

DRAFT

**IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL REASONABLY FORESEEABLE
FUTURE ACTIONS RELATED TO THE ADOPTION REVIEW OF
THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Prepared by

**Larry Canter, Ph.D.
Environmental Impact Training
Horseshoe Bay, Texas**

and

**David R. Turner
Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses
San Antonio, Texas**

Prepared for

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

January 2008

DRAFT

DRAFT

ABSTRACT

Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is required, to the extent practicable, to adopt the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)¹ for a potential high-level waste geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. DOE published an FEIS in February 2002 (the DOE 2002 FEIS) to accompany the site recommendation for Yucca Mountain. DOE is currently preparing two supplemental environmental impact statements (EISs)² to bring the 2002 FEIS up to date prior to submitting a license application to NRC in June 2008.

Chapter 8 in the DOE 2002 FEIS specifically relates to cumulative impacts, and a key feature is the inclusion of reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFAs)³ by federal, state, and local governments and by the private sector. The objective of this survey is to independently identify RFFAs that could be relevant to the potential repository at Yucca Mountain, and develop a tool that may be useful during the NRC adoption review process. The identifications were based on the review of the DOE 2002 FEIS and various Internet and local newspaper article searches. Recommendations from this survey include the following: (i) ensure that the RFFA information has been updated as appropriate (e.g., seven post-2001 FEISs or draft EISs and their associated RFFAs can be addressed in an update to Chapter 8 in the DOE 2002 FEIS); (ii) conduct systematic reviews of local newspapers to identify key development projects that could potentially contribute to cumulative impacts; and (iii) evaluate additional information from environmental assessments prepared for Yucca Mountain, the Nevada Test Site, and Nellis Air Force Base and the NevPLAN (transportation) relative to their potential contributions to cumulative impacts. Further, this survey relied on publicly available information and did not include specific contacts with key federal, state, and local agencies that may already have identified other future actions within their overall plans. Accordingly, as appropriate, such contacts could be considered and documented as part of the adoption process. Finally, this study emphasized identifying RFFAs. Appropriate specific analyses of these RFFAs may be used to determine their contributions to cumulative impacts on the environment related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

¹ It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

² It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

³ It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

DRAFT

CONTENTS

Section	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
TABLES	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Background	1-1
1.2 Objective of This Survey.....	1-2
2 REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTIONS	2-1
2.1 Scope of This Survey and Process Used	2-1
2.2 Information on RFFAs in the DOE 2002 FEIS	2-2
2.2.1 Federal Actions	2-2
2.2.2 Non-Federal and Private Actions	2-3
2.2.3 Transportation-Related Actions	2-4
2.2.4 Other Considerations	2-5
2.3 RFFAs Within Recent Environmental Assessments Related to the Potential Repository	2-5
2.3.1 The Yucca Mountain Infrastructure Environmental Assessment	2-5
2.3.2 Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Withdrawal of Public Lands Within and Surrounding the Caliente Rail Corridor	2-6
2.4 RFFAs Within Recent EISs	2-6
2.5 RFFAs in Recent Environmental Assessments Related to the Nevada Test Site	2-12
2.6 RFFAs in Recent Environmental Assessments Related to Nellis Air Force Base	2-13
2.7 RFFAs Identified Through Systematic Newspaper Searches.....	2-16
2.8 Cumulative Water Usage—A Potential Cumulative Impact Concern	2-17
2.9 Other Possible RFFAs.....	2-17
3 CONCLUSIONS AND POTENTIAL FOLLOWUP	3-1
4 REFERENCES.....	4-1

APPENDIXES

A	SUMMARIES OF REVIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN FUTURE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSES
B	SUMMARIES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS THAT CAN BE MONITORED TO DETERMINE RELEVANCE TO FUTURE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSES
C	SUMMARIES OF REVIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS THAT CAN BE EXCLUDED FROM FUTURE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSES
D	NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN LAS VEGAS AND CLARK COUNTY

DRAFT

CONTENTS (continued)

Section	Page
E NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN PAHRUMP AND NYE COUNTY	
F NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN INYO COUNTY	
G NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO WATER NEEDS AND ASSOCIATED CONFLICTS IN SOUTHERN NEVADA	
H NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO ENERGY DEVELOPMENTS	
I NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO THE RENO AREA	
J CONTACT INFORMATION FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES	

DRAFT

TABLES

Table	Page
2-1 Results of Reviews of Environmental Impact Statements (EISs).....	2-10

DRAFT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report describes work performed by the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses (CNWRA) and its contractors for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) under Contract No. NRC-02-07-006. The activities reported here were performed on behalf of the USNRC Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Division of High-Level Waste Repository Safety. This report is an independent product of the CNWRA and does not necessarily reflect the view or regulatory position of USNRC. The USNRC staff views expressed herein are preliminary and do not constitute a final judgment or determination of the matters addressed or of the acceptability of a license application for a geologic repository at Yucca Mountain.

The authors would like to thank B. Werling and B. Sagar for their thoughtful reviews, and L. Selvey and L. Mulverhill for excellent word processing and technical editing support.

QUALITY OF DATA, ANALYSES, AND CODE DEVELOPMENT

DATA: No CNWRA data were generated in this report.

ANALYSES AND CODES: No software was used to generate the information presented in this report.

DRAFT

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is required, to the extent practicable, to adopt the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)¹ for a potential high-level waste geologic repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. DOE published an FEIS in February 2002 to accompany the site recommendation for Yucca Mountain (the DOE 2002 FEIS). DOE is currently preparing two supplemental environmental impact statements (EISs)² to bring the DOE 2002 FEIS up to date prior to submitting a license application to NRC in June 2008. One key aspect of the DOE 2002 FEIS and the planned supplements is the consideration of potential cumulative impacts that may result from the proposed action.

In the National Environmental Policy Act, implementing regulation 40 CFR 1508.7, the Council on Environmental Quality defines cumulative impacts as follows.

Cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, actions taking place over a period of time.

A key feature of the definition of cumulative impacts is the need to address reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFAs)³ by federal, state, and local governments and by the private sector. To illustrate the importance of RFFAs in cumulative impact assessment, the findings from a recent peer-reviewed paper on case law can be instructive (Smith, 2006). This review contains an analysis of 25 cumulative impacts-related opinions issued by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals during the 10-year period from 1995–2004. The plaintiffs prevailed in 15 cases (60 percent), and the agencies won in 10 cases (40 percent); however, the plaintiffs won 8 of the 11 most recent cases (72 percent). Agency losses primarily occurred because agencies (i) failed to present cumulative impact analysis in their National Environmental Policy Act document; (ii) left out obvious past or present actions left out, or (iii) RFFAs; or they provided undocumented assertions that their projects would not cause any cumulative impacts. The most common plaintiff claim related to the inadequate analysis of other actions, including RFFAs. This claim appeared in 15 of the 25 cases (60 percent). Proponent agencies lost in 13 of the 15 cases involving claims relative to other actions. In conclusion, the results of the Smith (2006) analysis illustrate the need to systematically identify pertinent RFFAs and to then analyze their contributions to cumulative impacts on specific resources, ecosystems, and human communities. A systematic approach for the initial identification of potential RFFAs is described elsewhere (Rumrill and Canter, 1997).

¹It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

²It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

³It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

DRAFT

Identifying potential RFFAs typically requires systematic contacts with various programs of the proponent agency (DOE), other governmental agencies (federal, state, and local), and the private sector to ascertain the existence of both near-term and long-term future projects, plans, or programs in the vicinity of the actions and alternatives being evaluated in an EIS. DOE used this approach to prepare the Yucca Mountain 2002 FEIS (DOE, 2002).

After RFFAs are identified, they are analyzed to determine their potential contributions to cumulative impacts on resources, ecosystems, and human communities that will be affected by the proposed actions and alternatives.

The phrase “resources, ecosystems, and human communities” is used in the Council on Environmental Quality guidance on addressing cumulative impacts (effects) in the National Environmental Policy Act process (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997). The phrase is often shortened to resources, with the single term encompassing the range of issues associated with the phrase. Cumulative impacts on a total of 13 resources were addressed in Chapter 8 of the DOE 2002 FEIS (DOE, 2002).

The analyses approach for the identified RFFAs considers the contributing effects of each RFFA to the resources that are anticipated to be affected by the proposed action and alternatives. These contributing effects will be a function of the types of RFFAs, their timing and locations, potential environmental transport and fate processes, and such. Such analyses approaches were used in Chapter 8 of the DOE 2002 FEIS (DOE, 2002).

1.2 Objective of This Survey

As part of the adoption review process, the NRC will examine the DOE 2002 FEIS and the anticipated October 2007 supplemental EISs for Yucca Mountain (DOE, 2006a,b; 2004a,b) to ensure that these documents include relevant new and updated information regarding numerous impact categories, including cumulative impacts. Accordingly, and in preparation for the adoption process, the results of a reconnaissance-level survey of RFFAs in the affected environment surrounding Yucca Mountain and the Caliente Rail Corridor are presented in this report. The objective of this survey is to independently identify those RFFAs that could be relevant to the NRC adoption review process. The identifications were based on public information, and no specific agencies or private sector proponents were contacted. The survey was based on a review of the DOE 2002 FEIS, published draft and FEIS, and various Internet and local newspaper article searches.

DRAFT

2 REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTIONS

A number of publicly available information sources were surveyed to identify reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFAs)¹ that might influence a cumulative impacts analysis for the potential high-level waste geologic repository at Yucca Mountain. The results of this survey are presented in the subsequent sections.

2.1 Scope of This Survey and Process Used

The scope and process used to develop this survey includes

- Review of the RFFA information in the Executive Summary and Chapter 8 of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) 2002 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)² (DOE, 2002).
- Summarize proposed actions DOE evaluated in the 2002 FEIS as part of its repository program.
- Review of Notices of Availability of draft or final EISs³ by various agencies for actions to be conducted in the environs of Yucca Mountain; the emphasis was for Notices of Availability issued from January 2002 through May 2007. The January 2002 date was chosen based on the assumption that “potential” RFFAs after 2002 were not included in the DOE 2002 FEIS.
- Internet searching of several specific web sites, as well as “Googling” of specific terms. The websites that were searched included those for affected units of local government, the Nevada Commission on Economic Development, the Nevada Department of Transportation, the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, the Nevada Test Site, and Nellis Air Force Base. Google searching was conducted for several federal agencies using the following terms: U.S. Department of Energy and Nevada, Bureau of Land Management and Nevada, Federal Highway Administration and Nevada, and U.S. Air Force and Nevada.
- Internet searching for summary information on 33 final EISs and 7 draft EISs. The summary information was then reviewed to determine the potential relevance of the included RFFAs in any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.
- Internet searching for environmental assessments prepared for the Nevada Test Site and Nellis Air Force Base between January 2002 and May 2007.
- Five regional and local newspapers were selected based on the ease of access to online archives for the 2-year period considered in the report. Online searching of the

¹ It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

² It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

³ It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

DRAFT

newspapers for articles related to residential and commercial developments, infrastructure projects, and topical issues such as water demands and conflicts. These articles were not focused on federal projects requiring the preparation of EISs. Rather, they primarily related to larger scale private projects that also represent potential RFFAs in the vicinity of Yucca Mountain . More than 200 separate articles were reviewed and categorized in relation to potential RFFAs.

- Contact information for local, state, and federal agencies that might have RFFA-related information was compiled via Internet searching. The contact information included mailing addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, and websites.

The following sections of this report summarize the findings of this survey. Section 3 includes conclusions and recommendations for potential followup activities.

2.2 Information on RFFAs in the DOE 2002 FEIS

Chapter 8 of the DOE 2002 FEIS provides detailed information on RFFAs known as of 2002 (DOE, 2002). The chapter was reviewed to provide the appropriate context for the survey described herein. Both short-term and long-term cumulative impacts (effects) on 13 resources were addressed for the Yucca Mountain repository region {this typically included an 80-km [50-mi] radius around Yucca Mountain itself}. In addition, cumulative transportation effects were addressed at the national level and for the State of Nevada. Cumulative impacts were also discussed with regard to offsite manufacturing of disposed containers, rail shipping casks or overpacks, legal-weight truck shipping casks, drip shields, emplacement pallets, solar panels, and dry storage cask shells.

2.2.1 Federal Actions

In the 2002 FEIS, DOE considered eight separate RFFAs associated with federal activities (DOE, 2002, pp. 8-3 to 8-5):

- (1) Inventory Module 1—Disposal of all spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the proposed Yucca Mountain repository
- (2) Inventory Module 2—Disposal of all spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, as well as Greater-Than-Class C waste and Special-Performance-Assessment-Required waste, in the proposed Yucca Mountain repository
- (3) Nellis Air Force Range—National testing and training for military equipment and personnel
- (4) Nevada Test Site—Defense (stockpile stewardship and management, material disposition, nuclear emergency response), waste management, environmental restoration, nondefense research and development, work for others
- (5) Nevada Test Site—Alternative Energy Generation Facility
- (6) DOE Complex-Wide Waste Management Activities Affecting the Nevada Test Site—Treatment, storage, and disposal of low-level radioactive waste, mixed waste, transuranic

DRAFT

waste, high-level radioactive waste, and hazardous waste from past and future nuclear defense and research activities

- (7) Low-Level Waste Intermodal Transfer Station—Construction and operation of an intermodal transfer station for the shipment of low-level radioactive waste to the Nevada Test Site near Caliente
- (8) Timbisha Shoshone Reservation—Creation and development of a discontiguous reservation in eastern California and southwestern Nevada

2.2.2 Non-Federal and Private Actions

DOE identified nine separate non-federal and private RFFAs in the 2002 FEIS (DOE, 2002, pp. 8-3 to 8-5)

- (9) Cortez Pipeline Gold Deposit Projects—Continued operation and potential expansion of a gold mine and processing facility
- (10) Apex Bulk Commodities Intermodal Transfer Station—Construction and operation of an intermodal transfer station for copper concentrate near Caliente
- (11) Shared use of a DOE branch rail line—Increase in rail operations and traffic resulting from rail service options for nearby mine operators and communities
- (12) Private Fuel Storage—Temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel at the Goshute Reservation in Utah
- (13) Owl Creek Energy Project—Temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel
- (14) Ivanpah Airport—Construction of an airport on previously undisturbed land
- (15) Moapa Paiute Energy Center—Lease land and water use for construction of a coal-fired powerplant
- (16) Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act—Convey approximately 110 km² [42 mi²] of Bureau of Land Management lands to commercial and private entities
- (17) Desert Space Station Science Museum—Construct an 8,800-m² [94,700-ft²] science museum on land acquired from the Bureau of Land Management

A detailed summary of the cumulative impacts on the 13 resources (or issues) in the Yucca Mountain repository region is in Table 8-5 of the DOE 2002 FEIS (DOE, 2002, pp. 8-21 to 8-28). The effects of the proposed action (the potential repository and transportation) are also included in Table 8-5. During the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) adoption review of the DOE 2002 FEIS and related supplemental EISs, an update of the 17 RFFAs identified for the Yucca Mountain repository region may be appropriate to assess potential cumulative impacts.

2.2.3 Transportation-Related Actions

DOE addressed cumulative transportation effects at both the national and State of Nevada levels (DOE, 2002, pp. 8-89). For the national level, DOE analyzed cumulative radiological doses, latent cancer fatalities, and traffic fatalities. The RFFAs included Inventory Modules 1 and 2, as previously noted. Additional RFFAs related to high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuels included (DOE, 2002, pp. 8-89):

- (18) The transportation of radioactive material identified in other DOE National Environmental Policy Act analyses; for example, the 1996 Nevada Test Site EIS (DOE, 1996), the 1995 DOE Spent Nuclear Fuel Management EIS (DOE, 1995), and the 1997 DOE Waste Management EIS (DOE, 1997). Other RFFAs include limited transportation of radioactive material (for example, shipment of submarine reactor components from the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard to the Hanford Site for burial, and shipments of uranium billets and low-specific-activity nitric acid from the Hanford Site to the United Kingdom). In addition, for RFFAs where a preferred alternative was not identified or a Record of Decision has not been issued, the analysis in the DOE 2002 FEIS used the alternative estimated to result in the largest transportation impacts.
- (19) General radioactive materials transportation that is not related to a particular action; for example, shipment of radiopharmaceuticals to nuclear medicine laboratories and shipments of commercial low-level radioactive waste to commercial disposal facilities.

A detailed summary of the national transportation-related cumulative impacts is in Table 8-58 of the DOE 2002 FEIS (DOE, 2002, pp. 8-90). This table includes a list of 20 specific RFFAs that comprise the cumulative national transportation effects. Some of these listed RFFAs may have already been included in the proposed action.

The discussion of cumulative transportation effects in Nevada included an analysis of several earlier identified RFFAs. The analysis addressed potential cumulative impacts in the vicinity of the five potential branch rail line corridors, the three potential intermodal transfer station locations, and the five associated potential highway routes for heavy-haul trucks. The RFFAs that were addressed in this state-level analysis, and that were identified and numbered earlier, include three federal and three private ones:

- (1) Inventory Module 1
- (2) Inventory Module 2
- (7) Low-level waste intermodal transfer station
- (9) Cortez Pipeline Gold Deposits Projects
- (10) Apex Bulk Commodities intermodal transfer station
- (11) Shared use of a DOE branch rail line

No summary table related to cumulative transportation effects in Nevada was included in the DOE 2002 FEIS. Rather, a descriptive discussion was included, along with quantitative information when it was available.

During the NRC adoption review of the DOE 2002 FEIS and related supplemental EISs, updating information on the transportation-related RFFAs at both the national- and Nevada-level may be appropriate to assess potential cumulative impacts.

DRAFT

2.2.4 Other Considerations

The RFFAs included in the analysis of cumulative offsite manufacturing effects were Inventory Modules 1 and 2. The DOE 2002 FEIS includes quantitative information on the numbers of various components to be used in the emplacement of radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuels in the potential Yucca Mountain repository (DOE, 2002, Table 8-59, pp. 8-101).

Relative to the NRC potential adoption of the DOE 2002 FEIS and related supplemental EISs, it may be appropriate to update information on the two RFFAs relevant to offsite manufacturing (DOE, 2002, Table 8-59).

Finally, the DOE 2002 FEIS summarizes cumulative impacts for the 13 resources (issues of concern) for the Yucca Mountain repository region and other in-state areas associated with transportation (DOE, 2002, Table 8-60, pp. 8-103 and 8-104). The information in this table may need to be updated pending the findings of the previously noted recommendations.

For the majority of RFFAs identified and described in the DOE 2002 FEIS, there is no indication as to when they might occur. Such information could provide NRC with an understanding of the timing of RFFAs in preparing for the adoption review.

2.3 RFFAs Within Recent Environmental Assessments Related to the Potential Repository

Two recent environmental assessments DOE prepared have direct relevance to the cumulative impacts analysis to be included in the planned supplemental EIS for the potential repository (DOE, 2006a). Accordingly, both should be subjected to detailed review in relation to the anticipated cumulative impacts analysis, as appropriate.

2.3.1 The Yucca Mountain Infrastructure Environmental Assessment

In June 2006, a draft environmental assessment for proposed infrastructure improvements in the potential repository area was released (DOE, 2006c). The four main elements of the improvements include

- Construction of up to 53 km [33 mi] of new and replacement roads (with two options for an access road)
- Construction of up to 33.2 km [20.6 mi] of new 138 kV power lines (with two options for a main power line)
- Development of a Central Operations Area consisting of six support buildings to replace existing infrastructure that is nearing or, in some instances, has exceeded its expected design and operational life
- Siting, repairing, and constructing other facilities and structures for the potential Yucca Mountain repository

The infrastructure draft environmental assessment addresses the environmental consequences of the noted main elements relative to air quality; wildlife; plants; special-status species; water resources; land use; cultural resources; American Indian concerns; socioeconomics; visual

DRAFT

resources; transportation changes; health and safety; and energy, utilities, and site services. A brief section on cumulative impacts is also included.

2.3.2 Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Withdrawal of Public Lands Within and Surrounding the Caliente Rail Corridor

The second final environmental assessment is for the proposed withdrawal of public lands within and surrounding the Caliente rail corridor and is related to in-state transportation of materials to the potential repository (DOE, 2005). The proposed action recommends withdrawing for a limited period of time (10 years) approximately 125,000 ha [308,600 acres] of public land in Lincoln, Nye, and Esmeralda Counties in Nevada from the surface entry and the location of new mining claims, subject to valid existing rights. The Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management will administer this action. The proposed withdrawal area extends approximately 0.8 km [0.5 mi] from both sides of the centerline of the Caliente rail corridor, as described in the DOE 2002 FEIS. The proposed withdrawal begins near Caliente in Lincoln County, Nevada, extends westward through Nye County north of the Nevada Test and Training Range, enters into Esmeralda County near the town of Goldfield, and continues south-eastward to the Yucca Mountain repository. Under the proposed withdrawal, the Bureau of Land Management would retain management responsibilities for its lands and manage these lands consistently and in accordance with applicable Bureau of Land Management land use plans, laws, and regulations and relevant Department of the Interior policy. This environmental assessment addresses the impacts from the proposed withdrawal of public lands and from DOE evaluation activities. All DOE evaluation activities would be limited to “casual use” as sanctioned by Bureau of Land Management regulations (DOE, 2005). These activities could include photo documenting the corridor; conducting archaeological, historical, noise and vibration, and biological surveys; and placing survey markers for topographic mapping.

2.4 RFFAs Within Recent EISs

One indicator of near-term RFFAs is the proposed actions in other recently completed EISs or the alternatives being addressed in EISs that are under preparation. A total of 40 draft or final EISs were identified, along with 2 additional ones in progress. Internet searching provided the information for these documents.

A U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website (<http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa>) was the information source for Notices of Availability for the 40 draft or final EISs (click on Environmental Impact Statements—Notices of Availability). This website included Notice of Availability information from January 2, 2004, through May 25, 2007. Searching for Notices of Availability from 2002 and 2003 was accomplished by accessing Federal Register—Environmental Impacts Statements at the Notice of Availability location previously noted. Then weekly searching was done by Friday patterns (e.g., January 4, 11, 18, and 25, 2002).

The 40 draft, final, or final supplemental EISs are listed: (i) by sequential numbers as used herein, (ii) the county locations near the Yucca Mountain repository proposed for Nye County, and (iii) the proponent/preparing agencies. Of these 40 reports, summary information on 7 pertinent EISs is included in Appendix A. Summary information on the five EISs that should be monitored, as appropriate, are in Appendix B. Summary information on the other 28 EISs is included in Appendix C.

