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Comment Letter

From: Keyzers, Anna M CIV NAVFAC SW, OPWM39
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 15:02
To: redwards@usbr.gov
Cc: Waxter, Debora E CIV NAVFAC SW; Cottie, Gary CIV NAVFAC SW
Subject: FW; BOR Newlands RMP Comments Due

Mr. Edwards,

Please see the below comments from the NAS Fallon, Environmental Division on the Draft Resource Management Plan /Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMP/EIS) for the Newlands Project.

Page 1-5: Add NAS Fallon to list of water users. Navy has 1,058 acres of water rights in the Newlands Project.

Page 3-26 Re: Navy has 14,000 AcFt in Dixie Valley. The Navy doesn't have this many water rights in Dixie Valley. Dixie Valley is not in the Newlands Project.

Page 3-49 Update the bat species. They are using our old 1997 Ecological Inventory. Use 2008 Ecolinventory for list of bats.

Page 3-68 correct acreage for Main Station is 8,670 acres. 2800 civilians is incorrect. Contact Zip Upham, PAO for correct numbers.

Old Navy Documents in Reference Section:
-1997 Ecolinventory.
-2000 INRMP SAIC this was only a Draft.
-1991 Tui Chub Report from Dixie Valley-uncertain to what this is referring to.
-Starting on Page 3-1, 1991 reference to CA Dept of Water Resources data. Use NV or USGS data for references.

Anna Keyzers
NAS Fallon, PW ENV
Natural Resources/EMS Program Manager
Ph: 775.426.2922
Alt: 775.853.6939

Responses

Page 1-5: Information corrected.

Page 3-26: Information corrected.


Page 3-68: Information corrected.
Reclamation has considered the 2009 Forest Service recommendations in the formulation of the Final Grazing Management Plan (See Appendix A).

Reclamation has considered the effects of climate change on the lands described in this RMP and the policies and decisions being made through this RMP. Information on the potential effects of climate change on the environment within the Planning Area has been included in Section(s) 3.1 and 4.2.

The influence of those potential effects on water policy is outside the scope of this RMP. The influence of those effects on the decision being made in this RMP, primarily concern grazing. The effects of climate change will be able to be managed through the Grazing Management Plan, which is an adaptive plan allowing for changes in management due to changes in forage and drought conditions.
will be retained by Reclamation. Implementation of these recommendations, including closing reseeded
pastures a minimum of two years, changing the season of use, developing rotation systems, allowing
several years of rest for smaller pastures, and implementing utilization limits, should hasten the recovery
of Reclamation lands long-stressed from livestock activities.

We also recommend that the Final RMP/EIS include additional information on how climate change may
affect planning area resources and future Newlands Project management decisions. The Draft RMP/EIS
provides little detail about how climate change may affect the planning area. The EPA believes that the
long duration of this management plan (most likely two or three decades), and the warming anticipated
to occur in the planning area, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS, warrants the inclusion of a climate
change mitigation and adaptation plan in the Final RMP/EIS.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Draft RMP/EIS, and are available to discuss our comments.
When the Final RMP/EIS is released, please send one CD copy to this office. If you have any questions,
please contact me at 415-972-3521, or contact Jason, the Lead reviewer for this project. Jason can be
reached at 415-947-4221 or gerdes.jason@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Martyn Goforth, Manager
Environmental Review Office

Enclosure: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
An Objective and Action item has been added to the Cultural Resources Section in Chapter 2 Alternatives to address NHT (Object CR 6 and Action CR 6.1). A map has been added depicting the NHT within the planning area (Fig 3-7). Additionally NHT are now addressed in Chap 3 and 4

Please note, this RMP does not propose any new projects that might impact the trails.
The referenced section has been clarified. The discussion in the subject paragraph has been deleted, as the relinquishing of lands to the Bureau of Land Management is not a decision being made through this RMP. The potential relinquishing of lands to the BLM is discussed under cumulative impacts, as it is a reasonably foreseeable action. The cumulative impact section (Section 4.21) contains discussion of the differences between Reclamation and BLM management of cultural resources. Discussion of the SHPO’s perspective on the difference between Reclamation and BLM management has been included.
Comment Letter

