

Round 9 Preliminary Recommendation

Expenditure of the Special Account for

The Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act

And

Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act –

Round 5

April 18, 2008

EXHIBIT E-4 - LANDS Document consists of 20 pages. Entire Exhibit Provided Meeting Date: 06-06-08
--

INTRODUCTION

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998

The Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998, Public Law 105-263 (SNPLMA), as amended, provides for the disposal of Federal public land within a specified disposal boundary in the Las Vegas Valley. SNPLMA creates a Special Account in which 85% of the gross proceeds generated by land sales or exchanges in the Las Vegas Valley are deposited. The remaining 15% is distributed to the State of Nevada's general education program and the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) for water treatment and transmission facility infrastructure in Clark County, Nevada.

The Act and subsequent amendments authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend amounts deposited in the Special Account for the following purposes:

- *Acquisition of environmentally sensitive land in Nevada, with priority given to lands within Clark County;*
- *Capital Improvements at the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area, the Great Basin National Park, and other areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service (FS) in Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties, and the Spring Mountain National Recreation Area;*
- *Development and implementation of a multi-species habitat conservation plan (MSHCP) in Clark County;*
- *Development of parks, trails, and natural areas in Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties in Nevada. Washoe County, Nevada, is eligible until December 31, 2011, to submit nominations for funds to acquire land (not to exceed 250 acres) and develop one regional park and natural area, pursuant to a cooperative agreement with units of local government or regional governmental entities;*
- *Conservation Initiatives on Federal land in Clark, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties, administered by the Department of Interior or the Department of Agriculture;*
- *Lake Tahoe environmental restoration projects;*
- *Development and implementation of multi-jurisdictional hazardous fuels reduction and wildfire prevention plans for the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Carson Range in Douglas and Washoe Counties and Carson City, and the Spring Mountains;*
- *Implementation of the Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project in White Pine and Lincoln Counties;*
- *Reimbursement of certain implementation costs.*

The Secretary of the Interior has charged the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) with the implementation of the Act. The BLM, in collaboration with the National Park Service (NPS), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), USDA Forest Service (USFS), the State of Nevada, affected local governments throughout the State, and other interested parties, has developed a funding recommendation process that identifies projects in the various expenditure categories and identifies environmentally sensitive lands for

acquisition. This process is documented in the *SNPLMA Implementation Agreement* (signed June 7, 2006 and re-issued with technical revisions on October 22, 2007).

Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000

The Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000, Public Law 106-248 (FLTFA), commonly referred to as the "Baca Act" provides for revenues from the disposal of public land nationwide, identified for disposal as of the date of passage of the FLTFA, to be deposited into a Special Account (FLTFA Account) created by the FLTFA. Ninety-six (96%) of the revenue generated by eligible land sales or exchanges is deposited into the FLTFA Account and the remaining 4% is distributed to the State.

The FLTFA authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to expend the revenue in the FLTFA Account for:

Acquisition of in holdings within the boundaries of federally designated areas, and lands adjacent to federally designated areas which contain exceptional resources as defined in the Act.

THE ROUND 9 PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND

The Preliminary Recommendation is an interim product in the process of identifying and selecting projects in the capital improvements; park, trail and natural area projects; conservation initiatives; land acquisitions; hazardous fuels and wildfire prevention; and projects to implement the Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project categories for funding. The list of projects in these categories was generated from a call for nominations that was open from October 22, 2007 to December 12, 2007. Lake Tahoe Round 9 projects were nominated, reviewed and ranked through a separate process described below and are not a part of this Preliminary Recommendation. Projects for the Clark County Multi-species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) funding category are nominated on a biennial cycle and were not nominated in this Round.

The Subgroup for each project category reviewed, scored and ranked the nominations according to criteria found in the *Implementation Agreement*. The Subgroups consist of representatives from the eligible entities for each category. The Subgroup recommendations were forwarded to the Partners Working Group (PWG) for consideration in developing this Preliminary Recommendation. The PWG includes representatives from BLM, NPS, FWS, BOR, USFS, State of Nevada, local government and the Nevada Association of Counties. Projects not approved as part of Round 9 may be re-nominated in a subsequent round at the discretion of the nominating entity.

The Preliminary Recommendation includes a proposed budget and a list of projects included in the tables in the Appendix for each of the six project categories listed above. The projects on these tables are in priority order.

The Round 9 Lake Tahoe Restoration Projects Recommendation

Lake Tahoe restoration projects are nominated, reviewed, and ranked through a separate but similar and generally parallel process to the above categories. The list of projects recommended by the Tahoe Regional Executive Committee (TREX) is reviewed by the SNPLMA Executive Committee and will be included in the SNPLMA Final Recommendation for this round. The Preliminary Recommendation for Round 9 Lake Tahoe Restoration Act projects is not included in this Preliminary Recommendation but is available for public review and comment from April 14, 2008 through May 14, 2008 at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/ltbmu/>.

The recommendation of the PWG is that funding for approved Round 9 Lake Tahoe Restoration projects be provided from the Lake Tahoe Set Aside; funds set aside and approved in Round 6 for Lake Tahoe projects approved in future rounds.

