

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

United States Navy

Cotton Peak Right Of Way and Communications Improvement Project

DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0005-EA
NVN-043346

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau
of Land Management
Carson City District
Stillwater Field Office
5665 Morgan Mill Road
Carson City, NV 89701
775-885-6000

February 2015



It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0005-EA
NVN-043346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i

LIST OF TABLES ii

LIST OF APPENDICES ii

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS iii

1.0 INTRODUCTION/PURPOSE & NEED..... - 1 -

1.1 INTRODUCTION - 1 -

1.2 BACKGROUND - 1 -

1.3 PURPOSE & NEED - 2 -

1.4 LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE STATEMENT - 2 -

1.5 RELATIONSHIPS TO STATUTES, REGULATIONS, OTHER PLANS AND ANALYSIS..... - 2 -

1.6 DECISION TO BE MADE..... - 3 -

1.7 SCOPING AND ISSUE IDENTIFICATION..... - 3 -

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES - 4 -

2.1 PROPOSED ACTION - 4 -

2.2 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE..... - 6 -

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS .
..... - 6 -

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES - 7 -

3.3 SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES - 7 -

3.4 RESOURCES OR USES OTHER THAN SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES - 8 -

3.5 RESOURCES PRESENT AND BROUGHT FORWARD FOR ANALYSIS (All Resources)..... - 11 -

4.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS..... - 18 -

4.1 PAST, PRESENT AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTIONS - 18 -

5.0 PERSONS, GROUPS, AND AGENCIES CONSULTED - 20 -

5.1 LIST OF PREPARERS..... - 20 -

5.2 PERSONS, GROUPS, OR AGENCIES CONSULTED - 20 -

6.0 REFERENCES - 21 -

7.0 APPENDICES - 22 -

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Existing Land Use Authorizations
- Table 2: Supplemental Authorities*
- Table 3: Resources or Uses Other Than Supplemental Authorities
- Table 4: Wildlife Species Observed in the Vicinity of the Project Area
- Table 5: Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix 1. Maps showing project area and overall proposal modifications photos, and conceptual design of equipment
- Appendix 2. Right Of Way 1986
- Appendix 3. Nevada Department of Wildlife response to Cotton Peak Communication Site
- Appendix 4. Nevada Natural Heritage Program Letter of response for Endangered, threatened, candidate, and at risk plant and animal taxa records
- Appendix 5. Nevada BLM Special Status Species List for the Carson City District
- Appendix 6. Letter to State of Nevada State Historic Preservation Office
- Appendix 7. State of Nevada State Historic Preservation Office Letter of response
- Appendix 8. Letter to Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
- Appendix 9: Visual Resource Management Worksheets
- Appendix 10: Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Worksheets

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AUM	Animal Unit Month
BCC	Birds of Conservation Concern
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
B-20/Bravo 20	Bombing Range located north of Fallon on Lovelock Highway
CCD	Carson City District
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CESA	Cumulative Effects Study Area
CFR	Code of Federal Regulation
CRMP	Consolidated Resource Management Plan
E	East
EA	Environmental Assessment
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976
FPST	Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribe
FRTC	Fallon Range Training Complex
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
ID Team	Interdisciplinary Team
IM	Instruction Memorandum
KOP	Key Observation Point
LWC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MDM	Mount Diablo Meridian
NAS	Naval Air Station
NASF	Naval Air Station Fallon
NDOW	Nevada Department of Wildlife
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NV	Nevada
N	North
NE	Northeast
NW	Northwest
R	Range
RFFA	Reasonably Foreseeable Future Action
ROW	Right of Way
S	South
SE	Southeast
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SW	Southwest
TACTS	Tactical Aircrew Combat Training System
T	Township
USC	United States Code
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VRI	Visual Resource Inventory
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WA	Wilderness Area
WSA	Wilderness Study Area

1.0 INTRODUCTION/PURPOSE & NEED

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Navy currently operates a microwave communication link on an existing Right of Way (ROW) NVN-043346 in Churchill County, Nevada (NV) that provides communication for Naval Aviation training on Navy withdrawn training and bombing ranges. The Navy is proposing to expand the current ROW from .06 acres to 1.5 acres and replace the failing equipment located at the Cotton Peak site (refer to Appendix 1, maps and figures). The Navy is also proposing to replace the current helicopter landing area with one further up the ridge to improve communications and improve site safety for maintenance and equipment inspections.

The communication site expansion would be adjacent to the existing Navy ROW, approximately 150 feet away. The new location of the microwave communication would improve communication with a better line of sight to other communication relays, in the area. The new landing area would improve safety and the ability to perform maintenance on the communication equipment.

1.2 BACKGROUND

On June 26, 1986 the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Carson City District (CCD) issued a ROW to the Department of the Navy to locate, construct, use, control, maintain, improve, and repair a remote relay station site for the Tactical Aircrew Combat Training System (TACTS) Site No. T23. This ROW is located at Mount Diablo Meridian (MDM), Township (T) 24 North (N), Range (R) 35 East (E) Section 3 Northeast (NE) ¼, and Southwest (SW) ¼ in Churchill County, NV.

The current ROW site does not meet the Navy's needs for current training and communications within the area. The current proposal for the Cotton Peak site is to expand the site to allow for the construction and installation of new equipment at the site and a new helipad to meet current training and communication needs for the Navy. The Cotton Peak site is part of a communication ring that runs from Naval Air Station Fallon (NASF) Main Station to Desert Peak to Bravo-20 (B-20) to Cotton Peak to New Pass to Fairview and back to NASF Main Station. All range communication (including aircraft tracking) for the Fallon Range Training Complex (FRTC) runs through this ring so any break in the link would compromise naval operations in this area and all communication would stop.

The Cotton Peak project would place a new microwave link that relays between B-20 and New Pass Peak. The current infrastructure in this link is degraded and this project would be step one in repairing that capability. In future years, other upgrades to the B-20 link would be made, but the Cotton Peak upgrades needs to occur before the other upgrades can occur. The current link capability has dropped from three video channels to one and from four data channels to one. The addition of the new microwave relay would increase the broadband capabilities and increase the amount and type of data that is needed for training operations. The new location for the semi-improved helicopter landing area would improve safety for the pilot and any crew that is needed for repair and inspection of the site. It would also allow the maintenance and repair in a wider range of weather conditions.