Bob Edwards
July 25, 2013
Page 2 of 3

The SHPO has the following comments on specific items in the document:

- Page 3-40: The SHPO takes exception to the misinformation, omissions, misunderstandings, and the mischaracterization of our online statewide archaeological and architectural database (NVCRIS). First, the EIS asserts that NVCRIS system is housed by the Nevada State Museum. NVCRIS is a creation of the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office and has been managed by the SHPO since its inception in the early 1990’s. NSM is a partner archive but has never managed NVCRIS. Second, the discussion about the data within NVCRIS is also incorrect. The data in NVCRIS represents the 106 activities of all agencies in Nevada, not just the BLM. Third, NVCRIS has never presumed to be 100% accurate. Checking the files of land managing agencies is a best practice that should always be conducted in conjunction with pre-field research.

- Also on Page 3-40: The document states that the National Register website (NRHP 2010) was checked. This data is known to be incomplete and does not include restricted archaeological sites. The best source for National Register data is the SHPO, but the EIS does not mention that these records were checked. It is concerning that this EIS seems to go out of its way to dismiss NVCRIS’s data but completely omits a similarly detailed discussion on the NRHP database.

- Section 3.9: This document fails to mention that two National Historic Trails (congressional-designated significant national resources) run directly through this planning area. Both the Pony Express NHT and the California NHT both have a comprehensive management and use plan that can be found at this location: http://www.nps.gov/caliparkmgmt/upload/CALI-CMP-SM-updated.pdf. This office also maintains a database of resources that must be considered in any planning document but are not necessarily present in either NVCRIS or in the National Register website. As with the comment above, had this office be consulted during the data collection stage of document preparation, we would have provided this information.

- There appears to be contradiction in the cultural resources environmental consequences section and the discussion of effects on cultural resources from the alternatives. On page 4-42 (section 4.8.3), the document states that common to all alternatives there will be either no effects or only negligible

Responses

Page 3-40a: Discussion of the NVCRIS has been corrected.

Page 3-40b: The discussion of the assessment of cultural resources has been amended to state just what databases were checked.

Section 3-9: An Objective and Action item has been added to the Cultural Resources Section in Chapter 2 Alternatives to address NHTs (Object CR 6 and Action CR 6.1). A map has been added depicting the NHT segments within the planning area (Fig 3-7). Additionally, NHTs are now addressed in Chap 3 and 4

Page 4-42: Livestock grazing would have no or only negligible effects on cultural resources, and was not included as a resource area. The impacts associated with each alternative are discussed in subsequent sections.
The commenter is correct. At the time the Draft Grazing Management Plan (GMP) was made available for public review, Reclamation had not yet begun consultation with SHPO on a grazing Programmatic Agreement. Reclamation will enter into consultation with SHPO prior to the finalization of the GMP.

Page 3-35: Typo has been corrected.
Paragraph 2: A citation for the new revision has been added to the subject section (http://www.ndow.org/Nevada_Wildlife/Conservation/Nevada_Wildlife_Action_Plan/). The new revision has been considered in the formulation of the Proposed Plan and the revision of the EIS.

Paragraph 3: Specific maps have not been generated, but coordination with NDOW is ongoing.

Paragraph 4: The lands withdrawn for the Newlands Project were not withdrawn from Mineral Leasing activities such as geothermal leasing and development. Geothermal leasing and development is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) under BLM rules and regulations. Reclamation does review and approve land surface stipulations. All geothermal development is subject to NEPA documentation completed by BLM. NDOW is given the opportunity to comment on all BLM NEPA documents.

Paragraph 5: Carson Lake Wildlife area is considered a wildlife management area.
Paragraph 6: An Action item **Action B-MR 3.2.** has been added. **“Action B-MR 3.2.** Consult with NDOW prior to any abandoned mine closures to ensure protection of bat habitat.”

