

Executive Summary

Background

Project Area

The Middle Kyle Complex is located in the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest within the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area (SMNRA). The project area is approximately 35 miles northwest of Las Vegas, Nevada and encompasses approximately 4,300 acres along Kyle Canyon Road (Nevada State Route [SR] 157). An additional area of approximately 4,900 acres located outside the project area is proposed to be closed to dispersed camping under an administrative action the Forest Service is considering as part of the Middle Kyle Complex project.

History of the Analysis

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service (Forest Service) conducted pre-National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) public involvement during 2004 and 2005 to identify potential land use options and new opportunities for conservation, recreation, and environmental education. The result was the planning document titled *Middle Kyle Canyon Framework Plan*, dated August 2005. Based on feedback from the public, three options were narrowed to a preferred option. This preferred option was presented in the Notice of Intent (NOI) as the Proposed Action for evaluation under the NEPA process.

In February 2006, an NOI to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) was published in the *Federal Register* (FR). In April 2008, the Proposed Action was modified to include replacement of the existing water main from the Rainbow Subdivision water meter to Kyle Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Camp and reconstruction of the Kyle Canyon Campground. A scoping notice was distributed by mail and posted on the project Web site for this modification to the Proposed Action. The notice was mailed to individuals and agencies that provided comments or expressions of interest on the NOI, individuals that may be affected or interested in the project, and some additional stakeholders.

On October 2, 2009, the Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Middle Kyle Complex Draft EIS (DEIS) was published in the FR. The DEIS was posted on the project Web site and distributed to interested individuals, federal agencies,

federally recognized tribes, state and local governments, and organizations. The DEIS was available for public review and comment for a period of 45 days, beginning October 2, 2009, and ending on November 16, 2009. Appendix A, *Response to Public Comment*, of this EIS includes the comment letters received during the comment period and the Forest Service responses to those comments.

Purpose of and Need for Action

Three need-for-action statements were identified. The need-for-action statements are presented first, followed by the purpose of the action.

- There is a need to provide new SMNRA recreation facilities and visitor services that: a) respond to anticipated increased SMNRA recreation demands from population growth in Las Vegas and Clark County; b) respond to future types of public recreation activities and trends; c) direct recreation users to less congested areas of the SMNRA and into developed recreation sites; and d) are outside of upper Kyle, Lee, and Deer Creek Canyons to reduce natural resource impacts on major concentrations of plant and wildlife species of concern.
 - To provide a diverse range of additional recreation opportunities that are socially, financially, and environmentally sustainable to the extent practicable and will attract visitors away from the sensitive upper Kyle, Lee, and Deer Creek Canyons. To reduce visitor impacts on major concentrations of plant and wildlife species of concern by providing a comprehensive destination visitor facility near the entrance to the SMNRA that will be readily accessible to the maximum number of SMNRA visitors.
- There is a need for relocating Forest Service fire and administrative facilities outside upper Kyle Canyon.
 - To provide Forest Service fire and administrative facilities in a secure, accessible location that would be less visible to the public; provide adequate work facilities and room for expansion; improve communications between agencies; provide more employee housing; preserve sensitive species habitat; preserve the historic setting of the Kyle CCC Camp; enhance the visitor experience; and be readily accessible to the Kyle Canyon and Deer Creek areas of the SMNRA.
- There is a need for providing improved visitor information and environmental interpretation.
 - To provide a focused destination for visitors to the SMNRA with multiple opportunities for on-site environmental interpretation and information that promotes visitor understanding and appreciation through a variety of methods and reflects the Forest Service's unique identity.

Significant Issue

The Forest Service identified the following issue to be analyzed in detail.

Spring Mountains Acastus Checkerspot Butterfly (*Chlosyne acastus robusta*)

Construction and use of the proposed Kyle Canyon Wash Trail from the Village to Kyle Canyon Campground through Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly habitat may adversely impact this species (designated as Forest Service sensitive species, Clark County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan [MSHCP] covered species, Conservation Agreement [CA] for the SMNRA species of concern, and SMNRA Landscape Analysis [LA] Tier 1 Special Status Species). The indicators used to compare between alternatives include the measure of permanent and temporary loss of Spring Mountains acastus checkerspot butterfly habitat (in acres). The potential loss of habitat is measured as the amount of known foraging and mate selection habitat within the project area that would be impacted temporarily (during construction) and permanently (during operations) due to the project. These indicators are tracked by analysis conducted for the evaluation of the alternatives.