DRAFT

The information from the review of EIS-related information included abstracts, tables of contents, and executive summaries. Information related to several common topics or questions was assembled. Following is a listing of the topics and questions included for each EIS:

- Title of reviewed document
- Document number used herein
- Information reviewed
- Proposed action
- Location relative to Yucca Mountain
- Impacts related to proposed action

The information presented in Appendixes A and B includes

- FEIS–1: Final EIS, Weber Dam Repair and Modification Project, Walker River Valley, Lyon and Mineral Counties, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Indian Affairs)
- DEIS–1: Table Mountain Wind Generating Facility Project, Spring Mountain Range between the Communities of Goodsprings, Sandy Valley, Jean, and Primm, Clark County, Nevada, 2002 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–2: Final EIS, Toquop Energy Project, Lincoln, Clark, and Washoe Counties, Nevada, 2003 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–3: Final EIS, Ivanpah Energy Center Project, Clark County, Nevada, 2003 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–4: Final EIS, Phoenix Project, Current Mining Operations and Processing Activities Expansion, Lander County, Nevada, 2002 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–5: Final EIS, Newmont Gold Mining, South Operations Area, Elko and Eureka Counties, Nevada, 2002 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–6: Final EIS, Leeville Mining Project, Elko and Eureka Counties, Nevada, 2002 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–7: Final Supplemental EIS, Betze-Post Project, Dewatering Operations and a Proposed Pipeline, Elko and Eureka Counties, Nevada, 2003 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–8: Final Supplemental EIS, Pipeline/South Pipeline Pit Expansion Project, Gold Acres Mining District, Lander County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–9: Final Supplemental EIS, Ruby Hill Mine Expansion—East Archimedes Project, Eureka County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- DEIS–2: Draft EIS, Emigrant Mine Project, Elko County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–10: Final EIS, Nevada Test and Training Range Resource Management Plan, Clark, Nye, and Lincoln Counties, Nevada, 2003 (Bureau of Land Management)

DRAFT

- FEIS–11: Final EIS, Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon, Resource Management Plan, Great Basin, Nevada, 2003 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–12: Final EIS, West Mojave Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan and Federal Land Use Plan Amendment, Portions of San Bernardino, Kern, Inyo, and Los Angeles Counties, California, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–13: Final EIS, Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area, Resource Management Plan, Cities of Las Vegas and Henderson, Clark County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–14: Final Supplemental EIS, Clark County Regional Flood Control Master Plan, Updated, Clark County, Nevada, 2004 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–15: Final EIS, Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Project, Clark County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–16: Final EIS, Humboldt Project Conveyance, Pershing and Lander Counties, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Reclamation)
- FEIS–17: Final EIS, Technical Area 18 (TA-18) Relocation of Capabilities and Materials at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), New Mexico, Nevada (Nevada Test Site), and Idaho, 2002 (DOE)
- FEIS–18: Final Environmental Impact Report and EIS, Lower Owens River Project, Habitat Restoration, Owens Valley, Inyo County, California, 2004 (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power)
- FEIS–19: Final EIS, Boulder City, US 93 Corridor Transportation Improvements, Clark County, Nevada, 2005 (Federal Highway Administration)
- FEIS–20: Final EIS, Las Vegas Resort Corridor Project, City of Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, 2003 (Federal Transit Administration and Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada)
- FEIS–21: Final EIS, Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge Complex Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Boundary Revision, Churchill and Washoe Counties, Nevada, 2002 (Fish and Wildlife Service)
- FEIS–22: Final EIS, Jarbidge Canyon Project, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Jarbidge Ranger District, Elko County, Nevada, 2003 (Forest Service)
- FEIS–23: Draft Supplement to 2001 FEIS, Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment, Several Counties, California and Nevada, 2003 (Forest Service)
- FEIS–24: Final EIS, Combined Array for Research in Millimeter-Wave Astronomy (CARMA) Project, Inyo County, California, 2003 (Forest Service)
- FEIS–25: Final Supplemental EIS, Great Basin National Park General Management and Development Concept Plans, White Pine County, Nevada, 2003 (National Park Service)

DRAFT

- FEIS–26: Final EIS, China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, Operational Increases and Implementation of Land Use and Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans, Inyo, Kern, and San Bernardino Counties, California, 2004 (Naval Air Weapons Station)
- DEIS–3: Draft EIS, White Pine & Grant-Quinn Oil and Gas Leasing Project, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Ely Ranger District, White Pine, Nye, and Lincoln Counties, Nevada, 2005 (Forest Service)
- DEIS–4: Draft EIS, Ely District Resource Management Plan, White Pine, Lincoln Counties and a Portion of Nye County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- DEIS–5: Draft EIS, Sheep Complex, Big Springs and Owyhee Grazing Allotments Sensitive Bird Species Project, Elko County, Nevada, 2006 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–27: Final EIS, North Valleys Rights-of-Way Projects, Water Transmission Pipelines, Washoe County, Nevada, 2005 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS–28: Final EIS, Martin Basin Rangeland Project, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Santa Rosa Ranger District, Humboldt County, Nevada, 2005 (Forest Service)
- FEIS–29: Final EIS, Nevada Test Site and Off-Site Locations in the State of Nevada, 1996 (DOE)
- FEIS–30: Final EIS, Sheep Complex, Big Springs and Owyhee Grazing Allotments Sensitive Bird Species Project, Elko County, Nevada, 2006 (Bureau of Land Management)
- FEIS– 31: Final EIS, Clean Water Coalition Systems Conveyance and Operations Program, City of Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, 2006 (Bureau of Reclamation and National Park Service)
- FEIS–32: Final EIS, Reconstruction of the Furnace Creek Water Collection System, Death Valley National Park, Inyo County, California, 2006 (National Park Service)
- FEIS–33: Final EIS, Commercial Pack Station and Pack Stock Outfitter/Guide Permit Issuance, Inyo National Forest, California, 2006 (Forest Service)
- DEIS–5: Draft EIS, Jarbridge Ranger District Rangeland Management Project, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Elko County, Nevada, June 2006 (Forest Service)
- DEIS–6: Draft EIS, Great Basin South Rangeland Management Project, Bridgeport Ranger District, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Lyon and Mineral Counties, Nevada, and Mono County, California, December 2006 (Forest Service)
- DEIS–7: Draft EIS, White Pine Energy Station Project, White Pine County, Nevada, April 2007 (Bureau of Land Management)

Table 2-1 summarizes the results of the systematic reviews of the EISs and RFFAs as contained in Appendixes A–C. Three classifications were used: (i) no further consideration is recommended, (ii) monitor the development of the projects or actions for their relevance to subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository, and

DRAFT

(iii) include in future analyses of repository cumulative impacts. The rationales for the specific decisions for each FEIS or draft environmental impact statement (DEIS)⁴ are presented in Appendix A or Appendix B. As can be seen from Table 2-1, 28 of the 40 reviewed documents (and associated RFFAs) need no further considerations. Five of the documents should be monitored, as appropriate, for developments that might support their inclusion in subsequent cumulative impacts analyses. Finally, RFFA information from seven FEISs or DEISs should be considered in such analyses, as appropriate.

Additional information on Notices of Availability was sought via searching the Northwestern University Library—Transportation Library. This library includes a composite collection of numerous EISs dating back to the 1970s. No additional relevant Notices of Availability were identified via the Northwestern University website (<http://nucatl.library.northwestern.edu>).

Table 2-1. Results of Reviews of Environmental Impact Statements (EISs)			
EIS Number*	No Further Consideration (NFC)†	Monitor the Development (MTD)‡	Include in Future Analyses of Repository (IFA)§
FEIS-1	X		
DEIS-1		X	
FEIS-2		X	
FEIS-3		X	
FEIS-4	X		
FEIS-5	X¶		
FEIS-6	X¶		
FEIS-7	X¶		
FEIS-8	X¶		
FEIS-9	X		
DEIS-2	X¶		
FEIS-10			X
FEIS-11	X#		
FEIS-12			X
FEIS-13	X		
FEIS-14	X		
FEIS-15	X		
FEIS-16	X		
FEIS-17			X
FEIS-18	X		

⁴ It should be noted that draft environment impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report, consequently, the acronym DEIS will be used.

DRAFT

Table 2-1. Results of Reviews of Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) (continued)			
EIS Number*	EIS Number*	EIS Number*	EIS Number*
FEIS-19	X		
FEIS-20	X		
FEIS-21	X		
FEIS-22	X		
FEIS-23	X**		
FEIS-24	X		
FEIS-25	X		
FEIS-26			X
DEIS-3		X††	
DEIS-4			X
FEIS-27	X		
FEIS-28	X		
FEIS-29			X
FEIS-30	X		
FEIS-31	X‡‡		
FEIS-32			X
FEIS-33	X		
DEIS-5	X		
DEIS-6	X		
DEIS-7		X	

*The EISs address proposed projects or actions thus they are Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs). The code FEIS denotes a Final EIS, and DEIS denotes a Draft EIS. Summary information on each of the proposed projects or actions is included in Appendix A.
†NFC denotes that no further consideration of this RFFA is recommended due to its localized impacts and distance from the Yucca Mountain repository. Summary information on each of the projects is included in Appendix C.
‡MTD denotes that the further development and implementation of the proposed projects or actions should be monitored, as appropriate, to make a final determination of its relevance in relation to contributions to the cumulative impacts of the Yucca Mountain repository. Summary information on each of the projects is included in Appendix B.
§IFA denotes that the contributions of the proposed projects or actions should be considered in future cumulative impacts analyses associated with the potential Yucca Mountain repository, as appropriate. Summary information on each of the projects is included in Appendix A.
¶If the Carlin rail alignment is selected, the proposed projects or actions could contribute to cumulative impacts associated with the rail corridor.
#There is a connection between FEIS-11 and FEIS-29.
**Periodic reviews of the effectiveness of fuels treatment would be worthwhile.
††future oil and gas developments in Nevada and their potential contributions to cumulative impacts resulting from the Yucca Mountain repository should be considered, as appropriate.
‡‡This RFFA should be considered, as appropriate in any regional water study that includes the Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

Two Notices of Intent for preparing EISs were also found via Internet searching the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management web site <<http://www.ocrwm.doe.gov>> and “Googling” the terms Bureau of Land Management and Nevada:

- Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS for the Gold Hill Project, Nye County, Nevada (Bureau of Land Management, 2004). The Bureau of Land Management is preparing this EIS for a proposed gold mine located on public lands in Nye County. The project is about 225 km [140 mi] north-northwest of the potential repository. The potential completion date is not known at this time.
- Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplemental EIS for the Round Mountain Expansion Project, Nye County, Nevada (Bureau of Land Management, 2006). The project, which is located about 233 km [145 mi] north-northwest of the potential repository, includes the expansion

of existing facilities at the Round Mountain mine and the development of new mines and leaching facilities at the nearby Gold Hill ore deposit. This supplemental EIS is related to the previously listed Gold Hill Project. However, its completion date is not known at this time.

2.5 RFFAs in Recent Environmental Assessments Related to the Nevada Test Site

The cumulative legacy of historical to current testing and activities at the Nevada Test Site is reflected in a series of semiannual and annual environmental reports dating from 1964 to the present. These reports are available from the Department of Energy web site <<http://www.nv.doe.gov/library/publications/aser.aspx>>. The 2005 summary environmental report will be used to illustrate the range of available information (National Security Technologies, LLC, 2006). The contents include a brief history of the Nevada Test Site along with a summary description of current programs and activities. The legacy of Nevada Test Site nuclear testing is then described, followed by summary information on nuclear radiation, radionuclides, and radiation dosage. Monitoring programs for Nevada Test Site radiation and pathways is then described along with estimates of the 2005 radiation dosage to the public from three pathways (air transport, ingestion, and groundwater).

The summary report then presents the detailed 2005 monitoring results from the onsite radionuclide air emissions and the offsite readings in selected towns and communities. Additional monitoring results are included from offsite radiological monitoring of groundwater and onsite monitoring of both surface waters and groundwater. A summary of nonradiological monitoring of onsite air quality, drinking water, and discharges to local sewage lagoons is then presented. Finally, the 2005 summary report includes information on environmental restoration of contaminated sites, pollution prevention and waste minimization activities, waste management, and ecological monitoring (National Security Technologies, LLC, 2006).

Prior nuclear testing at the Nevada Test Site has resulted in contaminants from exploded materials, waste dumps, and other testing practices and illustrates the legacy problem. Currently, the National Nuclear Security Administration has a corrective action and closure program for such legacy sites and locations. This program will reduce future transport of contaminants and thus decrease the contributions of the Nevada Test Site to local and regional

DRAFT

cumulative consequences. Three recent examples of continuing program activities are included herein (National Nuclear Security Administration, 2006a; Starand, 2006; Wickline, 2006).

Nonnuclear testing is also occurring at the Nevada Test Site, and such testing can be anticipated in the future. Three recent environmental assessments will be used to illustrate this type of testing and training in conjunction with counterterrorism activities. For example, a 2004 final environmental assessment focused on the release of biological stimulants and low concentrations of selected chemicals at various Nevada Test Site locations (National Nuclear Security Administration, 2004a). These releases are to be used for operational testing, contamination and decontamination testing, forensics testing, personal protective equipment testing, enclosed environment detection and decontamination training, and counterterrorism training as they relate to biological or chemical agents. Operational criteria for the various releases are included in the environmental assessment. As appropriate, this environmental assessment should be reviewed as a present and reasonably foreseeable future action in conjunction with evaluating the cumulative impacts analysis in the supplemental EIS for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

A 2006 draft revised environmental assessment analyzed the potential impacts of a proposal to conduct a single large-scale, open-air explosive detonation of up to 700 tons of an ammonium nitrate and fuel oil mixture above an existing tunnel complex in Area 16 at the Nevada Test Site (National Nuclear Security Administration, 2006b). The proposed experiment, known as divine strake, is detailed in the environmental assessment. The potential impacts of this detonation are addressed in Chapter 4. The impacts considered were related to land use, noise, human health and safety, waste management, infrastructure, topography and physiographic setting, geology and soils, surface water and groundwater, atmospheric resources, meteorological conditions, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics and environmental justice, aesthetics and visual resources, and cumulative issues and concerns. This experiment was planned to test the nation's ability to neutralize underground facilities that produce weapons of mass destruction. However, a large public outcry ultimately caused the cancellation of the detonation (Bauman, 2007). Conversely, such open-air detonations could be planned for the future; thus an awareness of this environmental assessment could be useful in evaluating the cumulative impacts analysis in the Yucca Mountain repository Supplemental EIS.

Finally, a 2004 final environmental assessment included a proposal to develop a radiological/nuclear countermeasures test and evaluation complex at Nevada Test Site (National Nuclear Security Administration, 2004b). This complex would meet the identified training needs of the Department of Homeland Security. This environmental assessment should also be considered in the evaluation process for the Supplemental EIS for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

2.6 RFFAs in Recent Environmental Assessments Related to Nellis Air Force Base

Nellis Air Force Base released eight environmental assessment in 2006–2007. The total includes six final environmental assessments and two draft environmental assessments. Even though environmental assessments conclude that there are no significant impacts, the cumulative consequences of multiple nonsignificant impacts need to be considered in identifying RFFAs and in the subsequent cumulative impacts assessment. Accordingly, summary comments will be included on four of the eight environmental assessments that should be considered, as appropriate, in the cumulative impacts analysis within the anticipated

DRAFT

supplemental EIS for the potential Yucca Mountain repository (DOE, 2006a,b). The four relevant environmental assessments include

- Final environmental assessment on Wing Infrastructure Development Outlook (U.S. Air Force, 2006a)
- Final environmental assessment on Base Realignment and Closure for Realignment of Nellis Air Force Base (U.S. Air Force, 2007b)
- Draft environmental assessment for Range 74 Target Complexes at the Nevada Test and Training Range (U.S. Air Force, 2007c)
- Draft environmental assessment for the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Nellis Air Force Base and Nevada Test and Training Range (U.S. Air Force, 2007d)

The final environmental assessment for the full Wing Infrastructure Development Outlook program infrastructure improvements for 2005 to 2006 includes repair, maintenance, installation, renovation, construction, and demolition at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada Test and Training Range and associated facilities, Creech Air Force Base (formerly Indian Springs Air Force Auxiliary Field), and Tonopah Test Range (U.S. Air Force, 2006a). The improvements will be reviewed and updated in 2008. Over 630 total projects are included in the improvements, with 80 of them involving new construction, expansion, or demolition of existing facilities and infrastructure. All of these proposed projects would occur within functionally compatible areas at Nellis Air Force Base, Creech Air Force Base, the Nevada Test and Training Range, and the Tonopah Test Range. Given their functional relationships with existing facilities, most Wing Infrastructure Development Outlook projects would likely be sited on previously used and/or disturbed land; occur within areas similarly zoned for such uses; and avoid important cultural resources, sensitive habitat, and environmental restoration program sites. Because of its inclusion of multiple projects, this final environmental assessment should be evaluated in relation to the potential repository and associated cumulative impacts, as appropriate.

The final environmental assessment for the Base Realignment and Closure-related realignment for Nellis Air Force Base should also be considered in the evaluation of potential cumulative impacts of the potential repository. Specifically, this environmental assessment proposes to implement the 2005 mandated realignment for Nellis Air Force Base. Realignment would supplement the 57th Adversary Tactics Group complement of aircraft for two existing aggressor squadrons at the base. The 64th Aggressor Squadron (64 AGRS) and the 65th Aggressor Squadron (65 AGRS) would receive 5 F-16 aircraft and 18 F-15C aircraft, respectively. As stated in the environmental assessment, , the aircraft and aircrews on temporary duty assignment perform missions of these aircraft at Nellis Air Force Base. For this reason, the realigned aircraft under the proposed action would not conduct additional sorties from the base or sortie operations at the Nevada Test and Training Range beyond those the temporary duty aircraft performed previously. Beddown of the aircraft would occur in fiscal years 2007, 2010, and 2011. The proposed action would include construction of 11 new facilities for personnel and equipment scheduled for fiscal years 2007 through 2009. Personnel increases of 464 permanently based personnel and 60 part-time reservists would also form part of the action (U.S. Air Force, 2007b).

In the draft environmental assessment for Range 74, the U.S. Air Force proposes to construct and operate three target complexes in mountainous terrain of the Nevada Test and Training

DRAFT

Range at Saucer Mesa, Limestone Ridge, and Cliff Springs (U.S. Air Force, 2007c). These three complexes are located about 64 to 80 km [40 to 50 mi] north or north-northeast of the potential repository. The Saucer Mesa target complex comprises nine discrete sites totaling approximately 53 ha [131 acres]. The Limestone Ridge target complex includes 10 discrete sites totaling approximately 99 ha [245 acres]. The target complexes would consist of reconfigurable target arrays and associated roads and trails with vehicles, downed aircraft, and silhouettes. Targets would be either dragged or hauled into place from existing roads or two-track trails and placed along or adjacent to existing roads (under trees or adjacent to steep slopes to provide natural cover for the targets). The Saucer Mesa target array would employ both large-scale live and inert munitions, and the Limestone Ridge sites would employ large-scale inert munitions; both target sites would employ small-scale live munitions. Targets would support air-dropped munitions and ground-fired munitions operations. The Cliff Springs target complex would consist of 15 no-drop targets within a linear 6-ha [15-acre] site. Again, due to the relatively close proximity of Range 74 to the potential repository, as well as the potential impacts to soils, vegetation, and wildlife, this proposed action constitutes an RFFA that should be incorporated in the cumulative impacts analysis for the Supplemental EIS for the potential repository.

The draft environmental assessment for the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan for Nellis Air Force Base and the Nevada Test and Training Range addresses the environmental consequences of conservation measures at these locations (U.S. Air Force, 2007d). A primary goal of the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan is to sustain military readiness while maintaining ecosystem integrity and dynamics. The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan provides guidance to establish mission actions that minimize impacts to natural resources as much as practicable. Implementation of the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan would have no significant impacts on land use; air quality; water resources; safety; hazardous materials/hazardous waste; solid waste; biological resources; cultural resources; geology and soils; and socioeconomics. In fact, the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan should help preclude degradation of the range vegetation and wetlands, riparian plant communities, and plant communities associated with local seeps and springs.

The remaining four environmental assessments can be excluded from further analyses due to a combination of considerations related to their location and level of impacts. For example, the proposed actions related to the Expeditionary Readiness Training final environmental assessment are located east of Indian Springs, Nevada {approximately 97 km [60 mi] to the east-southeast of the potential repository}. Further, the actions include small infrastructure projects and improvements in five small-arms training ranges (U.S. Air Force, 2006b). The proposed action in the final environmental assessment for a solar photovoltaic system is also located over 95 km [60 mi] to the east-southeast of the potential repository; further, the impacts are expected to be small and localized (U.S. Air Force, 2006c). Another final environmental assessment is related to increased depleted uranium ammunition usage at a specified target area (Target 63-10) at the Nevada Test and Training Range. Again, the location of Target 63-10 is over 97 km [60 mi] to the east-southeast of the potential repository (U.S. Air Force, 2006d). Finally, a final environmental assessment for a proposed sanitary landfill expansion on the Tonopah Test Range would be expected to produce only small and localized impacts. Further, the landfill location is approximately 120 km [75 mi] to the north-northwest of the potential repository (U.S. Air Force, 2007a).

DRAFT

2.7 RFFAs Identified Through Systematic Newspaper Searches

As noted previously, online searching of five newspapers was conducted during this study, which identified 208 articles. The period searched (22 months) was from August 2005, through late May 2007. A shorter timeframe was used to keep the number of articles more manageable.

- Las Vegas SUN—94 articles
- Pahrump Valley Times—80 articles
- Inyo Register—two articles (the number of articles is limited because the newspaper is currently updating its web site; thus searching was limited)
- Reno Gazette Journal—eight articles (the number of articles is limited because newspaper only allows free searching of the most immediate 7-day period)
- Nevada Appeal—24 articles

Identifying a newspaper article about a potential private or governmental development project does not mean that the project should be automatically classified as an RFFA. Rather, such projects could have varying probabilities of actual occurrence. Accordingly, at this time, the information from the newspaper searches should be viewed as indicative of potential growth and development activities in southeastern Nevada.

The 208 individual articles were divided into 6 topical categories: development activities in Las Vegas and Clark County (the numbered pdf files are in Appendix D), development and other activities in Pahrump and Nye County (Appendix E); development activities in Inyo County (Appendix F); water needs and associated conflicts in southern Nevada (Appendix G); energy developments (Appendix H); and the Reno, Sparks, and Carson City regional areas (Appendix I).

The review of the articles reveals the following highlights:

- Numerous large-scale development projects are being planned for Las Vegas and Clark County. Such projects include casinos and resorts, planned communities, residential developments and condominium towers, commercial centers and malls, and facilities and infrastructure improvements.
- Rapid population growth is occurring in the environs of Pahrump in Nye County. The growth is illustrated by numerous residential developments, master planning efforts, commercial projects, and various facilities and infrastructure projects.
- A potential development involving 65,000 homes is being discussed for Inyo County.
- Water demands and conflicts over usage are major issues in several counties in southeastern Nevada (e.g., Nye, Clark, and Lincoln counties), and in Inyo County.
- Oil and gas development projects may increase in Nevada in the coming years. In addition, several new power plants are proposed or under development in southeastern Nevada.

DRAFT

- Growth in the Reno, Sparks, and Carson City regional areas is causing greater demands for housing and associated infrastructure (transportation and water) projects.

Based upon the information identified in the newspaper searching for the selected 22-month period (August 2005 to May 2007), these planned activities should be reviewed, as appropriate, to ascertain potentially new RFFAs that would need to be considered in the cumulative impacts analyses DOE presented in the Supplemental EIS for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

2.8 Cumulative Water Usage—A Potential Cumulative Impact Concern

An important resource issue in both Nye County and Clark County is related to water usage and available water supplies. Based on the newspaper searches described in Section 2.7, over 40 water-related articles in both local and regional newspapers have appeared since August 2005 (see Appendix G). As would be anticipated, many of the articles relate to conflicts over the usage of locational supplies and the increasing pressures for expanded usage due to the rapid growth in regional populations.

One useful reference source that should be examined, as appropriate, relative to cumulative impacts on water resources is the 2004 Nye County Water Resources Plan (Buqo, 2004). The plan, which extends to 2050, includes both socioeconomic and demographic projections in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 provides inventory information on both surface water and groundwater resources. Historical, current, and future water demands are summarized in Chapter 4. Broad water management and planning issues are addressed in Chapter 5, with more detailed information on both water basin and water users' needs provided in Chapter 6. Finally, administrative and legal issues are highlighted in Chapter 7. Based on the contents of the Nye County plan, this plan should be considered, as appropriate, when evaluating the cumulative impacts analysis within the potential repository's supplemental EIS.