Paragraph 7: The suggested revision is too restrictive for a programmatic document such as a RMP. All projects approved by Reclamation are subject to NEPA documentation. Impacts are analyzed on a case-by-case basis. Minimizing impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat are dictated in project specific NEPA.

Paragraph 8: A new Action Item has been inserted into the Proposed Alternatives. **“Action B-FW 1.2.1.** Consult with NDOW when inventorying key habitats within the Newlands Project area or developing management strategies/goals for key habitats.”

Paragraph 9: Chapter 3 describes the environment of the Lahontan Valley. Chapter 4 discusses the impacts of Reclamation’s Proposed Plan. While Reclamation often cooperates with other non-federal agencies’ and organizations’ goals and efforts, these goals and efforts are not federal actions and no decisions on them are being made through this RMP/EIS.

Paragraph 10: Permission to introduce, reestablish or augment a species on Reclamation withdrawn lands does not require a Plan amendment as is required by other Federal Agencies.

Paragraph 11: See response to comment Paragraph 9 above.
Paragraph 12: Action 2.2 has been amended to include Carson Lake Pasture.
Item 1: The RMP is considering policy level decisions. The coordination discussed by the commenter concerns implementation level action. The Proposed Action is to include the state and local entities in implementation level actions.

Item 2: RMPs and EISs are slightly different in their requirements. As they are done together, these different requirements can result in some confusion. In the RMP process, alternatives discussed in the Draft RMP represent the range of potential actions. In the Final RMP, the Proposed Plan involves the selection of individual goals, objectives, and actions from within this range. The Proposed Plan will have elements of each of the alternatives.

A source of confusion comes from the EIS requirement to identify a preferred alternative in the Draft EIS. In the combined RMP/EIS process this often results in the “middle of the road” alternative being identified as the preferred alternative, even when the agency may be potentially leaning toward individual goals or objectives within one of the other alternatives. The commenters’ input on these individual goals, objectives, and actions is considered by Reclamation in formulating the Proposed Plan.

Item 2, Bullets 1 and 2: The RMP does not make decisions concerning individual features. Decisions about individual features would be made through the implementation level process. The commenter’s concerns have been considered for clarification of the policy level decisions being made through this RMP. Implementation level decisions would go through
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Letter</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Reclamation NEPA process (e.g., categorical exclusion (CX), environmental assessment (EA), or EIS) as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 2, Bullet 3: Action C-L 2.3 is to “Explore options for title transfer to appropriate entities for conservation purposes.” This Action was included in the Draft RMP/EIS as part of the range of alternative policies, not to document or decide on specific parcels of land. This action under Alternative C was not included in the Proposed Plan. If it had been included, the transfer of individual parcels of land would go through a site-specific NEPA process. The vast majority of the current Reclamation administered lands will return to the Public Lands domain under the management of the Bureau of Land Management. Any other lands that are proposed for sale under Reclamation’s disposal authority will be addressed in individual NEPA documents, which will allow for agency and individual comment.

Item 2, Bullet 4: Corrected. The RMP discusses the decision whether to consider closing roads to the public as a policy. The identification of roads would be the next step, if the decision were made to follow that policy. Individual roads and trails and the potential decisions about each would go through the Reclamation NEPA process (e.g., CX, EA, or EIS) as appropriate. Since there has been no previous RMP for these lands, there is no RMP level documentation supporting many of the Reclamation resource policies and practices. In these cases, this RMP is documenting the current policies and practices. The purpose of Action B-TA 2.2 is to continue the relationship with the county regarding county roads, ensure that all requirements (i.e., federal and county) are fulfilled and documented.
Item 3, Bullet 1: Please refer to Appendix A the Draft GPM for the findings on Rangeland Health Land health standards were analyzed by an interdisciplinary team from the Forest Service TEAMs Enterprise Unit in 2009.

Item 3, Bullet 2: Please see response to Item 3, Bullet 1. In addition, all information has been uploaded to the website.
Item 3, Bullet 3: Species inventory would take place during the implementation process. This process usually takes place in the first five years after the RMP is finalized. All inventories would be in consultation with NDOW.

Item 3, Bullet 4: Please see answer above. These inventories will take place during the implementation process.