Alternatives

The EIS considers three alternatives in detail: Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative) (current management), Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), and Alternative 3 (Market Supported Alternative).

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative represents the existing conditions in the Middle Kyle Complex project area (project area). Forest Service management presence in the project area would remain near current levels. Camping and picnicking would continue to occur at developed and dispersed sites within the project area. Hiking, mountain biking, snow play, and equestrian and off-highway vehicle (OHV) use would continue on limited designated routes and for the most part on user created routes. The Kyle Canyon Interim Visitor Center would continue as the primary source of visitor information. Existing Forest Service administrative facilities would remain in the same location and existing conditions in this area would persist. Forest Service permitted occupancies would remain in their existing locations. Permitted outfitter guide activities in the area would continue.

The 128-acre former golf course property would undergo limited restoration to a more natural state. The existing asphalt parking lot may be used as a fire command post.

Unauthorized activities, such as illegal dumping of trash, vandalism of cultural sites, and creation of unauthorized trails and roads would continue. Opportunities to reduce resource impacts in the upper canyon area and to improve environmental information, interpretative facilities, and the visitor experience in the SMNRA would remain the same. Recreation opportunities and facilities would be unchanged. Demand for recreational facilities, environmental interpretation, and information is anticipated to continue to increase as SMNRA visitation increases.

Alternative 2 – Proposed Action

The Forest Service would construct and operate new recreational and visitor facilities. The existing interim visitor center would be relocated outside of the project area. Non historic structures would be removed and the historic CCC structures renovated and managed for public use as a historic site. Additional public parking would be constructed at the Kyle CCC Camp and Fletcher Canyon Trailhead. The existing Kyle Canyon Campground would be reconstructed with upgraded restroom facilities and camp sites to meet Forest Service Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Guidelines to the extent practicable.

New visitor facilities would be constructed on the site of the former golf course property including a new visitor center with classrooms and a separate building with space for meeting rooms, retail shops and food vendors. Additional visitor amenities would include a plaza area, landscaped open space, amphitheater, outdoor classroom and additional parking (underground and surface). A biomass facility would heat and cool the visitor facilities.

Additional campgrounds and picnic areas would be constructed. The traditional Forest Service-style campgrounds would include recreational vehicle (RV) and tent sites. An equestrian campground is proposed as are large and small group campgrounds. New picnic sites would also accommodate large groups. A registration area with camp store and an RV dump station would be included.

Proposed recreational facilities and uses include trail systems throughout the project area along with new trailheads for hiking, biking, and equestrian use. New paved trails would be included and link the western project area to the eastern extent. An OHV trailhead would be constructed providing access to existing routes designated for motorized use outside of the project area. Equestrian and mountain bike rental buildings/concessions would also be constructed.

Forest Service administrative facilities would be relocated from the upper canyon area. Proposed facilities would include space for administration, warehouse, and maintenance. The same facility would provide space for an interagency fire facility including Nevada Department of Forestry (NDF) and Clark County Fire Department (CCFD) in addition to the Forest Service fire crews. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police (Las Vegas Metro) facility would be relocated adjacent to the Forest Service administrative/interagency fire facility. Two helipads would be constructed as would Forest Service employee housing, concessionaire office

and research center. A biomass facility would heat and cool the administrative facilities.

Abandoned areas, the former golf course property, trails and roads would be restored according to the vegetation management and treatment plan. Unauthorized user created roads and trails would be closed and restored as would the designated motorized trails in the project area. National Forest System (NFS) roads and unpaved motorized routes¹ would be improved, paved, converted to non-motorized trails or closed and restored. SR 157 would be improved for safety and to facilitate traffic movement at the primary highway intersections. A portion of Harris Springs Road would be paved.

