

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Categorical Exclusion
2016 Outfitter and Guide SRP Renewals**

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Elko District Office
3900 E. Idaho St.
Elko, NV USA
(775)753-0200



Categorical Exclusion

2016 Outfitter and Guide SRP Renewals

Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Elko District Office

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Categorical Exclusion Worksheet	1
2. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances	3
3. Stipulations and Documentation	7
3.1. Documentation	9
3.2. Stipulations	9

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances 5
Table 2.2. Reviewer Comments and Concurrence 6

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Categorical Exclusion Worksheet

2016 Outfitter and Guide SRP Renewals

This page intentionally
left blank

A. Background

NEPA ID No: DOI-BLM-NV-E000-2016-0003-CX

BLM Office: NV - Elko DO

LLNVE00000

Prepared by: Mike Setlock

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: SRP-NV-0200-16-01, SRP-NV-0200-16-02 & SRP-NV-0200-16-03

Type of Action (Subject Code): 2932

Project Name: 2016 Outfitter and Guide SRP Renewals

Location of Proposed Action: Elko District Office

Applicant: Dave Gowan (Canyons West GS), Wayne Testolin (Testolin GS) & Tim Craig (Boulder Creek Outfitters)

Description of Proposed Action: The proposed action would be to authorize three 10– year Special Recreation Permits (SRP), one for each of the proponents, to conduct hunting outfitting and guide operations on BLM-managed resources within the Nevada State Office. The Elko District Office would be the main contact for the proponents and manage the SRPs according to the guidance stipulated in the Nevada State Office Instruction Memorandum No. NV-2014-010. The proponents would offer guiding services via motorized vehicle and saddle/pack stock, on BLM and USFS-managed lands (USFS Special Use Permits apply to Testolin Guide Service and Boulder Creek Outfitters). NEPA documents are usually CXs under the recreation provision and have been authorized in this office as well as Winnemucca, Carson City, Ely, Battle Mountain, and Southern Nevada Districts for the same activity. General stipulations as outlined for outfitter and guides by the Nevada State Office as well as specialized stipulations for each district will mitigate for potential impacts to resources within each office respectively.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: NV - Elko and Wells RMPs

Date Approved/Amended: 1987 & 1985 respectively

Land Use Plan Name: Nevada and Northeastern California Greater Sage Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment

Date Approved/Amended: September 21, 2015

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s): Elko Resource Management Plan Record of Decision, Issue Recreation, Management Prescription #2: Manage the remainder of the planning area for dispersed recreation activities (p. 2). Wells Resource Management Plan Record of Decision, Issue #4– Recreation Management, Management Decision #5: Extensively manage remainder of Resource Area for dispersed recreation (p. 7).

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions) :N/A

C. Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with BLM Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 516 DM 11.9.

Sec. H. Recreation Management, Title 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 other areas authorized in a land use plan. This CX cannot be used for commercial boating permits along Wild and Scenic Rivers. This CX cannot be used for the establishment or issuance of Special Recreation Permits for “Special Area” management (43 CFR 2932.5).

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply.

D. Conclusion and Signature

Based upon this review, I have determined that the Proposed Action, as described, is in conformance with the land use plan and meets the criteria for the selected CX. There is no potential for significant impacts. Therefore, the action is excluded from further environmental analysis and documentation.

/s/ Camille L. Howes, acting DM, 29 Jun 16

Jill C. Silvey
Elko District Manager

Date

Contact Information

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Mike Setlock
Outdoor Recreation Planner
Tuscarora Field Office
3900 E. Idaho St.
Elko, NV 89801
(775) 753-0212
msetlock@blm.gov

* NOTE A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX.

Chapter 2. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances

2016 Outfitter and Guide SRP Renewals

This page intentionally
left blank

Each of the following questions must be answered negatively, with concurrence from all resource specialists participating on the interdisciplinary team (IDT), before this CX may be approved (516 DM).