Another potentially useful reference relates to an EIS being prepared on a groundwater development project in Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties (ENSR Corporation, 2007). The completion date for the EIS is not known; however, the focus is on meeting expanding water needs in Clark County. Accordingly, when completed, this EIS may have relevance to a regional perspective on cumulative water usage in both Nye and Clark Counties.

2.9 Other Possible RFFAs

As noted previously under the scope of this survey, several additional Internet searches were conducted. One search consisted of reviewing the California Affected Units of Local Government web sites found at <<http://www.ocrwm.doe.gov/links/index.html>>. Links to 10 counties were found (9 in Nevada and 1 in California); however, the California Affected Units of Local Government (Inyo County Yucca Mountain Repository Assessment Office) was not explored because the web site was down. Websites were explored for the following Nevada counties: (i) Clark County Nuclear Waste Division, (ii) Churchill County Nuclear Waste Planning Office, (iii) Esmeralda County Yucca Mountain Oversight Program, (iv) Eureka County Yucca Mountain Information Office, (v) Lander County Yucca Mountain Oversight Program, (vi) Lincoln County Nuclear Oversight Program, (vii) Mineral County Nuclear Projects Office, (viii) Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office, and (ix) White Pine County Nuclear Waste Project Office. More recent (2002–2007) post-FEIS information from the web sites was

DRAFT

reviewed in relation to the possible identification of RFFAs. However, no specific proposed projects that could be classified as RFFAs were identified.

Internet searching also determined that the Nevada Department of Transportation has recently revised the Statewide Transportation Plan (NevPLAN) over a 20-year planning horizon to 2025 (Nevada Department of Transportation, 2007). The Southern Nevada Plan has implications for highways and railways both within and in the vicinity of the Yucca Mountain repository region. Furthermore, the plan includes historical and projected land usage and demographic data that is relevant to the analysis of cumulative impacts. This suggests that the NevPLAN should be considered when determining pertinent transportation-related RFFAs that can be used to evaluate future potential cumulative impacts that might be associated with the potential repository.

Further information could be gathered on the previous two possible RFFAs (the expanding mission of Nellis Air Force Base and the NevPLAN) in discussions with the appropriate agencies. This information could then be evaluated to determine the potential for these RFFAs to contribute to cumulative impacts in (i) the potential Yucca Mountain repository region and (ii) the Nevada transportation corridors to be used in the transport of materials to the potential repository. This information would help provide staff with a more complete independent understanding of plausible RFFAs.

Another search focused on general economic development that is anticipated in the potential Yucca Mountain repository region. The web site of the Nevada Commission on Economic Development was used (www.expand2nevada.com/regions/). Specific information was gathered from web sites for the (i) Churchill Economic Development Authority for Churchill County, (ii) Economic Development Authority of Esmeralda/Nye for Esmeralda and Nye Counties, (iii) Eureka County Economic Development Program, (iv) Lincoln County Regional Development Authority, and (v) Nevada Development Authority in Clark County. Web links were not connected for the (i) Lander Economic Development Authority in Lander County, (ii) Mineral County Economic Development Authority, and (iii) White Pine Economic Diversification Council in White Pine County. Information indicated that population increases and economic growth and development is anticipated. While this information is not in the specific form of RFFAs, it is indicative that more future projects (i.e., RFFAs) can be anticipated in the Yucca Mountain repository region, and thus they should be conceptually considered in relation to cumulative impacts and potential human receptors, as appropriate.

The final search related to identifying key contact information for local, state, and federal agencies located in the key affected counties. The information included physical and email addresses, telephone numbers, and listed topical websites. Appendix I includes the contact information organized by 10 counties and 2 cities (Las Vegas and Reno). The counties included nine in Nevada (Clark, Churchill, Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye, and White Pine) and one in California (Inyo). Focused contacts with county agencies could be used as another means of identifying pertinent RFFAs for any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository. An independent understanding of the range of potential RFFAs will aid in staff preparation for the adoption review.

Examples of two new land uses near the potential Yucca Mountain repository are worth noting. Specifically, the Ponderosa Dairy is in Amargosa Valley, and the Pahrump Dairy is in the community of Pahrump. The Ponderosa Dairy occupies 400 ha [1,000 acres] and has about 5,000 cows and over 60 employees. The Pahrump Dairy uses 120 ha [300 acres] and has about 2,300 cows and 30 employees (Williams and Levy, 2000). These land uses represent

DRAFT

additional potential receptors of the effects of environmental releases of radioactive materials from the potential repository. In 2005, expansion plans for the Ponderosa Dairy were discussed.

DRAFT

3 CONCLUSIONS AND POTENTIAL FOLLOWUP

This survey has identified several reasonably foreseeable future action (RFFA)¹ issues and needs that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) may consider in its adoption process for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) final environmental impact statement (FEIS)² for a potential high-level waste geologic repository. For example, using new draft and final environmental impact statement (EIS)³ notices of availability (2002–May 2007) and notices of intent, 40 new potential RFFAs have been identified. Screening information on these RFFAs indicated that at least seven FEISs or DEISs and their associated RFFAs should be addressed, as appropriate, in an updated Chapter 8 in the DOE FEIS. In addition, other potential RFFAs were identified in the updated NevPLAN. To prepare for the NRC adoption review, potential followup activities may include

- As appropriate, review of the RFFA information DOE presented in the 2002 FEIS in the context of known proposed actions. The implications of this updated information relative to potential cumulative impacts should be addressed.
- Consider, as appropriate, information in two recent DOE environmental assessments for the potential repository area and the Caliente rail corridor. Appropriate information from these environmental assessments should be considered as part of the adoption review process. Further, several recent environmental assessments prepared for the Nevada Test Site and Nellis Air Force Base could also be considered in the process.
- Conduct further online searching of local newspapers, as appropriate, to identify development projects that could contribute to the cumulative impacts on resources that are anticipated to be affected by the potential repository.

This survey is based only on public information and is not based on specific contacts with key federal, state, and local agencies that may already have identified other future actions within their overall plans. However, Appendix I contains contact information that could be used if such contacts are deemed useful in the context of the NRC adoption process.

This survey has emphasized identifying RFFAs. Appropriate specific analyses of these RFFAs are recommended to determine their contributions to potential cumulative impacts associated with a potential repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.

¹ It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

² It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

³ It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

DRAFT

4 REFERENCES

- Bauman, J. "Divine Strake Bites the Dust—Huntsman, Others Hail Cancellation of Blast." *Desert Morning News*. February 23, 2007.
- Buqo, T.S. "Nye County Water Resources Plan." Report for Nye County Consulting Hydrogeologist. Pahrump, Nevada: Nye County Department of Natural Resources and Federal Facilities. 2004.
- Bureau of Land Management. "Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Round Mountain Expansion Project, Nye County, NV." *Federal Register*. Vol. 71, No. 247. pp. 77408–77410. December 26, 2006.
- . "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Gold Hill Project, Nye County, NV." *Federal Register*. Vol. 69, No. 70. pp. 19215–19216. April 12, 2004.
- Council on Environmental Quality. "Considering Cumulative Impacts Under the National Environmental Policy Act." Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President. 1997.
- DOE. "Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, NV." *Federal Register*. Vol. 71, No. 198. pp. 60490–60494. October 13, 2006a.
- . "Amended Notice of Intent to Expand the Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Alignment, Construction, and Operation of a Rail Line to a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, NV." *Federal Register*. Vol. 71, No. 198. pp. 60484–60490. October 13, 2006b.
- . DOE/EA–1566, "Draft Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Infrastructure Improvements for the Yucca Mountain Project, Nevada." Las Vegas, Nevada: DOE, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. 2006c.
- . DOE/EA–1545, "Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Withdrawal of Public Lands Within and Surrounding the Caliente Rail Corridor, Nevada." Las Vegas, Nevada: DOE, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. 2005.
- . "Record of Decision on Mode of Transportation and Nevada Rail Corridor for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, NV." *Federal Register*. Vol. 69, No. 68. pp. 18557–18565. April 8, 2004a.
- . "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Alignment, Construction, and Operation of a Rail Line to a Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, NV." *Federal Register*. Vol. 69, No. 68. p. 18565. April 8, 2004b.
- . DOE/EIS–0250F, "Final Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada." Las Vegas, Nevada: DOE, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. pp. 5-77 to 5-80 and 8-1 to 8-116. 2002.

DRAFT

———. DOE/EIS-0200-F, “Final Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Managing Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Radioactive and Hazardous Waste.” Washington, DC: DOE, Office of Environmental Management. 1997.

———. DOE/EIS 0243, “Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Nevada Test Site and Off-Site Locations in the State of Nevada.” Las Vegas, Nevada: DOE, Nevada Operations Office. 1996.

———. DOE/EIS-0203-F, “Programmatic Spent Nuclear Fuel Management and Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Programs Final Environmental Impact Statement.” Idaho Falls, Idaho: DOE, Idaho Operations Office. 1995.

ENSR Corporation. “Final Scoping Summary Report—Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties Groundwater Development Project Environmental Impact Statement.” Reno, Nevada: Bureau of Land Management, Nevada State Office. 2007.

National Nuclear Security Administration. DOE-NV-1167, “Closure Report for Corrective Action Unit 540, Spill Sites, Nevada Test Site, Nevada.” Las Vegas, Nevada: National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Operations Office. 2006a.

———. DOE/EA-1550, “Large-Scale, Open-Air Explosive Detonation, DIVINE STRAKE, at the Nevada Test Site.” Draft December 2006 Revised Environmental Assessment. Las Vegas, Nevada: National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Site Office. 2006b.

———. DOE/EA-1494, “Final Environmental Assessment for Activities Using Biological Stimulants and Releases of Chemicals at the Nevada Test Site.” Las Vegas, Nevada: National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Site Office. 2004a.

———. DOE/EA-1499, “Radiological/Nuclear Countermeasures Test and Evaluation Complex, Nevada Test Site.” Las Vegas, Nevada: National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Site Office. 2004b.

National Security Technologies, LLC. DOE/NV/11718-1214, “Nevada Test Site Environmental Report 2005 Summary.” Las Vegas, Nevada: National Security Technologies, LLC. 2006.

Nevada Department of Transportation. “Southern Nevada Plan—Land Use and Transportation.” Carson City, Nevada: Nevada Department of Transportation. <www.nevadadot.com/reports_pubs/Nev/Plan/>. 2007.

Rumrill, J.N. and L.W. Canter. “Addressing Future Actions in Cumulative Impacts Assessment.” *Project Appraisal*. Vol. 12, No. 4. pp. 207-218. 1997.

Smith, M.D. “Cumulative Impact Assessment Under the National Environmental Policy Act: An Analysis of Recent Case Law.” *Environmental Practice*. Vol. 8, No. 4. pp. 228-240. 2006.

Starand, D. DOE/NV-1154-REV 1, “Streamlined Approach for Environmental Restoration (SAFER) Plan for Corrective Action Unit 118: Area 27 Super Kukla Facility, Nevada Test Site, Nevada, Technical Report.” Las Vegas, Nevada: National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Operations Office. 2006.

DRAFT

U.S. Air Force. "Final Environmental Assessment for Sanitary Landfill Expansion on the Tonopah Test Range, Nye County, Nevada." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2007a.

———. "Final Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Assessment for Realignment of Nellis Air Force Base." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2007b.

———. "Draft Range 74 Target Complexes Environmental Assessment, Nevada Test and Training Range, Nevada." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2007c.

———. "Draft Environmental Assessment for the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan, Nellis Air Force Base and Nevada Test and Training Range, Nevada." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2007d.

———. "Wing Infrastructure Development Outlook (WINDO), Final Environmental Assessment." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2006a.

———. "Expeditionary Readiness Training (ExpeRT) Course Expansion, Final Environmental Assessment." Creech Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2006b.

———. "Leasing Nellis Air Force Base Land for Construction and Operation of a Solar Photovoltaic System, Clark County, Nevada, Final Environmental Assessment." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2006c.

———. "Final Environmental Assessment for Increased Depleted Uranium Use on Target 63-10, Nevada Test and Training Range." Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: U.S. Air Force. 2006d.

Wickline, A. DOE/NV-1131, "Corrective Action Decision Document/Closure Report for Corrective Action Unit 309: Area 12 Muckpiles, Nevada Test Site, Nevada, Technical Report." Las Vegas, Nevada: National Nuclear Security Administration, Nevada Operations Office. 2006.

Williams, J.M. and L. Levy. "The Ponderosa and Pahrump Dairies." Nye County Economic-Demographic Report No. 6. Pahrump, Nevada: Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office. 2000.

DRAFT

APPENDIX A

DRAFT

DRAFT

A. SUMMARIES OF REVIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS THAT SHOULD BE IN FUTURE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSES

(1) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS),¹ Nevada Test and Training Range Resource Management Plan, (formerly known as the Nellis Air Force Range), Implementation, Clark, Nye and Lincoln Counties. Nevada, Wait Period Ends: June 23, 2003 (Bureau of Land Management).

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-10

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of FEIS (May 23, 2003)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency comments on the FEIS (July 11, 2003)
- Notice of Availability of Record of Decision (July 23, 2004)

Proposed Action

The proposed action was developed based on a coordinated effort between Nellis Air Force Range and the Bureau of Land Management and input from the public. The action focuses on limiting conflicts with the military mission by dispersing animals evenly throughout a core area within the herd management area. In addition, the proposed plan provides for area wildlife needs and rangeland health improvement.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Resource Management Plan focuses on large areas of land associated with the Nevada Test and Training Range. Various activities related to the Resource Management Plan can be on lands contiguous to the potential Yucca Mountain repository and can extend up to approximately 80 km [50 mi] away in the easterly and northerly directions.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The Resource Management Plan addresses management on approximately 608,000 ha [1.5 million acres] of withdrawn public land in the planning area. The Nevada Test and Training Range Resource Management Plan/Record of Decision is designed to achieve or maintain desired future conditions developed through the planning process. It includes a series of management actions to meet the desired resource conditions for upland and riparian vegetation, wildlife habitats, cultural and visual resources, wild horse management, livestock grazing, limited hunting recreation, and military mission and safety objectives. The approved Nevada Test and Training Range Resource Management Plan is essentially the same as Alternative B in the Proposed Nevada Test and Training Range Resource Management Plan/Final EIS,

¹It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

DRAFT

published in May 2003, except that the military and the Bureau of Land Management agreed to an appropriate management level of 300–500 wild horses. The military felt comfortable that this lower number of horses would significantly reduce mission and safety concerns and still allow management of wild horses on the Nevada Test and Training Range. Finally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency did not send a formal comment letter to the Bureau of Land Management regarding the FEIS.

As appropriate, the Resource Management Plan associated with the Nevada Test and Training Range should be subjected to an in-depth review in relation to its contributions to cumulative impacts on various biological and cultural resources anticipated to be affected by the potential repository. This review should include one or more specific meetings with the Bureau of Land Management staff located in the Las Vegas Field Office. See also the recommendation related to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) 1996 Final EIS for the Nevada Test Site and Off-Site Locations (FEIS–29).

DRAFT

(2) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, West Mojave Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan and Federal Land Use Plan Amendment, Implementation, California Desert Conservation Area, Portions of San Bernardino, Kern, Inyo, and Los Angeles Counties, California, Wait Period Ends: May 2, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-12

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of the West Mohave Plan and FEIS (April 1, 2005)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary

Proposed Action

The proposed West Mohave Plan addresses the management of 1.3 million ha [3.3 million acres] of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in eastern Kern County, southern Inyo County, northern Los Angeles County, and western San Bernardino County, all in California. The Bureau of Land Management Ridgecrest and Barstow Field Offices administer most of these public lands. The West Mohave Plan was prepared collaboratively with local jurisdictions and state and other federal agencies. The West Mohave Plan will develop conservation strategies for over 100 federal- and state-listed plant and animal species that are found within the western Mojave Desert, including the federally listed as threatened desert tortoise and state-listed Mojave ground squirrel. The plan will simplify procedures for complying with the Endangered Species Act of 1974 as amended and the California Endangered Species Act. Other issues addressed include the development of a motorized vehicle access network for public lands in the region and effects of the program on regional economics, growth-inducing impacts, livestock grazing, mining, cultural resources, and recreation.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

Inyo County is the nearest California county to the potential Yucca Mountain repository. The northwesternmost boundary of the West Mohave Plan, which is located in Inyo County, is about 56 km [35 mi] southwest of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS addressed the impacts of the proposed action (the West Mohave Plan) and six alternatives on air quality, soils, water, biological resources, socioeconomics, the motorized vehicle access network, cultural resources, the Mohave River Wild and Scenic River eligibility determination, and cumulative impacts. In general, the West Mohave Plan should protect and enhance the habitat for the desert tortoise and other federal- and state-listed plant and animal species.

Because the tortoise is also affected by the potential repository and because of the relative nearness of the West Mohave Plan to the potential repository, this reasonably foreseeable

DRAFT

future action (RFFA)² should be incorporated, as appropriate, in the cumulative impacts analysis for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

²It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

DRAFT

(3) Title of Reviewed Document

Final EIS, Technical Area 18 (TA-18) Relocation of Capabilities and Materials at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, Operational Activities Involve Research in and the Design, Development, Construction, and Application of Experiments on Nuclear Criticality, New Mexico, Nevada (Nevada Test Site) and Idaho, Wait Period Ends: October 21, 2002. (DOE)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-17

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of FEIS (September 20, 2002)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Summary

Proposed Action

The National Nuclear Security Administration is responsible for providing the nation with nuclear weapons, ensuring the safety and reliability of those nuclear weapons, and supporting programs that reduce global nuclear proliferation. These missions are accomplished through the use of a core team of highly trained nuclear experts. The TA-18 facilities at Los Alamos National Laboratory are the nation's only facilities capable of performing general purpose nuclear materials handling and criticality experiments. These experiments provide unique training for a variety of federal agencies, including DOE, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and NRC personnel in areas such as nuclear materials safety, emergency response in support of counterterrorism activities, and safeguards and arms control in support of programs aimed at controlling excess nuclear materials. The TA-18 buildings and infrastructure are near the end of their useful life, and action is required to assess alternatives for continuing these activities for the next 25 years. Four siting alternatives were evaluated in this FEIS: (i) a different site at Los Alamos National Laboratory at Los Alamos, New Mexico; (ii) the Nevada Test Site near Las Vegas, Nevada; (iii) the Sandia National Laboratory at Albuquerque, New Mexico; and (iv) the Argonne National Laboratory-West near Idaho Falls, Idaho. The TA-18 Relocation Final EIS also evaluated the alternative of upgrading the existing facilities at TA-18 and the no-action alternative of maintaining the missions at the current TA-18 location. The preferred alternative identified in the FEIS is for activities involving Security Category I/II materials, which constitute roughly half of the activities conducted at TA-18. The Nevada Test Site alternative, which would house four of the five TA-18 experimental reactors in the existing Device Assembly Facility, was designated the preferred alternative based upon cost, technical, environmental, and mission factors. The National Nuclear Security Administration-preferred alternative also has the balance of the TA-18 missions, involving mostly Security Category III/IV materials and operations, remaining at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Nevada Test Site alternative would involve housing the TA-18 operational capabilities and materials associated with security Category I/II missions in and around the existing Device Assembly Facility. For this purpose, the Device Assembly Facility would be modified internally to accommodate the critical assembly machines, control rooms, and spent nuclear material vaults, and two new buildings would be constructed outside the Device Assembly Facility security perimeter. The two new buildings would constitute a "low-scatter" facility to house emergency response activities with minimal reflection and a new administration building to accommodate a Device Assembly Facility

DRAFT

Central Command Station and increased staffing associated with the TA–18 security Category I/II operations.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The existing Device Assembly Facility at the Nevada Test Site is located approximately 24 to 32 km [15 to 20 mi] east of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS evaluated the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts associated with relocating some of the TA–18 activities to the Nevada Test Site. Specifically, construction and operations impacts, along with transportation risks, were evaluated. Further, requirements and impacts related to land resources, air quality, water resources, socioeconomics, radiation exposure to the public and occupational workers under both normal operations and accident scenarios, environmental justice, waste management, and radiation exposures during transportation were evaluated.

Because of the nearness of this RFFA to the potential repository and because there are similar impact concerns related to infrastructure, energy, and water requirements, this RFFA should be considered in any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(4) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, Proposed Military Operational Increases and Implementation of Associated Comprehensive Land Use and Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans, Located on the North and South Ranges, Inyo, Kern and San Bernardino Counties, California, Wait Period Ends: April 5, 2004. (Naval Air Weapons Station)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-26

Information Reviewed

- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1—Purpose and Need
- Chapter 2—Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action

The proposed action encompasses an increase in the tempo of military test and evaluation and operational training activities conducted at the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station. The minor land use changes that would result from a decision to accommodate an increase in military operations would be reflected in the Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake Comprehensive Land Use Management Plan. The China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station is located in the western Mojave Desert of southern California, approximately 240 km [150 mi] northeast of Los Angeles, California. The station, composed of the North Range and the South Range, encompasses approximately 4,400 km² [1,700 mi²] and is located in portions of Inyo, Kern, and San Bernardino counties. The Naval Air Weapons Station land ranges, operated by the Department of the Navy for more than 50 years, provide a safe, secure, and highly instrumented volume of land and airspace in which to conduct controlled tests and operationally realistic training. The proposed action accommodates an increase in current test and training operations at the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station. The established mission of the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station is to conduct state-of-the-art weapons testing and evaluation and operational training within a safe, secure, and operationally diverse land range test environment. The need for the proposed action has been driven by the following factors: (i) changes to the type, tempo, and location of military test and training operations that support the military readiness mission in response to changing world events, Department of Defense/Navy fiscal directives, and the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station business development initiatives and (ii) passage of new laws and regulations affecting land use and environmental resources management. More specifically, the proposed action itself includes a moderate expansion of military operations (e.g., range flight operations, airfield flight operations, and range ground operations); continuation of current nonmilitary uses; and implementation of the China Lake Comprehensive Land Use Management Plan and Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The nearest location of the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station to the potential Yucca Mountain repository is the North Range; the northeastern corner of this range is about 97 km [60 mi] southwest of the potential repository.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The proposed action was analyzed in terms of its impacts on land use, noise, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, water resources, socioeconomics, utilities and public services, public health and safety, hazardous materials and wastes, and traffic and circulation.

Several of the impacts addressed for the proposed action are on resources that are also anticipated to be affected by the potential repository and by operations conducted at the Nellis Air Force Range. Examples include impacts on the protected desert tortoise and cultural resources. As appropriate, this RFFA should be considered in any future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository. At a minimum, one or more meetings with officials from both China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station and Nellis Air Force Range may be helpful prior to embarking on such analyses.

DRAFT

(5) Title of Reviewed Document

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS),³ Ely District Resource Management Plan and Implementation, White Pine, Lincoln Counties and a Portion of Nye County, Nevada, Comment Period Ends: November 28, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-4

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1—Purpose of and Need for Action

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the adoption of a comprehensive Resource Management Plan for approximately 4.6 million ha [11.4 million acres] of public land located in Lincoln, Nye, and White Pine counties in eastern Nevada that is administered by the Bureau of Land Management Ely Field Office. The Ely District Resource Management Plan will consolidate the Schell and Caliente Management Framework Plans approved in 1983 and 1981, respectively, and the Egan Resource Management Plan approved in 1987. The Draft Resource Management Plan/EIS considers and analyzes five alternatives, including a No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and an agency-preferred alternative (Alternative E). The issues addressed during the formulation of alternatives included (i) maintenance and restoration of resiliency to disturbed ecological systems within the portion of the Great Basin administered by the Ely Field Office; (ii) protection and management of habitats for special status species; (iii) upland and riparian habitat management; (iv) noxious weeds; (v) commercial uses (including livestock grazing, mineral development, oil and gas leasing, rights-of-way and communication use areas); (vi) areas of critical environmental concern; (vii) travel management; (viii) land disposal; and (ix) wild horses. Alternative E was identified in the draft EIS as the preferred alternative; it includes implementation of the Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project, management of all physical and biological resources and resource uses for the multiple use of renewable and nonrenewable resources, development of commodities, and allowance for future recreation and economic development of the counties and communities within the Ely District.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The planning area for the Resource Management Plan includes the entirety of White Pine and Lincoln Counties and a small portion of the northwestern part of Nye County. The shortest distance between the potential repository and the planning area occurs at the southwest corner of Lincoln County; the location is approximately 40 km [25 mi] directly east of the potential repository.