The Forest Service may also implement an administrative action that encompasses approximately 4,900 acres and extends outside of the project area. The administrative action would prohibit dispersed camping within 300 feet on either side of Forest Service roads and trails open to motorized vehicles, trailheads, county roads, and state highways within the Lee Canyon, Kyle Canyon, and Deer Creek areas of the SMNRA, including connecting and tributary Forest Service routes.

Alternative 3 – Market Supported Alternative

Under the Market Supported Alternative a similar range of developed recreation and visitor facilities as proposed in the Proposed Action would be implemented, but the facilities would be constructed with a smaller capacity and include recreation facilities that were found to be supported by market analysis. The primary exceptions that would or would not be implemented compared to the Proposed Action are described below.

Fletcher Canyon Trailhead on SR 157 would be relocated and additional public parking spaces would be built off the highway. New visitor facilities would be reduced in capacity with limited retail, a café and surface parking.

The Kyle Canyon Campground reconstruction would include camp cabins. New camping facilities would include a commercial style campground capable of accommodating Class A RVs and an individual RV/tent campground (traditional Forest Service style). The commercial-style campground would include camp cabins. Additional amenities may include a Laundromat, Frisbee golf, splash pad, multiuse playing fields, a playground and small amphitheater. Proposed picnic facilities would include one group site. An equestrian campground would not be implemented.

New visitor facilities may be constructed on both sides of SR 157 as the “main street” of the Village area. A roundabout or other traffic calming devices would be constructed to reduce highway traffic speeds through this area.

¹ The term “route” refers to both trails and roads, e.g., motorized routes would include both NFS roads and trails designated for motor vehicle use.

The equestrian and mountain bike rental buildings/concessions and the OHV trailhead would not be constructed. Harris Springs Road and the trailheads west of Harris Springs Road would not be paved. However, a trail bridge over the slot canyon would be built.

Forest Service administrative facilities would include separate buildings for the administrative office and warehouse, interagency fire facility (Forest Service, NDF, and CCFD) and interagency law enforcement facility (Forest Service, Las Vegas Metro and Nevada Highway Patrol). Other proposed facilities include one new helipad and a wildlife rehabilitation facility. Biomass facilities are not proposed at either the Forest Service administrative facilities or at the new visitor facilities.

Environmental Consequences

The comparison of alternatives draws together the conclusions from the information and discussion presented throughout this EIS and briefly summarizes the results of the analysis. The primary consequences of the alternatives are outlined in Table ES-1 below.

Forest Service's Preferred Alternative

The Forest Service's Preferred Alternative is Alternative 3 (Market Supported Alternative). The Record of Decision will identify the Selected Alternative with any modifications.

Table ES-1. Comparison of Alternatives Described in the EIS

	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Market Supported Alternative
RECREATION			
Quantity and Diversity of Recreation	<p>This alternative provides visitors to the project area with the lowest quantity and diversity of recreation facilities.</p> <p>Picnicking would continue to occur in developed and dispersed areas.</p> <p>Kyle Canyon Campground would not be reconstructed.</p> <p>Fletcher Canyon Trail (1.6 miles) and trailhead would be maintained.</p>	<p>This alternative offers an increased diversity of recreation opportunities in developed settings with group picnic and campgrounds, an equestrian campground, OHV trailhead and 48 miles of non-motorized multi-use trails. Equestrian and mountain bike rental facilities would also be available.</p>	<p>This alternative offers a diverse range of developed recreation opportunities however the capacity of the facilities would be smaller. Facilities proposed include one group picnic site, no group campgrounds, camp cabins, a commercial campground capable of accommodating Class A RVs, no OHV trailhead and 44 miles of non-motorized multiuse trails. Rental facilities are not included.</p>
	<p>Dispersed camping would continue alongside roads and motorized trails.</p>	<p>The Forest Service may implement an administrative action that would prohibit dispersed camping within 300 feet on either side of Forest Service roads and trails open to motorized vehicles, trailheads, county roads, and state highways within the Lee Canyon, Kyle Canyon, and Deer Creek areas of the SMNRA, including connecting and tributary Forest Service routes such as those in the Macks Canyon and Harris Springs areas.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action.</p>
	<p>Unauthorized trails and roads would remain undesignated and may be closed as necessary to reduce or prevent resource damage.</p> <p>Hunting and trapping would continue to occur in the project area, as permitted by Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) and Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). Recreational shooting of firearms (e.g., target practice) would continue to occur.</p>	<p>Opportunities for dispersed unmanaged recreation activities in undefined areas in the project area would be reduced. Much of that use would be redirected to the developed facilities proposed for construction, while some users would likely be displaced to other areas of the SMNRA. Shooting of firearms would also be redirected to other areas of the SMNRA as permitted by NDOW and NRS due to the prohibition on discharging firearms near developed recreation and Forest Service facilities. Hunting and trapping within the project area would continue as permitted by NDOW and the NRS and as allowed under 36 CFR 261Subpart A 261.10 (d)(1and 2).</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action.</p>