Table 2.1. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances

Resource Concerns	Yes	No
1. Will this project have significant adverse effects on public health or safety?		X
2. Will this project adversely affect such unique geographic characteristics as: (a) historic or cultural resources; (b) park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers; (c) sole or principal drinking water aquifers; (d) prime farmlands, wetlands, flood plains, or (e) ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department of the Interior's National Register of Natural Landmarks?		(a) X (b) X (c) X (d) X (e) X
3. Will this project have highly controversial environmental effects?		X
4. Will this project have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		X
5. Will this project establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		X
6. Will this project be related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		X
7. Will this project have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?		X
8. Will this project have adverse effects on species listed or proposed for listing on the Threatened or Endangered Species List, or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		X
9. Will this project require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act?		X
10. Will this project threaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		X
11. Will this project 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? (Executive Order 13007— Sacred Sites)		X
12. Will this project 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?		X

Table 2.2. Reviewer Comments and Concurrence

Resource	Specialist Name	Comments	Initials	Date
AFM- Non-Renewables	Bradlee Matthews	No Issues	/s/ BM	6-25-16
AFM- Renewables	Joshua Robbins	No Issues	/s/ JCR	27-June-16
Air/Hydrology/Soils	John Daniel	No Issues	/s/ JAD	6-21-16
Archaeology	Ryan Brown	No Issues	/s/ RB	6-22-16
Cultural Resources	Ryan Brown	No Issues	/s/ RB	6-22-16
Environmental Justice	Terri Dobis	No Issues	/s/ TKD	6-27-16
Fisheries	Beth Wood	NA	/s/ BW	6/21/16
Geology	Tom Schmidt	NA	/s/ TS	6/21/16
Health and Safety	Tom Schmidt	NA	/s/ TS	6/21/16
Native American Concerns	Richard Atkins	NA	/s/ RA	6/27/16
NEPA	Terri Dobis	No Issues	/s/ TKD	6-27-16
Range Management/ Grazing	Joshua Robbins	No Issues	/s/ JCR	27-June-16
Recreation	Mike Setlock	None	/s/ MSS	6/21/16
Weeds	Sam Cisney	See attached comments	/s/ SC	6/27/16
Wild Horses & Burros	Bruce Thompson	None	/s/ BWCT	6/27/16
Wildlife	Ken Wilkinson	No Concerns	/s/ KW	6/27/2016

Weeds comments:

- Avoid staging, camping, and travel through weed infestations.
- In addition to feeding pack/stock animals weed free materials prior to entering public lands (as indicated in 3.1 documentation RDF GEN 12), animals shall also be fed certified weed free material while on public lands.

Chapter 3. Stipulations and Documentation

This page intentionally
left blank

3.1. Documentation

RDF Analysis for Canyons West Guide Service, Testolin Guide Service & Boulder Creek Outfitters DOI-BLM-NV-E000-2016-0003-CX

RDFs Gen 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are not applicable to the proposed project.

No new roads or development of existing roads are being proposed. No permanent or temporary structures. No permanent structures that create movement are to be constructed.

RDF Gen 7: Require dust abatement practices when authorizing use on roads.

Activities are not anticipated to cause dust impacts.

RDF Gen 12: Control the spread and effects of nonnative, invasive plant species (e.g., by washing vehicles and equipment, minimize unnecessary surface disturbance; Evangelista et al. 2011). All projects would be required to have a noxious weed management plan in place prior to construction and operations.

A weed wash station or similar noxious weed management plan will be included in the stipulations. In addition, stipulations are included to require proponent's pack and saddle stock to be fed weed-free hay prior to use on public lands.

RDF Gen 13: Implement project site-cleaning practices to preclude the accumulation of debris, solid waste, putrescible wastes, and other potential anthropogenic subsidies for predators of GRSG.

"Pack it in, pack it out" and "Leave No Trace" requirements are included the permit stipulations.

RDF GEN 19: Instruct all construction employees to avoid harassment and disturbance of wildlife, especially during the GRSG breeding (e.g., courtship and nesting) season. In addition, pets shall not be permitted on site during construction (BLM 2005b).

This design feature is required in the permit stipulations.

RDF GEN 22: Load and unload all equipment on existing roads to minimize disturbance to vegetation and soil.

This design feature will be required in the permit stipulations. No cross-country motorized/mechanical travel is authorized in this permit.

This SRP, with stipulations and Required Design Features, is expected to be neutral to GRSG and its habitat, while providing an opportunity to educate the participants in responsible land use and fostering positive relationships with municipal partners in promoting responsible recreational use in PHMA areas surrounding urban centers.

3.2. Stipulations

Section 3.2 Stipulations is posted to the internet separately.