³It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The DEIS includes a comparison of the impacts of the five alternatives in relation to climate and air quality, water resources, soil resources, vegetation, fish and wildlife, special status species, wild horses, cultural resources, paleontological resources, visual resources, lands and realty, renewable energy, travel management and off-highway vehicle use, recreation, livestock grazing, woodland and native plant products, geology and mineral extraction, watershed management, fire management, noxious and invasive weed management, special designations, economic and social conditions, American Indian issues, environmental justice, health and safety, and cumulative impacts.

Because of the large area involved in the Resource Management Plan and its relative nearness to the potential repository, this RFFA should be considered, as appropriate, in subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(6) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Nevada Test Site and Off-Site Locations in the State of Nevada, 1996. (DOE)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-29

Information Reviewed

- Table of Contents
- Summary
- Chapter 2—Purpose and Need for DOE Action
- Record of Decision (December 9, 1996)
- Annual National Environmental Policy Act Planning Summary (January 2003) by the National Nuclear Security Administration/Nevada Site Office

Proposed Action

In the 1996 FEIS, the DOE proposed to continue managing the Nevada Test Site and offsite locations in Nevada and their resources in a manner that meets evolving DOE missions and responds to the concerns of affected and interested individuals and agencies. The FEIS analyzed the impacts from DOE programs at the Nevada Test Site, the Tonopah Test Range, portions of the Nellis Air Force Range Complex, the Central Nevada Test Area, and the Project Shoal Area. These programs include ongoing activities for the stewardship of the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile, management of radioactive waste, and environmental restoration. Also examined were newer programs, such as the proposed Solar Enterprise Zone facility sites at the Nevada Test Site and activities at Eldorado Valley, Dry Lake Valley, and Coyote Spring Valley. As identified in the Record of Decision, the chosen alternative for implementation included the following key elements: resource management and comprehensive land use planning, a defense program emphasizing stockpile stewardship experiments and operations, a "work for others" program, a waste management program, transportation of materials and waste, an environmental restoration program, site-specific remedial actions, and a nondefense research and development program.

DOE has a regulatory requirement to review sitewide EISs every 5 years. The review is to be documented via a supplement analysis to ensure the continued applicability and adequacy of the original FEIS and Record of Decision. For the 1996 Nevada Test Site FEIS, it was determined that this review would be accomplished in conjunction with a Resource Management Plan process. The original Resource Management Plan was developed in 1998 and distributed in 1999. In 2003, the National Nuclear Security Administration/Nevada Site Office prepared a supplemental analysis to document its 5-year review of the Nevada Test Site EIS. The purpose of the review was to determine whether the existing EIS remains adequate or whether to prepare a new sitewide EIS or supplement the existing EIS. Based on the analysis in the supplemental analysis, the National Nuclear Security Administration/Nevada Site Office determined that there are no substantial changes to the Nevada Test Site EIS or Record of

DRAFT

Decision or significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and that no supplemental EIS is needed.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The potential Yucca Mountain repository is located on the immediate southwestern boundary of the Nevada Test Site.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

In the 1996 FEIS, DOE weighed environmental impacts as one factor in its decisionmaking. DOE analyzed the potential impacts that might occur to land resources, air quality, noise, water resources, soils, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and human health for four alternatives. DOE also considered the impacts that might occur from use of special nuclear materials, facility accidents, and the transportation of radioactive materials. Finally, DOE addressed the impacts of projects and activities associated with the program categories for each alternative, the irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources, and the relationship between short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.

Because of the common boundary between the Nevada Test Site and the potential repository and because of impacts on common local and regional resources, the specific actions identified in the 1996 Nevada Test Site EIS and subsequent supplemental analyses should be considered, as appropriate, in future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Further, because of the potential contributions of the Nevada Test Site actions to local and regional cumulative impacts, one or more meetings with DOE could be held to discuss these potential contributions

DRAFT

(7) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Reconstruction of the Furnace Creek Water Collection System, Death Valley National Park, Inyo County, California, May 2006. (National Park Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-32

Information Reviewed

- DEIS—Notice of Availability of DEIS (October 12, 2005), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency rating of project and DEIS, Abstract, Table of Contents, and Executive Summary
- FEIS—Abstract, Table of Contents, Executive Summary, and Chapter 1: Purpose and Need

Proposed Action

The National Park Service has proposed to rebuild the water collection and distribution system in the Furnace Creek area of Death Valley National Park; the area is in Inyo County, California. The action provides a reliable quality and quantity of potable water for the National Park Service, the Xanterra resort facilities, the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe, and park visitors. Additional purposes include promoting the conservation of biological and cultural resources values in the Texas-Travertine Springs area, and enhancing water resources protection and management in the Furnace Creek area. The FEIS identifies and analyzes four alternatives. The preferred alternative (Alternative 3) would rebuild the outdated water collection system in the Furnace Creek area to deliver a safe and reliable potable and nonpotable water supply to the park's main visitor use area. It would also separate the potable and nonpotable water system in the project area and provide nonpotable water from the Inn Tunnel and a relocated Furnace Creek Wash collection gallery. Alternative 3 would provide potable water from two to three new groundwater wells in the Texas Springs Syncline; it would also treat water collected for potable purposes using a reverse osmosis water treatment plant and would dispose of concentrate water from the water treatment plant into a percolation trench in Furnace Creek Wash. The preferred alternative would also include a number of groundwater monitoring wells.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The project area is located approximately 56 km [35 mi] south-southwest of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS includes comparative impact information for the four alternatives in relation to the following resources: geologic resources and hazards, paleontological resources, hydrology, water quality, wetlands, vegetation, wildlife, special status species, air quality, soundscapes, cultural resources and landscape, visitor experience, transportation, scenic resources, socioeconomics, and park operations and facilities.

DRAFT

Because this project is focused on improving water resources and because of its close proximity to the potential repository, this RFFA should be considered, as appropriate, in any future cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

DRAFT

DRAFT

B. SUMMARIES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS THAT CAN BE MONITORED TO DETERMINE RELEVANCE TO FUTURE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSES

(1) Title of Reviewed Document

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS),¹ Table Mountain Wind Generating Facility Project, Construction of a 150 to 205 MW Wind-Powered Electric Generation Facility and Ancillary Facilities, Right-of-Way Grant, Spring Mountain Range Between the Communities of Goodsprings, Sandy Valley, Jean, and Primm, Clark County, Nevada, Comment Period Ends: August 26, 2002. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-1

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of DEIS (July 26, 2002)
- Press Release, Bureau of Land Management, Nevada, State Office, September 10, 2004
- Wind Energy Development Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)²

Proposed Action

The DEIS for Table Mountain proposed the development of a 150 to 205 MW wind-powered electric generation facility in the southern portion of Clark County, about 64 km [40 mi] south-southwest of Las Vegas, Nevada. The facility would include 153 wind turbine generators and auxiliary infrastructure. The proposed action for this facility is now on hold. However, there is continuing interest in wind energy development in various locations in the state. Further, a draft programmatic EIS focused on wind energy development on Bureau of Land Management-administered public lands in the western United States was issued in fall 2004.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The four communities associated with the on-hold Table Mountain Facility (Goodsprings, Sandy Valley, Jean, and Primm) are about 145 to 160 km [90 to 100 mi] southeast of Yucca Mountain.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Local construction-related impacts would occur along with the visual impacts of the wind turbines and potential impacts on local and migratory birds.

¹It should be noted that Draft Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym DEIS will be used.

²It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

DRAFT

As noted above, this reasonably foreseeable future action (RFFA)³ is currently on hold. However, due to the increasing interest in wind energy development in Nevada and potential developable sites nearer the potential Yucca Mountain repository, it would be helpful to continue to monitor such development initiatives through the Bureau of Land Management State Office in Reno. Further determinations are recommended to determine the relevance of visual and bird impacts in relation to cumulative impacts from the potential repository.

³It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

DRAFT

(2) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS),⁴ Toquop Energy Project, Toquop Land Disposal Amendment to the Caliente Management Framework Plan, Construction of a 1,100-MW Natural Gas-Fired Water-Cooled Electric Power Generating Plant and Associated Features on Public Lands Right-of-Way Grant, Lincoln, Clark, and Washoe Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: May 12, 2003. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-2

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Intent for preparing an EIS for a 750 MW coal-fired power plant in lieu of the earlier proposed 1,100-MW gas-fired plant (February 21, 2006)
- Conceptual design information for the 750 MW plant as presented in 2006 scoping meetings
- Executive Summary of FEIS for the 1,100 MW gas-fired plant

Proposed Action

Because of recent changes in market conditions relative to higher and volatile natural gas prices, the Bureau of Land Management has decided to prepare an EIS to reevaluate the alternative of constructing a 750 MW coal-fired power plant in lieu of an 1,100-MW gas-fired power plant and to complete studies necessary for a new 58-km [36-mi]-long railroad right-of-way connecting the project site to the existing Union Pacific Railway siding near Leith, Nevada. The EIS will evaluate, among other things, the alternative of constructing a 750 MW coal-fired power plant, a new railroad access line, coal unloading/handling/storage facilities, a solid waste disposal facility, water storage and treatment facilities, evaporation pond, cooling towers, and electric switchyard and support buildings. This Bureau of Land Management initiative has been necessitated by a proposal by Sithe Global Power, LLC, a privately held, independent power company, to construct a 750-MW coal-fired plant in the same location as the previously proposed 1,100-MW gas-fired plant. The sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from the coal-fired plant using low-sulfur Wyoming coal are expected to both be about 0.09 kg/MW · hr [0.06 lb per million BTU]. These emission rates are considerably lower than current national and regional averages.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed Toquop Energy Project plant site is in the southeast corner of Lincoln County, about 16 km [10 mi] west of the Arizona state line and 10 km [6 mi] north of the Clark County line. The site is 18 to 19 km [11 to 12 mi] north of Interstate Highway 15. This site is about 209 km [130 mi] east of the potential Yucca Mountain repository. The proposed 58-km [36-mi]-railway line is to the northwest and connects the site to an existing line in Leith, Nevada.

⁴It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

While the EIS on the 750 MW coal-fired plant is not yet completed, anticipated impacts would be expected to occur from construction-phase activities and from air pollutant emissions, water requirements, and waste disposal needs during the operational phase. Because of current water deficiencies in southern Nevada and air quality concerns in the Las Vegas area, this proposed energy project could contribute to cumulative impacts on these Lincoln County and Clark County resources.

Because of its distance from the potential repository, this RFFA (the 750 MW coal-fired Toquop Energy Project) would not be expected to contribute to cumulative impacts on resources that would be impacted by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. However, due to the regional importance of air and water resources in southeast Nevada, the Bureau of Land Management Ely Field Office development of the new EIS on the coal-fired plant should be monitored, as appropriate.

DRAFT

(3) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Ivanpah Energy Center Project, 500-MW Gas-Fired Electric Power Generating Station Construction and Operation, Approval, Right-of-Way Grant, Bureau of Land Management Temporary Use Permit, Federal Highway Administration Permit to Cross Federal Aid Highway, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 and 404 Permits and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit Issuance, Clark County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: June 16, 2003. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-3

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Section 1—Project Status
- Section 4—Supplemental Information

Proposed Action

Ivanpah Energy Center, L.P., a Diamond Generating Corporation Company, a subsidiary of Mitsubishi Corporation, proposes to construct and operate a 500 MW gas-fired electric power generating station in southern Clark County, Nevada. The facility would be known as the Ivanpah Energy Center, LP. Construction would require consideration of a natural gas supply pipeline, access roads, process water availability and conveyance, telecommunications, and electrical transmission interconnections to the southern Nevada power grid. The purpose of the project is to provide additional reliable electrical generating capacity within the southwestern United States to help meet near-term and future power needs. The proposed site for the Ivanpah Energy Center is near Goodsprings, Nevada, about 48 km [30 mi] southwest of Las Vegas, Nevada.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed Goodsprings plant site is about 130 km [80 mi] southeast of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The project will require water for cooling and other purposes, and water usage requirements and supply sources are still being developed. Other potential impact concerns related to regional resources include those associated with the protected desert tortoise and archeological and paleontological sites. Thermal plumes from project operations were also addressed.

Because of its potential impacts on regional resources that are also impacted by the potential repository, it would be helpful to monitor the Ivanpah Energy Center, LP, project via continuing contacts with the Bureau of Land Management Las Vegas Field Office.

DRAFT

(4) Title of Reviewed Document

DEIS, White Pine & Grant-Quinn Oil and Gas Leasing Project, Exploration and Development, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Ely Ranger District, White Pine, Nye and Lincoln Counties, Nevada, Comment Period Ends: October 11, 2005. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-3

Information Reviewed

- Description of DEIS (although listed, the complete DEIS was not available on the following website in early May 2006: <www.fs.fed.us/r4/hntf/projects/archived/2005/oil_gas/oil_gas_deis.shtml>
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) rating of DEIS (October 21, 2005)
- Chapter 2—Alternatives

Proposed Action

This DEIS focused on determining what lands within the White Pine and Grant-Quinn Divisions could be made available for oil and gas leasing, and, if made available, under what conditions leasing would be authorized. There are concerns that the potential proposed action would open new oil and gas leases in the large majority of the 40 roadless areas in these divisions.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The potential proposed action would be located approximately 225 km [140 mi] north-northeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The DEIS addressed the comparative impacts of four alternatives relative to wildlife and related habitat, other critical habitats, protected species, water quality, soils/geology, roadless areas, recreational opportunities, wilderness, visual quality, recreational sites, and heritage resources. The EPA assigned an EC-2 rating to the proposed action and DEIS. Environmental concerns were expressed in relation to impacts on water quality and habitat. Further, EPA requested that appropriate lease stipulations to protect these resources be included in the Record of Decision.

As of May 2006, this RFFA appears to be on hold. Further, key parts of the DEIS are no longer available on the Internet. However, in general, if oil and gas leasing becomes a major initiative in Nevada, then the consideration of this RFFA in future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository may be appropriate.

DRAFT

(5) Title of Reviewed Document

DEIS, White Pine Energy Station Project, White Pine County, Nevada, April 2007. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-7

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1.0—Introduction

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the construction, operation, and maintenance of a 1,590-MW coal-fired power plant on public lands in White Pine County, Nevada. The proposed plant site is in the Steptoe Valley, approximately 55 km [34 mi] north of Ely, 35 km [22 mi] north of McGill, and one mile west of U.S. Highway 93. In addition to the plant, the proposed action also includes a new well field to meet the water needs of the power plant, a new rail spur for coal transport, and linear infrastructure for electric transmission lines.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed plant site is located approximately 320 km [200 mi] north-northeast of the potential Yucca Mountain repository. It is about 200 km [125 mi] north of Caliente; thus it could have some relevance to the Caliente rail line.

Impacts Related to the Proposed Action

The impacts of the proposed power plant were addressed in relation to geology, soils, and minerals; surface and groundwater resources; biological resources (vegetation, noxious and invasive weeds, wildlife and fisheries resources, and protected species); air quality; noise; visual and recreation resources; land use; cultural resources; and various socioeconomic issues.

Because of its distance from the potential repository, the White Pine Energy Station Project would not be expected to contribute to cumulative impacts on resources that would be affected by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. However, due to the regional importance of air and water resources in east and southeast Nevada, as well as the project location in relation to the Caliente rail line, the Bureau of Land Management's Ely Field Office development of the FEIS on this coal-fired plant should be monitored, as appropriate.

DRAFT

APPENDIX C

DRAFT

DRAFT

C. SUMMARIES OF REVIEWS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS THAT CAN BE EXCLUDED FROM FUTURE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSES

(1) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS),¹ Weber Dam Repair and Modification Project, Propose To Repair and Modify Dam, Walker River Paiute Tribe, Right-of-Way Grant and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, Walker River Valley, Lyon and Mineral Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: June 20, 2005. (Bureau of Indian Affairs)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-1

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)²

Proposed Action

The Walker River Paiute Tribe and Bureau of Indian Affairs proposes to repair and modify Weber Dam in accordance with federal safety requirements for the structure. Weber Dam is operated for the benefit of the Tribe by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which must repair and modify the dam under the requirements of the Indian Dams Safety Act. The repair would allow Weber Reservoir to operate at the current full capacity of 13.2 million m³ [10,700 acre-ft]. The proposed repairs and modifications will provide a secure source of irrigation water, recreation, fish and wildlife habitat and will meet undetermined future uses for tribal members and reservation lands.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

Weber Dam is near the town of Schurz, which is on the Walker River Paiute Indian Reservation in western Nevada. The impounded Walker Lake behind Weber Dam is about 40 km [25 mi] from Schurz. The Yucca Mountain site is over 240 km [150 mi] to the southeast of Walker Lake.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Construction-related short-term impacts, as well as longer term impacts over the life of the project, were addressed in relation to geology and soil resources, water resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomic conditions, resource use patterns, other

¹It should be noted that Final Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym FEIS will be used.

²It should be noted that Draft Environmental Impact Statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym DEIS will be used.

DRAFT

values, and environmental justice and Indian Trust Assets. As appropriate, mitigation measures were identified, and long-term environmental benefits are anticipated. Region IX of EPA had no objection to the proposed project and rated the DEIS as having “Lack of Objections.”

Because of its localized impacts and the distance from the potential repository, this reasonably foreseeable future action (RFFA)³ does not influence the resources that would be affected by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended.

³It should be noted that reasonably foreseeable future actions is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym RFFA will be used.

DRAFT

(2) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Phoenix Project, Current Mining Operations and Processing Activities Expansion, Battle Mountain, Plan of Operations Approval, Lander County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: February 11, 2002. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-4

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability for the Record of Decision and Plan of Operations Approval (February 19, 2004)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Summary
- Chapter 1—Purpose of and Need for Action

Proposed Action

Battle Mountain Gold Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of Newmont Mining Corporation, has proposed expanding its current operations near Battle Mountain, Nevada. The expansion, which has now been approved, includes mining and beneficiation of gold, silver, and copper ores. The Phoenix Project would require up to an additional 1,745 ha [4,308 acres] of disturbance. Battle Mountain Gold Company would develop the new Phoenix and Reona pits and expand the existing Midas and Iron Canyon pits. Mining these ore deposits would be coupled with excavating and beneficiating low-grade gold ore stockpiles associated with the previous Tomboy, Northeast Extension, and Fortitude mining operations. Beneficiation operations would include heap leach facility expansion and new milling facilities. The plan also includes closing and reclaiming the copper heap leach facilities, lining and isolating the previous copper tailings facility, and backfilling three existing open pits (Tomboy, etc.). The project would have an estimated operational life of up to 26 years followed by approximately 5 years of reclamation.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The location of the Phoenix Project is in Lander County, approximately 19 km [12 mi] southwest of the town of Battle Mountain, Nevada. Accordingly, the location is about 355 km [220 mi] north-northwest of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Impacts associated with the proposed action were addressed relative to the following resources: (i) geology and minerals, (ii) water resources and geochemistry, (iii) soils and reclamation, (iv) vegetation, (v) wildlife and fisheries resources, (vi) range resources, (vii) paleontological resources, (viii) cultural resources, (ix) air quality, (x) land use and access, (xi) recreation and

DRAFT

wilderness, (xii) social and economic values, (xiii) visual resources, (xiv) noise, and (xv) hazardous materials. The identified impacts were primarily within the local environs of the Phoenix Project in Lander County.

Because of the localized impacts of the Phoenix Project and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not affect the resources that would be impacted by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended.

DRAFT

(3) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Newmont Gold Mining, South Operations Area Project Amendment, Operation and Expansion, Plan of Operations, Elko and Eureka Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: May 28, 2002. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-5

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of FEIS (April 26, 2002)
- EPA rating of the DEIS
- Notice of Availability of Record of Decision (July 26, 2002)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Summary

Proposed Action

The proposed action is related to expansion of mining at the Gold Quarry Mine. The total incremental disturbance in the South Operations Area would be 564 ha [1,392 acres], of which 224 ha [553 acres] are private lands and 340 ha [839 acres] are public lands. The disturbed area would include the mine pit, leach pads, waste rock disposal facilities, haul roads, and ancillary mine facilities. Mining and processing operations would result in recovery of oxide and sulfide ores by deepening the existing Gold Quarry pit approximately 107 m [350 ft]. The incremental disturbance area associated with development of the open pit would be 56 ha [139 acres]. Mining would continue through the year 2011, and ore processing would continue through 2016.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The South Operations Area Project is located in Eureka and Elko Counties, approximately 10 km [6 mi] northwest of Carlin, Nevada. Accordingly, the location is about 400 km [250 mi] north of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Impacts from the proposed action were analyzed in relation to the removal of waste rock and ore, pit dewatering expansion, and groundwater consequences. Further, impacts from land disturbances were considered relative to vegetation, noxious weeds, riparian areas, terrestrial wildlife, aquatic habitat and fisheries, protected species, livestock grazing, recreation, visual resources, noise, cultural resources and Native American religious concerns, and social and economic impacts.

EPA assigned a rating of EO-2 to the project and DEIS (EO denotes environmental objections related to the proposed project, and 2 denotes that the DEIS contained insufficient information for assessing project impacts). Basic to the rating were concerns regarding the proposed expansion of the South Operations Area due to potential significant adverse impacts to water, and air quality; specifically, potential acid rock drainage, contaminated pit lake water, and

DRAFT

mercury emissions to the air. EPA requested that the final environmental impact statement (EIS)⁴ include additional acid-generating potential analysis, pollution prevention measures, mitigation, and project monitoring.

Because of the localized impacts of the South Operations Area Project Amendment and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not affect the resources that would be affected by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended. However, the nearby Carlin rail alignment associated with the potential Yucca Mountain repository could be subject to cumulative impacts from the South Operations Area. Conversely, at this time, it does not seem likely that the Carlin rail alignment will be utilized.

⁴It should be noted that environmental impact statement is referenced frequently throughout this report; consequently, the acronym EIS will be used.

DRAFT

(4) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Leeville Mining Project, Proposal to Develop and Operate an Underground Mine and Ancillary Facilities including Dewatering Operation, Plan-of-Operations/Right-of-Way Permits and Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, Elko and Eureka Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: August 26, 2002. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-6

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of FEIS (July 26, 2002)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Chapter 1—Introduction
- DEIS Summary
- Record of Decision and Plan of Operations Approval

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the development of an underground gold mine approximately 32 km [20 mi] northwest of Carlin, Nevada. Specific features of construction include five shafts to access three main ore bodies at depths of approximately 760 m [2,500 ft] below ground surface. Ancillary mine facilities would be constructed to support underground operations including shaft hoists, waste rock disposal facility, refractory ore stockpile, facilities to support backfilling operations, installation and operation of mine dewatering well system, water treatment plant, water pipeline system to transport dewatering water to existing irrigation and infiltration systems in the Boulder Valley, and reclamation of surface disturbances. The Leeville Project would result in surface disturbances totaling 197 ha [486 acres] of land {13 ha [33 acres] of private land and 184 ha [453 acres] of public land}. The Leeville Project would have an approximate 18-year mine life and would produce about 16 million metric tons [18 million short tons] of ore and waste rock.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Leeville Project is located on public and private land in Eureka County, approximately 32 km [20 mi] northwest of Carlin, Nevada. Accordingly, the project is approximately 418 km [260 mi] north of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Specific attention was directed to impacts from the proposed action on geology and materials, paleontological resources, air quality, groundwater and surface water quantity and quality, soils, vegetation, invasive species, wetlands and riparian zones, fisheries and aquatic resources, terrestrial wildlife, protected species, grazing, recreation, access and land use, noise, visual resources, cultural resources, Native American concerns, social and economic resources, and environmental justice. As appropriate, mitigation measures for various impacts are included.

