

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Creator:** Molly Wainwright

**Field Office:** Stillwater

**Lead Office:** Stillwater

**Case File/Project Number:** SRP-LLNVC01-13502

**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 impact no more than 3 staging areas; and/or for recreational travel along roads, trails, or in areas authorized in a land use plan.**

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2013-0025-CX

**Project Name:** High Desert Endurance Races

**Project Description:** Nancy Upham with High Desert Endurance Races, part of American Endurance Ride Conference, has submitted a Special Recreation Permit to conduct a horse endurance ride southwest of the Job Peak Wilderness Study Area under a five year permit. Mrs. Upham has operated similar events in the past in the Stillwater Field Office and has maintained a good record of permit compliance. The proposed course differs from the past course, however the changes are positive. The one day event would be held the third Saturday of April annually, with set up beginning on Friday and take down/ clean-up on Sunday, no later than one week after the event. The proposed course begins and ends on USFWS land, however it is primarily conducted on BLM land and roads. Participants would be camping overnight on USFWS land. The endurance course would be approximately 50 miles over jeep trails, established washes and dirt roads consisting of water stops, vet checks, a spectator/ parking area and personnel along the route to ensure safety for the riders and horses. The horse and rider would cover the course within a 12-hour time period. Generally, there will be 40-80 participants, with around 20 spectators. The proposed course would be flagged with ribbons on clothes pins and white chalk. Ribbons will be removed after the event and chalk will be spread into the dirt.

**Applicant Name:** Nancy Upham, High Desert Endurance Races, 3618 Bottom Rd., Fallon, NV 89406

**Project Location:**

T20N, R32E, Section: 31

T20N, R31E, Section: 36

T19N, R32E, Section: 6,5,8,17,16,21,22,27,34,35,36,33,28,29,30,19,18

T19N, R31E, Section: 1, 12, 13

T18N, R32E, Section: 1,2,3,4,9,12,13,15,16,21,22,23,24,26,27

T18N, R33E, Section: 5,6,7,8

T19M, R33E, Section: 31

**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 CCFO”.**

**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)

<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? (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)		@ la KS
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)		luz
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		luz
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)		luz
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		luz
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)		jan
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)		JK
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)		luz
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		luz
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)		jan
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)		

**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: *SK*  
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD 1-28-13*  
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer/Molly Wainwright: *W*  
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), Position Vacant/Steve Kramer/Terri Knutson: *TK*  
Archeology, Susan McCabe: *SM 1/28/13*  
Water Quality, Position Vacant/Kelley Sterle: *KS 1/25/13*  
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *LA 1/28/13*

**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:

*Teresa J. Knutson*  
Teresa J. Knutson  
Field Manager  
Stillwater Field Office

2/5/2013  
(date)