This link is critical to the FRTC as the current link is degraded and cannot support the amount of data required to support operations. As a result some training has shifted to other ranges, but due to the increasing number of units coming to NASF, this link would need to be upgraded as soon as possible to support current and future training requirements.

1.3 PURPOSE & NEED

The purpose of the Cotton Peak Project (Proposed Action) is to grant the Navy a communications site ROW expansion in Churchill County, Nevada approximately 20 miles northeast of Fallon, NV in T24N, R35 E, MDM, Sec. 3, NE¼ and SW¼ adjacent to the existing ROW site. This ROW amendment would allow the Navy to expand the current ROW, to install a semi-improved helicopter landing area, and to install microwave communication equipment in a location approximately 150 feet away from the existing facilities. The new location of the microwave communication would improve communication with a better line of sight to other communication relays, in the area. The new landing area would improve safety and the ability to perform maintenance on the communication equipment.

The Navy needs the proposed action because the current link is degraded and cannot support the amount of data required to support current operations. The change in location would replace the current ageing system with a modern one increasing the broadband and give a clear line of sight to the other microwave sites. The increase size and better location of the proposed helicopter landing zone would allow safer access to conduct maintenance and equipment inspections in a larger range of weather situations.

The need for the action is established by the BLM's responsibility under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) to respond to a request for a ROW grant for communication sites on public lands.

The purpose and need of the Proposed Action in relation to Visual Resource Management (VRM) is to establish interim visual management objectives for the project area until such time that permanent objectives are designated in the revised Carson City District Consolidated Resource Management Plan (Carson City CRMP)

1.4 LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE STATEMENT

Land Use Plan conformance determinations are based on the decisions and information contained in the Carson City CRMP, approved in May 2001. The proposed action is in conformance with the Carson City CRMP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with Administrative Actions listed on page ROW-4 of the Right-of-way Corridors section and would comply with the Standard Operating Procedures listed on pages ROW-4 through ROW-6.

The Administrative Actions listed on page ROW-4 specify that all applicants for ROW grants, whether or not they are within corridors, are subject to standard approval procedures as outlined in the right-of-way regulations at 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 2800. These procedures include preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA), if applicable, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); a determination of compliance of the applicants proposed plan with applicable federal and state laws; consultation with federal, state, and local agencies; and any other action necessary to fully evaluate and make a decision to approve or deny the application and prescribe suitable terms and conditions for the grant or permit. Consultation with the public, including adjacent landowners, is to occur throughout the process.

1.5 RELATIONSHIPS TO STATUTES, REGULATIONS, OTHER PLANS AND ANALYSIS

The proposed action is consistent with federal laws and regulations; other plans, programs and policies and state and local government to the extent practical within federal law, regulation and policy, including the following:

- The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (PL 94 579, 43 USC 1761 [et Seq.]);
- Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Subpart 2800 Rights-of-Way under the FLPMA;
- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969;
- Noxious Weed Act of 1974;
- The Endangered Species Act of 1973;
- Standards and Guidelines for NV's Sierra Front-Northwestern Great Basin Area (2003);
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918;
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act – Interim Guidance – BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2008-050;
- Memorandum of Understanding Between the BLM and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to Promote the Conservation of Migratory Birds – BLM 2010-110;
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act – Executive Order 13806;
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990;
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1979;
- National Historic Preservation Act (Public Law 89-665; 16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 470 as amended through 2000);
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, As Amended (Public Law 96-95; 16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm).

1.6 DECISION TO BE MADE

Upon completion of this analysis, the BLM will decide whether or not to grant the communication site expansion ROW amendment to the Navy, and if so, under what terms and conditions. Additionally the Authorized Officer will establish interim visual management class objectives for lands within the project area.

1.7 SCOPING AND ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Internal Scoping

The Navy's internal scoping included a site visit attended by Navy personnel on December 8, 2011 and internal scoping meetings for the EA held on November 8, 2013. During that time, Navy personnel identified key issues and concerns regarding the Proposed Action.

The proposed action was scoped through the BLM's interdisciplinary team (ID Team) on July 28, 2014.

External Scoping

A consultation letter was sent to Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on January 6, 2012. The response of concurrence was received on February 6, 2012. The Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe (FPST) was notified of the proposed ROW and action via certified letter on January 12, 2012.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 PROPOSED ACTION

The Navy proposes to increase the size of the current ROW from .06 acres to 1.5 acres, move the equipment site, and create a new helicopter landing area in the Stillwater Mountain Range, Churchill County, NV at the Cotton Peak site. This would allow for improved communications and site safety for maintenance and equipment inspections. The laydown area for construction would be on the east side of the Stillwater Range on Navy property Bar A-3 Ranch. Helicopter flights would depart Bar A-3 Ranch and land at the construction site utilizing the proposed helicopter landing pad at the Cotton Peak site (refer to maps in Appendix 1). The site would be accessed only by helicopter during construction activities as there are no roads to access the site.

1. The proposed ROW expansion would encompass approximately 1.5 acres (length is 550' by 125' wide), beginning 50 feet south of the current site, extending northward, following the natural ridge line, to a point 75 feet beyond the proposed helicopter landing area and extending 50 feet westward and 75 feet eastward from the natural ridge line. The proposed ROW expansion would be located in Churchill County, Nevada approximately 20 miles north east of Fallon, Nevada in T24N., R35E., MDM, Sec. 3, SE ¼ and SW 1/4.
2. The construction process would proceed as follows:
 - a. Improve Helipad - The construction would begin with a single helicopter flight to make minor improvements to the proposed landing pad to clear an area of approximately 30 meters by 30 meters (remove rocks, logs, etc...). The landing pad would be used throughout construction and for future maintenance and repairs at the site. Work would ensure that the helicopter landing pad is clear of obstructions. Some trimming of vegetation may be required. All removed vegetation would be disposed of offsite or used as vertical mulching for ground surface disturbance. This would require 2 workers for 1 day. One helicopter would be used for 1 trip. Total weight would be less than 200 pounds.
 - b. Communication Site Work- This phase of construction would improve the proposed communications site. The area would be leveled (obstructions, rocks, logs, vegetation would be removed) to accommodate the footprint of the equipment (approximately a 12 foot by 20 foot area). Some trimming or removal of vegetation may occur to fit the equipment or to provide line of sight for clear signal transmission. All removed vegetation would be carried away and disposed of off-site or used as vertical mulching for ground surface disturbance.
 - c. Concrete Foundations and Piers- Work would include digging holes by hand for the placement of Sono-tubes for concrete. Bags of concrete and water would be flown by helicopter to the site and hand mixed in a wheel barrow. Tubes would be filled with concrete to form the piers for equipment and any anchors would also be set into the concrete. A cleanup area would be designated on site. All excess material and mixing equipment would be removed upon completion. This work would require 2 workers and a total of 2 days for this phase. One helicopter would be used for a total of 4 trips. Total weight would be less than 1200 pounds of material.