	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Market Supported Alternative
Safety and Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities and the Elderly	<p>Visitor safety and accessibility are compromised due to the unstructured nature of the recreation facilities and uses. Many of the existing facilities and services do not meet the standards set forth by the Forest Service Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Guidelines (FSORAG) or Forest Service Trail Accessibility Guidelines (FSTAG). There are no trails outside of the existing developed areas accessible to people with disabilities or the elderly.</p>	<p>Visitor safety and accessibility would be improved with defined structures, facilities, and uses. New recreation facilities would meet accessibility standards set forth by FSORAG and FSTAG. Existing facilities would be upgraded to the extent practicable to meet these same standards.</p> <p>Accessibility to recreation resources would be increased for a wide variety of skill and ability levels. Trails would be designed to meet the needs of different user groups including people with disabilities and the elderly.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action.</p>
	<p>Passenger car access would continue to be limited to the existing developed sites and trails immediately accessible from the highway.</p> <p>Safety of existing unauthorized trail infrastructure is compromised due to the improvised nature of many of the facilities, lack of designated use areas, and limited information. Lack of trail use designations has led to unsafe conditions and user conflicts.</p>	<p>All newly developed recreation facilities would have high standard road access, allowing for safe travel by all types of passenger vehicles.</p> <p>Trails would be designated, designed, and managed for appropriate mixes or individual user groups to enhance safety. Conflict between non-motorized and motorized trail users would be limited.</p> <p>Trails and roads would be signed and designated uses clearly identified. Information kiosks with trail maps and mileages would be posted at trailheads.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action.</p>
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)	<p>The majority of the project area, accessed via SR 157 and SR 158, has been inventoried as Roaded Natural. Some outlying areas, including areas east of Telephone Canyon Road, fall within the Semi-primitive Motorized category. These classifications would remain under the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Implementation of the Proposed Action would expand the ROS spectrum to include the Rural and Urban classifications for the developed areas. The developed areas (Village, Valley and Northern Area) are located on land already disturbed by the abandoned golf course and located in an area where development is already present with the existing hotel and condominium. The remainder of the project area, would have less developed facilities (trails and trailheads) or no facilities, and would still provide a Roaded Natural recreation setting.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action. However, the smaller size of the Village and the smaller facilities would make it feel less Urban, but it would still be a developed area. Conversely, the commercial-style campground would be more developed than the campground in the Proposed Action, but it would still generally fall within the Rural classification.</p>

