

---

---

## 6.0 Other Considerations



---

**Environmental Impact Statement**  
**Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**6 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRED BY THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT .....6-1**

**6.1 POSSIBLE CONFLICTS WITH OBJECTIVES OF FEDERAL, STATE, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS .....6-1**

**6.2 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY .....6-9**

**6.3 IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES .....6-9**

**List of Figures**

There are no figures in this chapter.

**List of Tables**

**TABLE 6-1: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION ..... 6-1**

This page intentionally left blank.

## 6 Other Considerations Required by the National Environmental Policy Act

### 6.1 Possible Conflicts with Objectives of Federal, State, Regional, and Local Plans, Policies, and Controls

The Proposed Action and any associated mitigations for the Fallon Range Training Complex (FRTC) Modernization Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would not conflict with the objectives of federal, state, regional, or local policies; or applicable legal requirements, except insofar as it may potentially conflict to some extent with the local county plans that are in effect, most notably the Churchill County 2015 Master Plan. This plan emphasizes the importance of public lands and their continued purpose as multi-use areas for various resources such as energy development, mining, and recreation. The expansion would remove over 540,000 additional acres of land from further or potential public use for at least one of these various purposes. The United States Department of the Navy (Navy) has incorporated into such alternatives various ways to reduce the conflicts that the Proposed Action would have with the local plans. The Navy has also consulted with regulatory agencies as appropriate during the National Environmental Policy Act process and before implementation of the Proposed Action to ensure applicable requirements have been met. Table 6-1 summarizes the Navy’s compliance with requirements (including substantive compliance with requirements not formally applicable to the Navy). Cooperating agency correspondence can be found in Appendix B (Agency Correspondence), cultural resource-related correspondence (with the State Historic Preservation Office) and government-to-government correspondence can be found in Appendix C (Tribal Correspondence), and supporting documentation can be found on the FRTC Modernization EIS website at <https://frtcmmodernization.com/>.

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. section 4321 et seq.) Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508) Department of the Navy Procedures for Implementing NEPA (32 CFR part 775)	This EIS was prepared in compliance with NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and Navy Procedures for Implementing NEPA (32 CFR part 775).
Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. section 7401 et seq.) Clean Air Act General Conformity Rule (40 CFR part 93[B])	The air quality analysis conducted for this EIS indicates that the Proposed Action would not cause National Ambient Air Quality Standards to be exceeded. The Proposed Action does not occur within a nonattainment or maintenance area. Therefore, the General Conformity Rule does not apply.
Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. sections 1251–1387)	Based on the analysis presented in Section 3.9 (Water Resources), the Navy has determined that the Proposed Action would have no substantial effect on the quality or quantity of surface waters or underground aquifers. The Proposed Action would include no point or non-point discharges into surface waters, nor would it include dredging or filling of surface waters. Therefore, the Proposed Action would be in compliance with the federal Clean Water Act.

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Federal Land Policy Management Act (43 U.S.C section 1701 et seq.)	The Navy consulted with the BLM in regard to public lands that would be withdrawn, as well as in regard to land that might be acquired and eventually attain public land status as a result of the Proposed Action.
National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. section 470 et seq.)	In accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the Navy is working with the Nevada SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, BLM, and potentially affected Indian Tribes to amend the Programmatic Agreement from 2011 that governs the identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic properties under Section 106 on lands to be managed by Naval Air Station Fallon within the FRTC as proposed for expansion; and to facilitate coordination between the Navy and the Nevada SHPO (and other parties referenced above) in accordance with applicable requirements. Copies of Section 106 and tribal correspondence are provided in Appendix B (Agency Correspondence) and Appendix C (Tribal Correspondence).
National Wildlife Refuge System Administrative Act and the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act (16 U.S.C. sections 668dd–668ee and Public Law 105-57)	USFWS manages wildlife refuges for protecting, conserving, and restoring fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats. The Navy consulted with the USFWS with respect to potential impacts on refuge lands in the withdrawal and acquisition area.
National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. section 1241 et seq.)	National Historic Trails and National Recreation Trails would not be impacted with implementation of the Proposed Action.
Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 405, Control and Preservation of Public Highways	<p>The Navy would replace any public roads that are closed in kind to maintain accessibility for the population to previously reachable locations. The Navy recognizes that there would be loss of access via non-traditional roads to areas proposed to be withdrawn or acquired; however, the Navy is not proposing to re-locate any such non-traditional roads or to build new roads.</p> <p>Using funding provided by the Navy, the Federal Highway Administration, in cooperation with the Nevada Department of Transportation, would be responsible for planning, designing, permitting, and constructing any realignment of State Route 839 or 361. The Navy has submitted a Needs Report to the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command requesting authority to utilize funding through the Defense Access Roads program. If approved, the Navy would coordinate construction execution through the Federal Highway Administration. NDOT would ensure that construction of any new route is complete before closing any portion of the existing State Route 839 or 361, and the Navy would not utilize any portion of an expanded B-17 range (if implemented) that would overlap the existing State Route 839 or 361 unless and until any such new route has been completed and made available to the public.</p>