- d. Install Equipment and Tower- Work would include the assembly of battery trays onto the concrete piers and installing supports for photo voltaic panels. The metal structure for the equipment would be installed on the concrete piers by bolting the frame together. Construction of the communication tower and placement of the repeater dish. This would require 2-4 workers for 4 days. One helicopter would make 4-6 trips. Total weight would be less than 2000 pounds.
 - e. Install Photo-Voltaic System and Equipment- Work would include installation of the photovoltaic panels which would then be placed on the frame and bolted into place. Batteries would be placed on the frame and connected to the photovoltaic panels. The communication equipment would be placed on the frame and connected to the battery power supply. This work would require 2-4 workers and a total of 2-4 days for this phase. One helicopter would be used for a total of 2-4 trips. Total weight would be less than 200 pounds. The relay tower would then be erected on a concrete pier and reinforced with two bracing arms also attached to the concrete piers. The tower dish would be attached to the tower prior to raising the tower. The tower would be aligned and connected to the communication equipment.
 - f. Grounding Protection - Grounding protection would include the installation of one air terminal at the top of the monopole, copper cabling down the pole and tying to a ground grid with four ½"x10' copper ground rods located around the base of the monopole. The frame to the solar array would be bonded to the ground grid as well. The ground rods should be evenly spaced around the pole about 10' apart forming the grid with copper cabling exothermically welded.
 - g. Extend Utilities- A utility trench would be hand dug between the existing communication site and the proposed site for a distance of approximately 150 feet. The trench would be approximately 18 inches deep and no more than two shovel-widths wide to accommodate the communication line. A communication line would be placed in the trench and backfilled with removed materials. The communication line would link the existing communication site with the proposed site. This would require 2 workers 2-4 days. One helicopter would be used for 2-4 trips. Total weight would be less than 200 pounds.
3. All trash produced on the site would be removed daily and all construction equipment would be removed at the end of construction.
 4. The construction and preparation of the semi-improved helicopter landing area is as follows:

2.1.1 LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The location of the Proposed Action is as follows:

MDM
T24 N, R35 E,
Sec 3,
SE¼ SW¼
Churchill County, Nevada

2.1.2 EXISTING LAND USE AUTHORIZATIONS

The proposed ROW expansion and associated activities would be associated with an established ROW currently owned by the Navy. The existing ROW that has been granted by the BLM on the public lands next to the proposed project area is as shown in the table below:

Table 1: Existing Land Use Authorizations

Holder	ROW/Activity	Case File No.	Township/Range/Section
Navy	Remote Relay Station Site T23	NVN 043346	MDM T24 N, R35 E, Sec 3, SE¼SW¼

2.2 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The current ROW and equipment would continued to be utilized and the ranges would begin to suffer at the current equipment begins to degrade. This could lead to a break in communication. With a break in communication the training that is currently being held in these areas would not be able to continue. The current helicopter pad is very close to the mountainside and existing equipment. This would result in dangerous conditions if flight conditions are not perfect.

The No Action Alternative would not achieve the Purpose and Need identified in Section 1.3. However, it is analyzed in this EA to provide a basis for comparison with the action alternative.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

Need for communication positioning greatly restricts options for alternate locations of similar facilities to meet current needs of the Navy. This location is a line of sight link from New Pass Peak to the B-20 site at Carson Sink. Other methods of communications are not available to the required areas. Thus, no additional alternatives have been identified that would meet the purpose and need as identified in Section 1.3.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter identifies and describes the current condition and trend of elements or resources in the human environment which may be affected by the Proposed Action or Alternatives and the environmental consequences or effects of the action(s).

3.1 SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES

Appendix 1 of BLM’s NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1) identifies Supplemental Authorities that are subject to requirements specified by statute or executive order and must be considered in all BLM environmental documents. The table below lists the Supplemental Authorities and their status in the project area. Supplemental Authorities that may be affected by the Proposed Action are further described in this EA.

Table 2: Supplemental Authorities*

Resource	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
Air Quality	No	No	The current equipment as well as the proposed equipment is photo-voltaic in its operations so air quality would not be reduced or affected by the proposed project. The 4-6 trips to the site via helicopter in 4 days would not decrease the air quality in any measureable way as it is temporary in nature.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	No	No	There are no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in the proposed project area.
Cultural Resources	Yes	No	The site was surveyed for cultural resources in 2012. One site was identified in the project area but was determined not eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. SHPO consultation has been completed. Therefore, no impacts to eligible sites would occur and cultural resources will not be further analyzed in this EA.
Environmental Justice	No	No	The Proposed Action or Alternatives would not disproportionately impact any low income or minority populations as described in the Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898.
Farm Lands (prime or unique)	No	No	No federally designated farmlands, prime or unique, exist within the CCD.
Floodplains	No	No	The Proposed Action or Alternatives do not meet the definition of “Actions Affecting or Affected by Floodplains or Wetlands” as described in 44 CFR Ch. 1 §9.4.
Invasive, Nonnative Species	Yes	No	Although the acreage to be disturbed for this project is minimal, there is always the potential for the spread of invasive or nonnative species anytime there are surface disturbing activities. These would be recorded and treated by the Navy in coordination with the BLM CCD.
Migratory Birds	Yes	Yes	See section 3.4.1.
Native American Religious Concerns	No	No	Tribal consultation has occurred since 2012 regarding this area. No concerns with the proposed project area or proposed activities were raised by the FPST to date.

Resource	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
Threatened or Endangered Species (animals)	No	No	No threatened or endangered plant species are known to occur in the proposed project area; therefore, this resource will not be further analyzed.
Threatened or Endangered Species (plants)	No	No	No threatened or endangered plant species are known to occur in the proposed project area; therefore, this resource will not be further analyzed.
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	No	No	No wastes, hazardous or solid would be utilized, stored, created, or encountered by implementing the Proposed Action or Alternatives contained in this EA.
Water Quality (Surface/Ground)	No	No	No digging or trenching over 18 inches would occur and it would be less than 150 ft. No Waters of the US are present in the proposed project area
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	No	No	There are no wetlands/ riparian zones in the proposed project area
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No	No	No federally designated wild and scenic rivers exist within the CCD.
Wilderness/Wilderness Study Area (WSA)	No	No	The proposed area is not within a WSA and the project would not affect the nearest wilderness area.