	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Market Supported Alternative
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
General Biological Resources	The project area would continue to be used for dispersed recreation resulting in adverse impacts on individual plants and degradation of wildlife habitat.	Approximately 425 acres of permanent and approximately 653 acres of temporary construction disturbance would occur on wildlife and plant habitat.	Approximately 331 acres of permanent and approximately 579 acres of temporary construction disturbance would occur on wildlife and plant habitat.
Federally Listed Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Species	No effect.	No effect.	No effect.
Regional Forester's (R4) List of Sensitive Species for the Toiyabe National Forest	The project area would continue to be used for dispersed recreation resulting in adverse effects on individual plants and degradation of wildlife habitat.	May affect individuals of 8 species, but is not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability.	Same as the Proposed Action
Conservation Agreement and MSHCP Covered Species	The project area would continue to be used for dispersed recreation resulting in adverse effects on individual plants and degradation of wildlife habitat.	The proposed project would adversely affect habitat of 19 species, but would not affect species viability. The proposed project would adversely affect individual plants and habitat of four species, but would not affect the species viability.	Same as the Proposed Action
Management Indicator Species of the SMNRA	The project area would continue to be used for dispersed recreation resulting in adverse effects on individual plants and degradation of wildlife habitat.	Not expected to adversely affect six species viability. Beneficial habitat changes could increase the population of three species.	Same as the Proposed Action
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
	Effects on historic properties would continue as they have in the past. Cultural resource sites located in areas where recreational use occurs would continue to be affected by trampling, soil erosion, vertical and horizontal artifact displacement, and artifact breakage. Vandalism, site disturbance and artifact collection would continue to occur as a result of the dispersed nature of recreation activities in the	Recommendations for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility have been generated so that impacts on eligible sites could be assessed. Evaluation and assessment of effects on cultural resources with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and culturally affiliated tribes is ongoing and would continue through project implementation. The Kyle CCC Camp was previously determined eligible for the NRHP and four newly recorded sites have been recommended eligible for the NRHP.	Effects on cultural resources under this alternative would be similar to those of the Proposed Action. Slot Canyon trail bridge construction and the commercial-style campground were identified by the Nuwuvi Working Group as areas of high concern regarding impacts on the landscape. This alternative is anticipated to attract fewer visitors than the

No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Market Supported Alternative
<p>project area.</p> <p>The historic structures at the Kyle CCC Camp would remain in the same location and setting. Existing non-historic structures would remain in the same location and existing Forest Service functions in this area would continue.</p>	<p>Effects on cultural resources would result from construction of proposed facilities in the form of vertical and horizontal displacement and artifact breakage. Recreational activities may also result in trampling, breakage, vandalism, site disturbance and artifact collection and removal. Dispersed recreation in the project area would be reduced and effects on cultural resources associated with this type of use would also be reduced.</p> <p>This is a sacred landscape to Nuwuvi people. The proposed activities and development in general would not be culturally compatible in areas of Nuwuvi significance, and would have an adverse impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Under this alternative the historic structures located at the Kyle CCC Camp would be restored and maintained for managed public use as a historic site. Non-historic structures would be removed and the areas restored.</p> <p>The Forest Service and the Nevada SHPO have developed a Programmatic Agreement that will guide Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) consultation between the Forest Service, Nevada SHPO, and culturally affiliated tribes and culturally affiliated Nuwuvi nations throughout project design and construction. In addition, the agreement will guide the development of any cultural resource mitigation identified through the Section 106 consultation process.</p>	<p>Proposed Action and, therefore, operational impacts on cultural resources would be less.</p>

	No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Market Supported Alternative
VISUAL RESOURCES			
Effects on Inventoried Visual Quality Objective (VQO) Zones	<p>For the most part there would be no change in existing Retention and Partial Retention VQOs. Lands within the project area fall within three inventory VQO classes: Preservation, Retention or Partial Retention. However, views of the former 128-acre golf course property would not achieve the Retention VQO and would be consistent with the Modification VQO. Restoration of the former gold course property would allow for a higher VQO to be met over time.</p>	<p>The effects on the visual character would be adverse because of the increased amount of apparent landscape alterations associated with the new recreation and administrative facilities.</p> <p>Proposed trail networks would negatively impact visual quality objectives on lands inventoried as Retention and Partial Retention. However, roads and trails (authorized and user created) already exist and reducing the width of existing roads and trails when converted to non-motorized trails would reduce the visual impact of these existing roads and trails.</p> <p>The majority of the development would occur within areas inventoried as Retention. Developed facilities such as the Village, Main Camping and Picnic Area, and the Northern Area could affect views from primary viewpoints or from SR 157. Therefore, the Retention VQO would not be met and the Modification VQO would be maintained.</p>	<p>The qualitative nature of the effects on the visual character would be the same as the Proposed Action except for:</p> <p>The wildlife rehabilitation center is located on land inventoried as Partial Retention. The visual effect of this facility would not exceed the thresholds set by the Partial Retention VQO.</p> <p>A general downsizing of recreation facilities would reduce the extent of the associated landscape alterations.</p> <p>The commercial campground would create a more intensively developed but cover smaller area than the campgrounds in the Proposed Action.</p>
Effects on Natural Landscape Character	<p>There would be no effect on the natural landscape character including the high desert shrublands, low conifer zone, or forest zone.</p>	<p>There would be no major changes to the overall natural landscape character in the project area. Localized effects on landscape character would be greatest in the low conifer zone, where the majority of the development would occur. Changes to existing landscape character in this zone would be evident from SR 157 and SR 158. The most obvious change would be the more developed nature of the Village area and other nearby facilities. While restoration and revegetation efforts would have a moderate beneficial effect on natural landscape character, the more urban character of the Village would be the most obvious change. Proposed facilities in high desert shrubland areas would be mostly trails, which would result in a negligible effect on the natural landscape character. Developments in the forest zone would also be minimal, with little or no effect on landscape character.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action, with the exception that the denser, more developed character of the commercial campground would create a more urban zone than the traditional Forest Service-style campgrounds in the Proposed Action. The more urban character of the commercial campground would be most visible from the viewpoints along SR 158.</p>

