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RED ROCK DESERT LEARNING CENTER
CORE GROUP MEETING
BLM Las Vegas Field Office
Tuesday, July 19, 2005
10:30 a.m.

“The mission of the Red Rock Desert Learning Center is to instill stewardship and respect by increasing knowledge and understanding of the Mojave Desert ecosystems and cultures through a unique experiential discovery program.”

AGENDA

1. Introductions & Announcements (5 min.)

2. Approval of Minutes from May 17, 2005 Meeting (5 min.)

3. Update on NEPA Process – Michael Johnson & Otak (30 min.)
   A. Overview of NEPA Process
   B. EA Timeline Schedule
   C. Status of interim EA report
   D. Status of cultural treatment plan

4. Matrix of Project Concerns and Resolutions – Michael Reiland (15 min.)

5. Review of Project Timeline Schedule – Michael Reiland (10 min.)
   A. Status of Request for Proposals
   B. Status of Water Options
   C. Status of Nevada Power Grid

6. Curriculum Development – Jeannie Klockow (10 min.)
   A. Wild Horse & Burro Curriculum

7. Community Outreach – Nancy Flagg (10 min.)
   A. Presentation to CCSD Regional Superintendents
   B. Newsletter Brochure

8. Standing Reports (20 minutes)
   A. Line and Space Architects – Les Wallach/Henry Tom
   B. BLM Capital Improvements – Michael Reiland

9. Committee Reports (10 min.)
   A. Building Committee – Angie Lara
   B. Design Oversight – David Frommer
   C. Educational Programs – Paul Buck
   D. Fund-raising and Partnerships – Blaine Benedict
   E. NEPA – Michael Johnson
   F. Operations – Jackson Ramsey
   G. Other Uses – Pat Williams
   H. Wild Horse & Burro – Billie Young

10. 2005 Meeting Schedule – Michael Reiland (5 min.)

11. Open Discussion / New Business (5 min.)
Meeting Minutes

OLIVER RANCH CORE GROUP
Bureau of Land Management Las Vegas Field Office
Tuesday, July 19, 2005

The meeting commenced at 10:30 a.m. with the following persons in attendance:
Kathy August, Blaine Benedict, Bruce Beierle, Paul Buck, Dale Etheridge, Nancy Flagg, Pat Fleming, Laurie Howard, Megan Iudice, Michael Johnson, Jeanne Klockow, Rob Mrowka, Alan O’Neill, Peg Rees, Michael Reiland, Mark Rehskynshyj, Henry Tom, Pamela Vilkin, Les Wallach, Pat Williams, Debbie Wright, Billie Young.

1. Introductions and Announcements
The group welcomed Jeff Wedding from the UNLV Harry Reid Center, Mark Holby of BLM, and Kate Schwarzler from Otak, Inc.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the May 15, 2005, meeting were approved with no changes.

3. Update on NEPA Process
NEPA Committee Chair Michael Johnson and John McCarty of Otak provided an agenda for their presentation (on file with BLM and UNLV Public Lands Institute). They provided an overview of the NEPA process and the basic elements of an environmental assessment (EA). The EA is a decision-making tool for the BLM to determine what, if any, actions may be required at the site. There are a minimum of 15 critical elements to a NEPA analysis and 6 basic elements of an EA. Public scoping normally isn’t required for an EA, but there are certain projects where issues can be complex and controversial. For this project, the BLM has determined that there will be no formal public scoping, but the final report will likely be made available for public viewing. Alternatives are part of the EA process, including a no action alternative, and mitigations are identified if any impacts are noted. The EA examines multiple potential impacts, including cumulative impacts, and identifies mitigation for any impacts. A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is prepared if there are no significant impacts (or significant impacts that can be mitigated) identified; but if there are significant impacts which cannot be mitigated, the agency will move to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Michael noted that at the June 9 NEPA committee meeting there was a request to have Otak provide a timeline for the EA. John McCarty of Otak described the process, which is conducted in two phases. Phase one was a preliminary effort to observe the design meetings held in April 2004 and gain perspective on the issues. Otak then proceeded with surveys of biological and cultural resources on the entire ranch parcel. The firm also conducted a benchmarking report by looking at other similar schools and the issues they had to address. These portions were summarized in a draft report to the BLM, along with a recommendation for three alternatives to be analyzed. After reviewing the draft report, the BLM will then notify Otak if it may proceed with the second phase, which is to conduct the actual EA.