March 2012

**See H-1790-1 (January 2008) Appendix 1 Supplemental Authorities to be Considered.*

Supplemental Authorities determined to be Not Present or Present/Not Affected need not be carried forward or discussed further in the document.

Supplemental Authorities determined to be Present/May Be Affected may be carried forward in the document.

3.2 RESOURCES OR USES OTHER THAN SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES

The following resources or uses, which are not Supplemental Authorities as defined by BLM's Handbook H-1790-1, are present in the area. BLM specialists have evaluated the potential impact of the Proposed Action on these resources and documented their findings in the table below. Resources or uses that may be affected by the Proposed Action are further described in this EA.

Table 3: Resources or Uses Other Than Supplemental Authorities

Resource or Issue**	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
BLM Sensitive Species (animals)	Yes	Yes	See section 3.4.2.
BLM Sensitive Species (plants)	No	No	No BLM sensitive plant species or their habitat is known to occur within the proposed project area; therefore, no further analysis is required.
Fire Management/Vegetation	No	No	Wild land fire management activities would not change under the Proposed Action or the alternative. Therefore, wild land fire management would not be impacted.
Forest Resources	Yes	No	All proposed activities including the construction and the helicopter landing site are not anticipated to impact forest resources. No trees would be removed. Therefore, no further analysis is required.
General Wildlife	Yes	Yes	See section 3.4.3.

Resource or Issue**	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
Land Use Authorization	Yes	No	Project activities include setting up a communication relay, and semi improved helicopter landing area. The Project would be required to adhere to the stipulations set forth in the ROW grant. No adverse effects are anticipated. No further analysis is required.
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No	No	The Proposed Action does not occur on lands designated as having wilderness characteristics. However, the Proposed Action triggers the need to re-assess the inventory for wilderness characteristics. Refer to section 3.3 below and Appendix 10.
Livestock Grazing	Yes	No	The Proposed Action would have no effect to the grazing allotment(s) in the proposed area. No loss of Animal Unit Months (AUMs) would occur as a result of the Proposed Action or alternatives therefore no further analysis is required.
Minerals	Yes	No	Mineral resources exist on the CCD; however, no major soil disturbing activities would occur under the Proposed Action or Alternative. Therefore, mineral resources would not be impacted.
Paleontological	No	No	Paleontological resources are known to exist on the CCD; however, no major soil disturbing activities would occur under the Proposed Action or Alternatives. Therefore, paleontological resources would not be impacted.
Recreation	No	No	There are no developed recreational areas or activities in the area. The proposed area is a rocky outcrop on the top of a ridge and no roads go to the proposed project area. Visitors to the project site for recreation purposes are likely to be minimal due to access being limited; therefore this resource will not be further analyzed.
Socioeconomics	No	No	Construction would last for up to 7 days with the use of 4 personnel. Project activities would not contribute to any population growth or reduction, nor would it create any new jobs or tax base to the local communities. Therefore, project activities are not anticipated to have an impact on socioeconomics. No further analysis is required
Soils	Yes	No	Land and soil surfaces would be disturbed through leveling and by potential clearing/removal of protective vegetation during construction where the tower and batteries are placed and where the helipad would be improved. Disturbance of the soil surface during leveling would expose soil and could increase wind- and water-driven erosion, where rocky outcrop is not present. The soils within the proposed project area have been analyzed for their susceptibility to wind and water erosion, as classified by Natural Resource Conservation Service ratings of K factor

Resource or Issue**	Present Yes/No	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
			and Wind Erodibility Group; the soils are slightly susceptible to sheet and rill erosion by water and have a low susceptibility to wind erosion. Although soils would be disturbed during construction, their susceptibility to erosion is minimal and therefore will not be further analyzed within this document.
Travel Management	Yes	No	Travel routes exist on the CCD; however they would not be affected by the Proposed Action or Alternatives. Therefore, travel management will not be further analyzed in this document as all work would be done via helicopter since there are no roads to the site.
Vegetation	Yes	No	The Proposed Action would have minimal disturbance to the vegetative community therefore no further analysis is required.
Visual Resources	Yes	Yes	See Section 3.3.4.
Wild Horses and Burros	Yes	No	The proposed action is located within the North Stillwater Herd Management Area (HMA); however the project is not anticipated to have an effect on the wild horse population. Horses may be displaced by the sound of the helicopter but would return to the area after the helicopter has left. The microwave relay has a small foot print and would have a negligible impact on any wild horses in the area; therefore no further analysis is required.
Global Climate Change	Yes	No	There is a public and scientific debate about human-caused contributions to global climate change, no methodology currently exists to correlate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and to what extent these contributions would contribute to such climate change.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Yes	No	There would be negligible contribution of GHG-produced from the proposed action.

March 2012

***Resources or uses determined to be Not Present or Present/Not Affected need not be carried forward or discussed further in the document.*

Resources or uses determined to be Present/May Be Affected may be carried forward in the document.

3.3 Land with Wilderness Characteristics

Wilderness characteristics are resource values that include naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. All BLM lands, including those in the project area, were inventoried for wilderness characteristics in 1979 and 1980 as directed under Section 603 of FLPMA. Lands found to have wilderness characteristics in the original 1979 and 1980 inventories were subsequently designated as either Wilderness Areas (WAs) or WSAs. The CCD wilderness inventory was conducted in 1979 and 1980 in accordance with BLM's Wilderness Study Policy: "Policies, Criteria and Guidelines for Conducting Wilderness Studies on Public Lands (47 CFR §5098-5122)".

Section 201 of FLPMA requires the BLM to maintain an inventory of BLM-administered public lands to determine whether they possess wilderness characteristics. Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

(LWCs) are lands that have been inventoried and determined by the BLM to contain wilderness characteristics as defined in Section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act. In order for an area to be classified as LWC, it must possess sufficient size (more than 5,000 acres), naturalness, and outstanding opportunities for either solitude and/or primitive and unconfined recreation.

