available for disposal and would result in a proportionally larger increase in tax and revenue to the cities.</p> <p>Groups who have an interest in preservation of the sensitive resources in the CTA study area would experience impacts to their community's values as a result of more limited protection of these sensitive resources.</p>	No mitigation measures are identified.
Alternative E	<p>Under Alternative E, 10,010 acres would be available for disposal and would result in a proportionally positive increase in tax and revenue to the cities.</p> <p>Groups who have an interest in preservation of the sensitive resources in the CTA study area would experience impacts to their community's values as a result of more limited protection of these sensitive resources.</p>	No mitigation measures are identified.
No-Action Alternative	<p>Under the No-Action Alternative, 12,150 acres would be available for disposal and would result in a proportionally larger increase in tax and revenue to the cities.</p> <p>Groups who have an interest in preservation of the sensitive resources in the CTA study area would experience impacts to their community's values as a result of more limited protection of these sensitive resources.</p>	No mitigation measures are identified.