No Action Alternative	Proposed Action	Market Supported Alternative	
	<p>The Forest Service acknowledges that all new construction would have a degree of impact on the American Indian experience of viewscapes and isolationism. In the design and construction phases of the Middle Kyle Complex, consultation will be conducted with culturally affiliated American Indian nations to ensure that these impacts are mitigated where and when feasible.</p>		
<p>COMPLIANCE WITH THE GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (GMP) FOR THE SMNRA</p>			
<p>GMP Standard 0.31</p>	<p>No construction would occur within the 100-yard buffer zone of potential habitat for rough angelica in compliance with the GMP.</p>	<p>A project-specific amendment to the GMP would be required. Approximately 4 acres of permanent and approximately 17 acres of temporary construction disturbance would occur on potential rough angelica habitat.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action, with the exception that an additional approximate 0.5 acre of potential rough angelica habitat would be disturbed on both a permanent and temporary basis.</p>
<p>GMP Guideline 11.71</p>	<p>The Harris Springs site would continue to be available for permitted designated group use, including blackpowder shooting and other uses in compliance with the GMP.</p>	<p>A project-specific amendment to the GMP would be required. Construction of recreation facilities at the Harris Springs site would not comply with Guideline 11.71. Construction of these facilities would eliminate use of this area for permitted designated group uses, including blackpowder shooting.</p>	<p>Same as the Proposed Action.</p>

Contents

	Page
Tables	iv
Figures	v
Acronyms and Abbreviations	vi
Chapter 1 Purpose of and Need for Action	1-1
1.1 Document Structure	1-1
1.2 Background	1-3
1.2.1 Legislative Mandates	1-4
1.2.2 Agency Direction Document	1-5
1.2.3 Agency Guidance Documents	1-6
1.2.4 Other Relevant Resource Documents	1-9
1.3 Purpose and Need for Action	1-10
1.3.1 Need Statement 1	1-10
1.3.2 Need Statement 2	1-17
1.3.3 Need Statement 3	1-20
1.4 Proposed Action	1-22
1.5 Decision Framework	1-27
1.6 Public Involvement	1-27
1.6.1 Pre-NEPA Public Involvement	1-27
1.6.2 Notice of Intent	1-28
1.6.3 Notice of Availability	1-29
1.6.4 Cooperating Agencies	1-30
1.6.5 American Indian Collaboration	1-30
1.7 Issues	1-31
1.7.1 Significant Issues	1-31
1.7.2 Non-Significant Issues	1-32
1.8 Permits and Required Compliance	1-33
Chapter 2 Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Alternatives Considered in Detail	2-1
2.2.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	2-3
2.2.2 Alternative 2 – Proposed Action	2-5
2.2.3 Alternative 3 – Market Supported Alternative	2-12
2.3 Summary Comparison of Alternatives	2-17
2.3.1 Design Criteria and Mitigation Common to All Alternatives	2-31
2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study	2-39