To comply with this directive, the CCD recently completed review of the original LWC findings throughout the District as part of the Resource Management Plan revision. The site of the proposed action falls within the original inventory polygon CCD LWC NV-030-142. During the original inventory, this polygon was dropped from further wilderness consideration due to the number of roads and human intrusions that were noted. This polygon was re-evaluated in 2014 by the LWC interdisciplinary team and it was determined that the polygon does not meet the guidelines for designation as lands with wilderness characteristics. The assessment forms and polygon map can be found in Appendix 10.

3.4 RESOURCES PRESENT AND BROUGHT FORWARD FOR ANALYSIS (All Resources)

The following resources are present in the area and may be affected by the Proposed Action. The description of the Affected Environment for the No Action Alternative would be the same as that for the Proposed Action.

3.4.1 Migratory Birds

Affected Environment

On January 11, 2001, President Clinton signed Executive Order 13186, which placed emphasis on the conservation and management of migratory birds. Migratory birds are protected under the MBTA of 1918, and the Executive Order addresses the responsibilities of federal agencies to protect them by taking actions to implement the MBTA. BLM management for these species is based on IM 2008-050 dated December 18, 2007.

The NV Comprehensive Bird Conservation Plan (2010) and the USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) (2008) were used to determine which avian species known to occur, or could potentially occur, within and out to 1.61 km (1 mile) of the proposed project area have been classified as priority species by the USFWS and/or the state of NV. The ecological tenet underlying the process is that actions focused on priority species would impact other avian species that utilize similar habitats.

The habitat within the proposed project area consists of rocky terrain with a single-leaf pinyon pine (*Pinus monophylla*) and juniper (*Juniperus spp.*) overstory, with pockets of rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus spp.*) and Wyoming big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata ssp. wyomingensis*) in the understory. Table 4 below lists priority avian species that are known to occur, or could potentially occur, within and out to 1.61 km (1 mile) of the proposed project area.

Table 4: The Nevada Comprehensive Bird Conservation Plan (2010) and the USFWS BCC (2008) priority species that occur, or could potentially occur, within and out to 1.61 km (1 mile) of the proposed project area. .

Species	Notes
Golden Eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)	The bird feeds on a variety of small mammals, snakes, birds, juvenile ungulates, and carrion. Nests are generally constructed on rock ledges or in large trees (WAPT 2012).
Lewis’s Woodpecker (<i>Melanerpes lewis</i>)	The bird is a cavity nester that uses dead aspen, cottonwood, and pinyon trees (Neel 1999).

Species	Notes
Loggerhead Shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>)	Loggerhead shrikes nest in isolated trees or large shrubs and use scattered, tall shrubs and fences as perches to feed on a variety of prey, which includes small birds, lizards, and mice (Neel 1999).
Pinyon Jay (<i>Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus</i>)	Pinyon jays are known as semi-colonial nesters and pinyon pine woodland obligates (Neel 1999).
Prairie Falcon (<i>Falco mexicanus</i>)	Nests are generally constructed on the ledges of rocky cliffs, but prairie falcons will also nest in trees utilizing old hawk and raven nests. Prairie falcon populations are strongly correlated with the populations of ground squirrels and other small mammals (GBBO 2010).

Environmental Consequences

Implementing the Proposed Action would result in the permanent loss of up to 1.5 acres of foraging and/or nesting habitat for the avian species listed in Table 4. Noise generated during the construction phase and maintenance of the site (including helicopter landings) could result in migratory birds avoiding areas greater than the actual disturbance area. To reduce the likelihood of mortality to breeding birds and the destruction of their nests, the mitigation below would be implemented when surface disturbing activities (during both the construction phase and general maintenance) are to take place.

- If surface disturbing activities need to occur during the bird nesting season (March 1 through July 31 for raptors and April 1 through July 31 for all other species), a pre-construction site survey by a qualified biologist will be required. The exact area to be surveyed will be determined by BLM based on the scope of the surface disturbing activity. The survey must be done no more than fourteen (14) days before start of surface disturbing activities. If it is determined that nesting birds are present, a BLM approved buffer zone (generally 250 foot buffers for passerine species, buffers for raptor species will vary) will be established and maintained until a qualified biologist has determined that the young birds have fledged or the nest has failed.

Migratory birds could potentially collide with the communication tower (including its support braces) and its associated structures (e.g. photo-voltaic battery charging system). Furthermore, the communication tower, which would extend above the existing vegetation within and around the proposed project area, would create an artificial perching and nesting site for raptors and ravens. Non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation emitted by communication towers has been correlated with nest and site abandonment, decreased productivity, plumage deterioration, and reduced survivorship for birds utilizing areas around communication towers (Balmori 2005, Balmori and Hallberg 2007, and Everaert and Bauwens 2007). Although the Proposed Action could impact individual migratory birds, there should not be significant negative impacts to local and regional populations.

3.4.2 BLM Sensitive Species

Affected Environment

BLM sensitive species are defined by BLM Manual 6840 as species that normally occur on Bureau administered lands for which the Agency has the capability to significantly affect the conservation status of the species through management. The State Director may designate additional categories of special status species as appropriate and applicable to his or her state's needs. The sensitive species designation may include such native species as those that:

- Could become endangered in or extirpated from a state, or within a significant portion of its distribution in the foreseeable future,
- Are under status review by USFWS and/or National Marine Fisheries Service,
- Are undergoing significant current or predicted downward trends in habitat capability that would reduce a species' existing distribution,
- Are undergoing significant current or predicted downward trends in population or density, such that federally listed, proposed, candidate, or state listed status may become necessary,
- Have typically small and widely dispersed populations,
- Inhabit ecological refugia, specialized, or unique habitats, or
- Are state listed but which may be better conserved through the application of BLM sensitive species status.

The habitat within the proposed project area consists of rocky terrain with a single-leaf pinyon pine and juniper overstory, with pockets of rabbitbrush and Wyoming big sagebrush in the understory. No riparian areas occur within the proposed project area. BLM sensitive species that are known to occur, or have the potential to occur, within the proposed project area are depicted in Table 5 below.

Table 5: BLM sensitive species that occur, or could potentially occur, within the proposed project area for foraging and/or breeding.

