

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

---

**Decision Record**

**June 18th, 2012**

**PREPARING OFFICE**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
602 Cressler Street  
Cedarville, California 96104 Modoc  
530-279-6101  
530-279-2171





# **Decision Record**

**June 18th, 2012**

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Home Camp Acquired Lands Projects .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Introduction .....	1
1.2. Decision .....	1
1.3. Alternatives Considered but not Selected .....	1
1.4. Decision Rationale: .....	1
1.5. Consultation and Coordination .....	1
1.6. Public Involvement: .....	2
1.7. Plan Consistency .....	2
1.8. Appeal or Protest Opportunities: .....	2
1.9. Authorizing Official: .....	3
1.10. Contact Person .....	3

This page intentionally  
left blank

# **Chapter 1. Home Camp Acquired Lands Projects**

This page intentionally  
left blank

## **1.1. Introduction**

The purpose for the Home Camp Acquired Lands Projects is to implement 5 projects that will improve land health standards and help develop, conserve, and protect the specific resources that were the primary reasons for the BLM acquiring these lands. The completion of this Environmental Assessment (EA) will provide a base of projects that will help BLM better manage these lands and protect some of the degraded resources that were a result of previous management.

The need for this EA is to comply with the requirements of NEPA and ensure that the proposed projects and activities are in conformance with the Surprise RMP and other applicable laws and regulations.

## **1.2. Decision**

It is my decision to authorize the 5 projects as described in chapter 2, Proposed Action (projects 1-4, 6), of the Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-CA-N70-2012-201-EA. The proposed projects would include:

1. Boulder Reservoir Recreational Enhancement Project
2. Pinto Springs Riparian Protection and Habitat Enhancement Project
3. Divine Spring Aspen Stand Habitat Enhancement Project
4. Divine Spring Campground
5. Corral Allotment Aspen Stand and Sage-Steppe Habitat Enhancement Project

See Maps in the EA for locations of the proposed projects.

This decision is effective immediately.

## **1.3. Alternatives Considered but not Selected**

The no action alternative was considered but not selected. Under this alternative no projects would be implemented on the newly acquired lands. This alternative would not include specific projects to achieve resource goals outlined in this alternative.

## **1.4. Decision Rationale:**

The EA document was written analyzing the impacts of the actions on issues/resources that were identified through both internal and external scoping. Based on the impact analysis there was a Finding of No Significant Impacts, therefore, and Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary. The proposed action was selected since it involved minimal impacts to resources and short and long-term benefits for the resource area. These projects are laid out to improve land health standards and would give BLM the tools to better manage these newly acquired lands.

## **1.5. Consultation and Coordination**

A list of agencies consulted and coordinated with is provided in chapter 5 of the EA.

There are no Threatened or endangered species in the project areas. Greater Sage grouse are a candidate species and present in the project areas. Nevada Division of Wildlife was consulted and supported all the projects as proposed.

## **1.6. Public Involvement:**

The BLM Surprise Field Office conducted internal scoping with an interdisciplinary team of specialists, conducted an Environmental Stewardship Program Technical Review Team (TRT) to provide recommendations, as well as sent out letters to interested parties. On March 14th BLM personnel met with the Home Camp permittees to discuss the proposed projects. On March 27th BLM personnel conducted a field visit to two of the projects with one permittee. In addition, the EA was made available for a 37 day public comment period from April 18th through May 24th. See Chapter 5 & 7 for a history of the scoping process. An appendix of comments and responses are attached. BLM also made edits to the EA and noted those areas in the Appendix at the back of the EA.

## **1.7. Plan Consistency**

Based on information in the EA, the project record, and recommendations from BLM specialists, I conclude that this decision is consistent with the Surprise Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD), approved on April, 2008, the Endangered Species Act; the Native American Religious Freedom Act; other cultural resource management laws and regulations; Executive Order 12898 regarding Environmental Justice; and Executive Order 13212 regarding potential adverse impacts to energy development, production, supply and/or distribution.

## **1.8. Appeal or Protest Opportunities:**

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations at Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 4, and the information provided in BLM Form 1842-1.

If an appeal is taken, your notice of appeal must be filed in the Surprise Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, 602 Cressler Street, Cedarville, CA 96104, 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 for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the board, pursuant to Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 4, Subpart E, 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 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.

Standards to Obtaining a Stay:

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulations, 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.

## **1.9. Authorizing Official:**

---

Timothy J. Burke  
Surprise Field Manager

Date

## **1.10. Contact Person**

For additional information concerning this Finding, contact.

Dan Ryan- Realty Specialist  
Surprise Field Office  
602 Cressler Street  
Cedarville, CA 96104  
dryan@blm.gov or 530-279-2719