Item 4: Relinquishment as used in this RMP means the ending of the current withdrawal of land from the public lands domain under management by Reclamation. The land would be returned to the public lands domain under the management of the Bureau of Land Management. This RMP discusses the relinquishment as reasonably foreseeable and discusses the efforts that would be undertaken to support the future decision-making (e.g., development of suitability criteria, identification of land parcels, inventories of existing facilities, etc.).

The transfer or disposal of land to entities other than BLM is also reasonably foreseeable. As with relinquishment, this RMP documents the efforts that would be undertaken to the potential transfers or disposals (e.g., solicitation of interest, identification of land parcels, inventories of existing facilities and environmental conditions, etc.). Any transfer or disposal would be documented through would go through the Reclamation NEPA process (e.g., CX, EA, or EIS) as appropriate.
ES-9 Comment: Definition of flood zone has been added to Section 3.7 and the glossary. The definition used in this RMP is the FEMA mapped 100-year flood plain.

1-2 Comment: The various shades on the Figures are standard Department of Interior shading. The inclusion of the Regional Park in the legend is standard for DOI maps. There is no indication of a Regional Park existing in the Planning Area according DOI standards.

1-4 Comment: The number presented represents the entire average run off from both the Carson River and Truckee River basins.

2-3 Comment: Comment noted. Under the proposed grazing management plan, grazing leases would be issued for longer periods of time.

2-4 Comment: The RMP explores alternatives for Reclamation land management policies and practices. As support to grazing is not part of Reclamation’s mission, this RMP evaluates the alternative of ending grazing on Reclamation administered lands. The Proposed Plan is not to phase out grazing, but to manage grazing per the Grazing Management Plan.
3-61 3.11.4 Invasive Species: Saltcedar and purple loosestrife should be added to the list.

3-79 Alternate Route 95 runs south in Lyon County from Fernley, but the road that goes from Silver Springs into Churchill County is U.S. Highway 50, not Alternate Route 50.

3-81 Electricity: There is also a geothermal plant at Salt Wells. Water: Churchill County adopted a (Final) Water Resources Plan in October 2003. Said Plan was updated in April 2007. The draft RMP/EIS refers to the Final “Draft” Plan. There are significant groundwater resources in Dixie Valley but currently these do not “provide” water to our community as is implied in the RMP/EIS.

3-93 Largest employers in Churchill County: Should say Churchill County, not Churchill County Comptroller.

4-30 Assumptions: “Reclamation would retain water rights and protect riparian zones and wetlands.” According to page 1-1 of the Introduction, “Reclamation possesses state permits to store water in its reservoirs but does not own any water rights in the Newlands Project.” So how will they retain them? Will they acquire water rights?

If you have any questions or need clarification on any of the above please contact me or Associate Planner Terri Pereira at (775) 423-7627.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Lockwood
County Manager

2-22 Comment: Action B-IS 1.1 includes “biological” methods of weed control. Goats, sheep and cattle would fall into that category.

2-28 Comment: Comment noted. This is the purpose of the Grazing Management Plan. To ensure a healthy well managed rangeland going into the future.

2-31 Comment: The RMP discusses the decision whether to consider closing roads to the public as a policy. The identification of roads would be the next step, if the decision were made to follow that policy. Individual road closures and access decisions would go through the Reclamation NEPA process (e.g., CX, EA, or EIS) as appropriate.

3-15 Comment: The Salt Wells Geothermal Plant is outside of the Planning Area.

3-47 Comment: Wild Horse and Burros (WH&B) are not considered wildlife. Also, Reclamation lands are considered “Horse Free.” Any Wild Horses or Burros discovered on Reclamation lands would be relocated back to BLM Horse Areas.

3-52 Comment: Mud Snails were included in the discussion of invasive species.

3-53 Comment: It is the purpose of this section to identify the existing environmental conditions. It is not the purpose of the RMP/EIS to identify the source of the mercury but to note the presence of mercury in the environment.
3-60 Comment 1: Corrected.

3-60 Comment 2: Wheatgrass has been added to the discussion.