Species	Notes
Avian	
Golden Eagle	Habitat described in the Migratory Birds Section. The closest known eagle nest to the proposed project area is approximately 1.5 miles to the southwest. Multiple areas that function as suitable golden eagle nesting habitat (cliff faces) occur within five miles of the proposed project area.
Lewis's Woodpecker	Habitat described in the Migratory Birds Section.
Loggerhead Shrike	Habitat described in the Migratory Birds Section.
Pinyon Jay	Habitat described in the Migratory Birds Section.
Mammals	
California Myotis (<i>Myotis californicus</i>)	The species is found in a variety of habitats in Nevada, which includes lowland riparian, desert scrub, sagebrush steppe, montane grassland, pinyon-juniper woodland, and mixed-conifer. Mines, caves, rock crevices, and hollow trees are used as roosting sites, and small moths, flies, and beetles comprise the majority of their diet (Bradley et al. 2006).
Desert Bighorn Sheep (<i>Ovis Canadensis Nelsoni</i>)	Desert bighorn sheep prefer rough, rocky, and steep terrain; require freestanding water in the summer months or during drought; and eat a variety of grasses, shrubs, and forbs. The habitat within the proposed project area is classified as year-round habitat by the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW).
Little Brown Myotis (<i>Myotis lucifugus</i>)	The bat primarily forages on aquatic insects such as caddis flies, midges, and mayflies (WAPT 2012).
Long-Eared Myotis (<i>Myotis evotis</i>)	The species is predominately found in coniferous forests and gleans prey off of foliage, tree trunks, rocks, and the ground (WAPT 2012).
Pallid Bat (<i>Antrozous pallidus</i>)	Pallid bats are found throughout Nevada in low to mid elevations in habitats that include pinyon-juniper, blackbrush, creosote, sagebrush, and salt desert scrub. Foraging occurs both in vegetation and on the ground surface, and the bat's diet primarily consists of ground-dwelling arthropods (Bradley et al. 2006).
Spotted Bat	Spotted bats display a scattered distribution within Nevada, as their

Species	Notes
<i>(Euderma maculatum)</i>	distribution is closely associated to the availability of cliff-roosting sites. The species has been found in pinyon-juniper, sagebrush, and riparian areas that range from 540-2,130 m (1,772-6,988 ft.) in elevation (Bradley et al. 2006).
Townsend's Big-eared Bat <i>(Corynorhinus townsendii)</i>	Townsend's big-eared bats are highly adaptable and inhabit a variety of habitats in Nevada that range from 210-3,500 m (689-11,483 ft.) in elevation. Primary threats to the species includes disturbance during the hibernation and maternity periods (Bradley et al. 2006).

The rocky, pinyon-juniper habitat does function as suitable foraging and/or day roosting sites for the sensitive bat species listed in Table 5. No sites that could function as a maternity roost or hibernaculum are known to occur within the proposed project area.

Environmental Consequences

General impacts to BLM sensitive species and their habitat are the same as described in the Wildlife Section.

Implementing the Proposed Action would result in the loss of up to 1.5 acres of habitat for bighorn sheep. Furthermore, noise generated during the construction phase and maintenance of the site (including helicopter landings) could result in bighorn sheep avoiding areas greater than the actual disturbance area. Due to the amount of bighorn sheep habitat within the Stillwater Range, the impacts from the Proposed Action would be minimal.

Implementing the Proposed Action would result in the loss of up to 1.5 acres of pinyon-juniper roosting and foraging habitat for the sensitive bat species listed in Table 5. This loss of habitat is considered negligible due to the amount of pinyon-juniper roosting and foraging habitat adjacent to the proposed project area within the Stillwater Range. Noise generated during the construction phase and maintenance of the site (including helicopter landings) could result in sensitive bat species avoiding areas greater than the actual disturbance area. Furthermore, bats could potentially collide with the communication tower and its associated structures (e.g. photo-voltaic battery charging system).

Impacts to the BLM sensitive avian species listed in Table 5 are the same as described in the Migratory Birds Section.

For the BLM sensitive species listed in Table 5, implementing the Proposed Action could impact some individuals but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or significantly impact local or regional populations.

3.4.3 Wildlife (General)

Affected Environment

The habitat within and immediately adjacent to the proposed project area consists of rocky terrain with a pinyon pine and juniper overstory, with pockets of rabbitbrush and Wyoming big sagebrush in the understory. No riparian areas occur within the proposed project area.

According to the NDOW, pronghorn (*Antilocapra Americana*) and mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) year-round habitat occurs within and immediately adjacent to the proposed project area. Additional wildlife observed within and adjacent to the proposed project area include coyotes (*Canis latrans*), mountain lions (*Puma concolor*), desert cottontails (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), desert woodrats (*Neotoma lepida*), least chipmunks (*Neotamias minimus*), little pocket mice (*Perognathus longimembris*), Great

Basin gopher snakes (*Pituophis catenifer deserticola*), western fence lizards (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), Great Basin collared lizards (*Crotaphytus bicinctores*), Great Basin rattlesnakes (*Crotalus oreganus lutosus*), and ravens (*Corvus corax*).

Environmental Consequences

Implementing the Proposed Action would result in the permanent loss of up to 1.5 acres of primarily pinyon-juniper wildlife habitat. Surface disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action, such as digging the utility trench, leveling the ground where the tower and batteries would be placed, and digging holes for concrete piers, has the potential to result in the spread of invasive/nonnative species in and around the disturbed areas. Noise generated during the construction phase and maintenance of the site (including helicopter landings) could result in wildlife avoiding areas greater than the actual disturbance area. Also during the construction and maintenance phases, there is the potential of direct mortality to wildlife. Birds and bats could potentially collide with the communication tower and its associated structures (e.g. photo-voltaic battery charging system). Furthermore, the communication tower, which would extend above the existing vegetation within and around the proposed project area, would function as an artificial perching and nesting site for raptors and ravens.

3.4.4 Visual Resources

Affected Environment

The project site is located along a rugged ridgeline in the northern part of the Stillwater Range past the north end of the Stillwater Wilderness study area near Cotton Peak. The landscape at the higher elevations is dominated by trees such as pinyon pine and juniper; and low shrubs such as big sage and rabbit brush with sporadic rocky outcrops with sparse vegetation along rugged slopes. The lower elevations along the toe of the slope are dominated by desert scrub brush and cheat grass. At higher elevations, colors are comprised of dark greens from the pinyon-junipers as well as grays and whites from the sporadic rock outcrops and talus slopes. The lower elevations are dominated by tans and yellows.