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. section 1531 et seq.)	There are no endangered or threatened species known to occur within the FRTC region of influence. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not have the potential to affect federally listed endangered or threatened species, and formal consultation with the USFWS under the Endangered Species Act was not required.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. sections 703–712)	Based on the analysis in Section 3.10 (Biological Resources), the Navy has determined that military readiness and construction activities under the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse effect on a population of a migratory bird species, as defined in the Final Rule authorizing incidental take of migratory birds during military readiness activities (50 CFR Part 21).
Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. sections 668–668d)	The Navy has determined that implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in the “taking” of bald or golden eagles, their nests, or their eggs as defined by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. section 9601 et seq.)	Based on analysis in Section 3.14 (Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children), the Navy has determined that the Proposed Action would not require CERCLA-related cleanup of uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous-waste sites, accidents, or spills. The Navy would report any spill or release of hazardous substance of a quantity equal to or greater than the reportable quantity.
Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (42 U.S.C. section 11001 et seq.)	The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act is applicable to the Proposed Action because small quantities of hazardous materials would be stored on site. Section 312 (Tier Two) reporting applies; this requirement is satisfied by complying with Nevada’s counterpart regulations. Under the Proposed Action, the Navy would not manufacture, store, or otherwise use hazardous chemicals above Toxics Release Inventory (Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act Section 313) reporting thresholds..
Federal Noxious Weed Act (7 U.S.C. section 2801 et seq.)	The U.S. Department of the Navy would continue to manage and control the spread of noxious weeds on lands withdrawn or acquired as a result of the Proposed Action in accordance with the integrated natural resources management plan.
Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. section 136 et seq.)	FIFRA regulates the use of pesticides. Under the Proposed Action, all pesticides would be used in accordance with their labeling, and only certified applicators would apply restricted-use pesticides. Wood pilings from the demolition of the wharf would be disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. section 6901 et seq.)	Small quantities of hazardous waste would continue to be generated at the FRTC under the Proposed Action. Hazardous wastes would continue to be safely disposed of through local vendors in accordance with hazardous waste standard operating procedures.

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. sections 315–316o)	The BLM would continue to use this permitting system to manage livestock grazing, and maintain or improve rangeland conditions on grazing lands that would remain open to grazing activities.
General Mining Law of 1872 (30 U.S.C. section 22 et seq.)	The Navy is consulting with the BLM, and the BLM would continue to regulate prospecting and development of minerals when and where applicable. Navy policy does not allow mining or utilities to occur within active WDZs (OPNAVINST 3550.1A) for public safety reasons. See Section 2.5.6.2 (Mining on Live-Fire [Bravo] Ranges) for more information on the Navy’s consideration of this issue.
Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. section 181 et seq.)	Leasable minerals would continue to be subject to leases, permits, or licenses granted by the Secretary of the Interior on the authority administered by the BLM where and when applicable.
Geothermal Steam Act (30 U.S.C. section 1001 et seq.)	The BLM would continue to administer development of geothermal resources through leasing or other appropriate means within its authority to the extent compatible with mission and safety requirements.
Materials Act of 1947 (30 U.S.C. sections 601–604)	The BLM would continue to administer the disposal of salable minerals from public lands at its discretion where and when applicable.
Military Reservations and Facilities: Hunting, fishing, and trapping (10 U.S.C. section 2671)	As discussed during consultation and planning, the Navy would work with the BLM and USFWS to develop procedures to give designated fish and game officials access to the ranges to effect measures for managing, conserving, and harvesting fish and game resources.
Federal Cave Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. sections 4301 et seq.)	The Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture would continue to secure, protect, and preserve significant caves on land managed by them. The Navy would consult with these agencies if applicable.
Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act (42 U.S.C. sections 7701 et seq.)	All construction that is part of the Proposed Action would be in compliance with the International Building Code for the United Facilities Criteria for construction and earthquake resistance.
Defense Withdrawal (“Engel Act”) (43 U.S.C. sections 155-158)	The Secretary of the Interior would continue to have jurisdiction over all minerals within lands withdrawn for the Department of Defense.
Paleontological Resources Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. sections 470aaa et seq.)	The Act does not generally apply on withdrawn land. The B-ranges would be fenced and closed to public access, which would prevent violations of the Act as a practical matter. The DVTA would not be fenced, however, and it is anticipated the DVTA would remain under management of the BLM for purposes of the Act. BLM-managed land is open to casual collecting of common invertebrate and plant paleontological resources for non-commercial personal use under the Act or other authorities, unless otherwise specified. Collection of other paleontological resources may require a permit, and questions should be directed to BLM.

