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: LLNVC02000-12507
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-C020-0024-CX
Project Name: Nevada Adventure Company (NAC)
Project Description: NAC is proposing to renew their permit to conduct guided OHV tours in the Pine Nut area. NAC has been conducting OHV tours in the Pine Nuts under BLM permit since 1994. NAC is proposing to use approximately 140 miles of existing roads to conduct their tours. Given the proximity to the urban interface, a high percentage of the proposed road network receives moderate to high dispersed OHV use. The proponent would use ATV's (quads), side-by-sides, and two passenger "off-road buggies" (600cc power-plant) to conduct their tours. The range of vehicles (including guide) on any given tour is 3-8. A large percentage of the company's clientele is classified as beginner or new to the sport. Average length of tour would be approximately two hours. The company averages approximately 100 tours per year in the Pinenuts. Tours would stage out of NAC's business property located adjacent to Johnson Lane and public lands.
Applicant Name: Nevada Adventure Company; Ari Makinen
Project Location: Douglas County, Carson City. T.13 N., R. 20 E., S.1-2; T.13 N., R. 21 E., S. 1-6, 8-10, 12-17, 23-24; T.13 N., R. 22 E., S.6, 18-19; T.14 N., R. 20 E., S. 10-15, 23-26, 35-36; T.14 N., R. 21 E., S. 4-5, 7-10, 14-18, 19-23, 25-30, 31-36; T.14 N., R. 22 E., S.17-20, 30-31; T.15 N., R. 20 E., S. 12-13; T.15 N., R. 21 E., S.18-20, 20, 29, 33.
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)

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)		ADC
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)		ADC RGC PZ nc
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)		ADC
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		ADC
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)		ADC
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		ADC
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)		PZ BJB
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)		ADC
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		ADC
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)		BJB

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:

8-30-12
(date)

Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office