At the last core group meeting, concerns had been expressed about the cultural survey. Michael Johnson introduced Jeff Wedding of the UNLV Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies to elaborate more on the study that was conducted.
Jeff noted that field surveys of the property were conducted in July 2004. A total of 18 sites were identified, including the original ranch house and structures, wagon roads, fence lines, prehistoric sites, and other historical structures. The field report was submitted to BLM in August 2004 and to the state historical preservation office (SHPO). An agreement between the agencies was reached to begin devising a treatment plan. The plan was finished last month, and BLM now has 30 days to review, followed by another month for SHPO review. Jeff noted that 7 of the 18 sites were determined to be eligible for the National Register, while 11 were deemed not eligible.

Peg Rees asked Jeff to describe what a field survey entails. He said a team of four archaeologists space themselves 30 meters apart, walking back and forth across property lines.

Nancy Flagg asked Jeff to elaborate on what it meant that 7 sites are eligible for the historic register. Jeff replied that 4 criteria determine this, including whether the site is important to themes of the area, whether the site is significant to a person, any significant architecture or artistic element, and whether the site contributes data important to history or prehistory. The BLM ultimately determines whether to nominate any of the sites for the historic register.

Michael Johnson asked Jeff to discuss the cultural treatment plan. Jeff stated that the plan has been submitted to the BLM but is not public at this time because it contains privileged information. At present, the plan may be viewed only by the BLM, SHIPO, and the contractor.

Paul Buck asked if students will ever know where the cultural sites were after they have been mitigated. Jeff said yes and that part of the treatment plan includes interpretive signage and curation of some items at the desert learning center.

Michael Reiland clarified that the 11 cultural sites which were determined not to be eligible will not be ignored. Some sites can be used even if they aren’t eligible for the historic register. Billie Young said this could be useful for conveying to the public the cultural history of the area.

Paul Buck asked if the treatment plan addresses ongoing monitoring of cumulative effects and suggested it might be good to involve students in monitoring the condition of archaeological sites. Jeff said they didn’t address this as part of their work, but could see it being incorporated into the curriculum.

Peg Rees said she understood the sensitive nature of the findings, but she asked whether it was the site or the location that was considered privileged information. Jeff said that after the treatment plan is approved the locations could probably be identified. Michael Reiland noted that a brief summary of the sites had been provided to the core group last fall, and the general public can request a summary of the original report from Stan Rolf or Susanne Rowe at BLM. A summary of the inventory report will also be included in the EA. Loretta Asay wanted to make sure Jeanne Klockow has the list as she works on the cultural strands of the core curriculum.

Paul Buck asked how long it might be before trails on the property could be determined. Michael Reiland said that as mitigation proceeds after the treatment plan is approved, then Line & Space can be involved. Part of the mitigation will involve building the trails and interpretive sites. Jeff noted they will need another couple weeks after SHPO approval of the treatment plan. It will take 9-12 months to get results back from all outside labs, but he agreed that discussion of trail locations can proceed while this is ongoing.
Peg Rees asked who is deciding what goes on the interpretive signs. Michael said it would be a combination of the curriculum committee, Line & Space Architects, and a contractor that Line & Space has hired. Peg suggested BLM think about it being an active process for students, using a numbered system rather than a written sign. Loretta Asay asked if there were any issues with placement of buildings vis a vis the findings in the cultural report. Michael said he was not sure.

John McCarty of Otak explained the benchmarking report. The firm looked at Campbell Creek Science School, Gore Range Natural Science School, Islandwood, and Olympic Park Institute. Of those, 3 EAs from the schools are included in the appendices to Otak’s draft report. After benchmarking, Otak has reduced the number of elements identified in phase one from 31 to 16: air quality, water, wetlands and riparian, cultural, waste, flood plains, migratory birds, threatened species, invasive species, Native American religious concerns, socio-economic, visual resources, vegetation, transportation, wild horse and burro, and wildlife. John said paleontology is not recommended for further follow-up in phase two of the EA, but BLM has the option to add it back in if they choose to do so.

John provided a timeline for the EA process through June 2006 (on file with BLM and UNLV Public Lands Institute) but pointed out that BLM has not had an opportunity to respond to it. Otak anticipates some unresolved issues, with domestic water supply being one of them, because the project has gone from the potential of using a well to using a domestic water supply. Otak is also conducting the EAs for the Red Rock Canyon campground and visitor center projects. They will need to survey the roadway for the water pipeline. The timeline also anticipates the possibility of the EA being challenged in court and, thus, represents a worst case scenario. Otak’s goal is to complete the EA in calendar year 2005 if at all possible.

Pam Vilkin asked if it been determined that domestic water will run from Summerlin, and she asked where the additional funding is coming from. Michael noted a request has been made to use funds from the SNPLMA special account reserve (SAR).

Rob Mrowka asked if BLM would consider the participation of the core group in the review of the draft EA report, with public participation after the final report is issued. Michael Johnson pointed out that BLM cannot seek consensus from the core group because of federal FACA guidelines. Given the interest of the core group and its history, Rob suggested it would be good to have a comment period prior to finalization of the draft, rather than solely using the regular public comment period after the final report is submitted. Alan O’Neill concurred that it would be preferable to draw upon the core group during the internal review process.

Paul Buck asked about the architectural alternatives Otak is considering. John said the preferred alternative is represented by the architect’s current drawings. Paul asked how the other alternatives are developed and whether the core group will have an opportunity to comment on them. John said this remains to be determined. Otak will acknowledge the “disturbed site” option and analyze it. The EA looks at pros and cons to help understand the nature of the preferred alternative. Michael Johnson said there is no set number of alternatives that must be looked at, but it is always better to look at some alternatives.

Peg Rees asked how Otak and Line & Space work together. John replied that the goal all along is to have an iterative process, but he acknowledged it has not been as smooth as originally desired because of some federal EA rules. Otak did participate in the design meetings held by Line and Space and has met with the architects to share perspectives. When Otak did surveys, Line & Space participated in the nature of the issues but not the specifics. Otak has engaged in
exchanges with the Design Oversight Committee. Michael Reiland pointed out that if a major issue was identified, BLM would ensure that appropriate parties were notified.

4. **Matrix of Project Concerns & Resolutions**

Michael Reiland said he is still finalizing a matrix of the project concerns compiled by the university. He has gone through the resolutions and is now documenting where they occurred. He hopes to have a document ready for the next meeting, which will grow as the project continues and serve as an ongoing tracking mechanism.

5. **Review of Project Timeline Schedule**

Michael Reiland provided an update on several project issues.

A. **Status of Request For Qualifications.** BLM has an appointment on July 26 with the new contracting officer in the state office. She has given some indications that a cooperative agreement may be the best vehicle for operation of the center, rather than a concessionaire’s agreement. More will be known after the meeting. BLM hopes to issue a Request for Information (RFI) fairly soon, but Michael is also continuing his discussion with personnel at Lake Havasu concerning the concessionaire pathway just in case.

B. **Water Options.** The BLM held a meeting on July 7 with the Las Vegas Valley Water District to discuss providing water to the campground and visitor center. Initial cost estimates look good. BLM has requested Special Account Reserve funding to bring a municipal water line to the site. The Southern Nevada Water Authority is also interested in partnering with BLM on the desert learning center project. Peg Rees asked about the timeline for running municipal water to the site. Michael said it is about the same as constructing the school -- 2.5 to 3 years. John McCarty said that would fit the current EA timeline, but the need for additional surveys still needs to be determined.

