

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
POCATELLO FIELD OFFICE

FONSI, and Decision Record

For the

Morgan Bridge Acquisition Environmental Assessment

DOI- BLM-ID-I020-2013-0037-EA

-----

Proposed Action: Morgan Bridge Acquisition - Donation

Applicant: BLM – Pocatello Field Office

EA No.: DOI-BLM-ID-I020-2013-0037-EA

Serial Number: IDI-037510

Contact Person: Danny Miller, Realty Specialist

Location of Action: T. 4. S., R. 39 E, Section 17, W2W2; Section 18, E2E2; and Section 19, E2NE. The Morgan Bridge property includes approximately 400 acres of land immediately north of the BLM Morgan Bridge Campground. The property is approximately 1.5 miles long and is located on both sides of the Blackfoot River in Bingham County, ID.

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)**

I have reviewed this Environmental Assessment (EA) including the explanation and resolution of any potentially significant environmental impacts. I have determined that the proposed action will not have any significant impacts on the human environment and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

/s/ David A. Pacioretty  
Pocatello Field Manager

9/30/2013  
Date

## **DECISION RECORD (DR)**

**Decision:** It is my decision is to proceed with the Proposed Action to acquire (via donation) of 400 acres of the Morgan Bridge property, including all fee simple rights, including mineral rights, attached to this property.

### **Rationale:**

Acquisition of the 400 acres of private land located along the Blackfoot River would: allow the parcel to be protected from any future development, secure legal public access to the existing BLM Morgan Bridge Campground, ensure protective management to be implemented in support of Greater Sage-grouse and Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout, allow management of recreation, livestock, and riparian zones that is consistent with management of adjacent public lands.

I have determined that the Proposed Action is in conformance with the Approved Pocatello Resource Management Plan, April, 2012.

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the following RMP Objective and Actions:

**Objective LR-5.2** Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands.

**Action LR-5.2.1** A land tenure adjustment program will be implemented based upon a four zone concept where zones (areas that contain common issues or planned actions) and respective priorities are described below. Land tenure adjustments will be considered across Field Office and District boundaries.

This project is located within a Land Tenure Adjustment Zone 1, which has the following description. Public lands that contain special designation because of significant resource values. Zone 1 lands will be retained in public ownership. Examples of Zone 1 lands include Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and Research Natural Areas, special status species habitat, and crucial wildlife habitat. BLM's priority for Zone 1 is to seek to acquire all private and State land inholdings. Public access will be considered in land tenure actions. Approximately 50, 800 acres (9% of the Pocatello Field Office) of public land will be identified in this zone.

**Objective SS-1.3** Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.

**Action SS 1.3.6** To the extent possible and to promote conservation, Greater sage-grouse habitat will be managed consistent with the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (IDFG 2006) or any future revisions/amendments and/or current BLM guidance. Appropriate actions, conservation measures and guidelines that may be considered include, but are not limited to:

In areas where sage grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring

conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. (One of eleven items listed under Action SS-1.3.6)

dated April 1987, as amended (pg. 30). The Record of Decision states on page 30; Utility and transportation development may be permitted based on consideration of the following criteria:

1) Type of and need for the proposed facility; 2) Conflicts with other existing or potential resource values and uses; and 3) Availability of alternatives and /or mitigation measures.

/s/ David A. Pacioretty  
Pocatello Field Manager

9/30/2013  
Date

### **APPEALS INFORMATION**

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 this office (at the above address) 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 pursuant to regulations at 43 CFR 2801.10 or 43 CFR 2881.10 for a stay 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 in this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

#### Standards for 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.