Relationship between Round 9 and Projects Approved in Previous Rounds

The approved Round 9 projects will be appended to the list of projects approved in previous rounds. The Capital Improvements category has budgeted funds available from projects approved in Rounds 1 through 7 that will be completed for less than the originally approved amount. When this occurs, the unspent funds are available for “budget reallocation” (BRA) for expenditure on other previously approved projects and/or current project nominations. The PWG recommends funding the capital improvement projects in this Preliminary Recommendation with Capital Improvement BRA. This recommendation is reflected in the Round 9 budget table as a subtraction from the total estimated costs.

ROUND 9 PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION

The following is the preliminary recommendation by category. A summary budget table follows. In addition, detailed charts of nominated projects can be found in the appendix

Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

Twenty-three Round 9 project nominations were received in the Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas (PTNA) funding category for a total of \$36,808,010, not including a 10% contingency. The PTNA Subgroup recommended funding the twelve highest ranked projects, for a total funding recommendation of \$19,298,969, including the 10% contingency. Following review and consideration, the PWG made no modifications to the Subgroup recommendation. A detailed chart of projects nominated in this category can be found in the appendix. [\[Click here to go to recommendation chart.\]](#)

Capital Improvements

Nine Round 9 project nominations were received in the Capital Improvements funding category totaling \$29,731,885, not including a 10% contingency. The Capital Improvement Subgroup recommendation included two options for consideration by the PWG. The Subgroup options were developed assuming availability of funds from re-scoping previously approved capital improvement projects at a lower cost (i.e., Capital Improvement Budget Reallocation (BRA) funds). In addition, in light of the BRA funds, both options recommended funding the second phases of two Round 8 capital improvement projects. Those projects are the Administrative Headquarters Ash Meadows (FWS, Round 8 Priority 2) and the Great Basin National Park Interpretative Facilities and Visitor Access (NPS, Round 8 Priority 3). Funding for these two projects had been cut to meet budgetary constraints in Round 8. Project nominations for these two Round 8 projects were not available for consideration at the March 20-21, 2008 PWG meeting; however were subsequently received and are available for public review. [\[Click here to go to recommendation chart.\]](#)

Option 1 recommended funding all 9 nominations, plus the two Round 8 projects, for a total of \$39,414,005 utilizing projected revenue and Capital Improvement BRA. Option 2 recommended funding the five highest ranked Round 9 nominations, plus the two Round 8 projects, for a total of \$24,730,894 utilizing both projected revenue and the BRA. Option 2 would fund each Federal agency’s top priority project.

The PWG Preliminary Recommendation is to fully fund the five highest ranked Capital Improvement projects plus the two Round 8 projects from the Capital Improvement BRA for a total estimated cost of \$24,730,894

including a 10% contingency.¹ A detailed chart of recommended projects for this category can be found in the appendix.

Conservation Initiatives

Twenty-two Round 9 project nominations were received in the Conservation Initiatives funding category totaling almost \$21,898,173, not including a 10% contingency. The recommendation of the Conservation Initiatives Subgroup was to fund the eight highest ranked projects totaling \$7,245,942. [\[Click here to go to recommendation chart.\]](#)

The Partners Working Group Preliminary Recommendation is to fund the eight highest ranked projects recommended by the Subgroup with the following funding reductions and/or conditions:

- 1) Reduce the 5th ranked project (Implementing Service First in Southern Nevada) by \$80,000 to exclude funding for video conferencing equipment.
- 2) The PWG has asked staff from the BLM to meet with the nominators of the 7th ranked project (Interagency Science and Research Strategy Implementation) to discuss questions and issues raised by the PWG during its deliberations. Staff will report back to the PWG at its May 19-20, 2008 meeting. At that time the PWG will determine if the questions and issues have been adequately addressed such that the PWG will continue to recommend the project to the Executive Committee for inclusion in the Final Recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior for approval.

The estimated total cost of the Conservation Initiative Preliminary Recommendation is \$7,157,942 including a 10% contingency. A detailed chart of recommended projects for this category can be found in the appendix.

Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisitions

Seven Round 9 project nominations were received in the Land Acquisition funding category totaling \$46,706,300, not including a 10% contingency. Three of the nominations are conservation easements which were previously nominated, but not recommended. Land acquisition nominations may be considered for funding through SNPLMA or through the FLTFA (Round 5), or a combination of both, for those lands that meet applicable criteria. The Land Acquisition Subgroup recommended funding the four highest ranked land acquisitions with SNPLMA funds with an estimated total cost of \$5,125,230. The Subgroup did not make recommendations for the last three ranked conservation easements or recommend funding any acquisitions through FLTFA because discussions were still being conducted with the project proponents on the three easements and one fee acquisition regarding asking price. The Subgroup decided that final funding decisions should be made by the PWG after any revised asking prices were received and actual requested amounts could be considered. [\[Click here to go to recommendation chart.\]](#)

The PWG Preliminary Recommendation is to fund the three highest ranked acquisition projects from FLTFA (Round 5) at an estimated cost of \$4,205,630 including a 10% contingency, and the 4th, 5th and 7th ranked acquisition projects from SNPLMA at an estimated cost of \$7,629,600 including a 10% contingency. A detailed chart of recommended acquisitions and funding sources can be found in the appendix.