Pam Vilkin suggested that public input might be warranted if taking a water line through a national conservation area. Michael reiterated that the EA doesn’t require public scoping. Pam asked about the cost estimate for the water line. Michael said it could range anywhere from $200,000 to $1.5 million. Pat Fleming noted the Water District prefers to put the water line under the pavement. Extending it from the visitor center is approximately 6 miles.

Nancy Flagg asked if a general project timeline will be provided to the core group. Michael said he would provide one to the university for distribution to the group.

C. **Nevada Power Grid.** There is a need to discuss net metering with Nevada Power, but Michael said nothing has happened with this discussion to date. Loretta Asay said she has been working with a group putting in solar panels on CCSD schools, where student can monitor the energy produced. One of the individuals is interested in partnering on the RRDLC project. Michael asked her to get him the contact information. Pam Vilkin suggested contacting Bob Balzar at Nevada Power, and she also suggested talking to the Harry Reid Center at UNLV, which has been very generous with photovoltaics. Michael said he will make sure to contact these individuals to move this issue forward.

6. **Curriculum Development**

Jeanne Klockow provided an update on the development of the RRDLC core curriculum. She thanked the core group and stakeholders for their help. The essential questions for the wild horse and burro curriculum were shared at the last core group meeting. The expanded curriculum will
be presented to the core group and to the curriculum committee after it has been reviewed by the national wild horse and burro representatives in late July.

Jeanne reported that the historical curriculum is now under development. Ten essential questions have been proposed, which she distributed (on file with BLM and UNLV Public Lands Institute). She encouraged feedback to be sent to her via email. As the historical curriculum development continues, the goal is to start the cultural strands in early August.

7. Community Outreach
Nancy Flagg provided an update on plans for community outreach activities. The university is working on a presentation to be given in early September to the Clark County School District regional superintendents. The presentation will provide a general overview of the project, including its mission and progress on the center to date. Loretta Asay is also helping to arrange a similar presentation to the school board later in the fall.

Work has also started on a newsletter-style brochure to use as a handout at the CCSD presentations as well as at future public meetings. The newsletter will feature short articles about different aspects of the center, along with the architects’ renderings.

Nancy also circulated conceptual drawings of the RRDLC playground that were drawn by students in the Discover Mojave Outdoor World program, another SNPLMA initiative. The students, ages 7-12, were asked to envision desert-themed playground equipment at the center. The drawings will be compiled into a scrapbook for display at public events. Les Wallach suggested adding photos from the dormitory design competition held in 2004.

8. Standing Reports
A. Line and Space Architects
Henry Tom and Les Wallach of Line and Space Architects provided on update on recent activities (on file in UNLV Public Lands Institute office and BLM office). He reminded the group that the architects are in the design development stage and expect to be 50% complete by early August. The plans will be reviewed in Las Vegas August 10-11 with the Building Committee and representatives from BLM-Denver. They began review of the drawings in the Building Committee meeting today and will continue this afternoon. Part of this phase includes re-looking at the function of each building, how the buildings circulate, and making sure the program is interpreted and the design intent carries through. Design development is slated to be completed by early December.

Nancy Flagg asked about the status of the instructor housing. Henry replied that the instructor housing will be designed and listed as a construction alternative. They are looking at several options – one is to include housing for the maintenance person and the infrastructure for the instructor housing in the base bid. Another option is to break the construction of the housing into two packages of 5 facilities each.