2.4.1	Traditional Day Use Alternative	2-40
2.4.2	Modified Status Quo Alternative	2-40
2.4.3	Middle Kyle Canyon Framework Plan Option 2	2-40
2.4.4	Middle Kyle Canyon Framework Plan Option 3	2-41
2.4.5	Restoration of 128-Acre Site Alternative.....	2-41
2.4.6	No Retail Alternative	2-41
2.4.7	Utilize Partially Built Structures for Administrative Facilities.....	2-42
2.4.8	Relocate Cathedral Rock Picnic Facilities to 128-acre Site.....	2-42
2.4.9	Interagency Visitor Center Alternative	2-42
2.4.10	Utilize Lee Canyon More Extensively Alternative	2-42
2.4.11	Close SR 156 and SR 157 at SMNRA Boundaries Alternative	2-43
2.4.12	Limited Visitor Center Alternative	2-43
Chapter 3	Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	3.0-1
3.0	Introduction.....	3.0-1
3.1	Resource Impacts Considered.....	3.1-1
3.1.1	Air Quality	3.1-1
3.1.2	Non-Native Invasive Species of Plants.....	3.1-3
3.1.3	Geology and Soils.....	3.1-9
3.1.4	Hydrology.....	3.1-11
3.1.5	Social and Economic Resources.....	3.1-18
3.1.6	Transportation.....	3.1-21
3.2	Recreation Resources	3.2-1
3.2.1	Direct and Indirect Effects	3.2-2
3.2.2	Changes to the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum	3.2-11
3.3	Biological Resources	3.3-1
3.3.1	General Biological Resources	3.3-1
3.3.2	Spring Mountains Acastus Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat	3.3-5
3.3.3	Summary of Effects on Sensitive Biological Species Analyzed in Detail.....	3.3-10
3.4	Cultural Resources	3.4-1
3.4.1	Affected Environment.....	3.4-1
3.4.2	Direct and Indirect Effects	3.4-3
3.5	Visual Resources.....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Affected Environment.....	3.5-2
3.5.2	Direct and Indirect Effects	3.5-7
3.6	Compliance with the General Management Plan for the SMNRA.....	3.6-1
3.6.1	GMP Standard 0.31	3.6-1
3.6.2	GMP Guideline 11.71.....	3.6-2
3.6.3	Direct and Indirect Effects	3.6-2
3.7	Required Disclosures and Executive Orders.....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Climate Change Considerations.....	3.7-1
3.7.2	Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity.....	3.7-2
3.7.3	Unavoidable Adverse Effects	3.7-2

3.7.4	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	3.7-3
3.7.5	Cumulative Effects	3.7-3
3.7.6	Clean Air Act.....	3.7-9
3.7.7	Clean Water Act.....	3.7-10
3.7.8	National Forest Management Act of 1976	3.7-11
3.7.9	Energy and Natural or Depletable Resource Requirements and Conservation Potential of Various Alternatives and Mitigation Measures.....	3.7-11
3.7.10	Endangered Species Act of 1973.....	3.7-12
3.7.11	Migratory Bird Treaty Act.....	3.7-12
3.7.12	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.....	3.7-13
3.7.13	Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice).....	3.7-14
3.7.14	Executive Order 13112 (Invasive Species).....	3.7-15
3.7.15	Executive Order 13007 (Native American Sacred Sites)	3.7-15
3.7.16	Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management).....	3.7-16
3.7.17	Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands).....	3.7-17
3.7.18	Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments).....	3.7-17
3.8	Nuwuvi and the Spring Mountains Landscape	3.8-1
Chapter 4	Consultation and Coordination	4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	Preparers and Contributors.....	4-1
4.3	Consultation and Coordination.....	4-5
4.3.1	Federal, State, and Local Agencies.....	4-5
4.3.2	Tribes.....	4-5
4.3.3	Comments Received on the Middle Kyle Complex Draft Environmental Impact Statement.....	4-6
Chapter 5	References	5-1
 Index		
 Appendix A Response to Public Comment		
A1	Comment Letters	
A2	Response to Public Comments	
A3	Nuwuvi Comment Letter	
A4	Response to Tribal Comments	
 Appendix B Detailed Comparison of Alternatives		
 Appendix C General Wildlife Observed within the Middle Kyle Complex Project Area		
 Appendix D Summary of Revisions since the DEIS		

