

ERRATA SHEETS

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

LAKE MEAD INTAKE NO. 3 PROJECT

LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

These Errata sheets are being prepared as a technical supplement to the *Lake Mead Intake No. 3 Environmental Assessment*. The Errata sheets should be attached to the environmental assessment in order to have a full and complete record of the overall conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process.

The *Lake Mead Intake No. 3 Environmental Assessment* was available for public review and comment for approximately six weeks from December 1, 2006 through January 9, 2007. Three comment letters were received during the public comment period. Comment letters supporting the proposed intake project were received from the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and from the City of Henderson (Nevada) Department of Utility Services. A comment letter received from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) expressed concerns regarding the effects of project implementation on downstream water quality for Metropolitan and other water users. The comments were screened to determine whether any new issues, reasonable alternatives, potential for significant impacts, or mitigation measures were suggested. The comments received did not identify new issues or alternatives, nor did they correct or add substantially to the facts presented in or increase the level of impact described in the environmental assessment. Comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives, or comments that only agreed or disagreed with National Park Service policy, are not considered substantive (i.e., they did not challenge the accuracy of the analysis, dispute information accuracy, suggest different viable alternatives, and/or provide new information that resulted in a change to the proposed project). The comments received did not result in changes to the environmental assessment. No design or construction modifications to the preferred alternative were made as a result of the comments.

Text changes for the environmental assessment for the Lake Mead Intake No. 3 Project are presented in Table E-1. Revised or new language is underlined in the table entry; deleted text is shown crossed out. The environmental assessment will not be reprinted.

Table E-1 - Changes to the Environmental Assessment, Lake Mead Intake No. 3 Project

Location in the Environmental Assessment	Text Change
Page 10, Introduction (B. Issues to be Addressed), 1 st paragraph, <i>et seq.</i> Modifications to text.	<p>All references in the text of the EA to <i>NPS Management Policies</i> (2001) should be revised to <i>NPS Management Policies</i> (2006). The 2006 Management Policies were adopted effective 31 August 2006, during the period when the environmental assessment was being reviewed at LMNRA and submitted to the NPS Regional Office for approval.</p> <p>The 2006 Management Policies have also been added to the References section of the environmental assessment later in this Errata table.</p>

Location in the Environmental Assessment	Text Change
Page 43, Affected Environment (A. Aesthetics), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 2 nd sentence.	A viewshed comprises the limits of the visual environment associated with the preferred alternative proposed project.
Page 55, Methodology of the Effects Assessment (B. Effects Assessment Criteria). Insertion to text; new heading and text after the 3 rd paragraph under the heading 'Impairment Analysis' (definition excerpted from <i>NPS Management Policies 2006</i>)	<p>'Unacceptable' Impacts</p> <p>The impact threshold at which impairment occurs is not always readily apparent. Therefore, the National Park Service applies a standard that offers greater assurance that impairment will not occur. NPS does this by avoiding impacts that it determines to be 'unacceptable.' These are impacts that fall short of impairment, but are still not acceptable within a particular park's environment. Park managers must not allow uses that would cause unacceptable impacts; they must evaluate existing or proposed uses and determine whether the associated impacts on park resources and values are acceptable.</p> <p>Virtually every form of human activity that takes place within a park has some degree of effect on park resources or values, but that does not mean the impact is unacceptable or that a particular use must be disallowed. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis (and consistent with <i>NPS Management Policies 2006</i>), 'unacceptable' impacts are impacts that, individually or cumulatively, would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be inconsistent with a park's purposes or values, or • impede the attainment of a park's desired future conditions for natural and cultural resources as identified through the park's planning process, or • create an unsafe or unhealthful environment for visitors or employees, or • diminish opportunities for current or future generations to enjoy, learn about, or be inspired by park resources or values, or • unreasonably interfere with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ park programs or activities, or ○ an appropriate use, or ○ the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or the natural soundscape maintained in wilderness and natural, historic, or commemorative locations within the park. ○ NPS concessioner or contractor operations or services.
Page 68, Environmental Consequences (A. Aesthetics, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	Implementation of project design features and mitigation measures would reduce and minimize minor to moderate adverse effects to the aesthetics of Boulder Basin and Saddle Island and would include all or some of the following measures:
Page 69, Environmental Consequences (A. Aesthetics, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 2 nd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to aesthetic resources.
Page 71, Environmental Consequences (B. Air Quality, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	Best management practices would be implemented during construction to minimize moderate adverse effects to air quality in the Saddle Island area, and would include all or some of the following measures:
Page 71, Environmental Consequences (B. Air Quality, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 2 nd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to air quality resources.