Peg Rees reviewed decisions made at the February 2005 Building Committee after the value analysis had been completed. She expressed concern with a decision to potentially defer construction of instructor housing while fully constructing all dormitories. She suggested reconsideration of the decision in order to establish a balance of students and instructors on site. Les Wallach reminded the group that each dorm has living quarters for chaperones. Peg reiterated the need for trained staff to be onsite for safety reasons. Paul Buck concurred and added it would be a relevant issue to potential operators, because instructor salaries will need to be higher if on-site housing is not provided in their overall compensation.
Peg asked if sleeping quarters in the nurse’s station had been cut. Henry Tom said it had been added back in the current drawings. Peg questioned the assumption that the ranch site was too remote for bicycle commuting, which affects potential LEED points. She also asked whether a Citizens Area Transit bus line could be negotiated. Henry responded that LEED requires two separate bus lines, which is a problem. Peg noted that a LEED point could potentially be gained for alternative transportation, because a study being conducted by UNLV as part of another SNPLMA project will look at hydrogen and electric transportation options. Peg also suggested putting a requirement for green cleaning in the operator’s agreement, which would gain another LEED point. Angie Lara asked for follow-up plan for these points, and Line and Space agreed to do so. Pat Fleming pointed out that projects always lose some LEED points when the formal evaluation occurs. Peg agreed and said that for this reason UNLV tries to meet as many possible points as possible on its capital projects.

B.  

**BLM Capital Improvements**

Mark Rehskynshyj provided an update on BLM capital improvements at Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. The Red Springs project is winding down and looks great. He thanked Patrick Putnam for his leadership as well as the Red Rock Canyon Interpretive Association for stepping in to help complete the project.

Meetings of the Visitor Center Core Group are held the second Tuesday of each month at 10:00 a.m. at the Interagency Center. Peg Rees asked if it would be appropriate to have Allison Brody, the project manager of the Environmental Education Strategy, serve on the core group in order to bring that facility into the strategic plan. Michael Reiland said the meetings are open to anyone. The project is currently in schematic design.

9.  

**Committee Reports**

There were no committee reports.

10.  

**Future Meeting Schedule**

Michael Reiland reviewed the upcoming meeting dates for the RRDLC Core Group. The group will return to monthly meetings throughout the remainder of 2005, on the third Tuesday of the month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, August 16, 2005</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UNLV (Room TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Sept. 20, 2005</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>BLM Interagency Conference Rooms A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 18, 2005</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UNLV (Room TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 15, 2005</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>BLM Interagency Conference Rooms A-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.  

**New Business**

No new business was noted.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.
Agenda

Red Rock Desert Learning Center and WHB -- CORE Meeting
Line and Space, LLC.

BLM Las Vegas Field Office 10:30am
Design Development Progress Report

1.) Update on RRDLC Progress for Design Development Phase
   - Summarize Revisions to Building Design

2.) Schedule Update
   - Design Development 50% Complete Progress Review August 10-11, 2005
   - Design Development Complete December 2, 2005
   - Design Development Value Analysis December 5-9, 2005
   - Design Development BLM Review and Approval December 12, 2005 - January 6, 2006
   - Design Development Review with Line and Space January 9-11, 2006
   - Construction Documents Complete October 2006
   - Bidding Phase October 2006 – February 2007
   - Construction February 2007- March 2009 **

** Please note the schedule listed does not show the possibility of completing the utility infrastructure prior to the commencement of the building construction, this may trim a few months off the schedule. This reflects BLM's concern with the schedule for project completion.

3.) Minutes from May 17, 2005 Building Committee Meeting are included for your information.
Building Committee Meeting Minutes

Red Rock Desert Learning Center
Wild Horse and Burro Facility

Subject: Building Committee
Location: UNLV Richard Tam Alumni Center
          UNLV Campus, Las Vegas, NV
Date: May 17, 2005
Time: 8:30am – 10:30am

Attendees: Michael Reiland, Billie Young, Mark Rekshynskj, Les Wallach, Dave Frommer, Pat Fleming and Henry Tom

Please note that an additional presentation was made to Angie Lara on May 18, 2005 at the Las Vegas Field Office at 2:00 pm. Henry Tom, Les Wallach, Michael Reiland, Mark Rekshynskj, Tim O’Brien, Pat Fleming and Debbie Wright were also in attendance. Notes and comments from both meeting are combined into this report.

