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

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Creator: Molly Wainwright, ORP

Field Office: Carson City District Office

Lead Office: Carson City District Office

Case File/Project Number: NVW01000-12-04

Applicable Categorical Exclusion Categorical Exclusion Reference 516 DM 11.9 H (1) "Issuance of Special Recreation Permits 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-C010_2012-0062-CX

Project Name: Nevada High Ridge Outfitters

Project Description: Mr. Keith Montes, a licensed Master Guide for hunting in the State of Nevada has submitted a commercial Special Recreation Permit (SRP) application to the Winnemucca District Office for hunting and guiding on BLM managed lands on a multi-jurisdictional, statewide basis. State and Federal regulations require guides to secure land use permits with the appropriate land management agency when charging a fee to accompany customers during the legal hunting and fishing seasons. Mr. Montes intends to guide customers on hunting trips throughout Nevada, with actual locations determined by client demand. Specially designated areas such as Wilderness Study Areas will be excluded from permitted use in the Carson City District until an Environmental Assessment level analysis is completed (43 CFR 2932.5). The permit will be valid for a two year period with an annual renewal clause dependent upon adherence to stipulations, completion of required paper work and payment of fees. Guiding may occur on public lands by hiking or use of ATV and 4WD's. Camping will be in tents or camper. It is anticipated that requested use will produce minimal impacts to resources. There will be a potential to reduce impacts through the application of stipulations and regulations compared to the alternative action which would be the unregulated use by unescorted and unsupervised hunters or hunting groups.

The Winnemucca District Office will be the lead on the permit, while each District Office within the state will review the application, provide cultural and NEPA clearance and additional stipulations as necessary for their respective management areas.

Applicant Name: Keith Montes

Project Location: Carson City District Wide

BLM Acres for the Project Area: N/A

Land Use Plan Conformance: This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001): page REC-7, SOP 3; All public lands not limited or closed in the RMP are open to all individual, commercial and competitive outdoor recreation uses. Opportunities for exploring the back-county by vehicle, hunting, camping, sightseeing and hiking are encouraged.

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)

Stillwater Field Office

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	**YES**	**NO**
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		
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)		ADC
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)		
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		
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)		
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		
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)		
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)		
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)		
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		
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)		
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)		

Sierra Front Field Office

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (project lead/P&EC)		[illegible]
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)		B2B RGC
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)		B2B
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		B2B
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)		B2B
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		B2B
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)		RGC
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)		B2B
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)		B2B
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		B2B
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)		RGC
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)		B2B for DT

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

Stillwater Field Office
Planning Environmental Coordinator, Steve Kramer: 8/30/2012
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: 7-30-12
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: 7/30/12
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: 7-30-12
Archeology, Susan McCabe: 7/30/12
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: 7-30-12

Sierra Front Field Office
Planning Environmental Coordinator: Brian Buttazoni
Sensitive Plants/T&E/Noxious Weeds: Dean Tonenna
Grazing: Katrina Leavitt
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC,: Arthur Callan
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species),: Pilar Zeigler
Archeology,: Rachel Crews RGC 8/30/12
Water Quality,: Niki Cuttler
Soils: Niki Cutler

RMP conformance and CX review confirmation:

Teresa J. Knutson 8/3/2012
Teresa J. Knutson (date)
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

Leon Thomas (date)
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

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:

8/3/2012
Christopher J. McAlear (date)
Carson City District Manager