From both of the Key Observation Points (KOP) chosen for this project, the viewshed can be divided into three distinct boundaries: the foreground, middle ground and background. The foreground consists of flat sandy soils sparsely populated with salt desert scrub with predominate colors of yellow, and light tans. The middle ground is comprised of rolling hills covered with cheat grass with a smooth texture and yellow and tan colors. The background consists of rugged terrain comprised of small ridges and canyons that provide dark and light contrasts from shadows with predominant colors of dark greens and grays.

The area surrounding the project site is basically natural in character, but is also influenced by disturbances such as roads and 4-wheel drive trails that are used by off road enthusiasts, old mining explorations and an existing communications tower with associated solar panels and battery boxes. One cattle ranch is located at the base of range below the tower site though binoculars were required to locate the existing tower from this property. This area is not heavily visited by the general public and the site itself is not directly accessible by roads.

Past decisions pertaining to VRM objectives throughout the District in previous land use plans were not complete and did not extend to the area of the proposed project. Because of this, the VRM objectives have not been assigned and the project area is considered to be unclassified. In cases such as this, the Carson City CRMP standard operating procedure states that an interim VRM objective is to be assigned at the time a project is proposed.

After a review of the Visual Resource Inventory (VRI) and assessment of the current resource use and activities in the area, the ID Team provided a recommendation to the Authorized Officer to assign the project area an interim rating of VRM Class III to allow for management decisions consistent with the resource allocation for the area as well as provide for the protection of resources and resource uses, until such time as the permanent designation is assigned through the Decision Record of the RMP. The objectives for VRM Class III are to partially retain the existing character of the landscape while allowing a moderate level of change to the landscape from permitted or authorized activities. These activities or developments may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Attempts are made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, color, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements and forms found in the natural landscape.

The VRI, which provides the baseline data used in establishing VRM objectives, was completed for the District in 2011 and used to establish the interim VRM objectives for this project (refer to Map, Visual Resource Inventory Polygons, in Appendix 9). The VRI inventory Class in the project area is identified as VRI Class III.

Environmental Consequences

Surface disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action, such as digging the utility trench, digging holes for concrete piers and leveling the ground where the tower legs and batteries boxes would be placed, have the potential to result in a negative effect on the visual or scenic quality of the project area. However, since the site is seldom if ever visited by the general public and the roads most likely traveled by the public are a considerable distance from the site, the degree of change to the existing environment is not expected to be noticeable. A visual contrast rating analysis from KOP 1 along Stillwater Road shows that the tower would not be seen since the scale of the range would dwarf the tower. No lights or reflectors would be used at the site. Based upon the assessments completed at two Key Observation Points (KOPs), this alternative would be in conformance with VRM guidelines and policy for VRM Class III designation. See Appendix 9, for the Visual Contrast Ratings Worksheets and Photo Logs for the analysis the proposed project may have on visual quality.

To comply with the guidelines for VRM Class III designated areas, the following mitigation measures are proposed for the project:

1. All new structures should be painted using dark greens or dark browns similar to Beetle, Juniper Green, or Shadow Gray as found on the BLM Standard Environmental Color Chart CC-001 to reduce visibility from areas most likely to be viewed by the public.
2. Microwave dish (and covers) should be painted similar dark colors as long as this does not conflict with aviation guidelines, since this will be the most visible part of the structures.
3. Vegetation removed during construction phase should be used as vertical mulching on any areas with surface disturbance
4. Surface disturbance should be kept to the minimum required to install equipment. Surface disturbance on side slopes on edge of ridge should be avoided.
5. Maintenance on existing structures should include painting with similar dark colors when necessary to reduce the cumulative impacts of the site.

3.5 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the new Right of Way, and the Navy would not be allowed to utilize the Cotton Peak area to place a new communication relay and helicopter landing zone on BLM-administered land for the proposed construction activities. The current ROW and equipment would continue to be utilized and the ranges would begin to suffer at the current equipment begins to degrade which could lead to a break in communication. With a break in communication the training that

is currently being held in these areas would not be able to continue. The current helicopter pad is very close to the mountainside and existing equipment. This would result in dangerous conditions if flight conditions are not perfect.

The impacts would be the same as they currently are to migratory birds, BLM sensitive species, and other wildlife on BLM-administered land, as the Navy already has a communication relay and helicopter landing area less than 150 ft. away from the proposed location. The No Action Alternative would have no effect on visual resources since the project would not be authorized.

4.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The purpose of the cumulative impacts analysis for the proposed action is to evaluate the combined, incremental effects of human activity within the scope of the project. Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations defines scope to include connected actions, cumulative actions, and similar actions (40 CFR 1508.25). The CEQ formally defines cumulative impacts as follows:

“...the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably 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’ (40 CFR 1508.7).”

For the purposes of this EA, the cumulative impacts are the sum of all past, present (including proposed actions), and reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFAs) resulting primarily from communication sites. The purpose of the cumulative analysis in this EA is to evaluate the significance of the Proposed Action’s contributions to cumulative environment.

As required under the NEPA and the regulations implementing NEPA, this chapter addresses those cumulative effects on the environmental resources in the Cumulative Effects Study Areas (CESAs) which could result from the implementation of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative, past actions, present actions, and RFFAs. The extent of the CESA varies by resource based on the geographic or biological limits of that resource. Unless otherwise stated below for each resource, the CESA for the project is considered a two-mile buffer around the project area.

For the purposes of this analysis and under federal regulations, ‘impacts’ and ‘effects’ are assumed to have the same meaning and are interchangeable.

4.1 PAST, PRESENT AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTIONS

The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions applicable to the CESA are identified as the following:

Table 5: Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

Project -- Name or Description	Status (x)		
	Past	Present	Future
Issuance of multiple use decisions and grazing permits for ranching operations through the allotment evaluation process and the reassessment of the associated allotments.	X	X	X
Livestock grazing.	X	X	X
Invasive weed inventory/treatments.	X	X	X
Recreation	X	X	X
Mineral exploration/geothermal exploration/abandoned mine land reclamation	X	X	X
Mineral Material Disposals	X	X	X
Range Improvements (including fencing, wells, and water developments)	X	X	X
Utility and other ROWs	X	X	X

4.1.1 Migratory Birds

The CESA for migratory birds is defined as a two mile buffer around the proposed project area. Within the CESA boundary, some of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (as stated in Table 5) would most likely have beneficial impacts on migratory birds , while other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions may have detrimental impacts on migratory birds. The Proposed Action should have negligible impacts on migratory birds when combined with the impacts from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions within a two mile buffer of the proposed project area.