Meeting Notes
1.) A presentation binder was handed out to each attendee. Minutes from the March 15, 2005 Building Committee Meeting were included. There were no comments regarding those minutes.

2.) DLC. Les Wallach gave an update on changes to the design for the Desert Learning Center. The following was presented:
   - Bus Drop Off. The original design (schematic) included a series of cantilevered shade structures (3 total) located along the bus-drop off area. In the new design, the shade structures have been eliminated and replaced by 3 Center Scored Concrete Masonry walls that are approximately 33’ long. The 3 walls ascend in height from 6’ for the west wall, 9’-4” for the middle wall and 12’-8” for the east wall. It was explained that except for when the sun is directly overhead, the vertical walls would provide shade during the morning and afternoons, when most bus pick ups and drop offs are to occur. A pattern of opening in the walls will be designed to allow for visual contact between each bus drop off area. The walls will come out of the ground through a landscaped area that is planted with desert trees and integrated with benches for seating. The cart storage area and the number of carts have been reduced to 3 per dorm. The storage area will simply be a designated portion of slab with an eyebolt for securing the carts with a chain and lock. The design also allow for each of the drop off areas to be identified with signage and coordinated with the Student Dormitories; for example, the students drop off at the “screw bean mesquite” area would be staying in the “screw bean mesquite” dorm. The bus drop off was redesigned per the recommendations of the Value Analysis and Building Committee approval. The following comments were made: Carts need to be secured so the winds don’t blow them around. There was also a comment regarding heat radiating from the walls; the group felt that this was not a major issue since trees will be shading the walls during the summer.

   - Friendship Circle. A trapezoidal shaped roof supported by columns has replaced the cantilevered roof at the friendship circle. The new roof will be simpler to construct and provide more shade. A gas fire pit and accessible seating area is now included. Per the recommendations of the Value Analysis and Building Committee approval the restrooms have been eliminated, a stair to the central restrooms has been added and the flagstone floor paving changed to exposed aggregate concrete. The stone veneer for the walls will remain. The Building Committee was concerned with heat
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radiation from the metal roof deck; a suggested solution would be the use of a non-cfc foam applied on the top of the metal deck. Line and Space mentioned that there was a concern from the CORE Group with winds; the design of the shade canopy will comply with local wind load requirements.

- Administration. Changes to the Administration design per the Value Analysis and Building committee approval includes the replacement of the two separate roof planes with a single plane roof, the elimination of the stone veneer in favor of split face concrete masonry units or cast in place concrete, the reduction of the glass to a 12' clear height and the elimination of the window shutters. The design has also been further developed to include the following: The parking lot is screened by the addition of a storage room, a cistern will collect rain water from the roof for a drip fountain at the entry, a sun screen wall has been added at the west and east side of the building (deleting the fin walls along the south), benches added at the entry, a door was added between the Nurses area and the offices to allow for after hour access, cabinet in the Lounge was moved from the west wall to the east, the hallway will now include tubular skylights, a door was added to allow for access out to the Patio and the Conference Room exterior door was moved to the east. The Building Committee offered the following comments: Add an door to the Director's Office for exterior access, widen the south patio space between the Director's Office and the Conference Room for ADA access. The BLM would also like for the landscaping at the entry to blend into the natural environment rather than a "manmade sculpted" look.

