

DECISION RECORD

EA Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-G010-2017-0006-EA
Project Name: ET Ranch Acquisition, 600 Acres
Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-37001
BLM Office: Safford Field Office

DECISION:

It is my decision to authorize the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), to acquire 600 acres of private land (ET Ranch) located in:

Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona

T. 6 S., R. 22 E., sec. 19, S1/2NE1/4, and N1/2SE1/4;
sec. 20, S1/2NW1/4, SW1/4, W1/2SE1/4;
sec. 29, lots 1 and 2, N1/2NW1/4.

The areas described aggregate 600 acres.

AUTHORITY:

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-579)

RATIONAL FOR DECISION:

Authorization of the Proposed Action would allow the BLM to acquire 600 acres of private lands (ET Ranch) to provide the public with improved access to public lands including the BLM North Santa Teresa Wilderness.

As documented in the EA #DOI-BLM-AZ-G010-2017-0006-EA and the Finding of No Significant Impact, the potential environmental effects that were identified would not be significant and thus an environmental impact statement is not required.

The EA considered two alternatives: the Proposed Action and No Action alternative. The No Action Alternative was not selected because it did not meet the purpose and need.

The following elements have been analyzed pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and would not be significantly affected: Livestock Management, Recreation, Water Quality, Water Rights and Quantity, Wilderness, and Wildlife.

There are no pending or authorized lands actions which might conflict with this Proposed Action. The decision to allow the Proposed Action would not result in any undue or unnecessary

environmental degradation. Per 43 CFR 1610.5 and BLM MS 1601.04(C)(2), this Proposed Action has been reviewed and determined to be in conformance with the Safford District Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (August 1991) as approved in the Partial Records of Decision dated September 1992 and July 1994, and as amended by the Decision Record for the Land Tenure Amendment to the Safford District RMP approved in September 1994 (the "RMP Land Tenure Amendment").

APPEAL:

This decision shall take effect immediately upon the date it is signed by the Authorized Officer and shall remain in effect while any appeal is pending unless the Interior Board of Land Appeals issues a stay (43 CFR 2801.10(b)).


This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR Part 4 and the enclosed Form 1842-1. If an appeal is taken, your notice of appeal must be filed in writing to U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Safford, ATTN: Scott C. Cooke, Field Manager, 711 S. 14th Avenue, Safford, AZ 85546, within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition (request) pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 2801.10 or 43 CFR 2881.10 for a stay (suspension) of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted. The BLM does not accept appeals by facsimile or email.

Standards for Obtaining a Stay

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

for 

 Scott C. Cooke
 Field Manager

6/9/17

 Date