3-61 Comment: Saltceder and purple loosestrife have been added to the discussion.

3-79 Comment: Corrected

3-81 Comment: Corrected

3-93 Comment: Corrected

4-30 Comment: Assumption has been corrected.
The RMP explores alternatives for Reclamation land management policies and practices. As support of grazing is not part of Reclamation’s mission, this RMP evaluates the alternative of ending grazing on Reclamation administered lands. The Proposed Plan is not to phase out grazing, but to manage grazing per the Grazing Management Plan. A determination to allow the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District to assume administration of the grazing program is outside of the scope of this RMP.
Comment Letter

July 29, 2013

Sent via facsimile transmission to (775) 882-7592
And via email to redwards@usbr.gov

Robert Edwards
RMP Project Manager
705 N. Plaza Street, Room 320
Carson City, Nevada 89701

RE: Comments to Newlands Project Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Draft)

Dear Bob:

Pursuant to notice previously given us in the above-captioned matter, this letter will serve to provide our written comments to the draft resource management plan (RMP) and environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Newlands Project Planning Area as depicted in figure ES-1 of the draft.

We extend to you our appreciation for this undertaking. Naturally, anything to do with the Project is important to us—including the use of federal lands administered by Reclamation which are, or may be, deemed "ancillary to the primary purpose of providing water for irrigation." (See Draft, p. ES-1). The District enjoys a long history associated with grazing; and, we view the practice as important to our Project success.

As you know, on December 18, 1928, the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District entered into a contract with the United States for the operation and maintenance of the Newlands Federal Reclamation Project. That contract provided, inter alia, for the fixing of the District’s repayment obligation assumed from individual water rights contract holders. The contract further allowed, we think, the District to benefit from the provisions of the recently enacted Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 930) including the deduction of certain costs from repayment obligations associated with the Project. In 1938, Congress modified the allocation of miscellaneous revenues with enactment of the Hayden-O'Mahoney Amendment to the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1938. This Act eliminated the practice of "front-end" credits to annual obligations as established by the Fact Finders Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 701)—except where provision had been made by law or contract for the benefit of water users from the Project.

2666 Harrigan Road, P.O. Box 1306, Fallon, Nevada 89406-1306
In 1966 the District and Reclamation entered into the present contract. (No. 7-07-20-X0348). We construe the contract to preserve the provisions of Subsection I of the Fact Finders Act, in which the total accumulated net profits, as determined by the Secretary, "derived from the operation of Project power plants, leasing of Project grazing and agricultural lands, and the sale or use of town sites shall first be credited toward the construction charges associated with the Project, if any." (See Contract No. 7-07-20-X0348, Article 7, p. 9.) "Thereafter, the net profits from such sources may be used by the water users for Project Operation and Maintenance charges, and any remaining funds may be spent as the water users may direct." Id.

Pursuant to the Draft, we understand that one of the planning issues is that of "[h]ow Reclamation will manage grazing, particularly in Harmon pasture?" (Draft at ES-4). Management alternatives were developed to address the major planning issues. These alternatives include: 1. No action (Alternative A—Continue Current Management); 2. Alternative B (Agency Preferred – Consisting of balanced management resource uses with management of natural and cultural resources); and, 3. Alternative C (Conservation). (See Draft, pgs. ES-6, 7). The agency preferred alternative includes a Grazing Management Plan which is intended to "be developed with public input to balance grazing with restoration of land health in grazing areas." Id. at p. ES-6. Ostensibly, the plan will provide for decision criteria governing most every facet of grazing on public lands, including, without limitation, boundaries, lease terms, conditions, fees, drought management, and the sustainability of rangeland health and protection of sensitive habitat. (See Draft, p. ES-7). Alternative A purports to implement a custodial type of management which is the least restrictive to livestock grazing. (See Draft, p. ES-12). Alternative B touts a "more flexible grazing plan...to ensure a healthy and sustainable rangeland system, considering annual adjustments in such aspects as season of use, area available for grazing, carrying capacity." Id. at ES-13. This alternative specifically contemplates "implementation of use authorization fees, [made] in accordance with the grazing management plan, which could change the cost to lease holders...Id. Important to us is the fact that the "plan would likely reduce the overall number of lease holders, the area available for grazing, and the number of livestock." Id. More drastic, even, Alternative C would phase out and eliminate grazing on Reclamation-administered lands within two (2) years. Id.