- Dormitories. The dorm building was completely redesigned to improve circulation, safety, views and to economize on structure, HVAC and plumbing. The circulation corridor, which was originally at the south face of the building and a part of the trombe wall concept, has been moved to the north. The trombe wall, which was part of the glass corridor, is now reduced in size and integrated within the south façade of the building. Each room now has direct views to the south. The main entry into the building remains at the center of the building, glass on top of the bench will slide open to allow for the gathering area to open up to the entry patio. The Chaperone Rooms remain adjacent to the gathering area on the north side of the building. Entry to each dorm room is now from the north side along a day lit corridor; light is borrowed for the corridor from a north clerestory window, which also allows for night sky viewing. A bench is provided at each end of the corridor, which also functions as a gallery and a space for small gatherings. Exits are provided at each end of the corridor. Four storage rooms have been added. In addition, the following items were changed due to the Value Analysis and Building Committee approval: Stone Veneer deleted in favor of split face concrete masonry units throughout entire building, night sky radiation elements (moveable insulation) deleted, roof overhang extended and horizontal glass reduced and excavation reduced by reversing the building configuration. The Building Committee had the following comments: Need to verify that sleeping on mats adjacent to each other is okay per code; Line and Space will verify to see if this is an code issue and will also reconfirm with Loretta Asay from the Clark County School District. Dave Frommer suggested using a time delay device for the exit doors to control unapproved exiting by the students. Angie Lara suggested not putting color on the horizontal light shelf for building identification; she would rather see signage similar at the drop off area located somewhere in the entry patio.

- Flex Labs. A few minor revisions were made to the floor plan of the research lab area (east side). The lab storage area adjacent to the exterior patio is now for
hazardous material storage only and a mechanical room was added. The library was reduced in size to allow for an interior storage area. The storefront windows along the North side of all the labs were changed to a window wall with awning windows and two swing type doors. The use of the Kalwall system (insulated translucent panels) was discussed for the roof and walls of the Flex Labs, this would allow for the labs to be entirely lit by natural lighting and glow from the exterior in the evenings. Line and Space will need to do further research in regards to heat transmission before deciding on cladding the entire lab with this system.

- Central Plant and Maintenance Facility. The separate Central Plant and Maintenance Facility were combined into one facility per the direction of the Value Analysis and Building Committee approval. The maintenance area was reduced in size by the elimination of the private office. The new design includes a raised area in the Northwest corner of the Central Plant for viewing by the students. Students will be brought to this area along a gradual incline between the solar water heating arrays.

3.) Revision to the Mechanical System. The mechanical system for the Desert Learning Center using a conventional electric chiller has been modified to include an “adsorption chiller”. This adsorption water chiller uses a thermodynamic process to convert the energy in solar heated water into chilled water for cooling. This system works well since we will have an abundant amount of solar heated water during the summer months. This system will provide first stage cooling (30-40 Tons) and is limited in capacity by available solar heat.

4.) LEED Update. Line and Space along with their consultant GLHN has initially estimated, using the US Green Building Council (USGBC) LEED-NC Version 2.1 Project Checklist, that the Desert Learning Center may be able to obtain 48 out of the 69 available LEED Points. This puts the facility into a Gold rating and within 4 points of a Platinum rating. Out of the remaining 26 points, 11 points are uncertain at this time and 15 are not likely achievable. A discussion was held on whether each building should be rated individually or collectively as a campus; the BLM decided to pursue the LEED rating for the entire campus collectively. It was noted that this update is early in the process and that changes will likely occur, the group was also made aware that projects don’t typically get all the points that they project during design because of unforeseen problems that occur or because the USGBC does not agree with the interpretation used. A LEED Design Narrative and the LEED-NC Version 2.1 Project Checklist was presented to the group.

5.) WHB. Henry Tom gave an update on changes to the design for the Wild Horse and Burro Facility. The following was presented:

- Administration. The Administration was redesigned per the recommendations of the Value Analysis and Building Committee approval. The following changes were made: The public gang restrooms were replaced by one unisex accessible restroom that is entered from the exterior, the unisex staff restroom and the janitor’s closet was relocated adjacent to the public restrooms (entered from the interior), the outdoor gathering area was reduced in size and the spaces in the area of the office storage and mechanical room were reconfigured.

