

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: SFFO**

**Lead Office: SFFO**

**Case File/Project Number: NVC02-13506**

**Applicable Categorical Exclusion:** 516 DM 11.9(H) : Recreation Mgt. (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-C020-2013-0008-CX**

**Project Name: Reno Rodeo Cattle Drive**

**Project Description:** For 20 years the Reno Rodeo Association (RRA) has conducted a cattle drive north of Reno in the week prior to the beginning of the annual Reno Rodeo held in June. The RRA is proposing to renew their permit for another five year term. The annual event would take place over a five day period with overnight camping on four nights. There are a total of eight proposed camp sites identified; three on private and five on public. A typical drive would camp two nights on private and two nights on public. The proposed 80 mile road network consists entirely of well-established roads, where each annual event would use about ½ or 40 miles of the network. Up to 100 riders on horseback (40-75 participants, 25 support personnel) would drive up to 200 cattle to their final destination at the Washoe County Fairgrounds. Feed and water are provided for the livestock at each campsite. Temporary water troughs and animal feed are delivered by pick-up truck/trailer combinations. Livestock are corralled during the evening. Horse-drawn wagons carry supplies for food, clothing and bedrolls. Dinner and breakfast are camp-cooked. Night-time entertainment includes storytelling and folk music around a campfire or, depending on fire restrictions, simulated (gas-fired) campfire.

Is the project located within preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse?  Yes  No

Is the project located within preliminary priority habitat for sage-grouse?  Yes  No

**Applicant Name: Reno Rodeo Association (Butch Van Leuven)**

**Project Location:** T25N, R19E, S. 32-33; T24N, R17E, S. 1, 12; T24N, R18E, S. 1-2, 6-11, 14-17, 23-25, 36; T24N, R19E, S.3-6, 11, 13-14, 31; T24N, R20E, S. 19, 29-30, 32-33; T23N, R18E, S.25, 36; T23N, R19E, S.5-9, 14-16, 18-19, 24, 30; T23N, R20E, S. 3-4, 10, 15-16, 19, 21-22, 27-30, 33-35; T22N, R18E, S. 1; T22N, R20E, S. 2, 11, 14-15, 20-22, 29-31; T21N, R20E, S. 36; T21N, R20E, S. 6-8, 18-19, 30; T20N, R19E, S. 1-2. Washoe County.

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** 100 acres

**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:

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

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

**Realty Specialist:** Perry Wickham \_\_\_ or Erik Pignata asp

**Outdoor Recreation Planner:** Arthur Callan A

**Hydrologist:** Niki Cutler nc

**Archaeologist:** Jim Carter \_\_\_ or Rachel Crews RCC

**Wildlife Biologist:** Pilar Ziegler PZ

**Botanist:** Dean Tonenna DT

**Planning & Environmental Coordinator:** Brian Buttazoni BB

**Range Management Specialist:** Katrina Leavitt \_\_\_ or Ryan Leary RL or Kathryn Dyer \_\_\_

**Wild Horse and Burro Specialist:** John Axtell JA

**Geologist:** Dan Erbes \_\_\_ or Joel Hartmann JH

**Forester:** Coreen Francis CF

**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.

Approved by:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Leon Thomas  
Field Manager  
Sierra Front Field Office

5-15-13

\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)