Hazardous Fuels Reduction and Wildfire Prevention

Thirteen Round 9 project nominations were received in the Hazardous Fuels and Wildfire Prevention funding category totaling \$22,947,859, not including a 10% contingency. The Subgroup recommended eight projects at

¹ Subsequent to the Partner's Working Group meeting (PWG), a revised nomination for the Seed Warehouse was received which increases the size of the warehouse to service a broader area (Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and California) at a revised estimated cost of \$3,025,000, plus \$302,500 for a 10% contingency, for a revised total cost of \$3,327,500. The revised nomination is provided for public review but is not part of the PWG's Preliminary Recommendation for Round 9. The revised nomination will be provided to the SNPLMA Executive Committee along with the original project nomination.

a cost of \$10,020,619 based on availability of funds and reduction in cost of projects ranked 2nd, 3rd, 6th, and 9th. The 8th and 9th ranked projects are both USFS projects and had almost identical scores. The 9th ranked project was given priority by the USFS and therefore recommended for funding before the 8th ranked project. The Subgroup provided further funding recommendations if the PWG were able to allocate additional funding for this category.

In light of this Subgroup recommendation, the PWG is recommending an additional \$1 million in funding to the two Nevada Fire Safe Council projects (2nd and 3rd ranked) that had been reduced by the Subgroup. The PWG recommendation, therefore is to fund the eight projects recommended by the Subgroup at an estimated total cost of \$11,120,619 including a 10% contingency. A detailed chart of recommended projects for this category can be found in the appendix. [\[Click here to go to recommendation chart.\]](#)

Round 9 Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project Preliminary Recommendation

Eight Round 9 project nominations were received in the Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project funding category totaling \$5,215,802, not including a 10% contingency. The Subgroup recommended the six highest ranked projects for funding with a total estimated cost of \$3,813,469 including a 10% contingency. This recommendation included reducing funding for the 4th and 5th ranked projects. The PWG Preliminary Recommendation is to accept the Subgroup recommendation as stated. A detailed chart of recommended projects for this category can be found in the appendix. [\[Click here to go to recommendation chart.\]](#)

ROUND 9 PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION: BUDGET

The projected revenue for Round 9 provided to the PWG was \$70,000,000. Recent information on declines in the rate of return on SNPLMA investments led the PWG to allocate less than the full \$70 million in its Preliminary Recommendation. This amount does not include excess funds remaining in the Capital Improvements expenditure category. The total budget request including \$4 million for a Special Account Reserve (SAR), \$2.5 million for Pre-Proposal Planning (PPP) and the 10% contingency for projects is \$55,520,599. An additional \$24,730,894 in capital improvement budget reallocation (BRA) funds is recommended to fund capital improvement projects in this round.

- **Conservation Initiatives:** There is a statutory expenditure limitation of 10% of funds available since inception for Conservation Initiatives. The cost of already approved projects, and Round 9 projects recommended in this document, including the 10% contingency, does not exceed this spending cap.
- **Capital Improvements:** There is a statutory expenditure limitation of 25% of funds available since inception for Capital Improvements. The cost of already approved projects does not exceed this cap. This recommendation utilizes funds from already approved projects. Therefore, the recommended Round 9 projects will not increase the percent of funds expended on Capital Improvement projects.
- **Project Contingencies in Budget:** The recommended budgets for all categories include a contingency amount equal to 10% of the estimated cost of each project. Because the costs shown are estimates, the 10% in additional budget provides for some flexibility to complete projects without the need to utilize Special Account Reserve (SAR) funds or obtain an additional approval from the Secretary.
- **Special Account Reserve:** The PWG recommends that the overall budget request for Round 9 include a provision for a \$4,000,000 Special Account Reserve (SAR) to be expended at the discretion of the Executive Committee. This is consistent with the recommendation in previous rounds to allow a reserve fund to be spent at the discretion of the Executive Committee as described in the *Implementation Agreement*. This amount is requested in order to cover higher than expected costs on already approved projects as outlined in the *Implementation Agreement*, and funds needed to cover the cost of emergency

projects and acquisitions where the opportunity would be lost to protect environmentally sensitive land without quick action.

- Pre-Proposal Planning Fund:** The Partners Working Group recommended that the Round 9 budget request include a line item of \$2,500,000 for a Pre-Proposal Planning (PPP) reserve to be expended at the discretion of the Executive Committee. The PPP Fund would be used to fund feasibility and pre-proposal design, conceptual planning, and cost estimating by nominating entities for future projects to assure that nominations for those projects in future rounds are well thought out and costs are accurately estimated over the duration of the project. The ability to do pre-proposal planning will help ensure future projects can be completed as nominated within the budget request and help reduce the need for changes in scope and additional funds due to critical elements or costs that weren't appropriately addressed in the nomination.