- Handling Facility. The horse and burro handling facility has been evolving with the guidance of Billie Young and BT Frost. Bob Clements has visited several facilities with Billie and BT in addition to numerous phone conferences. Angie Lara suggested that we show the design to other BLM Horse and Burro personnel for their comments. She suggested that June 7-8 might be a good time to do this since this is during a WHB event. Line and Space will confirm availability to do this with Bob Clements.
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- Infirmary Building. Changes to the Infirmary Building were briefly reviewed. The changes shown on the revised plan are per the recommendations of the Value Analysis and Building Committee approval.

6.) Project Schedule Update. A revised project schedule dated April 15, 2005 was included in the presentation binder. BLM would like to condense the calendar for a December 2008 completion or extend it for a 2009 summer completion. Currently, the schedule shows a March 2009 completion, which falls midway into the Clark County School District spring semester. The BLM would like to time the completion so that the school is not left empty waiting for users for an extended period of time. Line and Space expressed concern that the December 2008 date would be pushing the completion schedule and may not be attainable. BLM and Line and Space will explore alternative construction contracting scenarios to examine effect on the timeline.

7.) Summary. In general, other than a few comments, there were no objections to the changes presented. Line and Space will move forward with the design unless notified otherwise.

8.) Water Discussion. Prior to the beginning of the meeting a discussion was held regarding the potable water issues for the Desert Learning Center. The BLM Las Vegas Field Office (LVFO) has been working on this and reported the following:
- The Nevada State Engineer Office (NSEO) has an administrative practice (unwritten) that prohibits the transfer or purchase of ground water rights into Red Rock Canyon NCA. It was discussed in previous meetings that the BLM would purchase or transfer water rights into the property.
- The BLM LVFO had a discussion with the local NSEO, about developing a groundwater supply. It was the BLM LVFO understanding that this would be possible if the BLM would construct an infiltration gallery to recharge the shallow aquifer at the Oliver Ranch Site using the surface water discharged from Whispering Ben Spring. After further discussion with the local NSEO, they would not approve this solution. It was mentioned that the State BLM Office may try to pursue the discussion at the State Level.
- The BLM is looking into other options such as extending a water supply line from the visitor center. This is a costly solution and will require environmental approval for running the line. However, this would be a dependable water supply and the high cost may be offset by little or no maintenance.
- Another option is to capture the water from Whispering Ben Spring and store it on site for use. The BLM would prefer other options since an extensive water tank (guess to be +2 million gallons) would need to be constructed, extensive water treatment required and the water flow from the spring is unpredictable. The use of water from Whispering Ben could potentially not require any more storage than a vertical well, if we can legally develop a horizontal well. Guidance needs to be obtained from the NSEO about what the BLM can legally do to exercise their right to water from Whispering Ben.

Until further direction is given, the BLM has directed Line and Space to continue designing the water system as if a well will be used. However, thoughts should be given for a design for use of the surface water.

End of Report.
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Otak NEPA Review Agenda

1. The NEPA process

2. The preliminary efforts
   - Preliminary design meetings
   - Blue Diamond public meeting
   - Field surveys
     - Biological
     - Cultural
     - Treatment plan
   - Benchmarking
   - Recommendation on how to progress forward

3. Draft report

4. Anticipated timeline
Statement (516 DM 6)

Requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact
Construction of the RDL is not an action that normally

1508.9

a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) (40 CFR
to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or
sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether
EA is a concise public document which briefly provides

EA

BLM has decided to address the environmental impacts
516 DM 6 Appendix 5.3
15 Critical Elements of NEPA

- Religious Concerns
- Native American
- Floodplains
- Unique
- Farm Lands, Prime
- Environmental Justice
- Cultural Resources
- Air Quality (ACECs)
- Environmental Concern
- Areas of Critical
Basic Elements of an EA

- Mitigation
- Impacts (direct, non-direct, and cumulative, including the No Action alternative)
- Alternatives (not required for an EA)
- Public Scoping
- Proposed Action
- Purpose and Need
An EIS is required if impacts are determined to be significant.

FONSI is signed if impacts are determined to be insignificant.