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

Case File/Project Number: SRP-NV-040-12-02

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-C010-2013-0003-CX

Project Name: Comstock Mountain Bike Race Nevada

Project Description:

Ted Oxborrow from Nevada Trail Expeditions is requesting a Special Recreation Permit to hold an annual Comstock Mountain Bike event. The race is proposed as an 8-day, fully supported mountain bike race across central Nevada on dirt and graveled roads. This is an individual team self-supported 8 day stage race. The race is anticipating 10 riders plus a vehicle support crew. The ride starts at the NV/UT state line at the Border Inn. The ride ends at Crystal Bay on the CA/NV state line on Lake Tahoe's north shore. Each day riders will be traversing some of Nevada's most rugged and isolated landscapes and 9 counties; primarily following the American Discovery Trail.

The bicycle race is scheduled for June 29- July 7, 2013. Participants will ride a stage per day on off road routes from east to west across Central Nevada. Riders will depart daily after a daily safety & orientation meeting. There will only be one lead vehicle and sweep vehicle on course. All team support vehicles go to the start point and finish points only and will not travel on the course, they will drive around on Highway 50 for each stage.

Each rider is responsible for his/her daily needs including: SPOT GPS tracking device, bike, riding gear, medical support including emergency support service, and food and water. Porta-potties will be available at the start/finish areas. There will be a total of 8 Comstock operational staff to handle logistics.

The proponent will be using local hotels in various town locations along the 8-day ride. No BLM facilities will be used. A daily motel shuttle will transport racers to and from start/finish locations.

The EYDO will be the lead office and all events would be coordinated through an Interoffice Coordination Report with BMDO and CCDO.

Applicant Name: Ted Oxborrow, Nevada Trail Expeditions

Project Location: The event starts at Crystal Bay at the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and travels across Nevada to the Nevada/Utah state line.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: Not applicable

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: 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)

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)		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)		JW JMC DW
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)		AR
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		AR
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)		AR
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		AR
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)		JMC
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)		JW
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)		JMC AR
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		AR
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)		JMC
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: 10/4/12
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: 10/4/12
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: 9/24/12
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: 10-4-12
Archeology, Susan McCabe: 9/24/12
Water Quality,
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: 10/4/12

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:

10/4/2012
(date)

Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office