DRAFT

Because of the localized impacts of the proposed new Leeville mine and ancillary facilities and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not affect the resources that would be impacted by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended. However, the Carlin rail alignment associated with the potential Yucca Mountain repository could be subject to cumulative impacts from the Leeville Project. Conversely, at this time, it does not seem likely that the Carlin rail alignment will be used.

DRAFT

(5) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS), Betze-Post Project, Updated Information, Dewatering Operations and a Proposed Pipeline, Elko and Eureka Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: March 3, 2002. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-7

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of Final Supplemental EIS (January 31, 2003)
- EPA rating of the DEIS
- Chapter 3 from Draft Supplemental EIS

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves changes in the groundwater pumping and water management activities related to the Goldstrike Mine in the north central section of Eureka County just to the south of Elko County. These hydraulic changes have implications for several resources in the study area, including groundwater and surface water resources, geology, riparian vegetation, wildlife, aquatic resources, protected species, and grazing management. As appropriate, mitigation and monitoring measures are included in the proposed action. Regarding water-related impacts, the Goldstrike Mine is located within the Humboldt River basin in north-central Nevada. The entire basin covers an area of nearly 44,000 km² [17,000 mi²]; upstream of the project facilities, the river drainage occupies approximately 19,400 km² [7,500 mi²]. The Humboldt River flows within an enclosed basin, having no external drainage to a larger flow system. The river flows westward and terminates by evaporation and infiltration in the Humboldt Sink south of Lovelock, Nevada.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Betze-Post Project is located on public and private land in Eureka County, approximately 48 km [30 mi] northwest of Carlin, Nevada. Accordingly, the project is approximately 435 km [270 mi] north of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Specific attention was directed to impacts from the proposed action on geology, groundwater and surface water quantity and quality, riparian vegetation, wildlife resources, aquatic resources, protected species, and grazing. As noted previously, mitigation measures and monitoring for various impacts are included.

EPA assigned an EC-2 rating to the Betze-Post project and its associated Draft Supplemental EIS: (1) environmental concern denotes environmental concerns relative to the project and its impacts (2) denotes and insufficient information for evaluating impacts in the EIS. Specifically, EPA expressed concerns regarding the project's direct and cumulative impacts to biological resources and recommended considering an alternative to mitigate impacts to springs and streams. The agency also requested additional information regarding ecological risk, cumulative impacts, and mitigation measures.

DRAFT

Because of the localized impacts of the proposed Betze-Post Project and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not affect the resources that would be impacted by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended. However, note that the Carlin rail alignment associated with the potential Yucca Mountain repository could be subject to cumulative impacts from the Betze-Post Project. Conversely, at this time, it does not seem likely that the Carlin rail alignment will be used.

DRAFT

(6) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Supplemental EIS, Pipeline/South Pipeline Pit Expansion Project, Updated Information on Modifying the Extended Plan of Operations (Plan), Gold Acres Mining District, Lander County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: March 28, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-8

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of Final Supplemental EIS (February 25, 2005)
- EPA rating of the Draft Supplemental EIS

Proposed Action

This proposed action involves modifying the extended operational plan for the existing Gold Acres mine and expanding a current pipeline project. The site is located in Lander County approximately 48 km [30 mi] south of Battle Mountain, Nevada. EPA has expressed concerns relative to the longer term closure of the mine and related pit lakes.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

As noted above, the area of the project is approximately 48 km [30 mi] south of Battle Mountain. such, this project is located about 355 km [220 mi] north of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The impacts associated with this proposed action were typical of the Bureau of Land Management impact studies associated with mining projects (e.g., impacts on groundwater and surface water resources, and terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna). Regarding this Final Supplemental EIS, EPA expressed (i) concerns that the Bureau of Land Management has deferred until mine closure the designation and evaluation of postmining beneficial uses and applicability of beneficial use requirements for pit lakes, (ii) concerns regarding the long-term mitigation and monitoring fund, and (iii) concerns that the Final Supplemental EIS does not address the issues critical to establishing the effectiveness of the fund and its availability for future mitigation and monitoring needs should they arise. The agency thus recommended including additional information on these issues the Record of Decision.

Because of the localized impacts of this Gold Acres Mining District Project and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not affect the resources that would be affected by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended. However, the Carlin rail alignment associated with the potential Yucca Mountain repository could be subject to cumulative impacts from the Gold Acres Mining District Project. Conversely, at this time, it does not seem likely that the Carlin rail alignment will be used.

DRAFT

(7) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Supplemental EIS, Ruby Hill Mine Expansion—East Archimedes Project, Extension of Existing Open Pit, Expansion of Two Existing Waste Rock Disposal Areas, Plan-of-Operations Permit, Eureka County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: April 25, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-9

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of Final Supplemental EIS (August 26, 2005)
- EPA rating of Draft Supplemental EIS (May 13, 2005)
- Abstract
- Executive Summary
- Table of Contents
- Chapter 1.0—Introduction

Proposed Action

Homestake Mining Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of Barrick Gold Corporation has proposed to expand its Ruby Hill Project, an existing gold mining and processing operation. The Ruby Hill Project is located within the historic Eureka Mining District in Eureka County, approximately 1.1 km [0.7 mi] northwest of Eureka, Nevada. The proposed action would be developed within the previously approved Ruby Hill Mine permit area. The expansion would include an extension of the existing open pit, expansion of two existing waste rock disposal areas, expansion of the existing heap leach pad, and construction of dewatering facilities. Portions of the existing power line would be relocated for the expansion. The proposed action would require surface disturbance of approximately 301 ha [744 acres], including 77 ha [190 acres] of public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and 224 ha [554 acres] of private land owned by Homestake. The anticipated mine life would be approximately 7 years, followed by an estimated additional 2 years for final reclamation.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

As noted above, this proposed expansion project is located 1.1 km [0.7 mi] northwest of the town of Eureka in Eureka County, Nevada. As such, the project is approximately 280 km [175 mi] north of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Anticipated impacts from the proposed expansion project were determined for air quality, geology and minerals, paleontology, surface and groundwater quantity and quality, soils, vegetation resources, range resources, woodland products (Christmas-tree cutting), invasive and nonnative species, terrestrial wildlife, protected and other species (golden eagles, ferruginous hawks, Swainson's hawks, prairie falcon, greater sage grouse, burrowing owl, pinyon jay, vesper sparrow, juniper titmouse, loggerhead shrike, bats, and pygmy rabbit), land use authorizations and access, recreation and wilderness, visual resources, noise and blasting vibrations, cultural resources, Native American traditional values, social and economic values,

DRAFT

hazardous materials and solid waste, and environmental justice. The EPA rating of the proposed action and the Draft Supplemental EIS was EC-2 (EC denotes environmental concerns related to the proposed action, while 2 denotes that the Draft Supplemental EIS contained insufficient information for assessing the environmental impacts). Specifically, EPA expressed concerns about the potential impacts of pit lake water quality on aquatic life and water fowl, heap leach closure, and surface water diversion structure design and maintenance and recommended that the Final Supplemental EIS provide additional information and identify additional mitigation.

Because of the relatively localized impacts of the proposed Ruby Hill Mine Expansion Project, and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not affect the specific resources that would be impacted by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended.

DRAFT

(8) Title of Reviewed Document

DEIS, Emigrant Mine Project, Develop and Operate an Open Pit Mine, Construct a Waste Rock Disposal Facility, South of Carlin in Elko County, Nevada, Comment Period Ends: June 24, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-2

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Intent for preparation of EIS (May 25, 2004)
- Notice of Availability of DEIS (March 25, 2005)
- Bureau of Land Management Elko Field Office—Project and Planning Schedule (February, 2005)

Proposed Action

The Newmont Mining Corporation has submitted a plan of operations to open the Emigrant Mine about 16 km [10 mi] south of Carlin, Nevada. The proposed Emigrant Mine would include (i) developing and operating an open pit mine, (ii) constructing a waste rock disposal facility, (iii) storing oxide waste in mined out areas of the pit, (iv) developing an oxide heap leach pad (v) constructing ancillary facilities, (vi) rerouting an intermittent stream and flows in the pit area, and (vii) performing concurrent reclamation. The mining operations would last for approximately 9 years through the year 2014. Approximately 475 ha [1,172 acres] of public land and 105 ha [260 acres] of private land would be disturbed.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

As noted above, the proposed Emigrant Mine is located in Elko County about 16 km [10 mi] south of Carlin, Nevada. As such, the proposed mine is located about 385 km [240 mi] north of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The DEIS addressed potential impacts to wildlife and cultural resources; the potential for waste rock, heap leach, and pit walls to produce acid rock drainage or heavy metals; and diversion of an unnamed drainage. Cumulative impacts were also addressed. The following resources were also analyzed in the DEIS: (i) geology and minerals; (ii) Native American religious concerns, (iii) air and water quality; (iv) paleontology; (v) lands and realty; (vi) fisheries; (vii) aquatic and riparian resources; (viii) range management; (ix) vegetation; (x) soils; (xi) visual resources; (xii) recreation; (xiii) wilderness; (xiv) weeds; (xv) social and economic values; (xvi) environmental justice; and (xvii) threatened, endangered, candidate, and sensitive species. Mitigation measures are considered in the DEIS to minimize environmental impacts and undue or unnecessary degradation of public lands.

Because of the localized impacts of the proposed Emigrant Mine Project and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not influence the resources that would be potential by

DRAFT

the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended. However, the Carlin rail alignment associated with the Yucca Mountain repository could be subject to cumulative impacts from the Emigrant Mine Project. Conversely, at this time, it does not seem likely that the Carlin rail alignment will be used.

DRAFT

(9) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon, Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area and Associated Wilderness, and Other Contiguous Lands, Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Great Basin, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: October 14, 2003. (U.S. Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-11

Information Reviewed

- Record of Decision (July 2004)

Proposed Action

The Black Rock-High Rock Canyon planning area consists of 486,000 ha [1.2 million acres] of public lands in northwest Nevada. This area includes parts of Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt counties and is administered by the Bureau of Land Management Winnemucca (Winnemucca, Nevada) and Surprise (Cedarville, California) Field Offices. The planning area includes all 474,935 ha [1,172,680 acres] designated in the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area Act of 2000 as the National Conservation Area and 10 Wilderness Areas. Several other relatively small areas outside the National Conservation Area or Wilderness Areas are included in the planning area because they are contiguous to the National Conservation Area or Wilderness and similar planning issues apply to them. These other areas {totaling 13,106 ha [32,360 acres]} are the South Playa, located between the south boundary of the National Conservation Area and the town of Gerlach; the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Wilderness Study Area; acquired federal lands within the Wilderness Study Area; the strip of public land located between the Wilderness Study Area and the Summit Lake Paiute Indian Reservation; and road and motorized trail corridors associated with Wilderness access and boundaries and with the National Conservation Area boundary. The primary FEIS-related decision approved the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area and Associated Wilderness Areas and Other Contiguous Lands in the Nevada Resource Management Plan. Examples of some land use allocations within the Resource Management Plan include transportation, off-highway vehicle management, wilderness management, special management areas, livestock grazing management, wild horse and burro management, energy and mineral management, and recreation.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area is located about 480 km [300 mi] northwest of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS explored various beneficial and detrimental environmental consequences of the previously listed land use allocations. In general, with appropriate mitigation measures and management actions, the natural resources of the National Conservation Area should be preserved and enhanced.

DRAFT

Because of the localized impacts of the Resource Management Plan for the National Conservation Area and the distance from the potential repository, this RFFA does not influence the resources that would be affected by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended.

DRAFT

(10) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area, Resource Management Plan, Implementation, Cities of Las Vegas and Henderson, Clark County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: November 14, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-13

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary
- Chapter 1—Purpose and Need

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves adopting a Resource Management Plan for the Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area and the North McCullough Wilderness located in the southern Nevada Mohave Desert in Clark County south of Las Vegas and Henderson. The 19,617-ha [48,438-acre] National Conservation Area forms the mountainous southern skyline of Henderson and Las Vegas and contains important cultural resources and archaeological sites. The centerpiece is the Sloan Canyon Petroglyph Site, one of the most significant cultural resources in southern Nevada. Although residential housing, schools, parks, and businesses will eventually border much of the northern and western edges of the National Conservation Area, the conservation area currently is undeveloped and sparsely used. Accordingly, the Resource Management Plan provides guidance in managing public lands in the Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area for the next 15 to 20 years. The overall Resource Management Plan currently includes eight resource-specific plans as follows: recreation monitoring plan, North McCullough Wilderness management plan, cultural resources management plan, an interpretive strategy and environmental education strategy, litter cleanup plan and public lands awareness campaign, vegetation restoration strategy, biological management strategy, and biological assessment.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area is located approximately 150 km [95 mi] southeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS addresses the impacts of the Resource Management Plan relative to recreation, the North McCullough Wilderness, cultural resources, visual resources, interpretation, facilities, lands and realty, registered motorized vehicles, vegetation management, wildlife management, air quality, livestock grazing, socioeconomics and environmental justice, and cumulative impacts.

Because the impacts of the Resource Management Plan are localized and because of the approximate 150-km [95-mi] distance to the potential repository, it is not recommended that this

DRAFT

RFFA be considered further in a subsequent cumulative impacts analysis for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(11) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Supplemental EIS, Clark County Regional Flood Control Master Plan, Updated and Replaced the Original 1991 FEIS, Facilities Construction and Operation, Right-of-Way Approval and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, Clark County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: November 22, 2004. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-14

Information Reviewed

- EPA rating of plan and Draft Supplemental EIS
- Record of Decision
- Annual Report, Clark County Flood Control District, 2002/2003

Proposed Action

The proposed action relates to the approval of the Clark County Regional Flood Control District's 2002 Master Plan Update. The focal point of the proposed action is an expanded detention/conveyance system. In addition, identified mitigation measures are included along with monitoring and enforcement related to specific permits and rights-of-way grants. Further, as specific facilities are developed, they will be reviewed regarding their potential environmental consequences.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

Planned facilities related to regional flood control are identified for numerous locations throughout Clark County. The westernmost facilities are approximately 95 km [60 mi] southeast of the potential Yucca Mountain repository. The general flow direction associated with the existing basins and conveyances is southerly.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The Final Supplemental EIS addressed typical impacts associated with detention basins and conveyance channels, including construction-related impacts on air quality and noise and impacts from runoff waters associated with flood events. Issues related to floodplain resources, biological impacts, and protected species were also addressed. EPA assigned an EC-2 rating to the plan and the Draft Supplemental EIS. Environmental concerns related to the plan were reflected by EC, while the 2 indicated that the Draft Supplemental EIS contained insufficient information for assessing all of the impact concerns. Specific EPA comments related to concerns associated with potential impacts to air quality, U.S. waters, shallow groundwater, and biological resources. EPA also recommended that additional information be included in the FEIS regarding these resources, other reasonable alternatives to meet the project purpose, indirect impacts, and mitigation measures.

Because of the localized and downstream nature of the impacts from the Clark County flood control projects and because of their relatively large distance from the potential repository, This RFFA does not influence the resources that would be affected by the potential Yucca Mountain repository. Therefore, no further consideration is recommended.

DRAFT

(12) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary Project, Disposal and Use of Public Land under the Management of Bureau of Land Management, Implementation, Clark County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: January 24, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-15

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary
- Record of Decision

Proposed Action

The Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary FEIS analyzes the potential impacts associated with the disposal and use of public land under the management of the Bureau of Land Management as directed by the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998, as amended by the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002. Under the proposed action in the FEIS, all remaining Bureau of Land Management lands {approximately 18,900 ha [46,700 acres]} within the disposal boundary area in Clark County would be sold or transferred by 2015. This "land disposal" action is needed because the Bureau of Land Management-managed lands in the Las Vegas Valley are being surrounded by more urbanized private lands, thus making it difficult for the Bureau of Land Management to properly manage federal lands. Disposal would allow local governments to control, manage, and regulate the future uses of these lands. The land disposal action would also make the public lands available for use by local governments for public purposes or for purchase at auction to accommodate the rapid urban development in the Las Vegas Valley. The Record of Decision for the Valley Disposal Boundary Project indicated that the Bureau of Land Management decided to select the Conservation Transfer Alternative as analyzed in the FEIS as the agency's preferred alternative. The Conservation Transfer Alternative is also the environmentally preferred alternative. Selection of this alternative will still allow the Bureau of Land Management to dispose of approximately 18,900 ha [46,700 acres] of lands in the Las Vegas Valley. However, approximately 2,000 ha [5,000 acres] of sensitive vegetation and unique paleontological and archeological resources will be subject to a process of more study; collaboration; further National Environmental Policy Act analysis, as needed; and approval of a conservation agreement, if signed, prior to any transfer of title.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The lands subjected to Bureau of Land Management disposal are located in multiple parcels throughout the Las Vegas Valley. The westernmost lands are located approximately 95 km [60 mi] southeast of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The environmental consequences of the Conservation Transfer Alternative on various environmental, socioeconomic, and land use program areas were identified. Direct environmental impacts would be caused by land use activities that would occur subsequent to disposal. The disposal action and subsequent transfer of title do not have direct impacts, because these administrative actions do not cause any environmental change. The transfer of title would directly impact users of the land (i.e., nonenvironmental impacts) in the resource areas of recreation, range management, and hazardous materials. Once land is disposed, the new owners would undertake development activities that would not have occurred if the land remained under the Bureau of Land Management; therefore, impacts related to changes in land use after development are indirect impacts of the land disposal action. The FEIS addressed such direct and indirect effects on air quality, earth resources, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, Native American resources, paleontological resources, visual resources, land use, recreation and wilderness, hazardous materials, socioeconomics, environmental justice, and range management.

Because of the localized and downstream nature of the impacts from the land disposal actions and because of their relatively large distance from the potential repository, no further consideration of this RFFA is recommended in subsequent cumulative impacts analyses associated with the potential repository.

DRAFT

(13) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Humboldt Project Conveyance, Transferring 83,530 Acres from Federal Ownership to the Pershing County Water Conservation District, Pershing and Lander Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: November 14, 2005. (Bureau of Reclamation)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-16

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary
- Humboldt Project Chronology
- Chapter 1.0—Introduction

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves transferring the Humboldt Project to the Pershing County Water Conservation District in accordance with Public Law 107-282 (the Humboldt Project Conveyance Act). The Humboldt Project, which is located in the high desert of north central Nevada, includes the Humboldt Sink, the Rye Patch Dam and Reservoir, and the Battle Mountain Community Pasture. These areas are contained within three separate noncontiguous areas along the Humboldt River. The Humboldt River is the longest river within the State of Nevada and is the major source of irrigation water for the Humboldt Project. The Humboldt Sink itself consists of two noncontiguous segments at the terminus of the Humboldt River. The northeast segment includes the Toulon Lake, Humboldt Lake, and Humboldt drainage, and the southwest segment includes the White Plains area. In total, approximately 13,225 ha [32,650 acres] of withdrawn lands located in Pershing and Churchill Counties are included in the proposed title transfer. The northern extent is located approximately 16 km [10 mi] south of Lovelock, the county seat of Pershing County. The Rye Patch Dam and Reservoir are located on the Humboldt River about 35 km [22 mi] upstream from Lovelock and approximately 29 km [18 mi] from the northern extremity of the Pershing County Water Conservation District service area. The lands to be transferred include approximately 3,425 ha [8,460 acres] of withdrawn lands and approximately 5,000 ha [12,340 acres] of acquired lands. The Battle Mountain Community Pasture is located approximately 200 km [125 mi] upstream of the northern end of Rye Patch Reservoir and is traversed by the Humboldt, Rock Creek, and Reese Rivers. The lands to be transferred include approximately 12,150 ha [30,000 acres] of acquired lands north of Interstate 80, with a few isolated parcels south of the interstate. There are pasture lands primarily north and east of the unincorporated town of Battle Mountain, the county seat of Lander County, Nevada.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

Of the three parcels of land to be transferred, the nearest to the potential Yucca Mountain repository is the Humboldt Sink. The Sink is approximately 370 km [230 mi] northwest of the potential repository.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS addressed the impacts of the transfer of the three parcels on land resources and use, water resources, geologic resources, soil resources, biological resources, hazardous materials and dam safety, recreation, socioeconomics, environmental justice, paleontological resources, cultural resources, Indian Trust assets, and cumulative concerns.

Because of the localized nature of the impacts from the proposed action and the distances from the conveyance areas to the potential repository, further consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in subsequent cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(14) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Environmental Impact Report and EIS, Lower Owens River Project, to Implement a Large-Scale Habitat Restoration Project, Funding, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit and Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, Owens Valley, Inyo County, California, Wait Period: August 24, 2004. (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-18

Information Reviewed

- Project Summary (Abstract)
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary

Proposed Action

The Lower Owens River Valley is located in the southern portion of Inyo County, California. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and Inyo County proposes to implement a large-scale habitat restoration project in the Owens Valley. The Lower Owens River Project was originally identified in a 1991 agreement between Inyo County and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The project was identified in a 1991 Environmental Impact Report as mitigation for impacts related to groundwater pumping by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power from 1970 to 1990. The project was augmented in a Memorandum of Understanding signed by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Inyo County, and other parties and implemented through a joint effort by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and Inyo County. The Lower Owens River Project involves four primary restoration efforts: (i) releasing water to the Lower Owens River to enhance native and game fisheries and riparian habitats along 100 km [62 mi] of the river, (ii) providing water to the Owens River Delta to maintain and enhance various wetland and aquatic habitats, (iii) enhancing a 608-ha [1,500-acre] off-river area with seasonal flooding and land management to benefit wetlands and waterfowl, and (iv) maintaining several off-river lakes and ponds. The project also includes construction of a pump station to capture and recover some of the water released to the river. In addition, the project includes range improvements and modified grazing practices on leases in the Lower Owens River Project area.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The upper portion of the watershed for the Lower Owens River is approximately 160 km [100 mi] west of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The Final Environmental Impact Report/EIS for the Lower Owens River Project addressed significant and unavoidable impacts (to water quality and game and native fish), significant but mitigable impacts (to hydrology; wildlife, including special status species; wetlands, riparian habitat, and upland habitats; cultural resources; and public health and safety), adverse but not significant impacts to several resources, and beneficial impacts (also to several resources).

DRAFT

This proposed action encompasses a large-scale and comprehensive habitat restoration program for the Lower Owens River Valley. However, due to its approximate location 160 km [100 mi] west of the potential Yucca Mountain repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential repository.