The Round 9 preliminary budget recommendation for SNPLMA expenditures follows below:

ROUND 9 PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION BUDGET

Expenditure Category	Funding Requested	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
Parks, Trails & Natural Areas	\$17,544,517	\$1,754,452	\$19,298,968
Reallocation of Capital Improvement Funds from Previous Rounds	(\$22,482,631)	(\$2,248,262)	(\$24,730,894)*
Capital Improvements	\$22,482,631	\$2,248,262	\$24,730,894
Conservation Initiatives	\$6,507,220	\$650,722	\$7,157,942
Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisitions	\$6,936,000	\$693,600	\$7,629,600
Hazardous Fuels and Fire Prevention	\$10,109,654	\$1,010,965	\$11,120,619
Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Project	\$3,466,790	\$346,679	\$3,813,469
TOTAL	\$67,046,812	\$6,704,680	\$73,751,492
Special Account Reserve	\$4,000,000	\$0.00	\$4,000,000
Pre-Proposal Planning Fund	\$2,500,000	\$0.00	\$2,500,000
Total Round 9 Budget Recommendation			\$80,251,492
Total Budget Requested			\$55,520,599

*The Capital Improvement budget adjustment reflects budgeted funds available in this category due to Capital Improvement projects that can't be completed or are completed below the estimated cost. These funds will be reallocated to the recommended projects following the guidelines in the Implementation Agreement.

OTHER ROUND 9 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommend that the Executive Committee request Secretarial authorization to fund the full Round 9 budget amount of \$7,157,942 for Conservation Initiatives before providing funds to the other Round 9 categories. This recommendation is based on the fact that the majority of the projects in these categories are multi-year projects, are labor intensive, and do not lend themselves to periodic funding of groups of projects based on priority since all are to be implemented within the same time frame.
- Recommend that the Executive Committee seek Secretarial authorization to carry over any approved Round 8 SAR funds to be added to any SAR approved for use during Round 9, in order to provide sufficient funds to meet expected SAR needs.
- Recommend that the Executive Committee seek Secretarial authorization to carry over the Lake Tahoe Restoration SAR in the amount of \$2,000,000 for Lake Tahoe Restoration projects to be expended at the discretion of the Executive Committee toward allowable expenditures authorized by SNPLMA and in accordance with the *Implementation Agreement*, where special circumstances warrant. The Lake Tahoe Restoration SAR is to be funded with the Lake Tahoe set-aside funds from the Special Account.
- Recommend that the Executive Committee seek Secretarial authorization to reallocate funds between the Special Account Reserve (SAR) and the Pre-Proposal Planning (PPP) Fund, if a SAR and the PPP Fund are approved by the Secretary, to allow for maximum flexibility throughout Round 9 to meet the needs relative to carrying out approved projects and acquisitions, addressing emergency or urgent situations, and the need for pre-proposal planning to ensure accurate project nominations in future rounds.

APPENDIX

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION CHARTS
FOR

PARKS, TRAILS, & NATURAL AREAS

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

CONSERVATION INITIATIVES

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LAND ACQUISITIONS

HAZARDOUS FUELS REDUCTION & WILDFIRE PREVENTION

EASTERN NEVADA LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROJECT

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263)

Round 9 Nominations - Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas

Preliminary Recommendation

The following is a prioritized lists of Park, Trail, and Natural Area projects that have been received and reviewed for possible funding under Round 9 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263).

The purpose of releasing these lists is to obtain input from all interested parties. Beginning April 18, 2008, the BLM is accepting written comments on these recommendations until close of business (4:30 PM Pacific Time) on June 2, 2008. Comments may be mailed to Ron Wenker, SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502-7147 or faxed to the attention of the SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair at (775) 861-6601. The SNPLMA Executive Committee will meet following the comment period to review comments received and develop a final recommendation for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. Questions may be addressed to the BLM Nevada State Office at (775) 861-6401.

Round 9 PTNA Projects Recommended for Funding								
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
1	5	Wetlands Park Trails Program Phase II	Clark County	The Clark County Wetlands Park, Clark County	\$1,557,000	\$1,557,000	\$155,700	\$1,712,700
2	20	Whitney Mesa Preserve Phase II	City of Henderson	The project is located in the City of Henderson in Clark County at the southwest corner of Galleria Drive and Patrick Lane.	\$2,989,514	\$2,989,514	\$298,951	\$3,288,465
3	10	White Pine County Regional Park Upgrades	White Pine County	Throughout White Pine County.	\$839,762	\$839,762	\$83,976	\$923,738
4	4	Mesquite Regional Park and Trails System Phase I	Clark County	City of Mesquite, Nevada	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$110,000	\$1,210,000
5	21	Lincoln County Park Upgrades	Lincoln County	This project is located in Panaca, Nevada.	\$821,000	\$821,000	\$82,100	\$903,100
6	11	Preston Community Center	White Pine County	Preston Nevada, located 32 miles south of Ely on State Route 318, seven miles from the community of Lund.	\$174,518	\$174,518	\$17,452	\$191,970
7	13	White Pine County Courthouse Park	White Pine County	The County Courthouse Park is located on Aultman (US Highway 50) in the center of downtown Ely.	\$252,420	\$252,420	\$25,242	\$277,662
8	16	Floyd Lamb Park Trail Amenities	City of Las Vegas	The project site is within Floyd Lamb Park, which is located on the east side of Durango Drive, between Racel Street and the Log Cabin Way alignment.	\$2,270,000	\$2,270,000	\$227,000	\$2,497,000
9	12	North Ely Park	White Pine County	The proposed park site is on Avenue A between 10th and 11th Streets in Ely, across the street from the Nevada Northern Railway Museum.	\$187,803	\$187,803	\$18,780	\$206,583