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
<p>The Sikes Act of 1960 (16 U.S.C. sections 670a–670o, as amended by the Sikes Act Improvement Act of 1997, Pub. L. No. 105-85)</p>	<p>In accordance with the Sikes Act, an integrated natural resources management plan has been prepared and implemented at the FRTC in cooperation with the USFWS and the Nevada Department of Wildlife. The plan is reviewed by the parties annually as to operation and effect and would be updated if the Proposed Action were carried forward to cover the newly withdrawn lands.</p>
<p>Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. section 470aa–mm)</p>	<p>Based on the cultural surveys conducted in support of this EIS, proposed new target areas have the potential to impact identified cultural resources.</p> <p>Ground-disturbing activities associated with use of the drill ground maneuver area and close air support target area would be conducted in accordance with an amended 2011 PA and placed to avoid affecting known cultural resources when mission and safety requirements allow.</p> <p>If cultural resources cannot be avoided, the Navy would follow 36 CFR Part 800.6 with additional stipulations as included in an amended 2011 PA. In the event of post-review discovery of cultural resources, or an inadvertent discovery under NAGPRA during training activities, training in the immediate vicinity of the discovery would be suspended until an archaeologist could assess the potential significance of the resource(s) and actions to be taken in accordance with applicable legal requirements, as appropriate. The Navy anticipates that, with implementation of these measures, training activities would impact cultural resources, but through the implementation of mitigation measures, the impact could be reduced to a level less than significant.</p>
<p>Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act, as amended (54 U.S.C. section 312501–312508: Preservation of Historical and Archaeological Data)</p>	<p>No impacts on known archaeological sites would be anticipated to occur as a result of implementation of the Proposed Action because the cultural surveys conducted in support of this EIS would be used to determine construction locations that would not disturb historical or archaeological data. In the event of inadvertent discovery of sensitive archaeological materials during construction, the Navy would ensure that measures are taken promptly to protect the find from disturbance, assess the significance of the discovery, and implement appropriate mitigating measures for significant resources. Inadvertent discovery of sensitive archaeological materials would be handled in accordance with appropriate standard operating procedures, which include provisions for notifying the Nevada SHPO, Indian Tribes, and other appropriate parties of the discovery.</p>

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. section 3001)	<p>Of the 900 documented places of cultural and/or religious importance to Native Americans who are culturally affiliated with the lands within the proposed FRTC of potential cultural and religious importance identified in this study, about half are within the FRTC boundaries. Such properties include mountain peaks, springs, plant resources, and pinyon stands that derive importance from their association with traditional origin and mythological places or spiritual/ceremonial locations as well as traditional hunting and gathering locations.</p> <p>Specifically, the Fallon Paiute-Shoshone, the Walker River Paiute, and the Yomba Paiute Tribes utilize resources within the existing and proposed FRTC Modernization area (U.S. Department of the Navy &amp; Bureau of Land Management, 2001). Based on previous consultation and discussions with these tribes regarding the Resource Management Plan for certain federal lands in Churchill County, the Navy and BLM identified sensitive areas that may have religious or cultural importance (U.S. Department of the Navy &amp; Bureau of Land Management, 2001).</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the Navy recognizes that additional ethnographic studies or inventories need to be conducted in consultation with the Indian tribes to more fully determine the presence of potential TCPs or sacred sites and has programmed for this requirement. The Navy also recognizes that access constraints could impact traditional cultural practices of these tribes.</p>
American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. section 1996)	No Native American resources or artifacts subject to AIRFA have been identified in the area of potential effects. If such resources are discovered, the Navy would comply with AIRFA and continue consultations with federally recognized tribes.
Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1331–1340)	BLM has agreed to maintain management responsibility of wild horses and burros. The Navy currently has an MOU with the BLM for management of wild horses and burros that would be extended onto any lands requested for withdrawal or proposed for acquisition. The Navy would consult with the BLM on issues pertaining to wild horses or burros.
Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. sections 1131 et seq.)	The Navy consulted with the BLM on WSAs and other wilderness areas within the region of influence. Any change to the WSA designation would presumably be accomplished through any ultimate Congressional withdrawal legislation.
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (54 U.S.C. sections 200301 et seq.)	The Navy is compliant with this Act, as no Section 6(f) properties would be converted to non-recreational uses as a result of the Proposed Action.

Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
Department of Transportation Act Section 4(f) (49 U.S.C. section 303)	Section 4(f) properties apply only to agencies within the USDOT. The FAA must take the lead on Section 4(f) compliance for the USDOT if they are involved in a NEPA action. Special Use Airspace actions are exempt from the requirements of Section 4(f); therefore, this Act does not apply to the Navy under the Proposed Action.
NRS Chapter 533, Adjudication of Vested Water Rights	Any valid claims to water rights that would be revoked as a result of Navy action would be justly compensated by the Navy. The Navy would purchase existing and valid water rights claims, or compensate for the movement of such rights off of any lands acquired by or withdrawn for the benefit of the Navy as a result of any ultimate implementation of the Proposed Action, in accordance with applicable law.
NRS Chapter 534, Underground Water and Wells	Navy would not be affecting the groundwater and would not construct any wells or pull from any aquifers for purposes of this action.
EOs 11988, <i>Floodplain Management</i> ; and 13690, <i>Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input</i>	Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplain maps do not exist for the FRTC ground ranges. Periodic flooding is expected to occur along the washes in these areas, and drainage into dry lake beds occasionally creates standing water. The Proposed Action includes development or construction activities and would be implemented in accordance with these EOs. The Navy would allow land managers to continue coordinating access to the ranges for flood management purposes (regarding B-16 and B-20).
EO 11990, <i>Protection of Wetlands</i>	The Navy would continue to protect wetlands at the FRTC in accordance with EO 11990.
EO 12088, <i>Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards</i>	The Navy would continue to ensure Federal facilities and activities under the Proposed Action would be in compliance with environmental pollution prevention, control, and abatement standards.
EO 12630, <i>Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights</i>	The Navy would purchase private properties that are proposed for acquisition and would pay the fair market value of the property.
EO 12898, <i>Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations</i>	The Navy addressed requirements of EO 12898 in Section 3.15 (Environmental Justice) and determined that implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations.
EO 13007, <i>Indian Sacred Sites</i>	No concerns regarding Indian Sacred Sites have been identified for the Proposed Action based on consultation with Indian Tribes. If concerns are identified, the Navy would comply with EO 13007 and avoid or mitigate impacts on Indian Sacred Sites in consultation with affected Tribes.

Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
EO 13045, <i>Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks</i>	The Navy addressed requirements of EO 13045 in Section 3.14 (Public Health and Safety and Protection of Children) and determined that implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in health or safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.
EO 13112, <i>Invasive Species</i>	The Navy would continue to implement invasive plant and weed controls at the FRTC in accordance with the integrated natural resources management plan, which ensures compliance with EO 13112.
EO 13175, <i>Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments</i>	The Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet invited the following federally recognized Indian Tribes and the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada to participate in the NEPA and NHPA Section 106 processes for this EIS: Duckwater Shoshone Tribe, Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribes, Lovelock Paiute, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Summit Lake Paiute Tribe, Te-Moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (as well as the Battle Mountain Band, Elko Band, South Fork Band, and Wells Band), Walker River Paiute Tribe, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, Winnemucca Paiute Tribe, Yerington Paiute Tribe, and Yomba Shoshone Tribe. Correspondence with these Indian Tribes and the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada can be found in Appendix C (Tribal Correspondence).
EO 13406, <i>Protecting Property Rights of the American People</i>	Owners of private properties would be justly compensated by the Navy if such properties would be acquired for Navy use as a result of the Proposed Action. In addition, this action does not involve the taking of private property for the purpose of advancing economic interests of private parties.
EO 13783, <i>On Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth</i>	The Proposed Action is consistent with the policy and immediate review of all agency actions that potentially burden the safe, efficient development of domestic energy resources. This EO revokes EO 13653, <i>Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change</i> .
EO 13834, <i>Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade</i>	In accordance with EO 13834, to create a sustainable energy economy and demonstrate the federal government’s commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the Navy is committed to improving energy security and environmental stewardship by reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The Navy is actively developing and participating in energy, environmental, and climate change initiatives that would increase use of alternative energy and help conserve the world’s resources for future generations.