DRAFT

(15) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Boulder City, US 93 Corridor Transportation Improvements, Study Limits are between a western boundary on US 95 in the City of Henderson and an eastern boundary on US 93 west of downtown Boulder City, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404 Permits Issuance and Right-of-Way Grant, Clark County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: May 13, 2005. (Federal Highway Administration)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-19

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Executive Summary
- Record of Decision

Proposed Action

This FEIS documents potential environmental impacts associated with the Boulder City/US 93 Corridor Project. The study limits are between a western boundary on US 95 in the City of Henderson, Nevada, where the present freeway ends, and an eastern boundary on US 93 approximately 7.5 km [4.7 mi] east of downtown Boulder City. The eastern boundary is coincident with the planned western end of the Hoover Dam Bypass project being developed by the Federal Highway Administration on behalf of the Nevada and Arizona Departments of Transportation. The study covers a total distance of approximately 16.7 km [10.4 mi] on the present route of US 93. The project is in Clark County, Nevada, and lies on lands under both local municipal and federal jurisdiction. Within the study corridor, US 93 varies from a four-lane divided roadway to a two-lane roadway with numerous business driveways and cross streets. The highway project under consideration would provide overall transportation improvements in the corridor to reduce traffic congestion and crashes and improve regional mobility while maintaining or improving local circulation and access within Boulder City. Alternative D from the FEIS was identified in the Record of Decision as the selected alternative.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed Boulder City infrastructure project is located approximately 150 km [95 mi] southeast of the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS addressed the potential impacts of the construction and use of the improvements on air quality, noise, biology/threatened species, water quality, wetlands/waters of the United States, floodplains, cultural resources, land use and Section 4(f) lands, visual resources, economic resources, social characteristics, environmental justice, bicycles/pedestrians, hazardous wastes, and energy use. Mitigation measures were identified as appropriate.

Because of the generally localized nature of the impacts from the proposed action and the distance from this transportation infrastructure project to the potential repository, further

DRAFT

consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in subsequent cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(16) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Las Vegas Resort Corridor Project, Transportation Improvements, Funding, City of Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: March 24, 2003. (Federal Transit Administration and Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-20

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of FEIS (February 21, 2003)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary

Proposed Action

In 1997, the Regional Transportation Commission of Clark County (now the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada) adopted the Resort Corridor Transportation Master Plan, which included 29.6 km [18.4 mi] of fixed guideway transit, an expanded bus system, a transportation system management/transportation demand management component, and a street and highway component. The Resort Corridor Transportation Master Plan is currently contained within the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed action as specified in this FEIS would be approximately 3.7 km [2.3 mi] of elevated double-track with four new stations and an operations and maintenance service facility and would provide a seamless interface with the Las Vegas Monorail Corporation 5.8-km [3.6-mi], seven-station system now under construction. The proposed action is an improvement to the transit system in the Las Vegas Resort Corridor, as described, which is the focal point of the Las Vegas metropolitan area.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed action is located in the central part of downtown Las Vegas; thus it is approximately 130 km [80 mi] southeast of the potential repository area.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS details three alternatives, including the proposed action, in relation to capital and operating costs and potential effects on transportation service, traffic, transit ridership, accessibility, neighborhoods, economic factors, natural resources, air quality, noise, parklands, historic sites, and financial feasibility. More specifically, comparative environmental impact information is presented for land use and economic development, displacements and relocation, neighborhoods and community resources, environmental justice, visual and aesthetic resources, air quality, noise and vibration, water resources, energy, historic and archeological resources, hazardous materials, major utilities, geotechnical conditions, and construction-related impacts on these issues.

DRAFT

Because of the localized nature of the impacts and the approximate 130-km [80-mi] distance to the potential repository further consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(17) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge Complex Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Boundary Revision, Implementation, Churchill and Washoe Counties, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: June 24, 2002. (Fish and Wildlife Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-21

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of FEIS (May 31, 2002)

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the adoption of a 15-year comprehensive conservation plan for the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge Complex. The complex includes (i) the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge, Stillwater Wildlife Management Area, and Fallon National Wildlife Refuge, which are located in west-central Nevada, about 10 km [6 mi] northeast of Fallon, Churchill County and (ii) Anaho Island National Wildlife Refuge, located about 48 km [30 mi] northeast of Reno, Nevada, in Washoe County. The Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge encompasses about 32,225 ha [79,570 acres] of federal land, Stillwater Wildlife Management Area about 26,529 ha [65,503 acres], and Fallon National Wildlife Refuge about 7,228 ha [17,848 acres], for a combined total of 66,024 ha [163,021 acres] of federal land. Nonfederal holdings within the approved boundaries are about 24,182 ha [59,708 acres]. Anaho Island National Wildlife Refuge encompasses the entire island, which has fluctuated in size from 90 to 300 ha [220 to 745 acres] in recent history due to the fluctuating water levels of Pyramid Lake. This FEIS identifies and provides an evaluation of four alternative boundaries for Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge and five alternative management approaches for managing the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge Complex for the next 15 years. The preferred alternative proposes that the revised boundary of Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge exclude the western portions of the Stillwater Wildlife Management Area and the northern portions of Fallon National Wildlife Refuge. Major habitats added to Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge include the lower Carson River and its delta marsh, the sand dunes along the southern edge of the Carson Sink, and the stabilized dunes and salt desert shrub habitat between the Carson River and Stillwater Marsh. Further, this preferred alternative would attempt to approximate natural historical diversity, including breeding habitat for waterbirds, but would also emphasize adaptive management to refine broad management strategies to meet the needs of key wetland-dependent wildlife guilds and to provide additional fall and winter habitats for migratory waterbirds. Livestock grazing would have limited application in the habitat management program, and muskrat trapping would primarily be undertaken to prevent damage to the water management infrastructure. Waterfowl hunting would continue to be an integral part of the visitor services program, but a more balanced approach to managing other wildlife-dependent recreational activities including environmental education and interpretation, and wildlife observation and photography, would receive considerably greater emphasis.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The nearest location of this proposed action to the potential Yucca Mountain repository is about 320 km [200 mi] to the north-northwest.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

While there may be localized, short-term negative impacts associated with the proposed action, the longer term consequences are expected to be beneficial to natural biological/ecological conditions in the management areas.

Because of the localized nature of the predominantly beneficial impacts and due to the large distance from the proposed action to the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses conducted for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(18) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Jarbidge Canyon Project, To Implement a Road Management Plan and Construct a Water Project along the Charleston-Jarbidge Road, and Reconstruct the South Canyon Road, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Jarbidge Ranger District, Elko County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: April 25, 2005. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-22

Information Reviewed

- Executive Summary
- Record of Decision (April 2005)

Proposed Action

The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest in northeastern Nevada proposes to authorize the reestablishment of the Jarbidge Canyon Road (referred to as South Canyon Road) as requested in a proposal submitted by Elko County; the original road was washed out in a 1995 flood event. The proposal would reestablish passenger vehicle access from the Pine Creek Campground to the Jarbidge Wilderness via South Canyon Road. Accordingly, this action is planned to provide access within the West Fork of the Jarbidge River Canyon to the Jarbidge Wilderness, while also improving the environment and aquatic habitat and conditions for the listed bull trout. The proposed action includes a Road Management Plan that addresses road maintenance needs and improvements for the Charleston-Jarbidge Road from the Idaho border south to the Elko Grade/South Canyon Road intersection. The Charleston-Jarbidge Road includes approximately 10 km [6 mi] of road that traverses lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and 8 km [5 mi] of road crossing National Forest System lands.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Jarbidge Canyon Project area is located in northeastern Nevada approximately 160 km [100 mi] north of Elko in Elko County. Accordingly, the project area is about 515 km [320 mi] north-northeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS addressed the impacts of the proposed action on land use and ownership; transportation; recreation and scenery; socioeconomics; public services and utilities; cultural resources; geology, mass wasting, and soils; and waterways (floodplains), water quality, vegetation, fisheries, and wildlife.

Because of the localized nature of the impacts of the proposed action, as well as the distance from the potential repository, further consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in future cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(19) Title of Reviewed Document

Draft Supplement to 2001 FEIS, Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment, New Information on a Range of Alternatives for Amending Land and Resources Management Plans, Modoc, Lasser, Plumas, Tahoe, Eldorado, Stanislaus, Sequoia, Sierra, Inyo and Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forests, and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Several Counties, California and Nevada, Wait Period Ends: September 12, 2003. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-23

Information Reviewed

- Draft of Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Management Review and Recommendations

Proposed Action

The proposed action in the 2001 FEIS related to maintaining existing habitat for species associated with old forest ecosystems, particularly the California spotted owl, and strategically placing fuel treatments across broad landscapes to reduce the size and severity of wildland fires. The action will encompass amendments to the land and resources management plans of 10 National Forests and 1 Basin Management Unit.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The nearest National Forest to be potentially affected by the proposed action is located approximately 56 km [35 mi] southeast of the potential repository. The majority of the affected National Forests are located at considerably further distances from the potential repository, primarily to the northwest.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

In general, the impacts of the plan amendments are expected to be beneficial to the biological/ecological resources.

Because the impacts of the proposed action are anticipated to be beneficial within the affected forest and because their locations are typically long distances away from the potential repository, further consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in future cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository. However, periodic reviews of the nature and extent of the fuels treatment and their effectiveness would be helpful.

DRAFT

(20) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Combined Array for Research in Millimeter-Wave Astronomy (CARMA) Project, Construction, Reconstruction and Operation of 23 Antennas at the Juniper Flat Site, Special-Use-Permit Issuance, Inyo Mountain, Inyo National Forest, Inyo County, California, Wait Period Ends: December 1, 2003. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-24

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Intent for preparation of EIS (May 8, 2002)
- EPA rating of DEIS (May 23, 2003)
- EPA comments on FEIS

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the issuance of a Special-Use Permit for a project in the Inyo National Forest to operate an array of radio telescopes (antennas). The project is called Combined Array for Research in Millimeter-Wave Astronomy. The proposed array would combine two existing arrays: six antennas currently operated by the California Institute of Technology at the existing Owens Valley Radio Observatory site and nine antennas at Hat Creek in Shasta County, California, operated by the Berkeley-Illinois-Maryland Association. An additional eight antennas from the University of Chicago, currently under development, are also proposed as part of the Combined Array for Research in Millimeter-Wave Astronomy project.

The Combined Array for Research in Millimeter-Wave Astronomy would enhance the United States' capability for research and education in millimeter-wave astronomy by using a combined array at an altitude approximately 1,220 m [4,000 ft] higher than that at the Owens Valley Radio Observatory facility. The increased altitude minimizes the adverse effects of atmospheric water vapor on astronomical observations. The proposed site for the project is an unnamed flat, which will be referred to as Juniper Flat, which is at an altitude of 2,275–2,410 m [7,800–7,900 ft] in the Inyo Mountains, northeast from Big Pine, California. The site is located in Management Prescription #18 within Inyo National Forest Management Area #13 and is designated as a Multiple Resource Area. The proposed use will be consistent with the management direction for Multiple Resource Areas in the Land and Resources Management Plan for Inyo National Forest. The 23-antenna array would be positioned within an area of approximately 325 ha [800 acres]. The project would require the disturbance and development of approximately 12.4 ha [30.5 acres] including a central complex, outlying antenna stations, size access improvements, and a repeater station.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed site is located at least 160 km [100 mi] to the west-northwest of the potential repository.

DRAFT

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The local impacts would be primarily associated with the infrastructure construction on about 12.4 ha [30.5 acres]. Some visual impacts from the antenna array would also be anticipated. The EPA rating of the DEIS was LO (lack of objections). Finally, EPA provided no formal comment letter on the FEIS to the Forest Service.

Because of the localized construction-related impacts associated with the proposed action and the large distance from the potential repository, further consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses conducted for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(21) Title of Reviewed Document

Final Supplemental EIS, Great Basin National Park General Management and Development Concept Plans, Implementation, White Pine County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: May 5, 2003. (National Park Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-25

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Availability of Final Supplemental EIS (April 8, 2003)
- Notice of Approval of Record of Decision (June 25, 2003)

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the construction of a Visitor Learning Center in the townsite of Baker, Nevada (rather than on National Park Service lands north of Baker, known locally as Baker Ridge). Baker is in White Pine County. This conservation planning and environmental impact analysis effort identified and analyzed three alternatives (and foreseeable environmental consequences and appropriate mitigation strategies) for constructing the new park Visitor Learning Center. The center includes about 650 m² [7,000 ft²] of facilities. The Great Basin National Park's General Management Plan will also be amended.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The proposed action is located approximately 290 km [180 mi] northeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Localized construction-related impacts were addressed for the proposed action and two alternatives. EPA raised two concerns in their review of the DEIS. The first centered upon "Greening the Government" opportunities (Executive Order 13101, Executive Order 13123, and Executive Order 13148). The second concern was in regard to exclusion of water quality (including permitting under Section 402 and 404 of the Clean Water Act) as an impact issue topic. Both concerns were addressed in the FEIS.

Because of the localized and short-term nature of the impacts of the proposed action and its large distance from the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in any subsequent cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(22) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, North Valleys Rights-of-Way Projects, Proposed Construction and Operation of Water Transmission Pipelines, Washoe County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: December 9, 2005. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-27

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Summary
- Chapter 1—Introduction

Proposed Action

The FEIS analyzes potential impacts associated with installation of water pipelines across public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Fish Springs Ranch, LLC, and Intermountain Water Supply, Ltd., submitted rights-of-way applications for two water transmission pipelines to the Carson City Bureau of Land Management Field Office. Each company is proposing to construct and operate water supply and transmission projects to meet present and future water demands of the Stead/Lemmon Valley Areas (encompassed by the North Valleys Area Plan) in Washoe County in southwestern Nevada. The proposed pipelines consist of installation and operation of wellheads, electrical distribution lines, electrical substations, water pipelines, pump stations, surge tanks, and a terminal water storage tank. The preferred alternative is Alternative A, Construct Pipelines within Common Right-of-Way. The two pipelines range from 39 to 45 km [24 to 28 mi] in length; one would convey 9.8 million m³/yr [8,000 acre-ft/yr] and the other 3.1 million m³/yr [2,500 acre-ft/yr].

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The two pipeline projects are located approximately 400 km [250 mi] northwest of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The impacts of the proposed action are discussed in relation to geology, minerals, and paleontology; air resources; water resources; soil resources; vegetation resources; wildlife resources; access and land use; recreation; noise; visual resources; social and economic resources; cultural resources; Native American religious concerns/Indian Trust responsibilities; and environmental justice.

Because of the localized impacts of these two projects and the large distance from the potential repository, further consideration of this RFFA is not recommended in future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(23) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Martin Basin Rangeland Project, Authorize Continued Livestock Grazing in Eight Allotments: Martin Basin, Indian, West Side Flat Creek, Buffalo, Bradshaw, Buttermilk, Granite Peak and Rebel Creek Cattle and Horse Allotments, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Santa Rosa Ranger District, Humboldt County, Nevada, Wait Period Ends: August 15, 2005. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-28

Information Reviewed

- Notice of Intent to prepare EIS (December 30, 2002)
- EPA comments on FEIS (September 23, 2005)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary

Proposed Action

The Santa Rosa Ranger District of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest proposes to authorize continued livestock grazing on eight allotments within the Martin Basin Rangeland Project area. The area includes the majority of the Santa Rosa Mountain Range located in Humboldt County, Nevada. This action is needed to maintain or improve the condition of riparian resources and the overall health of the rangeland. The proposed action would allow for livestock grazing that maintains or moves rangeland within the project toward a desired functioning condition. The proposed action is designed to provide for “adaptive management” that would allow for flexibility to respond to changing conditions.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Martin Basin Rangeland Project area is about 50 km [30 mi] north of Winnemucca in Humboldt County, Nevada. This area is approximately 480 km [300 mi] north-northwest of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

Significant concerns related to the livestock grazing options included impacts to water quality, soil quality, sage grouse, fisheries/Lahontan cutthroat trout, riparian habitat (includes meadows, streams, seeps, springs, and cottonwood), aspen, upland vegetation, noxious weeds, social and economic consequences, heritage resources, and dispersed recreation and trails. EPA comments on the FEIS included continuing concerns due to further resource decline; the agency also recommended an aggressive implementation schedule to reduce utilization rates in critical areas and the use of tiered environmental documentation for specific Allotment Management Plans.

Because of the large distance between this project area and the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in future cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(24) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Sheep Complex, Big Springs and Owyhee Grazing Allotments Sensitive Bird Species Project, Determine Impacts of Livestock Grazing, Elko County, Nevada, May 31, 2006. (Bureau of Land Management)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-30

Information Reviewed

- DEIS (December 2005)—Abstract, Table of Contents, and Chapter 1.0: Introduction
- FEIS—Abstract, Executive Summary, Table of Contents, and Chapter 1.0: Introduction

Proposed Action

On April 14, 2003, three multiple use decisions made by the Bureau of Land Management Elko Field Office for the Sheep Allotment Complex, Big Springs and Owyhee allotments were challenged in the U.S. District Court. On August 18, 2004, the Bureau of Land Management was directed to complete an EIS to determine impacts of livestock grazing with respect to the following sensitive birds: (i) Sheep Allotment Complex: Western burrowing owls, raptors, and sage-grouse; (ii) Owyhee Allotment: Western burrowing owls, raptors, and sage-grouse; and (iii) Big Springs Allotment: sage-grouse. The Elko District is located in northeastern Nevada. The Sheep Allotment Complex and Big Springs Allotment are in the southeast corner, and the Owyhee Allotment is in the northwest corner of the District. This FEIS analyzes the effects of four alternative grazing systems and proposed range improvements to the species and their habitat, including uplands, springs, and riparian areas. The proposed action would implement each of the multiple use decisions, as modified to include a phased approach to the level of grazing to be permitted, in combination with range improvement projects.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Sheep Allotment Complex and Big Springs Allotment are located approximately 385 km [240 mi] north-northeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The FEIS includes information on the impacts of each alternative on the following resources associated with each of the three allotments—vegetation resources, wetland/riparian zones, avian sensitive species, and cumulative impacts. Conservation/mitigation recommendations and residual impacts were also identified for each allotment area.

Because the proposed action is focused on the beneficial reductions of adverse grazing impacts and the implementation of range improvement projects and because of the large distance of the project area from the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered in future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(25) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Clean Water Coalition Systems Conveyance and Operations Program, Construction, Operation and Maintenance, City of Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada, October, 2006. (Bureau of Reclamation and National Park Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-31

Information Reviewed

- DEIS—Abstract, Table of Contents, Executive Summary, and Chapter 1.0: Purpose and Need for the Action
- FEIS—Notice of Availability of FEIS (March 7, 2007), Executive Summary, and Chapter 1.0: Purpose and Need for the Action

Proposed Action

This FEIS analyzes the potential impacts resulting from the construction and implementation of the Systems Conveyance and Operations Program. The City of Las Vegas, Clark County Water Reclamation District, and the City of Henderson comprise the Clean Water Coalition, which was created to address the management of the increasing wastewater flows in the Las Vegas Valley. The Clean Water Coalition proposed to implement the Systems Conveyance and Operations Program, which would be a system of pipelines and tunnels that discharges highly treated effluent to an alternate location in Lake Mead. The Systems Conveyance and Operations Program system would be designed to collect the treated effluent flows from three existing treatment facilities for conveyance to an area in the lower Colorado River system, while the majority of the flows bypass the lower Las Vegas Wash. The Systems Conveyance and Operations Program would be located in Clark County, Nevada, and would include activities and infrastructure located on lands owned and/or managed by the City of Las Vegas, Clark County, City of Henderson, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Lower Colorado Region, and the National Park Service Lake Mead National Recreation Area. Five alternatives are analyzed in this FEIS. The Systems Conveyance and Operations Program would allow the Clean Water Coalition to expand and optimize their facilities to handle the increasing quantities of wastewater through 2050.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

At its nearest location, the Systems Conveyance and Operations Program would be about 130 km [80 mi] southeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action:

The impacts of the 5 alternatives were comparatively evaluated in relation to the following 14 “resources”: water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, recreation, hazardous materials, noise, air quality, earth resources, land use, visual resources, socioeconomics, environmental justice, transportation and traffic, and paleontological resources.

DRAFT

As appropriate, this RFFA should be considered in any regional cumulative impacts study of water resources. If such a study would be conducted because of the water needs at Yucca Mountain, then this RFFA should be incorporated.

DRAFT

(26) Title of Reviewed Document

FEIS, Commercial Pack Station and Pack Stock Outfitter/Guide Permit Issuance, Inyo National Forest, California, December 2006. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

FEIS-33

Information Reviewed

- DEIS—News Release (March 17, 2006), Table of Contents, and Chapter 1: Purpose and Need for Action
- FEIS—Abstract, Summary, Table of Contents, and Record of Decision

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the issuance of 20-year resort permits to 12 existing resort special use permit holders (commercial service supported by horses and mules) for a variety of commercial pack stock-related activities. The Forest Service also proposes to issue a 10-year outfitter/guide permit for one current outfitter and guide (commercial service supported by burros). The services, as proposed, would occur in the Inyo and Sierra National Forests in four wildernesses and in the nonwilderness portions of the Inyo National Forest. This Final EIS focuses on the environmental effects of issuing permits to the 12 pack stations that operate in the Inyo National Forest along with one current outfitter/guide. The analysis area in this document includes nonwilderness areas of the Inyo National Forest as well as the Golden Trout/South Sierra and Ansel Adams/John Muir Wildernesses. The decision from this document will also assign stations the Ansel Adams and John Muir destination quotas, day rides, and stock in the wilderness at one-time limits to individual pack stations. Alternative 2 is the proposed action. For the most part, this alternative continues current pack station use levels and locations in the nonwilderness and the Golden Trout and South Sierra Wildernesses. For the Ansel Adams and John Muir Wildernesses, Alternative 2 incorporates 2005 decisions related to destination quotas, stock in the wilderness at one-time limits, designated stock holding camps, trail suitability, grazing direction, and campfire direction. A number of environmental protections are in Alternative 2, including directions related to grazing, travel management, facilities, and camping.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The nearest locations to be used by the permit holders are about 145 km [90 mi] to the west-northwest of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to Proposed Action

The impacts of the proposed action and two alternatives were analyzed in relation to the human environment, physical environment, and biological environment. Within each category, several specific resources were addressed.

DRAFT

Because of the localized nature of the impacts and the distance of about 145 km [90 mi] to the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in any future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(27) Title of Reviewed Document

DEIS, Jarbridge Ranger District Rangeland Management Project, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Elko County, Nevada, June 2006. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-5

Information Reviewed

- Summary
- Table of Contents
- Chapter 1—Purpose of and Need for Action

Proposed Action

The Jarbridge Ranger District of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest is proposing to authorize continued livestock grazing in a 99,400-ha [245,500-acre] project area located between the Columbia River watershed to the north and the Great Basin to the south. The authorizations would be made under revised grazing management policies. Annual use indicators and strategies for grazing management are proposed to help the forest improve its rangeland conditions in ecologically important vegetation communities. Within the 99,400-ha [245,500-acre] project area, 15,900 ha [39,300 acres] are closed to livestock grazing due to special use designations. The remaining 83,500 ha [206,200 acres] are open to grazing and are divided into 24 allotments that provide forage for cattle, sheep, goats, horses, and wildlife.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The Jarbridge Ranger District Rangeland Management Project is located in the north-central portion of Elko County in northeastern Nevada. Accordingly, the project area is about 515 km [320 mi] north-northeast of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to the Proposed Action

The DEIS addresses the impacts of the proposed action on sagebrush communities meadows, aspen communities, aquatic species, wildlife species, water quality, soil quality, social and economic factors, and livestock management.