10	7	Horseman's Park Improvements	Clark County	This project is located at the existing Clark County Horseman's Park in Las Vegas, at the southeast corner of Flamingo Road and Jimmy Durante Boulevard.	\$512,500	\$512,500	\$51,250	\$563,750
11	1	Craig Ranch Play Area	North Las Vegas	Craig Ranch Golf Course, North Las Vegas	\$4,840,000	\$4,840,000	\$484,000	\$5,324,000
12	22	Echo Canyon	Lincoln County	Echo Canyon is located 12 miles east of the town of Proche, off State Highway 322.	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$200,000	\$2,200,000

Round 9 PTNA Projects Not Recommended for Funding

Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
13	15	White Pine Little League Renovation	White Pine County	The White Pine Little League Park is located on Avenue M on the southeastern border of the City of Ely.	\$791,843	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	14	White Pine County Fairgrounds Improvements	White Pine County	The White Pine County Fairgrounds is located approximately 2 miles north of Ely on east side of US Highway 93.	\$225,850	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	6	Laughlin Multimodal Trails Connector	Clark County	The Town of Laughlin under SR 163 extending north through the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, west of the Laughlin Bridge to the Dam Road up to Davis Dam in Clark County.	\$469,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
16	23	Fireman's Park	Lincoln County	This project is located in Panaca, Nevada.	\$1,689,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	8	Silver Bowl Park	Clark County	Las Vegas, Nevada.	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
18	19	Made in the Shade	City of Henderson	The project will include 12 existing City parks throughout the City of Henderson in Clark County.	\$687,600	\$0	\$0	\$0
19	9	Clark County Shooting, Park Flood Control	Clark County	The Clark County Shooting Park is located north of Moccasin Road, east of Decatur Boulevard and west of Buffalo Drive just north of the Las Vegas City limits.	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	17	Rotary Park	City of Las Vegas	The project site is located on Hinson Street, north of Charleston Boulevard, west of US95, between Valley View Boulevard and Arville Street.	\$1,900,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
21	2	Craig Ranch Ballfields	North Las Vegas	Craig Ranch Golf Course, North Las Vegas	\$5,100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
22	18	Ed Fountain Park Expansion Acquisition	City of Las Vegas	The parcel is located at 4747 Vegas Drive near the north east corner of Decatur Boulevard and Vegas Drive in urban Las Vegas.	\$3,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
23	3	Petititi Park Phase II	North Las Vegas	Petititi Park is located in the City of North Las Vegas (Clark County) on the southeast corner of Donna Street and Putnam Avenue.	\$1,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS					\$36,808,010	\$17,544,517	\$1,754,452	\$19,298,969

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263)

Round 9 Nominations - Capital Improvements

Preliminary Recommendation

The following is a prioritized lists of Capital Improvements projects that have been received and reviewed for possible funding under Round 9 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263).

The purpose of releasing these lists is to obtain input from all interested parties. Beginning April 18, 2008, the BLM is accepting written comments on these recommendations until close of business (4:30 PM Pacific Time) on June 2, 2008. Comments may be mailed to Ron Wenker, SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502-7147 or faxed to the attention of the SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair at (775) 861-6601. The SNPLMA Executive Committee will meet following the comment period to review comments received and develop a final recommendation for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. Questions may be addressed to the BLM Nevada State office at (775) 861-6401.

Round 9 Capital Improvements Projects Recommended for Funding								
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended**	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
1	1	Boulder Beach Visitor Facility Enhancements	National Park Service	Boulder Basin Area, Lake Mead National Recreation Area.	\$1,759,400	[\$1,759,400]	[\$175,940]	[\$1,935,340]
2	8	Administrative and Maintenance Facility Construction at Pahrangat National Wildlife Refuge	Fish & Wildlife Service	Pahrangat National Wildlife Refuge	\$6,900,000	[\$6,900,000]	[\$690,000]	[\$7,590,000]
3	4	Nevada Spillway House Rehabilitation and Restoration	Bureau of Reclamation	Hoover Dam, Lake Mead National Recreation Area.	\$2,921,050	[\$2,921,050]	[\$292,105]	[\$3,213,155]
4	6	Ward Mountain Recreation Area Renovation	USDA Forest Service	Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, Ely	\$3,125,676	[\$3,125,676]	[\$312,567]	[\$3,438,243]
5	9	Eastern Nevada Restoration Seed Warehouse*	Bureau of Land Management - Ely	Ely, Nevada	\$1,677,476	[\$1,677,476]	[\$167,747]	[\$1,845,223]
		Phase II Administrative Headquarters Ash Meadows (Round. 8, Priority 2)	Fish & Wildlife Service	Desert National Wildlife Refuge Complex		[\$3,771,854]	[\$377,185]	[\$4,149,039]
		Phase II Great Basin Interpretive Facilities and Visitor Access (Round. 8, Priority 3)	National Park Service	Great Basin National Park		[\$2,327,175]	[\$232,717]	[\$2,559,892]

