

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: LLNVC02000-12211

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-C020-0029-CX

Project Name: Eastern Sierra ATV & UTV Jamboree

Project Description: Northern Mono Chamber of Commerce (NMCC) is proposing a new permit to conduct one annual guided OHV tours in the Pine Nut, Buckskin, Singatse Ranges Range and Virginia City area over the next two years. Tours would occur in June; this year the tour is proposed for June 13-15, 2012. Two separate tours would be conducted over the course of 3 days. Tours would be staggered by one day. Each tour would begin in Coleville, CA and travel north through to VC. Tours would overnight in VC and travel south back to point of origin in CA. NMCC is proposing to use approximately 288 miles of existing roads in the SFFO to conduct their tours. It is estimated that 25 percent of the mileage total is proposed on private land. The proponent would use ATV's (quads) and side-by-sides to conduct their tours. The number of vehicles (including guide) on any given tour is 20. Since most of the equipment can accommodate up to two riders each tour could have up to 40 people. A large percentage of the company's clientele is classified as intermediate skill level with an average age of 50. Average length of a tour day would be approximately 8 hours.

Applicant Name: Northern Mono Chamber of Commerce

Project Location: Douglas, Lyon, Storey Counties, City of Carson City. T.9 N., R. 22 E., S.2-3, 10-13, 24; T.9 N., R. 23 E., S. 6-7, 18-19; T.10 N., R. 22 E., S.4-5, 9, 15-16, 22-23, 26, 27, 34-35; T.10 N., R. 23 E., S. 2-3, 10, 15-17, 20, 29-31; T.11 N., R. 21 E., S. 1, 12-13; T.11 N., R. 22 E., S.4-10, 15-18, 22-28, 32-33; T.11 N., R. 23 E., S. 19, 27-30, 34; T.12 N., R. 21 E., S.1-3, 11-14, 23-25, 36; T.12 N., R. 22 E., S.31; T.12 N., R. 21 E., S.1-3, 11-14, 23-25, 36; T.12 N., R. 22 E., S.31; T.13 N., R. 21 E., S.3-5, 8, 10, 15-17, 20-22, 25-27, 34-36; T.13 N., R. 23 E., S.4-5, 9, 15-16, 22-24, 26-27; T.13 N., R. 24 E., S.5, 7-8, 18-19; T.14 N., R. 20 E., S.1, 12-13, 24-25; T.14 N., R. 21 E., S.4, 6, 9-10, 15-16, 21-23, 25-28, 30-34; T.14 N., R. 22 E., S.6-21, 30; T.14 N., R. 23 E., S.1-3, 5, 8, 12-19, 21, 28-30, 32-33; T.14 N., R. 24 E., S.1-2, 6-11, 17-18, 20, 29, 32; T.15 N., R. 20 E., S.1, 11-13; T.15 N., R. 21 E., S.13, 18-20, 24-25, 29-33; T.15 N., R. 22 E., S.5-9, 11, 13-16, 18, 30, 31; T.15 N., R. 23 E., S.18-20, 28-29, 32-34; T.15 N., R. 24 E., S.2-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16, 21-25, 28-29, 31-32, 36; T.15 N., R. 25 E., S.7, 18-19; T.16 N., R. 20 E., S.1-2, 11-15, 22-26, 35-36; T.16 N., R. 21 E., S.6, 18-19, 30-31; T.12 N., R. 22 E., S. 31; T.16 N., R. 24 E., S. 32-33; T.17 N., R. 20 E., S.25, 36; T.17 N., R. 21 E., S.19, 29-32.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: Area of proposed route system is 145 acres (~150 miles @ ~8' width)

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 TC RC PZ
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)		DT PZ
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)		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:

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:



Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

6-5-12
(date)