Because of the localized nature of the impacts of the proposed action, as well as the large distance from the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in future cumulative impacts analyses related to the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

(28) Title of Reviewed Document

DEIS, Great Basin South Rangeland Management Project, Bridgeport Ranger District, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Lyon and Mineral Counties, Nevada, and Mono County, California, December 2006. (Forest Service)

Document Number Used Herein

DEIS-6

Information Reviewed

- Abstract
- Summary
- Table of Contents
- Chapter 1—Purpose of and Need for Action

Proposed Action

The proposed action authorizes continued domestic livestock grazing in the Great Basin south project area under updated grazing management policies and directions. The action includes closing the vacant Squaw Creek allotment, shifting the Aurora allotment from sheep to cattle, reducing utilization on upland vegetation, and eliminating grazing on portions of the Huntoon allotment that can no longer support grazing use. The overall project addresses 12 livestock grazing allotments totaling 166,250 ha [410,500 acres]. The area is in Lyon and Mineral Counties in Nevada and Mono County, California. The center of the area is about 40 km [25 mi] east of Bridgeport, California.

Location Relative to Yucca Mountain

The project area is located about 180 km [175 mi] northwest of the potential repository.

Impacts Related to the Proposed Action

The DEIS addresses the impacts of livestock grazing on riparian vegetation communities, upland vegetation communities, sage-grouse, water resources and soils, and several other topics.

Because the proposed action is focused on the beneficial reductions of adverse grazing impacts and the implementation of sustainable range grazing practices and because of the large distance of the project area from the potential repository, it is not recommended that this RFFA be considered further in future cumulative impacts analyses for the potential Yucca Mountain repository.

DRAFT

APPENDIX D

DRAFT

DRAFT

D. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN LAS VEGAS AND CLARK COUNTY

The online archives of five local and regional newspapers were online for development activities. The period searched was from August 2005 through late May 2007, and a total of 208 articles were identified as relevant to reasonably foreseeable future actions:

Las Vegas SUN <www.lasvegassun.com>: 94 articles (three are duplicates)
Pahrump Valley Times <www.pahrumpvalleytimes.com>: 80 articles
Inyo Register <www.inyoregister.com>: 2 articles
Reno Gazette Journal <www.rgj.com>: 8 articles
Nevada Appeal <www.nevadaappeal.com>: 24 articles

Of the 208 articles, 51 were related to developments in Las Vegas and Clark County. These articles were grouped by the general type of proposed development:

- Residential developments and condominium towers
 - Schoenmann, J. “A Good Sign for Downtown: Verge Condo Project Dares to go Where no Others Have.” Las Vegas Sun. March 17, 2007.
 - Hansel, M. “Tin Homes for Teachers: Urban Loft-Style Townhomes Pitched to City as Affordable Housing.” Las Vegas Sun. October 9, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Harnessing Leapfrog Growth Shaping up as Huge Task.” Las Vegas Sun. September 17, 2006.
 - Benston, L. “Architects Leaning Toward Strip Skies in Las Vegas.” Las Vegas Sun. July 30, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “Development Wins EPA Award.” Las Vegas Sun. April 18, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “New NLV [North Las Vegas] Community, Casino Are Raising Questions.” Las Vegas Sun. April 17, 2006.
 - Shubinski, J. “First of ‘New Wave’ Condos to Open Panorama Towers Dream of Land Broker Hallier.” Las Vegas Sun. March 31, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Land Action Plan May Add to Rift.” Las Vegas Sun. March 21, 2006.
 - Gorman, T. “Tom Gorman Looks at the New Southwest, Where Desert Solitude and Beauty Give Way to Development.” Las Vegas Sun. March 19, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Mayor Rocks BC’s Growth Philosophy Land-for-Bypass Plan Outrages Civic Leaders.” Las Vegas Sun. February 16, 2006.
 - Shubinski, J. “A Taste of Manhattan: The Recent Condo Boom Could Send Las Vegas Urban Living Upward—and Upscale.” Las Vegas Sun. February 5, 2006.

DRAFT

- Planned communities involving both residential and commercial developments
 - Pratt, T. “Years of Promises, No Building and No Jobs: Clock Ticking on Money for West Vegas Project.” Las Vegas Sun. May 12, 2007.
 - Hansel, M. “A Snapshot of Downtown’s Future, If Dominoes Fall Right.” Las Vegas Sun. April 23, 2007.
 - Schoenmann, J. “Downtown’s Time Is Now: After Years of Stalled Starts, the Area Boasts New Businesses and Real Projects under Way.” Las Vegas Sun. February 18, 2007.
 - Trask, M. “Looking in On: The Suburbs: NLV’s [North Las Vegas] Montandon Offers a Glimpse of His Dry Sense of Humor.” Las Vegas Sun. January 19, 2007.
 - Schoenmann, J. “Magnitude of City Center Plan Is Enough to Leave You Speechless.” Las Vegas Sun. January 21, 2007.
 - Trask, M. “NLV [North Las Vegas] Outgrowing its Reputation: Rich and Poor Divided in City, but Bad Image Is Transforming.” Las Vegas Sun. January 10, 2007.
 - Rake, L. “Lee Canyon, Deer Creek Residents Seek Voice.” Las Vegas Sun. January 7, 2007.
 - Benston, L. “Station Reveals Plan for Mixed-use Project: Neighbors Want to Know More, but Details Sketchy.” Las Vegas Sun. December 27, 2006.
 - Trask, M. “Water Street Setting Trends: Henderson’s Downtrodden Downtown Is Looking up.” Las Vegas Sun. November 20, 2006.
 - Kulin, D. “Downtown Builder Gets Good Land Deal.” Las Vegas Sun. July 13, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Henderson Developer Seeks Density Increase.” Las Vegas Sun. June 4, 2006.
 - Kulin, D. “Union Park plans are tweaked once again.” Las Vegas Sun. May 15, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Henderson Planning for Future Development.” Las Vegas Sun. January 31, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “County Girding for Battle over Annexation Henderson’s Plans for I-15 Corridor South of LV Valley Criticized.” Las Vegas Sun. January 17, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Redevelopment Study Launched.” Las Vegas Sun. August 3, 2005.
 - Kulin, D. “Van Epp May Oversee 61 Acres.” Las Vegas Sun. October 22, 2005.

DRAFT

- Wargo, B. “Massive Cleanup Needed for Planned Development Area.” Las Vegas Sun. December 25, 2005.
- Commercial centers and malls
 - Shubinski, J. “Big Plans in Store for Premium Outlets.” Las Vegas Sun. April 21, 2006.
 - Editorial. “Vote No on Risky Proposal: an Industrial Site That Is Home to Chemical Plants Is Not Safe for a Retail Development.” Las Vegas Sun. April 16, 2006.
 - Associated Press. “List Includes Summerlin “Monster.” Developers: Las Vegas on Verge of Mall Boom.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 2, 2005.
 - Wargo, B. “Plan for Wal-Mart next to BMI Raises Questions of Safety.” Las Vegas Sun. October 5, 2005.
 - Wargo, B. “Regional Mall Developers Plan NLV Projects.” Las Vegas Sun. August 4, 2005.
- Casinos and resorts
 - Trask, M. “Looking in On: Suburbs: Schroder Sticks With Berkley—for Now.” Las Vegas Sun. May 1, 2007.
 - Rake, L. “Mount Charleston Residents Come Down on Resort: Planners Also Rip Lee Canyon Proposal.” Las Vegas Sun. October 31, 2006.
 - Benston, L. “State Law Stands in Way of New Casino: NLV [North Las Vegas] Residents Have Help in Opposing Site.” Las Vegas Sun. May 15, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “Resort Planned for Lee Canyon Rouses Residents.” Las Vegas Sun. April 25, 2006.
 - Benston, L. “Aliante Station to join NLV [North Las Vegas] neighborhood casinos.” Las Vegas Sun. December 20, 2005.
 - Benston, L. “Starwood Announces \$1.7 Billion LV Project.” Las Vegas Sun. August 24, 2005.
- Miscellaneous facilities, infrastructure projects, and open space projects
 - Velotta, R.N. “The Year in Business: Real Estate Cools, but Big Projects Hot.” Las Vegas Sun. December 25, 2006.
 - Littlefield, C. “State’s Colleges Get Creative in Securing Funds for Growth.” Las Vegas Sun. November 26, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Plant Plans Already Drawing Opposition NV [North Las Vegas] Considering Sites for Sewage Treatment.” Las Vegas Sun. March 13, 2006.

DRAFT

- Gorman, T. “Design To Be Unveiled.” Las Vegas Sun. February 11, 2006.
- Wargo, B. “Boulder City Seeks Protection by Annexing 6,400 Acres.” Las Vegas Sun. December 16, 2005.
- Littlefield, C. “Construction Plans Considered: Development Companies Offer to Help Build University Facilities.” Las Vegas Sun. September 23, 2005.
- Kulin, D. “LV [Las Vegas] Council Approves Facility for 33 Horses in Northwest.” Las Vegas Sun. September 22, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Federal Law Slows down Big Projects in Nevada: Environmental Groups See the National Environmental Policy Act as Protection; Critics Say Law Needs to Be Changed.” Las Vegas Sun. August 19, 2005.
- Land development and tortoise protection
 - Trask, M. “Tortoise May Want Vote on Land Deal.” Las Vegas Sun. February 6, 2007.
- Tourism projects
 - Velotta, R.N. “Looking in On: Tourism: If Taxes Go, so Could Convention Upgrade.” Las Vegas Sun. May 12, 2007.

DRAFT

APPENDIX E

DRAFT

DRAFT

E. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN PAHRUMP AND NYE COUNTY

The online archives of five local and regional newspapers were searched for development activities. The period searched was from August 2005 through late May 2007, and a total of 208 articles were identified as relevant to reasonably foreseeable future actions:

Las Vegas SUN <www.lasvegassun.com>: 94 articles (three are duplicates)
Pahrump Valley Times <www.pahrumpvalleytimes.com>: 80 articles
Inyo Register <www.inyoregister.com>: 2 articles
Reno Gazette Journal <www.rgj.com>: 8 articles
Nevada Appeal <www.nevadaappeal.com>: 24 articles

Of the 208 articles, 67 were related to developments in Pahrump and Nye County. These articles were grouped by the general type of proposed development:

- Residential developments
 - Waite, M. "High Peaks: New Subdivisions Way Out There." Pahrump Valley Times. April 27, 2007.
 - Waite, M. "Basin and Blagg: County Overrules RPC [Regional Planning Commission] on Condos." Pahrump Valley Times. March 23, 2007.
 - Waite, M. "West Side Story: Developers See Mixed Results on Blagg Road Projects. County Manager and Yao Are Concerned About Further County Development Agreements." Pahrump Valley Times. March 7, 2007.
 - Wargo, B. "Harnessing Leapfrog Growth Shaping up as Huge Task." Las Vegas Sun. September 17, 2006.
 - Good, G.B. "Town Board Battles for Open Space Fees." Pahrump Valley Times. April 26, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. "Meadows Plan Irks Residents: 76-Parcel Subdivision on Tap for Gamebird." Pahrump Valley Times. March 1, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. "Commercial Projects Highlight RPC [Regional Planning Commission] Agenda." Pahrump Valley Times. January 11, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. "RPC [Regional Planning Commission] Preview: Mountain Falls on Planners' Agenda." Pahrump Valley Times. November 4, 2005.
 - Good, G.B. "Education: Builders to Help District Get Land Attorney for Concordia, Beazer Projects Would Work With Federal Government in Effort to Obtain BLM [Bureau of Land Management] Property for Schools." Pahrump Valley Times. September 7, 2005.

DRAFT

- Gomez, P. “Brothel Operators Finally Receive Large Subdivision Approval.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 19, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “Development Agreement Nears: Plans for 1,400 Homes Near Homestead Could Be Finalized.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 19, 2005.
- Editorial (Pahrump Valley Times). “More Apartments for Dandelion.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 12, 2005.
- Planned communities and commercial developments and master planning activities
 - Waite, M. “Nye Supports Land Acquisitions.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 11, 2007.
 - Waite, M. “Developments on Hold for Report From Consultants.” Pahrump Valley Times. January 24, 2007.
 - Pahrump Valley Times. “Consultants Will Present Six New Zones Wednesday.” Pahrump Valley Times. January 19, 2007.
 - Waite, M. “RPC [Regional Planning Commission] to consider Terrible’s Town Casino Expansion.” Pahrump Valley Times. September 13, 2006.
 - Pawlak, J. “Developer Plans for 7,000 Homes.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 26, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “\$2 Billion Project on South Side: 7,000 units on 900 Acres ‘Approved’.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 12, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “Lowe’s Home Improvement Outlet Is Approved with a Few Conditions.” Pahrump Valley Times. February 17, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “County Commission Preview: Subdivisions, Strip Clubs. Officials Have a Full Slate of Important Issues to Debate.” Pahrump Valley Times. February 17, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “Planning Commission Preview: Commercial Issues up for Discussion.” Pahrump Valley Times. February 10, 2006.
 - Stephens, R. “Beatty Town Board: Decision Needed on Land Development.” Pahrump Valley Times. January 27, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “Commissioners to Meet Tuesday: Several Contracts To Be Considered.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 23, 2005.
 - Gomez, P. “Persistent Wang Gets Development Approval: RPC [Regional Planning Commission] Nixes 10-Story High-Rise Plan but Green Lights Builder’s 14-Year Dream for Pahrump.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 21, 2005.
 - Gomez, P. “Pocket Builders Beware: Planners at Odds Over Development.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 21, 2005.

DRAFT

- Pahrump Valley Times. “Planning Commission Preview: 860-Unit Development Planned: Wang’s Big Dream for Pahrump up for Debate Tonight.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 14, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “Planning Commission Preview: Wang Reaches for the Sky. Developer Wants to Build 10-Story High Rise in Valley.” Pahrump Valley Times. October 7, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “Wang Development Planned: Las Vegas Resort Builder Resumes Lengthy Effort to Build.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 17, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “\$43 Million for Infrastructure: 10-Year Capital Improvement Plans Don’t Come Cheap.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 12, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “County Commission Preview: Another Three-Day Meeting for Officials.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 12, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “More Commercial Projects for Planning Commission.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 5, 2005.
- Potential Yucca Mountain repository and related transportation decisions
 - Waite, M. “2021 Seen as More Likely Yucca Opening Date.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 18, 2007.
 - Tetreault, S. “Yucca Mountain: Mina Off the Table, Caliente Is Back on.” Pahrump Valley Times. April 27, 2007.
 - Pahrump Valley Times. “Nuke Waste Panel to Review Yucca.” Pahrump Valley Times. April 11, 2007.
 - Waite, M. “County OKs Yucca Mtn. Study Pact.” Pahrump Valley Times. March 30, 2007.
 - Baker, D. “Yucca Rail: Rurals Concerned About Mina Route. Oversight Chief Not Pleased With Pace of Planning.” Pahrump Valley Times. March 2, 2007.
 - Mascaro, L. “New light on Yucca: Congress Wants to Get over the Mountain on Nuclear Waste.” Las Vegas Sun. August 15, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “Nye/Yucca Audit ‘Glowing’; Hammermeister Resigns.” Pahrump Valley Times. April 28, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “Meeting Preview: County Deluged With New Funding Requests Tuesday Primary Interest in Yucca Oversight, Public Projects.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 2, 2005.
 - Pahrump Valley Times. “Clark County Water Filings Subject of Discussion Today.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 2, 2005.

DRAFT

- Miscellaneous facilities, infrastructure projects, and open space projects
 - Waite, M. “New Theaters Could Break Ground as Early as August.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 4, 2007.
 - Good, G.B. “What a Desert View: Hospital Is Open! Sierra Health, Senior Dimensions and Health Plan Nevada Insurance Accepted.” Pahrump Valley Times. April 28, 2006.
 - Waite, M. “New High School on the Way: Existing High School to Become Second Middle School.” Pahrump Valley Times. April 4, 2007.
 - Waite, M. “\$1 Million Amargosa Valley Community Center Sought.” Pahrump Valley Times. April 4, 2007.
 - Waite, M. “Streets and Highways: Second Six-Figure Contract Awarded by Commissioners.” Pahrump Valley Times. March 30, 2007.
 - Eichelkraut, C. “New Shoulders on Way for Highway 160: Westbound Lane Work May Run Well Into Next Summer.” Pahrump Valley Times. October 6, 2006.
 - Waite, M. “Commission OKs Grant Request for Industrial Area: \$500,000 for Utilities.” Pahrump Valley Times. September 13, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “Four Companies Suggest Theme Park Plans.” Pahrump Valley Times. July 7, 2006.
 - Waite, M. “1.35 Million Acres Is Potential Wilderness.” Pahrump Valley Times. June 16, 2006.
 - Gomez, P. “West Side Story: Spring Mountains Meeting Scheduled. Public Invited to Give Input on Development of the West Side for Recreational Purposes.” Pahrump Valley Times. February 22, 2006.
 - Baldasano, M. “Vroom-Vroom: Man Has Huge Plans for Beatty. Fleming Envisions \$1 Billion Car-Themed Hotel, Casino, Park—Largest in Silver State.” Pahrump Valley Times. February 17, 2006.
 - McMurdo, D. “2005 in Review: Year of the Hospital: Growth, its Impacts Define Past 12 Months.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 23, 2005.
 - Gomez, P. “Community Development Block Grants: Tonopah, Amargosa Valley Projects Favored.” Pahrump Valley Times. November 25, 2005.
 - Gomez, P. “Nye World Could Bring Tourists: Contingent Headed to Atlanta for Convention.” Pahrump Valley Times. November 4, 2005.
 - Gomez, P. “County Puts Brakes on Jail: Citizen Urges Commission to Develop Calvada Eye.” Pahrump Valley Times. October 21, 2005.

DRAFT

- Gomez, P. "LAW AND ORDER: County Votes to Build New Jail. 40-Acre Site on Mesquite Avenue Targeted for Future Nye, Pahrump Government." Pahrump Valley Times. October 14, 2005.
- Flinchum, R. "Inyo Receives Highway Study Grant: Postle Will Use Funding to Track Vehicle Traffic." Pahrump Valley Times. October 14, 2005.
- Editorial (Pahrump Valley Times). "Pahrump Utility Co. Earns County Support to Purchase Federal Land." September 28, 2005.
- Gomez, P. "Science, Tech Park Back on Fast Track." Pahrump Valley Times. September 9, 2005.
- McMurdo, D. "Ensign to Present Hospital with Check." Pahrump Valley Times. August 26, 2005.
- Stephens, R. "Beatty Notes: Water, Sewer District Drowning." Pahrump Valley Times. August 5, 2005.
- McDermott, D. "Pahrump Valley High School Soccer: A Field of Their Own First Game Sept. 8, with Boulder City Girls Visiting." Pahrump Valley Times. August 3, 2005.
- Nonnuclear testing at Nevada Test Site
 - Waite, M. "Opponents Vow to Prevent Divine Strake Blast." Pahrump Valley Times. January 12, 2007.
 - Rake, L. "Critics Urge More Divine Strake Study." Las Vegas Sun. January 11, 2007.
 - Rake, L. "Concerns Over NTS Tests 'premature': Citizens' Group Worries That North Korean Blast Could Lead to Further U.S. Testing." Las Vegas Sun. October 11, 2006.
 - Rake, L. "Bomb Testing Valley's Patience Action Growing over Huge Explosion: Public Meetings to Address Concerns on Health, Environment." Las Vegas Sun. May 5, 2006.
- Tonopah Test Range
 - Tetreault, S. "Test Range to Close, Work May Be Shifted to Test Site." Pahrump Valley Times. October 27, 2006.

DRAFT

APPENDIX F

DRAFT

DRAFT

F. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN INYO COUNTY

The online archives of five local and regional newspapers were searched for development activities. The period searched was from August 2005 through late May 2007, and a total of 208 articles were identified as relevant to reasonably foreseeable future actions:

Las Vegas SUN <www.lasvegassun.com>: 94 articles (three are duplicates)
Pahrump Valley Times <www.pahrumpvalleytimes.com>: 80 articles
Inyo Register <www.inyoregister.com>: 2 articles
Reno Gazette Journal <www.rgj.com> 8 articles
Nevada Appeal <www.nevadaappeal.com>: 24 articles

Of the 208 articles, 4 were related to developments in Inyo County. These articles were grouped by the general type of proposed development:

- Major housing development (65,000 homes)
 - McMurdo, D. "Lamm: Inyo Development Bad for Valley." Pahrump Valley Times/Associated Press. August 26, 2005.
 - Flinchum, R. "New Boom: 65,000 Homes Planned for Inyo. Rural California Community Near Pahrump Braces for Onslaught of Big Development; Subdivisions Would Compete for PV's [Pahrump Valley's] Water." Pahrump Valley Times. June 3, 2005.
 - Rake, L. "Housing Proposal Near Pahrump Sparks Concerns Over Water Supply." Las Vegas Sun. August 22, 2005.
- Minor housing development
 - Klusmire, J. "Chalfant Valley 'Suburbs' Now a Real Possibility: Residents Invited to Comment on Proposal for Almost 50 Homes on 39 Acres in Small Community North of Bishop." Inyo Register. January 30, 2006.

DRAFT

APPENDIX G

DRAFT

DRAFT

G. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO WATER NEEDS AND ASSOCIATED CONFLICTS IN SOUTHERN NEVADA

The online archives of five local and regional newspapers were searched for development activities. The period searched was from August 2005 through late May 2007, and a total of 208 articles were identified as relevant to reasonably foreseeable future actions:

Las Vegas SUN <www.lasvegassun.com>: 94 articles (three are duplicates)
Pahrump Valley Times <www.pahrumpvalleytimes.com>: 80 articles
Inyo Register <www.inyoregister.com>: 2 articles
Reno Gazette Journal <www.rgj.com>: 8 articles
Nevada Appeal <www.nevadaappeal.com>: 24 articles

Of the 208 articles, 43 can be related to water needs and associated conflicts in Southern Nevada. These articles were grouped by the general type of proposed development:

- Water needs and concerns—primarily related to Las Vegas and Clark County
 - Green, E. “Dry Spell, Behind the Scenes: How West Was Won, With Nevada Water.” Las Vegas Sun. May 13, 2007.
 - Rake, L. “Chasing Lake Mead’s Water: Part 2 of 3: The smaller it gets, the dirtier it gets.” Las Vegas Sun. December 30, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “Coyote Springs cuts a water deal: Tentative pact would help supply 160,000 homes in development.” Las Vegas Sun. November 16, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “A matter of survival: LV’s [Las Vegas] growth will stop in 2013 without White Pine water, Mulroy says.” Las Vegas Sun. August 16, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “Putting it to a Vote: Ely Brothers Want Referendum on Water Authority’s Pumping Plan.” Las Vegas Sun. July 15, 2006.
 - Associated Press. “Talks Still on for Piping Water to Las Vegas Area.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 31, 2006.
 - Ryan, C. “Hearings on Rural Water Delayed.” Las Vegas Sun. March 14, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “Squeezing Tomorrow’s Water from Today’s Technology: Experts to Examine Fountain of Ideas to Help Southern Nevada Expand its Water Sources.” Las Vegas Sun. February 15, 2006.
 - Wargo, B. “Golf Developer Might Be Asking Too Much: Boulder City Considers Dutchman’s Pass Proposal.” Las Vegas Sun. January 24, 2006.
 - Rake, L. “Mulroy to Offer Money for White Pine Water.” Las Vegas Sun. January 11, 2006.
 - Ryan, C. “Water Deal for Whittemore’s Coyote Springs Project to Go Before State.” Las Vegas Sun. December 25, 2005.