Location in the Environmental Assessment	Text Change
Page 75, Environmental Consequences (C. Biotic Communities, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 3 rd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to biotic communities.
Page 77, Environmental Consequences (D. Cultural Resources, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 2 nd sentence.	The LMNRA <u>and SHPO are</u> is the recipients of any required monitoring reports.
Page 77, Environmental Consequences (D. Cultural Resources, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 3 rd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to cultural resources.
Page 80, Environmental Consequences (E. Geology and Soils, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	Best management practices would be implemented during construction to minimize adverse effects to geology and soils in the Saddle Island area and would include all or some of the following measures:
Page 80, Environmental Consequences (E. Geology and Soils, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph, 4 th bullet. Insertion to text.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SNWA will develop a Supplemental Seeding and Revegetation Plan and <u>a</u> Weed Management Plan, and implement the plans in consultation with LMNRA in response to field conditions. (PDF)
Page 80, Environmental Consequences (E. Geology and Soils, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph, 7 th bullet. Insertion to text.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil conditions <u>would be determined</u> in detail by a pre-construction geotechnical survey and soil sampling program, with the resulting requirements and approaches incorporated into the detailed project design and construction plans. (PDF)
Page 81, Environmental Consequences (E. Geology and Soils, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to text.	No Reporting requirements are anticipated for the first two years of during the operational period for the Weed Management Program.
Page 81, Environmental Consequences (E. Geology and Soils, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	With geology and soils mitigation measures, the preferred alternative <u>proposed project</u> is anticipated to reduce to a "minor" level any temporary, adverse effects on geology and soils, and cumulative effects are not anticipated.
Page 81, Environmental Consequences (E. Geology and Soils, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 2 nd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to geology and soils.
Page 84, Environmental Consequences (F. Hydrology and Water Quality, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	Best management practices would minimize minor to moderate, temporary and adverse effects to water quality in Lake Mead resulting from construction activities, and would include all or some of the following measures:

Location in the Environmental Assessment	Text Change
Page 85, Environmental Consequences (F. Hydrology and Water Quality, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 4 th sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to hydrology and water quality.
Page 86, Environmental Consequences (G. Noise and Vibration, Proposed Project, Effects Assessment), 4 th paragraph. Insertions to 1 st sentence.	During construction of the intake pumping station facilities <u>the use of</u> heavy earth-moving equipment, such as bulldozers and other heavy tracked equipment, <u>would</u> temporarily increase noise levels in the project vicinity.
Page 87, Environmental Consequences (G. Noise and Vibration, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	Noise and vibration abatement measures would be implemented during construction and operation to minimize minor, temporary, and adverse effects to noise and vibration levels in the Saddle Island area, which would include all of <u>some of</u> the following measures:
Page 87, Environmental Consequences (G. Noise and Vibration, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	With noise and vibration abatement measures, the proposed project is anticipated to maintain <u>result in</u> a "minor" level of any temporary and permanent adverse effects on noise levels.
Page 87, Environmental Consequences (G. Noise and Vibration, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 3 rd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to noise and vibration.
Page 90, Environmental Consequences (I. Visitor Use and Experience, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	Avoidance of designated recreation facilities would minimize minor adverse effects to visitor use and experience in Lake Mead and would include all of some of the following measures:
Page 90, Environmental Consequences (H. Transportation and Traffic, Proposed Project, Mitigation), 1 st paragraph. Revision to text (eliminate repeated sentence).	SNWA and the construction contractor would be responsible for the implementation of the abatement measures. The LMNRA would be the report recipient. The LMNRA would be the recipient of any required monitoring reports.
Page 90, Environmental Consequences (H. Transportation and Traffic, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Modifications to 1 st sentence.	With traffic mitigation measures, the preferred alternative <u>proposed project</u> is anticipated to reduce to a "negligible to minor" level any temporary adverse effects on transportation and traffic.
Page 90, Environmental Consequences (H. Transportation and Traffic, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 2 nd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to transportation and traffic.

Location in the Environmental Assessment	Text Change
Page 93, Environmental Consequences (I. Visitor Use and Experience, Proposed Project, Conclusion), 1 st paragraph. Insertion to text after 2 nd sentence.	With the implementation of the conservation measures detailed above, there are no 'unacceptable' direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts identified to visitor use and experience.
Page 94, References. Insert new reference.	National Park Service (NPS). 2006. <i>Management Policies 2006</i> . ISBN 0-16-076874-8. 150 p. + appendices. http://www.nps.gov/policy/MP2006.pdf .

EA	Environmental Assessment
LMNRA	Lake Mead National Recreation Area
NPS	National Park Service
PDF	Project Design Feature
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SNWA	Southern Nevada Water Authority