Round 9 Capital Improvements Projects Not Recommended for Funding								
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended for Reallocation from Previous Rounds	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
6	5	Old Mill Picnic Area Refurbishment	USDA Forest Service	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area	\$8,782,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7	2	Campground Reconstruction at the Great Basin National Park	National Park Service	Great Basin National Park, White Pine County.	\$2,979,646.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8	3	Lehman Caves Visitor Center Campus, Interpretive Media Rehabilitation	National Park Service	Great Basin National Park, White Pine County.	\$1,315,037.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9	7	Sawmill Trailhead and Picnic Area Improvements	USDA Forest Service	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area	\$271,400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTALS					\$29,731,885	/\$22,482,631/	/\$2,248,262/	/\$24,730,893/

*Subsequent to the Partner's Working Group meeting (PWG), a revised nomination for the Seed Warehouse was received which increases the size of the warehouse to service a broader area (Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and California) at a revised estimated cost of \$3,025,000, plus \$302,500 for a 10% contingency, for a revised total cost of \$3,327,500. The revised nomination is provided for public review but is not part of the PWG's Preliminary Recommendation for Round 9. The revised nomination will be provided to the SNPLMA Executive Committee along with the original project nomination.

**The adjustment to the Capital Improvement budget request reflects excess budgeted funds available for projects within this category due to projects that can't be completed or are completed below the estimated cost. These funds will be reallocated to the recommended projects following the guidelines in the Implementation Agreement.

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263)

Round 9 Nominations - Conservation Initiatives

Preliminary Recommendation

The following is a prioritized lists of Conservation Initiatives projects that have been received and reviewed for possible funding under Round 9 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263).

The purpose of releasing these lists is to obtain input from all interested parties. Beginning April 18, 2008, the BLM is accepting written comments on these recommendations until close of business (4:30 PM Pacific Time) on June 2, 2008. Comments may be mailed to Ron Wenker, SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502-7147 or faxed to the attention of the SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair at (775) 861-6601. The SNPLMA Executive Committee will meet following the comment period to review comments received and develop a final recommendation for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. Questions may be addressed to the BLM Nevada State office at (775) 861-6401.

Round 9 Conservation Initiatives Projects Recommended for Funding								
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
1	13	Humboldt - Toiyabe National Forest Wilderness Implementation, Phase II	USFS	5 Wilderness Areas in White Pine County	\$581,300.00	\$581,300.00	\$58,130	\$639,430
2	4	Environmentally Responsible Closure of Abandoned Mine Safety Hazards In Lincoln County, Phase II	BLM - Ely	Lincoln County	\$261,000.00	\$261,000.00	\$26,100	\$287,100
3	3	Meadow Valley Noxious Weed Control, Phase II	BLM - Ely	Meadow Valley Wash	\$823,000.00	\$823,000.00	\$82,300	\$905,300
4	18	Spring Mountains Butterfly Life History and Autecology Studies, Phase II	FWS & USFS	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area	\$400,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$40,000	\$440,000
5	21	Implementing Service First in Southern Nevada	BLM, FWS, NPS, & USFS	Clark County	\$833,924.00	\$753,924.00	\$75,392	\$829,316
6	20	Interagency Law Enforcement/Resource Protection, Phase III	BLM, FWS, NPS, & USFS	Clark County	\$2,200,000.00	\$2,200,000.00	\$220,000	\$2,420,000
7	22	Interagency Science and Research Strategy Implementation	FWS, NPS, & USFS	Clark County	\$599,127.00	\$599,127.00	\$59,913	\$659,040
8	16	Implementing the Conservation Agreement for Bonneville Cutthroat Trout in the State of Nevada	NPS	White Pine County	\$888,869.00	\$888,869.00	\$88,887	\$977,756

Round 9 Conservation Initiatives Projects Not Recommended for Funding								
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
9	2	White Pine County Backcountry Planning and Access	BLM - Ely	8 Wilderness area in White Pine County	\$1,607,175.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
10	15	Comprehensive Watershed Assessments of Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat in Lincoln County, Phase II	BLM - Ely, FWS	White River South, Delamat Valley and Emigrant Watersheds	\$1,034,836.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
11	1	A Regional Assessment of Post-Fire Rehabilitation of Desert Tortoise Habitat in the Mojave Desert of Southern Nevada	BLM	Desert Tortoise critical habitat throughout Clark and Lincoln Counties	\$1,094,136.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	8	Native Fish and Aquatic Species Refuge Restoration Investigation and Habitat Improvement - Improving a Public Resource	FWS	Devils Hole and Pahrangat National Wildlife Refuge	\$492,855.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	12	Responsible Closure of Abandoned Mine Features in the Schell Creek Range, White Pine County, Nevada	USFS	Schell Creek Range	\$437,500.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	17	White Pine and Lincoln County Cave Management	NPS, & USFS	Great Basin National Park and USFS and NPS administered lands in Lincoln and White Pine County	\$386,700.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	19	Conservation Agreement Revision	FWS & USFS	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area	\$275,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
16	5	BLM Ely District Travel Route Evaluation Planning and Access, Phase I	BLM - Ely	Lincoln and White Pine Counties	\$2,821,662.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	9	Ecological Assessment of the South Marsh, Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge	FWS	South Marsh, Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge	\$1,106,800.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
18	7	Integrating Groundwater Hydrology and Aquatic Biology to Guide Spring Management	FWS	Springs located in Clark, Lincoln and White Pine Counties	\$2,521,804.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
19	6	Survival and Habitat Requirements of Desert Bighorn Sheep on the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, Nevada, Phase I	FWS	Desert National Wildlife Refuge	\$500,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	10	Great Basin National Heritage Route Management Plan	NPS	White Pine County	\$162,730.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
21	11	Dendroglyph Documentation, Great Basin National Park	NPS	Great Basin National Park	\$265,755.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
22	14	Financial Sustainability for Recreation Facilities and Programs on the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area	USFS	Spring Mountains National Recreation Area	\$2,604,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS					\$21,898,173	\$6,507,220	\$650,722	\$7,157,942

