

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Creator:** Dan Westermeyer

**Field Office:** Stillwater

**Lead Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** SRP-LLNVC01000-12509

**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-C010-0055-CX

**Project Name:** Sierra Trail Dogs Dual Sport Motorcycle Ride

**Project Description:** Permit Renewal: Sierra Trail Dogs (STD) is proposing to renew their special recreation permit to conduct a two day dual sport motorcycle ride on BLM managed lands in the Wellington, Nevada to Hawthorne, Nevada area on June 9th and 10th 2012. The SFO is the lead office with SFFO providing authorization. Participants would overnight in Hawthorne then ride back to Wellington the second day. The proposed routes traverse 54 miles of the Stillwater F.O., 37 miles of the Sierra Front F.O., 13 miles of the Bishop Field Office and USFS lands under separate permit from the Bridgeport Ranger District. The BLM SFO is the lead agency for the BLM permit and will coordinate the permit with the Bishop F.O. Previous NEPA documentation used by both agencies was a CX. Each BLM Field Office is responsible for their NEPA documentation.

With the exception of one new section, the SFO course is located on routes authorized under previous STD permits and would be located on existing bladed roads with no use of trails. This new section has been run by the Modesto Ridge Runners in the past for a similar type of event in jeeps and buggies. Participant numbers usually range between 120 to 150 participants with no spectators. The nature of the event is geared towards orienteering where the participants, using scroll maps and GPS, would navigate their way along a predetermined route to their destination point. One stop is proposed for lunch, restroom access and fueling located on a private section of land owned by the Flying M Ranch. No other stops are proposed. Participants would ride in small groups spread out along the route. The event is non-competitive and is not a race. The

motorcycles are typically four-stroke, street legal and outfitted for off-highway touring, not racing. This group has conducted this event under BLM permit and USFS authorization and in compliance with permit stipulations since 1997.

**Applicant Name:** Michael Kaveney, Sierra Trail Dogs

**Project Location:** Mineral County E-SE of Hawthorne

For the NV BLM event route, the following township, range and sections apply within Mineral County. The remainder of the course is on the NV BLM Sierra Front F.O., CA BLM Bishop F.O. or Humboldt-Tioyabe National Forest:

**Stillwater Field Office**

T6N, R28E, Sec. 1,2,3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20  
T6N, R29E, Sec. 5,6,7  
T7N, R28E, Sec. 6, 7, 19, 28, 29,30,31, 33,34  
T7N, R29E, Sec. 12, 13,14,15,16, 17, 19,20,21,22,23,24,26,27,28,29,31,32  
T7N, R30E, Sec. 18  
T8N, R28E, Sec. 6,7, 18,19, 30,31  
T9N, R28E, Sec. 6, 7,17,18,20,29,31,32  
T10N, R28E, Sec. 18,19,30,31

**Sierra Front Field Office**

T7N, R27E, Sec. 12, 13, 24, 25  
T8N, R27E, Sec. 1, 11, 12, 14, 23, 25, 26, 36  
T9N, R27E, Sec 2,3,4,11,12  
T10N, R26E, Sec. 23, 24, 25, 26, 36  
T10N, R27E, Sec. 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27

**The course crosses the following 1:24:000 quads on NV BLM lands:**

**Stillwater Field Office**

Butler Mountain, Nevada, PE 1988;	Copper Canyon, Nevada, PE 1989
Corey Peak, Nevada, PE 1989	Mitchel Spring, Nevada, PE 1989
Mount Grant, Nevada, PE 1989	Ninemile Ranch, Nevada, PE 1989
Lucky Boy, Nevada PE 1989	Hawthorne West, Nevada, PE 1987
Hawthorne East, Nevada PE 1987	Aurora, Nevada, PE 1989

**Sierra Front Field Office**

Pine Grove Spring, Nevada, PE 1988	Mitchel Spring, Nevada, PE 1989
Ninemile Ranch, Nevada, PE 1989	Butler Mountain, Nevada, PE 1988

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** SFFO 37 miles, SFO 54 miles, BFO 13 miles.

**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.”

Section 8 – REC-2: Land Use Allocations, 1: “All public lands under CCFO jurisdiction are designated open to Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use unless they are specifically restricted or closed.”

Section 8 – REC-6: Administrative Actions, 4: “On public land designated open for off highway vehicles, there will generally be no restrictions on use. Organized competitive OHV events have been allowed in Mason Valley, Wilson Canyon, Hungry Valley OHV Area, Moon Rocks, Lemmon Valley MX Area, Dead Camel Mountains, Salt Wells Area, Wassuk Range and in the Frontier 500 and Carson Rally OHV corridors. Organized events will be handled on a case-by-case basis through the Special Recreation Permit review and Environmental review process. Organized activity is generally restricted to existing roads and trail

**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)		JD
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 WJ JL JL
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)		JL
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		JL
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)		JL
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JL
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)		JL
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)		JL JL
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		JL
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)		JL
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)		JD

**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: *SKS 5/12/2012*
- Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD 5-13-12*
- Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW 5-13-12*
- Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW 5-13-12*
- Archeology, Susan McCabe: *SMC A.P.C. 21*
- Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *X/12*
- Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *CS 5/14/12*

**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

*6/6/2012*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)