

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 FO

**Lead Office:** Stillwater FO

**Case File/Project Number:** 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-C020-2012-0042-CX

**Project Name:** Sierra Trail Dogs (STD) - Mystery 250 Dual Sport Ride

**Project Description:** STD is proposing to renew their special recreation permit over a five-year period to conduct an annual two day dual sport motorcycle ride on BLM managed lands in the Wellington, Nevada to Hawthorne, Nevada area. This year's event is proposed for 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. The SFFO course is located on routes authorized under previous STD permits and would be located on existing roads with no use of trails. Participant numbers range between 120-150 and no spectators. The nature of the event is geared towards orienteering where the participants, using scroll maps and GPS, 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:** Sierra Trail Dogs (Michael Kaveney)

**Project Location:** SFFO - Lyon County: T. 10 N., R. 26 E. S. 23-26, 35, 36; T. 10 N., R. 27 E.; S. 13-16, 19-22, 26-27; T. 9 N., R. 27 E.; S. 2-4, 11-12; T. 8 N., R. 27 E.; 1, 11-12, 14, 23, 25, 26, 36; T. 7 N., R. 27 E., S. 12-13, 24, 25.

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** SFFO 36 acres

**Land Use Plan Conformance:** "Provide a wide range of quality recreation opportunities on public lands..." (REC-2).

**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 mc PZ RC
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)		RC
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)		PZ DT
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)		<del>AC</del> RC
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)		DT

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

Eric Pignata, 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

**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:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Leon Thomas  
Field Manager  
Sierra Front Field Office

6-5-12

\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)