In consideration of "Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice" related concerns, the Draft informs us that Alternative A proposes the lowest level of restriction and would, therefore, "be the least likely of the alternatives to increase economic contribution of resource uses." Id. at ES-18. Alternative B retains grazing; but, less land would be made available to grazers. Id. Costs would increase. Id. And, again, under Alternative C, grazing would be eliminated. Id.

The "Draft Grazing Management Plan Lahontan Basin Area Office" for the Newland Project (Draft Plan), accompanying the Draft Newlands Project Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, provides among other things, as part of the "long-term strategy", a determination as to what lands will be retained for Newlands Project Purposes through internal review." (See Plan, p. 4). The plan contemplates that a new fee structure
Comment Letter

Comment 1: The RMP explores alternatives for Reclamation land management policies and practices. As support to grazing is not part of Reclamation’s mission, this RMP evaluates the alternative of ending grazing on Reclamation administered lands. The Proposed Plan is not to phase out grazing, but to manage grazing per the Grazing Management Plan (GMP).

Comment 2: See response above.

Comment 3: Allowing the District to resume management of the grazing on Project lands is outside of the scope of this RMP. Allowing the District to manage the grazing program is contrary to Reclamation Policy and current Directives and Standards.

Comment 4: The District realizes revenue from the grazing program through Subsection I credits. Under current conditions the Subsection I revenues are net proceeds after Reclamation accounts for the cost to administer the program. Under the new GMP, the administration costs will be paid by the grazing permittees in addition to a grazing use fee. All of the use fee will be credited to the district as Subsection I revenue.

Responses

Comment 1: The RMP explores alternatives for Reclamation land management policies and practices. As support to grazing is not part of Reclamation’s mission, this RMP evaluates the alternative of ending grazing on Reclamation administered lands. The Proposed Plan is not to phase out grazing, but to manage grazing per the Grazing Management Plan (GMP).

Comment 2: See response above.

Comment 3: Allowing the District to resume management of the grazing on Project lands is outside of the scope of this RMP. Allowing the District to manage the grazing program is contrary to Reclamation Policy and current Directives and Standards.

Comment 4: The District realizes revenue from the grazing program through Subsection I credits. Under current conditions the Subsection I revenues are net proceeds after Reclamation accounts for the cost to administer the program. Under the new GMP, the administration costs will be paid by the grazing permittees in addition to a grazing use fee. All of the use fee will be credited to the district as Subsection I revenue.
Comments to Newlands Project Draft Resources Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Draft)

Page 4

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to the institution of practices that sustain the promise of the existing Contract while doing honor to the health of lands within the Project.

Sincerely,

TRUCKEE-CARSON IRRIGATION DISTRICT

[Signature]

cc: Board of Directors

File Code: L103-168
Project: 29
Control No: 1203538449
Folder ID: 1235236

2666 Harrigan Road, P.O. Box 1356, Fallon, Nevada 89407-1356
July 14, 2013
Bureau of Reclamation
705 N. Plaza St. Room 320
Carson City, NV 89701
Attn: Andrea Minor

Dear Andrea,

I have briefly reviewed the grazing management plan, and offer the following proposal for the Fernley Wildlife Management Area.

The proposal is based on 25 consecutive uninterrupted years of grazing use. It is based on limitations for grazing developed by the Nevada Department of wildlife that have been followed for 25 years. It is based on range improvements in place funded equally by NDOw and me, and on a lack of fencing of the East boundary.

It is based on existing land conditions on the pasture. I am enclosing correspondence from NDOw regarding certain concerns for waterfowl and a reliable water source.

The waterfowl concerns are being met through the August 1 through February 15 grazing season. The water source concerns remain, however the addition of affluent from the town of Fernley is changing that situation.

