

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Dan Westermeyer, ORP
Field Office: Stillwater Field Office
Lead Office: Stillwater Field Office
Case File/Project Number: SRP NV-040-11-001

Applicable Categorical Exclusion: 516 DM 11.9(H) : Recreation Management (1): Issuance of SRP's for day use or overnight use up to 14 consecutive nights; that impacts no more than 3 staging area acres; and/or for recreational travel along roads, trails, or in areas authorized in a land use plan.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2011-C010-0512-CX

Project Name: XP Rides- Equestrian Trail Rides

Project Description: The proposal is to issue a five-year Special Recreation Permit to Dave Nicholson from the XP Rides Club, who is proposing to hold a historical point to point trail ride along the Pony XP Trail, as well as an endurance loop ride near the vicinity of Cold Springs, NV. The permit will be issued and managed by the Egan Field Office with the Stillwater Field Office providing authorization. The exact course and camp areas were reviewed and approved through CX NV-030-04-47 in 2004 for SRP NV-030-04-034. All riding would take place on established roads and trails. All staging will be on private property. The majority of camps are proposed on private; however the club is proposing to use areas that are on public lands near Cold Springs and Sand Mountain in NDOW gravel pits. The ride is proposed for mid July 2011 the first year. The XP Rides have completed this re-ride since 1976. Each participant must supply their own provisions, horses, and self-contained trailers or campers. The ride is limited to 50 riders; however the club does not expect to receive more than 30 this year. The XP Rides Club will have a logistics trailer equipped with repair equipment, water, portable toilets, trash containers, and medical equipment for members during the ride. All horses will be fed weed free hay.

Applicant Name: David Nicholson

Project Location: The Pony Express Trail across Nevada from Schellbourne, NV to Virginia City, NV with one endurance ride through part of the Clan Alpine Mountains near Cold Springs.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: Linear feature so acreage is not calculated.

Land Use Plan Conformance: Section 8 – REC-2: Desired Outcomes, 1: “Provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities on public land under the administration of the Carson City Field Office.”

Name of Plan: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		la gd
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology, Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		JD JD la
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		JD
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		JD
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JD
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JD
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (Archeology)		JD
8. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the list of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? (Wildlife)		JD
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and Archeology)		JD
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		JD
11. Would the Proposed Action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007)? (Archeology)		JD
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		gd

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

- Planning Environmental Coordinator, Steve Kramer: *SK*
- Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD*
- Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW*
- Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW*
- Archeology, Susan McCabe: *Sm C. 20. a*
- Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *GV*
- Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *LA JD*

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

Teresa J. Knutson
Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

06/21/2011
(date)