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263) Round 9 and Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-248)

Round 5 Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisitions Preliminary Recommendation

The following are prioritized lists of Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisition projects that have been received and reviewed for possible funding under Round 9 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263) and/or the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-248) Round 5.

The purpose of releasing these lists is to obtain input from all interested parties. Beginning April 18, 2008, the BLM is accepting written comments on these recommendations until close of business (4:30 PM Pacific Time) on June 2, 2008. Comments may be mailed to Ron Wenker, SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502-7147 or faxed to the attention of the SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair at (775) 861-6601. The SNPLMA Executive Committee will meet following the comment period to review comments received and develop a final recommendation for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. Questions may be addressed to the BLM Nevada State office at (775) 861-6401.

Round 9 Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisition Projects Recommended for SNPLMA Funding											
Rank	Tab	Property Name	Acres (+/-)	County	Acquiring Agency	Nominating Entity	Resource Values	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
4	7	Toll Road Canyon	230	Washoe	Bureau of Land Management	Nevada Land Conservancy	Historic, Wildlife Habitat, Recreational, Sensitive Species	\$586,000	\$586,000	\$58,600	\$644,600
5	6	Ranch No. 1 Conservation Easement	350	Douglas	Bureau of Land Management	Terra Firma Associates, LLC	Protect Wetland & Wildlife Habitats; Tie Water Rights to Land	\$5,187,000	\$5,187,000	\$518,700	\$5,705,700
7	5	Quilici Ranch Conservation Easement	67.1	Lyon	Bureau of Land Management	The Nature Conservancy	Protect Riparian Corridor & Wildlife Habitat; Tie Water Rights to Land	\$1,163,000	\$1,163,000	\$116,300	\$1,279,300
TOTAL SNPLMA RECOMMENDATION								\$6,936,000	\$6,936,000	\$693,600	\$7,629,600

Round 9 Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisition Projects Recommended for FLTFA Funding											
Rank	Tab	Property Name	Acres (+/-)	County	Acquiring Agency	Nominating Entity	Resource Values	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
1	3	Hutchinson Property	2.27	Clark	Bureau of Land Management	Terri Gamboa, Broker & BLM	Recreational Access, Improved Federal Land Management, Reduce Incompatible Uses in NCA	\$1,661,600	\$1,661,600	\$166,160	\$1,827,760
2	2	Horseshutem Springs 2	5	Nve	USDA Forest Service	Rulon and Lisa Bunker	Riparian, Wildlife Habitat	\$1,150,600	\$1,150,600	\$115,060	\$1,265,660

3	1	Daggett Pass	123	Douglas	USDA Forest Service	The Trust for Public Lands	Historic, Recreational, Wildlife Habitat, Riparian	\$1,011,100	\$1,011,100	\$101,110	\$1,112,210
TOTAL FLTPA RECOMMENDATION								\$3,823,300	\$3,823,300	\$382,330	\$4,205,630

Round 9 Environmentally Sensitive Land Acquisition Projects Not Recommended for Funding											
Rank	Tab	Property Name	Acres (+/-)	County	Acquiring Agency	Nominating Entity	Resource Values	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
6	4	Mack Ranch Conservation Easement	450	Douglas	Bureau of Land Management	Terra Firma Associates, LLC, as Owner's Representative	Protect Riparian Corridor & Habitat	\$18,197,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263)

Round 9 Nominations - Hazardous Fuels and Fire Prevention

Preliminary Recommendation

The following is a prioritized lists of Hazardous Fuels and Fire Prevention projects that have been received and reviewed for possible funding under Round 9 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263).

The purpose of releasing these lists is to obtain input from all interested parties. Beginning April 18, 2008, the BLM is accepting written comments on these recommendations until close of business (4:30 PM Pacific Time) on June 2, 2008. Comments may be mailed to Ron Wenker, SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502-7147 or faxed to the attention of the SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair at (775) 861-6601. The SNPLMA Executive Committee will meet following the comment period to review comments received and develop a final recommendation for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. Questions may be addressed to the BLM Nevada State office at (775) 861-6401.