Tables

	Page
2-1 Summary Comparison of Alternatives	2-19
2-2 Issue Comparison by Alternative	2-24
2-3. Summary Comparison of Effects by Alternative.....	2-25
2-4. Design Criteria Common to Action Alternatives	2-32
2-5. Proposed Mitigation Measures	2-39
3.1-1. Summary of Proposed Changes to Existing National Forest System Routes by Alternative.....	3.1-24
3.2-1. Comparison of Effects by Alternative.....	3.2-3
3.2-2. ROS Analysis for the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Market Supported Alternative.....	3.2-12
3.3 1. Acreage Summary of Potential Permanent and Temporary Project Impacts that May Result from Implementation of the Proposed Action	3.3-3
3.3 2. Acreage Summary of Potential Permanent and Temporary Project Impacts that May Result from Implementation of the Market Supported Alternative	3.3-4
3.3 3. Summary of Species Analyzed in Detail and Determination of Effects for the Proposed Action and Market Supported Alternative	3.3-11
3.5-1. Proposed Action - Direct and Indirect Effects on Existing Views	3.5-8
3.5-2. Market Supported Alternative - Direct and Indirect Effects on Existing Views	3.5-12
3.7-1. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Activities in the SMNRA	3.7-4
4-1 Preparers and Contributors	4-1

Figures

	Follows Page
1-1 Regional Location.....	1-4
1-2 Project Vicinity.....	1-4
1-3 Proposed Action	1-22
1-4 Proposed Dispersed Camping Closure Areas	1-26
2-1 Existing Conditions.....	2-6
2-2 Proposed Action, Improvements to Kyle CCC Camp and Fletcher Canyon Trailhead	2-6
2-3 Proposed Action, Proposed Reconstruction of Kyle Canyon Campground	2-6
2-4 Market Supported Alternative	2-14
2-5 Market Supported Alternative, Proposed Improvements to Kyle CCC Camp and Fletcher Canyon Trailhead.....	2-14
2-6 Market Supported Alternative, Proposed Reconstruction of Kyle Canyon Campground	2-14
2-7 Market Supported Alternative, Conceptual Layout for Commercial Style Campground.....	2-16
3.2-1 ROS Spectrum by Alternative.....	<i>On Page 3.2-14</i>
3.3-1 Spring Mountains Acastus Checkerspot Butterfly Habitat in Kyle Wash	3.3-8
3.5-1 Inventoried Visual Quality Objectives	3.5-2

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	best management practices
Business Plan	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Market, Financial and Operational Analysis
CA	Conservation Agreement
CCC	Civilian Conservation Corps
CCDAQEM	Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management
CCFD	Clark County Fire Department
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	carbon monoxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
Forest Service	U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service
FR	Federal Register
Framework Plan	Middle Kyle Canyon Framework Plan
FSM	Forest Service Manual
FSORAG	Forest Service Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Guidelines
FSTAG	Forest Service Trail Accessibility Guidelines
GHG	greenhouse gas
GMP	General Management Plan

IDT	Interdisciplinary Team
LA	Landscape Assessment
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LID	low-impact development
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan
LVVWD	Las Vegas Valley Water District
Market Supported Alternative	Alternative 3
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCWC	Mt. Charleston Water Company
Metro	Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
MIS	Management Indicator Species
MM	Mitigation Measure
MSHCP	Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MVUM	Motor Vehicle Use Map
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NDEP	Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
NDF	Nevada Department of Forestry
NDOT	Nevada Department of Transportation
NDOW	Nevada Department of Wildlife
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NFS	National Forest System
NHP	Nevada Highway Patrol
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NNIS	non-native invasive species
No Action Alternative	Alternative 1
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO _x	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NRS	Nevada Revised Statutes
O ₃	ozone
OHV	off-highway vehicle

PM ₁₀	particulate matter smaller than 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns
Proposed Action	Alternative 2
PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers
ROS	recreation opportunity system
ROW	right-of-way
RRCNCA	Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area
RV	recreational vehicle
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMNRA	Spring Mountain National Recreation Area
SMNRA Act	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Act of 1993
SNPLMA	Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SR	State Route
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
US 95	U.S. Highway 95
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VOC	volatile organic compounds
VQOs	Visual Quality Objectives
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan