

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Lead:** Arthur Callan

**Field Office:** Sierra Front

**Lead Office:** Sierra Front

**Case File/Project Number:** LLNVC02000-12003

**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-2012-C020-0017-CX

**Project Name:** Escape From Prison Hill

**Project Description:** Tom Wion of Tahoe Mountain Milers is requesting a Special Recreation Permit renewal to hold an April 28, 2012 foot race at Silver Saddle Ranch and Prison Hill Recreation Area. The race is proposed as a one day (5 am – 2 pm) foot race on approximately 12.5 miles of dirt roads and single track trails. Each racer would complete 1 lap. Past races have attracted around 125-150 racers and up to 100 spectators. Five “aid stations” are proposed along the course to verify racers are staying on race course and provide assistance to the runners if needed. Aid station numbers 2-5 are accessible by vehicle, however; aid station number 1 is located in the non-motorized use area. A local Boy Scout Troop will pack in the aid station supplies (i.e. table, trash receptacle, water, etc.) to this station. Event staging (i.e. participant parking, registration, Start/Finish, etc.) would occur at Silver Saddle Ranch. Race course will be marked with flagging. No new surface disturbance or temporary structures are proposed along the course or at SSR.

**Applicant Name:** Tahoe Mountain Milers

**Project Location:** Silver Saddle Ranch – Prison Hill Recreation Area; T. 15 N., R. 20 E., S. 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35; T. 14 N., R. 20 E., S. 2, 3, 4.

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** Area of proposed course is estimated at 3 acres. Area of proposed aid stations is estimated at less than ½ acre. Area of proposed staging at SSR is estimated at less than 1.5 acres.

**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:** NV – Carson City RMP.

**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? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
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? (wildlife biologist, hydrologist, outdoor recreation planner, archeologist)		AC hc AB PL
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
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? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
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? (archeologist)		PL
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 biologist, botanist)		AB
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		AC
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)? (archeologist)		PL
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)? (botanist)		AB

**SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:** During ID Team consideration of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Jo Ann Hufnagle, Realty Specialist  
Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner  
Niki Cutler, Hydrologist  
Rachel Crews, Archaeologist  
Pilar Ziegler, Wildlife Biologist/BLM Sensitive Species - Wildlife  
Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist/BLM Sensitive Species - Plants  
Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Although BLM Sensitive Species is not described in one of the 12 extraordinary circumstances question, review of the applicability of this CX has taken them into consideration.

**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:



Alan R. Bittner  
Acting Field Manager  
Sierra Front Field Office

  
(date)