I do not agree that a general policy of competitive leasing fits the situation at Fernley Wildlife Management Area due to the above information and the agreement between NDOw and BOR.

I believe stability and past gains will be lost by a competitive process. A negotiated lease for Fernley Wildlife Management Area with tenure of at least three years is in the best interest of the U. S. and NDOw. The fee charged should consider at least two facts; one- this seasonal limits provide only mature low quality forage outside of the nutritious growth period. Number two; the East boundary remains unfenced. (April 8, 1987 letter from and NDOw)

Please consider those thoughts and let me know what develops.

Sincerely,

Edwin L. Depaoli

The grazing on the Fernley Wildlife Management Area will be conducted in accordance with the Grazing Management Plan, which will allow for longer permit tenure.
Alternative A is nominally the conditions and policies currently existing within the planning area. Many of those policies are being changed through agency wide directives. The RMP assesses different ways to achieve compliance with those directives. Not complying with those directives, or “less rules,” is not within the power of the Lahontan Basin Area Office, or within the scope of this RMP.

General Comments: The lands in the planning area that are managed by the Bureau of Reclamation are withdrawn lands. Lands withdrawn from the public lands domain for a reclamation project or other use are not public lands and are not subject to the same multiple use mandates for those federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management. This also applies to those federal lands withdrawn for military purposes. Therefore, Reclamation managed withdrawn lands are, in fact, closed to un-restricted un-permitted recreation or travel. This includes the operation of Off Road Vehicles (ORV) or any other mechanical device including automobiles, trucks or motorcycles. This is the prime reason that Reclamation is proposing that the un-needed withdrawn lands be returned to the public lands domain to be managed by BLM as multiple use lands.

The commenter suggests that the prohibition of off road travel impacts those issued a grazing permit under the Reclamation Directives and Standards. This assumption is incorrect. The grazing permittees would be allowed to manage their herds using ORVs or other motorized vehicle if they requested to use
this equipment and the permission was granted in the grazing permit.
Churchill County was included in the early scoping and discussions on this RMP. The previous County Manager was consulted on a regular basis during regular County/Reclamation coordination meetings between himself and Reclamation management.

The spreadsheet format is the standard for listing and describing management alternatives.

The questions listed in Chapter 1 are a list of issues raised during the scoping process. It is not necessary to answer all questions nor is it sometimes possible. Some questions raised are outside of the scope of the proposed RMP.

The answer as to the management of the “Checkerboard Lands” Under all alternatives, Reclamation seeks to simplify the management of the Newlands project and retain lands being used for project purposes. The strategy, depending on the alternative, is to relinquish some of the checkerboard lands to the BLM.

The publishing of a document in a book format does not allow for including large maps in the publication. This is the reason a link is provided to view the maps.

Page 3-35: Section Corrected

Section 3-10: Wild Horse and Burros (WH&B) are not considered wildlife. Also, Reclamation lands are considered “Horse Free”. Any Wild Horses or Burros discovered on
Reclamation lands would be relocated back to BLM Horse Areas

Table 3.19-3: The table has been updated.
are in 2013 and the 2010 figures have been completed and verified. This would show a clearer picture of things not just estimates from years ago.

Page 3-92 notes Churchill County Master plan 2005, but a 2010 version has been completed and adopted. (It would also be helpful to have a reference page.)

Page 3-93 lists the Churchill County Comptroller as one of the highest employers within the county. (Remove Comptroller.) Page 3-96 also listed Washoe County Comptroller as one of the highest employers in Washoe County. (remove Comptroller).

Page 4-5, Section 4.2 Air Resources states in the first paragraph that, “the source of carbon monoxide is burning wood in residential stoves and fireplaces and the main source of particulate matter is construction and travel on unpaved roads.” Do you have data to support that? I don’t think that stoves and dirt roads in Washoe County are the cause of their air quality issues.

Page 4-27 mentions an NSO stipulation on the third paragraph of 4.5.6. What is an NSO stipulation? This abbreviation was not in the list at the front of this document. Page 2-8 states it will close areas to mineral development, page 4-27 states that it will be more restrictive and at a higher cost.