Round 9 Hazardous Fuels and Fire Prevention Projects Recommended for Funding								
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
1	3	Clear Creek Multijurisdictional Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project	USFS - Region 4	Adjacent to US50 west of Carson City	\$2,589,430	\$2,589,430	\$258,943	\$2,848,373
2	9	Lake Tahoe Basin Interagency and Integrated Hazardous Fuels Reduction Program	NV Fire Safe Council	Lake Tahoe Basin	\$8,647,921	\$3,750,000	\$375,000	\$4,125,000
3	8	Implementation of the Carson Range Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy, 10-Year Plan	NV Fire Safe Council	Carson Range	\$3,484,474	\$1,250,000	\$125,000	\$1,375,000
4	1	North Washoe Ecosystem Underburning and Fuels Treatment Project - Phase One	USFS - Region 4	South of Reno, near Mt. Rose	\$417,000	\$417,000	\$41,700	\$458,700
5	5	Tunnel Creek Prescribed Fire	Nevada State Lands	Lake Tahoe, south of Incline Village	\$64,790	\$64,790	\$6,479	\$71,269
6	12	Lake Tahoe Urban Forest Restoration and Fuels Reduction, Phase 3 of 4	USFS - LTBMU	Lake Tahoe Basin	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$100,000	\$1,100,000
7	6	State of Nevada Urban Lot Fuel Reduction (US Highway 50 Corridor, Douglas County, NV)	Nevada State Lands	Lake Tahoe Basin; Southeast shore from Glenbrook to Round Hill	\$288,434	\$288,434	\$28,843	\$317,277
9	13	Lake Tahoe Basin Prescribed Fire Underburn Project	USFS - LTBMU	Lake Tahoe Basin	\$1,349,000	\$750,000	\$75,000	\$825,000

Round 9 Hazardous Fuels and Fire Prevention Projects Not Recommended for Funding									
Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation	
8	11	South Shore Hazardous Fuels Reduction and Forest Health Restoration Project	USFS - LTBMU	Lake Tahoe Basin, South Lake Tahoe	\$2,450,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
10	4	Arrowhawk Hazardous Fuels Reduction Planning Project, Phase One of Three	USFS - Region 4	South of Reno	\$203,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
11	10	Incline Hazardous Fuel and Forest Health Planning Project	USFS - LTBMU	Lake Tahoe Basin, Incline Village	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
12	2	Jobs Peak Hazardous Fuels Reduction Planning Project, Phase One of Three	USFS - Region 4	South of Minden on CA border	\$209,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
13	7	The economics of linking biomass supply from fuel hazard treatment areas to local and regional end-users	NV Fire Safe Council						
					\$244,810	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTALS					\$22,947,859	\$10,109,654	\$1,010,965	\$11,120,619	

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263)

Round 9 Nominations - Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration Projects

Preliminary Recommendation

The following is a prioritized lists of Eastern Nevada Landscape Restoration projects that have been received and reviewed for possible funding under Round 9 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105 - 263).

The purpose of releasing these lists is to obtain input from all interested parties. Beginning April 18, 2008, the BLM is accepting written comments on these recommendations until close of business (4:30 PM Pacific Time) on June 2, 2008. Comments may be mailed to Ron Wenker, SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair, BLM Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Boulevard, Reno, NV 89502-7147 or faxed to the attention of the SNPLMA Executive Committee Chair at (775) 861-6601. The SNPLMA Executive Committee will meet following the comment period to review comments received and develop a final recommendation for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. Questions may be addressed to the BLM Nevada State office at (775) 861-6401.

Round 9 ENLRP Projects Recommended for Funding

Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Nomination Request	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
1	3	Ward Mountain Restoration	USFS & BLM	Ward Mountain, White Pine County, NV	\$306,000	\$306,000	\$30,600	\$336,600
2	6	Kern Mountains & Blue Mass Scenic Area Restoration - Phase One	BLM	Northeast of Ely	\$811,021	\$811,021	\$81,102	\$892,123
3	1	Snake Valley Invasive Weeds: Inventory, Treatment, Restoration and Education	NPS, BLM, & USFS	Areas of Snake Valley within Nevada	\$665,041	\$665,041	\$66,504	\$731,545
4	4	North Schell Restoration Project	USFS	North of Ely, NV	\$1,331,487	\$1,148,380	\$114,838	\$1,263,218
5	2	Landscape Level Vegetation Management Plan	NPS	Great Basin National Park	\$624,008	\$486,348	\$48,635	\$534,983
6	5	Camp Success Fuels Reduction	USFS	East of Ely, NV	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$5,000	\$55,000

Round 9 ENLRP Projects Not Recommended for Funding

Rank	Tab	Project Name	Requesting Entity	Location	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	10% Contingency	Total Recommendation
7	7	Swamp Cedar Natural Area Management Plan	BLM	East of Ely, NV	\$720,165	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	8	Planning for Monitoring, Management and Restoration of Water-Dependent Ecosystems in Spring Valley and other Eastern Nevada Landscapes	FWS	Valleys near the eastern border of Nevada	\$708,080	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS					\$5,215,802	\$3,466,790	\$346,679	\$3,813,469