**Table 6-1: Summary of Environmental Compliance for the Proposed Action (continued)**

Plans, Policies, and Controls	Status of Compliance
-------------------------------	----------------------

Notes: AIRFA = American Indian Religious Freedom Act; CFR = Code of Federal Regulations; DoD = Department of Defense; EIS = Environmental Impact Statement; FRTC = Fallon Range Training Complex; NAGPRA = Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; Navy = United States Department of the Navy; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act; NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act; U.S. = United States; U.S.C. = United States Code; USFWS = United States Fish and Wildlife Service; BLM = Bureau of Land Management; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Office; CERCLA = Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act; USDOT = U.S. Department of Transportation; EO = Executive Order; U.S. = United States; MOU = Memorandum of Understanding; TCP = Traditional Cultural Property; WSA = Wilderness Study Area; WDZ = Weapons Danger Zone; OPNAVINST = Chief of Naval Operations Instruction; PA = Programmatic Agreement; NDOT = Nevada Department of Transportation; FIFRA = Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

**6.2 Relationship between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity**

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (Part 1502), this EIS analyzes the relationship between the short-term impacts on the environment and the effects those impacts may have on the maintenance and enhancement of the long-term productivity of the affected environment. Impacts that narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment are of particular concern. This means that choosing one option may reduce future flexibility in pursuing other options, or that committing a resource to a certain use often may eliminate the possibility for other uses of that resource.

The Proposed Action in this EIS would be categorized as long term. For example, although the use of expanded training areas for individual training activities may be of short duration, the training areas would remain withdrawn for military use at all times for safety reasons. Because the Proposed Action includes an increase in withdrawn land, operational activities would be distributed over a larger area, which would affect the long-term productivity of environmental resources in those areas. However, there would also be short-term impacts that could arise due to this action, mostly associated with construction activities. Therefore, the determining factor in whether a resource is impacted in the long term or the short term depends on whether that resource is more affected by the withdrawal of lands or by construction activities.

The Navy has developed and periodically updates Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans, Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans, and other environmental management plans to establish a process for preserving the cultural and natural resources that exist on their various ranges without interfering with the military activities that occur on the ranges. These management plans can help to determine the issues a range manager might face in the future and allow the Navy to address any shortfalls through planning and accommodation of future training tempo requirements and deployment schedules. Improved planning facilitates long-term resource management strategies while achieving the near-term goal of providing the capacity and capabilities to fully support required training tasks and meet the Title 10 mandate (10 United States Code section 5062) to be organized, trained, and equipped for prompt and sustained combat.

**6.3 Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitment of Resources**

The National Environmental Policy Act requires that environmental analysis include identification of “any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed

action should it be implemented.” Irreversible and irretrievable resource commitments are related to the use of nonrenewable resources and the effects that the uses of these resources have on future generations. Irreversible effects primarily result from the use or destruction of a specific resource (e.g., energy or minerals) that cannot be replaced within a reasonable time. Irretrievable resource commitments involve the loss in value of an affected resource that cannot be restored as a result of the action (e.g., the disturbance of a cultural site, or closure of potential mineral resource areas).

Military training activities would not increase at the FRTC under the Proposed Action, but these activities would be conducted in different locations, along with where they currently take place. The Navy would make every effort to avoid the disturbance or loss of non-renewable resources such as cultural sites. The only irretrievable commitment of resources associated with training activities would be fossil fuel consumption, which would remain the same under the Proposed Action because the tempo of training would not change. Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources under the Proposed Action would include potential disturbance or closure of previously unrecorded mineral resource areas, the consumption of fossil fuels during construction activities, and the expenditure of funds for the purchase of private properties. Although the land acquisition, including withdrawal of any non-federally owned lands acquired, may render mineral resources associated with this land unavailable for development during the period of withdrawal, the future production yield of mineral resources is unknown, as is to what extent their development would be limited. The latter depends upon the specific terms of any withdrawal. While it seems that the Proposed Action would have considerable irretrievable impacts, the actual withdrawal would not permanently remove resources from future use. There is potential for the FRTC to be redistributed as public lands in the future, and almost all of the impacts that this EIS has detailed would no longer exist should that occur.

## **REFERENCES**

U.S. Department of the Navy, and Bureau of Land Management. (2001). *Bureau of Land Management and Navy Resource Management Plan for Certain Federal Lands in Churchill County, Nevada* (Navy Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan, Amendment to the BLM Lahontan Resource Management Plan, and Environmental Assessment). Fallon, NV: U.S. Department of the Interior.

This page intentionally left blank.