Page 4-76, section 4.10.2 has a list of reasons why invasive species take over or out compete native vegetation, (list starts at the bottom of the page and continues onto the next page), but there was no mention of wildfires which allow great opportunities for invasive species. Page 4-78 does make mention of this, it should be on the list from page 4-76 also.

Page 4-88 the fourth paragraph mentioned an alternative D. There is not a “D” alternative.

Page 4-103 Alternative C mentioned the eventual phase out of Grazing but I do not remember seeing a timeline for this. How long from the beginning of the plan being implemented until all grazing is eliminated?

Page 4-114 deals with energy development including right-of-ways; recently the Nevada Legislature adopted AB239 which requires Counties and Cities to create overhead utility corridors. AB239 will have an effect on the city of Fallon along with Churchill County and the need to create these corridors which will cross through Reclamation lands.

Page 4-141 Section 4.17 utilities needs to address the recent passage of AB239 and the construction of an overhead utility corridor within Fallon and Churchill County. Transmission lines were not address in this section.

Page 4-181 first paragraph, discusses many large mammals but Burros and Wild horses were not mentioned. Also, the paragraph starting with Salt Wells should be updated to where it currently stands not how it stood a few years ago.

Page 4-181 through 4-183 have many of these projects which have been completed or changed and should be updated to current. Each county, or BLM, could provide updated information.

Page 3-29: Corrected

Page 3-92: Corrected

Page 4-5: Discussion of carbon monoxide has been deleted. The document now reads “Activities within the planning area that can contribute to the PM\textsubscript{2.5} and PM\textsubscript{10} levels include vehicle travel on unpaved roads and farming activities on cropland”.

Page 4-27: NSO is No Surface Occupancy: Use or occupancy of the land surface for fluid mineral exploration or development and surface-disturbing activities is prohibited to protect identified resource values. Areas identified as NSO/No Surface-disturbing Activities are open to oil and gas leasing, but surface-disturbing activities cannot be conducted on the surface of the land. This has been added to the glossary.

Page 4-76: Information has been added.

Page 4-88: Corrected.

Page 4-103: If that alternative was selected all grazing would be phased out in 2 years. See Alternative Action C-LG 1.3.

Page 4-114: In 2008, the Departments of Energy, Interior and Agriculture jointly completed the West Wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS. The Energy Corridors identified in that EIS are the only corridors that currently affect Reclamation withdrawn lands. Reclamation will participate in the County corridor planning effort if invited.
Page 4-141: AB 239 is a State law and does not apply to federal lands. However, as stated above, Reclamation will participate in any planning effort if invited. Rights of way for transmission lines are addressed on a case-by-case basis. Objective A-L 1. allows for the issuance of use authorizations (rights of way).

Page 4-181a: See response to comment on page 3-10 above regarding wild horse and burros.

Confusion exists with the term of Salt Wells. The existing Salt Wells geothermal plant is outside of the Planning Area. The Salt Wells projects that were analyzed in a recent BLM EIS are within the Planning Area. Some testing has been completed but there are currently no plans for development.

Page 4-181b: The projects have been updated.
Comment Letter

concerning the projects in their area.

Chapter 6 References: Does not list anything from Fernley. They have many miles of Newlands project within their jurisdiction and should be included in this plan.

Glossary section: Fernley should also be listed in the Glossary similar to Fallon which is listed well over 30 times.

Thank you,

Michael K. Johnson
Chapter 6: The reference section includes the Lyon County Master Plan. No adopted plans from the city of Fernley were used in the creation of this RMP. The Newlands Project facilities in the City of Fernley are primarily water delivery or drainage features. These features are not within the scope of this RMP.

Glossary: Fernley has been added to the Index.
Reclamation has considered the request for extension of the comment period and has determined not to extend the comment period.

The commenter/requestor was notified via the U.S. Mail that Reclamation would not be able to extend the comment period.
Other than the potential relinquishing of the withdrawn land to the Bureau of Land Management, the scope of the EIS does not include any land transfers or sales.
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