DRAFT

- Manning, M. “Wash Getting a Face-lift.” Las Vegas Sun. November 30, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Colorado River States Bracing for Cutbacks in Water.” Las Vegas Sun. November 29, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Conservation Slipping? New Water-Reduction Efforts Might Be Needed.” Las Vegas Sun. November 22, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Water Plan Has Rural Counties Steamed: Various Political Organizations to Vote on Resolution Today.” Las Vegas Sun. October 18, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Solution on Water No Nearer Opposing Sides at Separate Meetings Show Battle Lines Are Drawn over the Future.” Las Vegas Sun. October 15, 2005.
- Manning, M. “Wildlife Refuge on Endangered List: Environmental Group Says Water Project Will Hurt Moapa Dace.” Las Vegas Sun. October 14, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Water Panel Makes Final Pitch: Water Authority to Get Advisory Recommendations.” Las Vegas Sun. September 27, 2005.
- Ryan, C. “Some Water Rights Protection Money May Be Misused.” Las Vegas Sun. September 1, 2005.
- Curran, S. “County May Take Back Land Leased for Golf Course.” Las Vegas Sun. August 30, 2005.
- Rake, L. “West Water Conference Opens with Call for Cooperation.” Las Vegas Sun. August 25, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Water Officials Revise Supply Estimates for Valley.” Las Vegas Sun. August 23, 2005.
- Shubinski, J. “Mulroy: Developers Can Help Build Cooperation on Nevada Water Issues.” Las Vegas Sun. August 12, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Water Authority Hires Firm to Design Intake.” Las Vegas Sun. August 9, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Rural Utah Group to Protest Water Plan.” Las Vegas Sun. August 1, 2005.
- Rake, L. “Plan to Pump Ground Water to LV [Las Vegas] Delayed New Lincoln County Studies Could Take Six Years: Water Authority May Have to Start from Scratch.” Las Vegas Sun. August 1, 2005.
- Water needs and concerns—primarily related to Pahrump and Nye County
 - Waite, M. “Nye Officials Aim at Pahrump Water Problems.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 9, 2007.

DRAFT

- Waite, M. “Water Advisory Board: Eminent Domain Muddies Waters.” Pahrump Valley Times. May 9, 2007.
- Waite, M. “Nye County Re-Files for Water Rights in Monitor Valley South: Pumping Water to Pahrump Is Not Just a Policy but Could Become a Reality.” Pahrump Valley Times. June 30, 2006.
- Associated Press. “White Pine to Deal its Water?” Pahrump Valley Times. January 18, 2006.
- Pahrump Valley Times. “Legislative Panel Studies Problem: Reno’s Water Supplies: Can They Meet Growth?” Pahrump Valley Times. December 23, 2005.
- Pahrump Valley Times. “Water Demands a Problem: Las Vegas Share Could Be in Jeopardy.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 16, 2005.
- Pahrump Valley Times. “Clark County Water Filings Subject of Discussion Today.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 2, 2005.
- Pahrump Valley Times. “Conservationists vs. Water Authority: Money-Saving Plan the Issue.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 2, 2005.
- Associated Press. “Pipeline Opposition Could Delay Project.” Pahrump Valley Times. November 18, 2005.
- Gomez, P. “The Manhattan Project: Arsenic Threatens Small Town’s Water Supply.” Pahrump Valley Times. August 12, 2005.
- Water needs and concerns—primarily related to Inyo County
 - Klusmire, J. “Could Boom Bloom in Desert? Developers With Major Plans Eyeing Charleston View in Distant Reaches of Inyo, but Water Needed First.” Inyo Register. May 1, 2006.
- Water needs and concerns—statewide
 - Reno Gazette-Journal. “Senate Majority Leader Says Water Funding Is Approved.” Reno Gazette-Journal. May 18, 2007.
 - Reno Gazette-Journal. “Reid Gets Money for Nevada Water Projects.” Reno Gazette-Journal. May 17, 2007.
 - Riley, B. “State Water Hearings Wrap Up.” Nevada Appeal. September 26, 2006.
 - Editorial (Nevada Appeal). “Vegas Water Grab Will Damage Rural Nevada.” Nevada Appeal. September 6, 2006.

DRAFT

- Johnson, A. "Water Wars to Begin for Rural Nevada." Nevada Appeal. January 26, 2005.
- Water needs and endangered species
 - Rake, L. "Fish Has Ally in Water War." Las Vegas Sun. December 22, 2006.

DRAFT

APPENDIX H

DRAFT

DRAFT

H. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO ENERGY DEVELOPMENTS

Based on ease of access, the online archives of five local and regional newspapers were searched for development activities. The period searched was from August 2005 through late May 2007, and a total of 208 articles were identified as relevant to reasonably foreseeable future actions:

Las Vegas SUN <www.lasvegassun.com> : 94 articles (three are duplicates)
Pahrump Valley Times <www.pahrumpvalleytimes.com>: 80 articles
Inyo Register <www.inyoregister.com> : 2 articles
Reno Gazette Journal <www.rgj.com>: 8 articles
Nevada Appeal <www.nevadaappeal.com>: 24 articles

Of the 208 articles, 10 can be related to energy developments in Southern Nevada. These articles were grouped by the general type of proposed development:

- Power plants
 - Sweet, P. "Pollution-Free Park Plea: National Park Service Warns of Risks from Coal-fired Plant Near Great Basin." Las Vegas Sun. May 19, 2007.
 - Sweet, P. "Nellis to Put the Sun to Work by 2008: Project Pitched as One of Largest in U.S." Las Vegas Sun. April 21, 2007.
 - Sweet, P. "Town Fired Up: Plans for a Coal-Fired Power Plant in Sleepy Community Not an Easy Sell." Las Vegas Sun. April 1, 2007.
 - Mascaro, L. "New Energy Bill Could Put Steam in Geothermal Plans: House-Approved Measure Would Cut Big-oil Tax Breaks." Las Vegas Sun. January 23, 2007.
 - Associated Press. "Solar One Now Under Construction in Boulder." Pahrump Valley Times. February 24, 2006.
 - Rademacher, K. "Power Firms Planning \$5 Billion Project Joining North, South: New Transmission Lines Could Help Spur Use of Renewable Energy." Las Vegas Sun. January 10, 2006.
- Oil and gas resources
 - Rake, L. "Nevada Could Be Home to Oil Exploration." Pahrump Valley Times/Associated Press. August 19, 2005.
 - Rake, L. "Oil Firms Hoping to Tap Nevada White Pine County Already Reaping Economic Benefits." Las Vegas Sun. August 10, 2005.
- Habitat restoration from oil and gas drilling
 - Mascaro, L. "Interior's Habitat Restoration Funds Called Diversions: Oil, Gas Drilling Hikes in West Part of Budget." Las Vegas Sun. February 8, 2007.

DRAFT

- Other fuels
 - Pahrump Valley Times. "Hydrogen Fuel Station Planned in Las Vegas."
Pahrump Valley Times. June 2, 2006

DRAFT

APPENDIX I

DRAFT

DRAFT

I. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES RELATED TO THE RENO AREA

The online archives of five local and regional newspapers were searched for development activities. The period searched was from August 2005 through late May 2007, and a total of 208 articles were identified as relevant to reasonably foreseeable future actions:

Las Vegas SUN <www.lasvegassun.com>: 94 articles (three are duplicates)
Pahrump Valley Times <www.pahrumpvalleytimes.com>: 80 articles
Inyo Register <www.inyoregister.com>: 2 articles
Reno Gazette Journal <www.rgj.com>: 8 articles
Nevada Appeal <www.nevadaappeal.com>: 24 articles

Of the 208 articles, 30 can be related to developments in the Reno area. These articles were grouped by the general type of proposed development:

- Residential and other economic developments
 - Voyles, S. “Reno Council OKs Urban Market Deal.” Reno Gazette Journal. May 24, 2007.
 - Sonner, S. “Sparks Makes Name for Itself.” Reno Gazette-Journal. May 21, 2007.
 - O’Driscoll, W. “Economy off to Slow Start.” Reno Gazette-Journal. May 20, 2007.
 - Hall, Z. “UNR [University report]: Growth Still Fuels Northern Nevada Economy.” Reno Gazette-Journal. May 18, 2007.
 - Reno Gazette-Journal. “Reid Gets Money for Nevada Water Projects.” Reno Gazette-Journal. May 17, 2007.
 - Harber, T. “Buzzy’s Ranch Land Sale, Water Rights Deal in Works.” Nevada Appeal. April 20, 2007.
 - Woodmansee, K. “Storey Panel to Hear New Development Request.” Nevada Appeal. April 3, 2007.
 - Woodmansee, K. “Highlands Residents Voice Opposition to New Development.” Nevada Appeal. March 12, 2007.
 - Woodmansee, K. “New Housing Development Will Bring Changes for Storey County.” Nevada Appeal. February 27, 2007.
 - Woodmansee, K. “Aspen Creek Developer Says They Will Respect Ranch’s History: Plans Include Spot for Second Bridge over the Carson River.” Nevada Appeal. December 12, 2006.
 - Vasquez, S. “New Deal in Works for East Douglas Redevelopment.” Nevada Appeal. December 7, 2006.

DRAFT

- Velotta, R.N. “Plans Under Development to Make Sparks a Major Tourist Destination.” Las Vegas Sun. October 3, 2006.
- Bosshart, B. “Commercial Development Proposed for Dayton Valley Road.” Nevada Appeal. September 23, 2006.
- Woodmansee, K. “Developer of Villages of Silver Springs Eager to Get Started.” Nevada Appeal. May 10, 2006.
- Lattin, C. “Steering Committee Discusses Region’s Economic Future and Strategy.” Nevada Appeal. April 26, 2006.
- Reno Gazette-Journal. “Today’s Hot Meeting: Sparks Development.” Reno Gazette-Journal. April 24, 2006.
- Woodmansee, K. “More Houses, More Growth for Lyon in 2006: Silver Springs next to Boom in State’s Fastest-growing County.” Nevada Appeal. December 30, 2005.
- Associated Press. “\$15 Million Pledge: University Receives Funds to Build Science Building.” Pahrump Valley Times. December 9, 2005.
- Benston, L. “New Resorts to Take up Station in Reno Area: Company, Culinary Trading Barbs over Plans.” Las Vegas Sun. October 21, 2005.
- Miscellaneous infrastructure (transportation and water-related) projects
 - Woodmansee, K. “A Tug-of-War Over the Carson River: Effect of Groundwater Changes on River Disputed.” Nevada Appeal. May 17, 2007.
 - Vasquez, S. “Douglas County Sewer Plant Expansion Concerns Neighbors: Saratoga Springs Residents Buck Effluent Storage Plans.” Nevada Appeal. May 12, 2007.
 - Woodmansee, K. “Airport, Utility to Receive Lyon Grants.” Nevada Appeal. January 8, 2007.
 - Cobourn, J. and S. Lewis. “Give River Room to Roam: Development Along River Channel Subject to Flooding.” Nevada Appeal. July 5, 2006.
 - Harber, T. “More Freeway Preparation Work to Come: Work Begins Saturday on Changes to Fairview Drive.” Nevada Appeal. October 6, 2006.
 - Cianci, L. “Pyramid Tribe Protests Water-Rights Transfers.” Nevada Appeal/Northern Nevada Business Weekly. November 24, 2006.
 - Woodmansee, K. “Six-Mile Project Gets Approval After Resolving Drainage Problems 135 Lots on 54.33 Acres to Be Developed.” Nevada Appeal. December 12, 2006.

DRAFT

- Garcia, M. “Churchill Approves Building Impact Fee to Ease Traffic Woes.” Nevada Appeal. November 21, 2005.
- Woodmansee, K. “Regional Water System One Idea to Meet Needs: Water District Manager: ‘There Is No Free Water in this System’.” Nevada Appeal. November 6, 2005.
- Woodmansee, K. “Past Traffic Analysis Included With Highway 50 Corridor Study.” Nevada Appeal. November 4, 2005.
- Dornan, G. “Bypass Contract in NDOT’s [Nevada Department of Transportation’s] 2006 Construction Program: Widening of Highway 50 Between Dayton and Churchill Also included.” Nevada Appeal. October 13, 2005.

DRAFT

APPENDIX J

DRAFT

DRAFT

**J. CONTACT INFORMATION FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND
FEDERAL AGENCIES**

Clark County Contacts

Business Development

Address: 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 455-2426

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Citizens Transit

Address: 600 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 228-7433

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Planning and Zoning

Address: 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., # 1, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 455-4314

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Water Reclamation

Address: 5857 E. Flamingo Rd., Las Vegas, Nevada 89122
Phone: (702) 434-6600

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
<<http://www.cleanwaterteam.com/communityprojects.html>>
<<http://www.cleanwaterteam.com/constructionupdates.html>>

Clark County Development Services

Address: 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 455-3000

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/development_services/majproj.htm>

Clark County Flood Control

Address: 600 S. Grand Central Pkwy., # 300, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 455-3139

Links to New Developments, New Projects, and Long Range Plans
<http://breccia.ccrfcd.org/pdf_arch1/public%20information/ProjectsFactSheet.pdf>
<http://breccia.ccrfcd.org/pdf_arch1/public%20information/CorpsFactSheetJuly2003.pdf>
<http://breccia.ccrfcd.org/pdf_arch1/public%20information/NorthwestAreaProgress.pdf>

DRAFT

Clark County Public Works

Address: 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 455-6000

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/pubworks/construction/projects_list.htm>
<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/pubworks/construction/Projects_Strip.htm>
<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/pubworks/about_pw/Trans_Plan.htm>
<<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/pubworks/beltway/beltway.htm>>

Clark County Redevelopment Agency

Address: 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, Nevada 89155
Phone: (702) 455-3111

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/comprehensive_planning/Redevelopment.htm>

Comprehensive Planning-Nuclear

Address: 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 455-5175

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<http://www.co.clark.nv.us/comprehensive_planning/LUP/LandUseUpdates.htm>

Department of Business and Industry

Address: 555 E. Washington Ave., Suite 4900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 486-2750

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<<http://dbi.state.nv.us/>> (Scroll down page)

Regional Transportation Commission

Address: 600 S. Grand Central Pkwy., # 350, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 228-7433

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<<http://www.rtcsonthernnevada.com/mpo/>>

Miscellaneous links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<<http://www.hooverdambypass.org/>>
<<http://www.i15northcorridor.com/>>
<<http://www.i515study.com/NEW/I515%20WEB/overview.htm>>
<<http://www.215515project.com/>>
<<http://www.ndotprojectneon.com/>>
<<http://www.mtcharlestontransportationstudy.com/>>
<<http://www.iteris.com/snvits/>>
<<http://www.us95.net/>>

DRAFT

Churchill County Contacts

Nuclear Projects

Address: 85 N. Taylor, Suite 198, Fallon, Nevada 89406

Phone: (775) 428-1592

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<<http://www.state.nv.us/nucwaste/news2005/pdf/comm2004report.pdf>>

Planning Department

Address: 155 N. Taylor, Suite 194, Fallon, Nevada 89406

Phone: (775) 423-7627

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<<http://www.churchillcounty.org/planning/agenda.php>>

Miscellaneous links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<<http://www.ceda-nv.org/land.htm>>

<<http://reid.senate.gov/record2.cfm?id=187753>>

Esmeralda County Contacts

Project Coordinator

Address: Elliott St. and Euclid St., Goldfield, Nevada 89013

Phone: (775) 485-3483

No specific links were found.

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: Goldfield, Nevada 89013

Phone: (775) 485-3411

No specific links were found.

Miscellaneous links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

<http://www.esmeraldanvnuke.com/scop_pr.pdf>

<<http://reid.senate.gov/record2.cfm?id=206362>>

<<http://www.tonogold.com/projects.shtml>>

Eureka County Contacts

Economic Development

Address: 701 S. Main St., Eureka, Nevada 89316

Phone: (775) 237-5484

<<http://www.eurekacounty.com/>>

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

DRAFT

Natural Resources

Address: 701 S. Main St., Eureka, Nevada 89316

Phone: (775) 237-6010

<<http://www.co.eureka.nv.us/county/natural.htm>>

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Natural Resources Conservation

Address: 701 S. Main, Eureka, Nevada 89316

Phone: (775) 237-5251

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: 491 N. Main St., Eureka, Nevada 89316

Phone: (775) 237-5420

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

Address: Eureka, Nevada 89316

Phone: (775) 237-5254

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Lander County Contacts

Battle Mountain Indian Colony

Address: 710 W. Front St., Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820

Phone: (775) 635-5866

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Building Department

Address: 200 Main, Austin, Nevada 89310

Phone: (775) 964-1133

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: 350 E. 4th St., Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820

Phone: (775) 635-2041

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

DRAFT

Planning Commission

Address: 825 N. 2nd St., Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820
Phone: (775) 635-2860

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

U.S. Federal Aviation Administration

Address: 470 E. 5th St., Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820
Phone: (775) 635-2688

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

Address: 50 Bastian Rd., Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820
Phone: (775) 635-4000

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Lincoln County Contacts

Planning and Building

Address: 1 N. Main St., Pioche, Nevada 89043
Phone: (775) 962-5165

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: State Route 319, Panaca, Nevada 89042
Phone: (775) 728-4486

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

Address: 1400 Front St., # 1, Caliente, Nevada 89008
Phone: (775) 726-8100

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

U.S. Department of Transportation

Address: Pioche, Nevada 89043
Phone: (775) 962-5145

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

DRAFT

Mineral County Contacts

Economic Development

Address: 901 E St., Hawthorne, Nevada 89415

Phone: (775) 945-5896

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: 8th and M St., Hawthorne, Nevada 89415

Phone: (775) 945-3236

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Nye County Contacts

Natural Resources Conservation

Address: PO Box 1147, Tonopah, Nevada 89049

Phone: (775) 482-5506

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Planning and Building

Address: 1114 Globemallow Ln., Tonopah, Nevada 89049

Phone: (775) 482-8181

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

U.S. Department of Energy

Address: Tonopah, Nevada 89049

Phone: (775) 482-9640

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

Address: 1553 S. Main St., Tonopah, Nevada 89049

Phone: (775) 482-7800

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: 805 S. Main St., Tonopah, Nevada 89049

Phone: (775) 482-2375

DRAFT

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

White Pine County Contacts

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: 1401 E. Aultman St., Ely, Nevada 89301
Phone: (775) 289-1700

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Nuclear Waste

Address: 957 Campton St., Ely, Nevada 89301
Phone: (775) 289-2033

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Regional Planning Commission

Address: 953 Campton St., Ely, Nevada 89301
Phone: (775) 289-8841

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Address: 744 E. North Industrial Way, Ely, Nevada 89301
Phone: (775) 289-6604

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

Address: 702 N. Industrial Way, Ely, Nevada 89301
Phone: (775) 289-1800

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

Inyo County, California, Contacts

Manzanar National Historic Site

Address: 661 N. Edwards St., Independence, California 93526
Phone: (760) 878-2032

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans
None found

DRAFT

Transportation Department Maintenance

Address: 655 N. Edwards St., Independence, California 93526

Phone: (760) 878-2481

Links to new developments, new projects, and long range plans

None found

Las Vegas Contacts

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Address: 2300 McLeod St., Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

Phone: (702) 486-4690

Business and Industry Administration

Address: 1771 E. Flamingo Rd., Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Phone: (702) 486-7220

Colorado River Commission

Address: 555 E. Washington Ave., # 3100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Phone: (702) 486-2670

Conservation and Natural Resources

Address: 1771 E. Flamingo Rd., # 121a, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Phone: (702) 486-2850

Nevada Department of Transportation

Address: 123 E. Washington Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Phone: (702) 385-6500

Department of Wildlife

Address: 4747 Vegas Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89108

Phone: (702) 486-5127

District Engineer

Address: 123 E. Washington Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Phone: (702) 385-6500

Economic Development

Address: 555 E. Washington Ave., # 5400, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Phone: (702) 486-2700

Environmental Health

Address: 625 Shadow Ln., Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Phone: (702) 383-1251

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Address: 944 E. Harmon Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Phone: (702) 798-2100

DRAFT

Las Vegas City Engineer Division

Address: 420 N. 4th St., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 229-6272

Las Vegas City Engineering

Address: 731 S. 4th St., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 229-6541

Las Vegas City Planning and Development

Address: 731 S. 4th St., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 229-6301

Las Vegas Engineering Planning

Address: 731 S. 4th St., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 229-2143

Las Vegas Water Pollution

Address: 6005 Vegas Valley Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89142
Phone: (702) 229-6200

Nevada Secretary of State

Address: 555 E. Washington Ave., # 2900, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 486-2880

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Address: 2300 McLeod St., Las Vegas, Nevada 89104
Phone: (702) 432-9425

U.S. Department of Energy

Address: 1551 Hillshire Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Phone: (702) 794-5555

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Address: 4701 N. Torrey Pines Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89130
Phone: (702) 515-5450

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

Address: 4701 N. Torrey Pines Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89130
Phone: (702) 515-5000

U.S. Bureau of Land Management—Fire Management

Address: 4765 Vegas Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89108
Phone: (702) 647-5130

U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Address: 7851 Industrial Rd., Las Vegas, Nevada 89139
Phone: (702) 263-9744

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Address: 1551 Hillshire Dr., # A, Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Phone: (702) 794-5047

DRAFT

U.S. Radiation Program Office

Address: 4220 S. Maryland Pkwy., # 532, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Phone: (702) 798-2476

U.S. Transportation Airport

Address: 5757 Wayne Newton Blvd., Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Phone: (702) 736-0950

Water Resources Division

Address: 400 Shadow Ln., # 201, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106
Phone: (702) 486-2770

Reno Contacts

City Manager

E. 1st St.
Reno, Nevada 89501
(775) 334-2020

Community Development Director

450 Sinclair St.
PO Box 1900
Reno, Nevada 89505
(775) 334-2063

U.S. Department of Agriculture

350 Capitol Hill Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 688-1180

Department of Wildlife

1100 Valley Rd.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 688-1500

Environmental Health Service

1001 E. 9th St.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 328-2434

Indian Commission

4600 Kietzke Ln., # 101
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 688-1347

Industrial Relations Department

4600 Kietzke Ln., # 153
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 824-4600

DRAFT

Mines and Geology Bureau

1664 N. Virginia St.
Reno, Nevada 89503
(775) 784-6691

National Agricultural Statistics

910 Valley Rd.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 784-5584

Natural Resources Conservation

5301 Longley Ln., # 201
Reno, Nevada 89511
(775) 784-5863

Nevada Agriculture Warehouse

295 Galletti Way
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 688-1354

Parks, Recreation, and Community Services

1301 Valley Rd.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775)334-2262

Regional Transportation Commission

1105 Terminal Way, # 316
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 348-8990

Reno Environmental Service Department

190 E. Liberty St.
Reno, Nevada 89501
(775) 334-2167

ReTRAC Project Office

264 Keystone Ave.
Reno, Nevada 89503
(775) 348-5140

Nevada Secretary of State

1755 E. Plumb Ln., # 231
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 688-1855

U.S. Department of Agriculture

1550 S. Wells Ave., # 100
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 784-5414

DRAFT

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
300 Booth St.
Reno, Nevada 89509
(775) 784-5304

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1340 Financial Blvd., # 234
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6300

U.S. Geological Survey
1340 Financial Blvd.
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6390

U.S. Bureau of Land Management
1340 Financial Blvd.
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6400

Washoe County Quality Management
401 Ryland St., # 331
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 784-7200

Washoe County Community Development
1001 E. 9th St.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 328-3600

Washoe County Engineering
1001 E. 9th St.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 328-2041

Washoe County Risk Management
1001 E. 9th St.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 328-2071

Washoe County Utility Engineering
4930 Energy Way
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 954-4600

Washoe County Water Resources
4930 Energy Way
Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 954-4601

DRAFT

Wildlife Department
1100 Valley Rd.
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 688-1500

Miscellaneous Links

<<http://www.freewayextension.com/>>
<<http://www.renospaghetibowl.com/>>