4.1.2 Sensitive Species

The CESA for sensitive species is defined as a two mile buffer around the proposed project area. Within the CESA boundary, some of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (as stated in Table 5) would most likely have beneficial impacts on sensitive species , while other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions may have detrimental impacts on sensitive species. The Proposed Action should have negligible impacts on sensitive species when combined with the impacts from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions within a two mile buffer of the proposed project area.

4.1.3 Wildlife

The CESA for wildlife is defined as a two mile buffer around the proposed project area. Within the CESA boundary, some of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (as stated in Table 5) would most likely have beneficial impacts on the pinyon-juniper habitat used by wildlife, while other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions may have detrimental impacts on the pinyon-juniper habitat. The Proposed Action should have negligible impacts to the pinyon-juniper habitat used by wildlife when combined with the impacts from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions within a two mile buffer of the proposed project area.

4.1.4 Visual Resources

The Proposed Action should have minimal impacts to the visual or scenic resources of the area surrounding the project site. The potential to introduce contrasting elements of line, form, color or texture from the construction of the tower is negligible when analyzing the scale of the project since the height of the tower would blend in with the existing pinyon juniper vegetation and not stand out on the horizon, which is typically the primary concern with the installation of towers. The nearest road, which is infrequently traveled by the public, is the graded Stillwater Road that runs parallel to the Stillwater mountain range. This road is located nine linear miles from the site. The proposed project would add an additional tower and related infrastructure adjacent to an existing similar tower, but this existing tower is not visible from Stillwater Road even with the aid of binoculars. No other projects are proposed or exist in this area.

4.1.5 Other Resources

All resources have been evaluated for cumulative incremental impacts when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Impacts from the Proposed Action would be minimal in nature and take place on open land, and staging areas are located within existing areas. The impacts analyzed to resources and resource uses in Chapter 3 of this EA have very minimal impacts due to the remote and self-contained nature of the Project. There would be minimal trips for construction, and no additional trips required for maintenance of the communication relays. Therefore, cumulative impacts are determined to be negligible as a result of the Proposed Action.

5.0 PERSONS, GROUPS, AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

5.1 LIST OF PREPARERS

5.1.1 Bureau of Land Management

NAME	TITLE	PROJECT EXPERTISE
Angelica Rose	Planning & Environmental Coordinator, Military Liaison	NEPA, Military Liaison
Matt Simons	Realty Specialist	Lands and Realty
Jason Wright	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, Native American Religious Concerns
Linda Appel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland Resources, Wild Horses and Burros; Vegetation
Chris Kula	Wildlife Biologist	General Wildlife, T&E and Sensitive Plant and Animal Species, Migratory Birds
Dan Westermeyer	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation and Visitor Services, Visual Resources Management, Wilderness/WSA
Michelle Stropky	Hydrologist	Soils, Water Resources, Air Quality

5.1.2 Naval Air Station, Fallon

NAME	TITLE	PROJECT EXPERTISE
Nathan Arcoraci	NEPA Coordinator	NEPA Compliance
Becky Kurtz	RCRA/MR/IR Compliance	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid, General Oversight and Coordination
Robin Michel	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Paleontological Resources, Native American Religious Concerns
Anna Keyzers	Natural Resource Specialist	Rangeland Resources, Wildlife, Vegetation
Gary Cottle	Natural Resource Specialist	Rangeland Resources, Wildlife, Vegetation

5.2 PERSONS, GROUPS, OR AGENCIES CONSULTED

NAME	AGENCY	PROJECT EXPERTISE
Alvin Moyle	Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribe	Tribal Chairman
Rebecca Palmer	Nevada State Historic Preservation Office Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources	Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer.
Timothy M. Herrick	State of Nevada Department of Wildlife	Biologist
Eric S. Miskow	State of Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources Nevada Natural Heritage Program	Biologist/ Data Manager

6.0 REFERENCES

Balmori, A. 2005. Possible effects of electromagnetic fields from phone masts on a population of White Stork (*Ciconia ciconia*). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 24: 109-119.

Balmori, A., and O. Hallberg. 2007. The urban decline of the House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): a possible link with electromagnetic radiation. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 26:141-151.

Bradley, P.V., M.J. O'Farrell, J.A. Williams, and J.E. Newmark. Editors. 2006. The Revised Nevada Bat Conservation Plan. Nevada Bat Working Group. Reno, Nevada. 216 pp.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2001a. Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan. Carson City, Nevada.

_____. 2008a. National Environmental Policy Act Handbook H-1790-1. January 2008.

Everaert, J., and D. Bauwens. 2007. A possible effect of electromagnetic radiation from mobile phone base stations on the number of breeding House Sparrows (*Passer domesticus*). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 26:63-72.

Great Basin Bird Observatory (GBBO). 2010. Nevada Comprehensive Bird Conservation Plan, ver. 1.0. Great Basin Bird Observatory, Reno, NV. Available online at www.gbbo.org/bird_conservation_plan.html

Neel, L.A. 1999. Nevada Partners in Flight Bird Conservation Plan. <http://www.partnersinflight.org/bcps/plan/pl-nv-10.pdf>

Nevada Natural Heritage Program, 2014. Data Request Endangered, Threatened, Candidate, and/or At Risk Plant and Animal Taxa. March 5, 2014.

Nevada Department of Wildlife, 2014. Data Request Wildlife Resources. March 4, 2014

Wildlife Action Plan Team (WAPT). 2012. Nevada Wildlife Action Plan. Nevada Department of Wildlife, Reno.

7.0 APPENDICES

- Appendix 1. Maps showing project area and overall proposal modifications photos, and conceptual design of equipment
- Appendix 2. Right Of Way 1986
- Appendix 3. Nevada Department of Wildlife response to Cotton Peak Communication Site
- Appendix 4. Nevada Natural Heritage Program Letter of response for Endangered, threatened, candidate, and at risk plant and animal taxa records.
- Appendix 5. Nevada BLM Special Status Species List for the Carson City District
- Appendix 6. Letter to State of Nevada State Historic Preservation Office
- Appendix 7. State of Nevada State Historic Preservation Office Letter of response.
- Appendix 8. Letter to Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
- Appendix 9: Visual Resource Management Maps and Worksheets
- Appendix 10: Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Maps and Worksheets