

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
KINGMAN FIELD OFFICE**

**Golden Vertex Corp
Right-of-Way Applications**

Environmental Assessment: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2017-0046-EA

AZA 037252: Access Road
AZA 037253: 24.9 kV Powerline
AZA 037478: Fiber Optic Line
AZA 037253 AA: Temporary-Use Permit

DECISION

INTRODUCTION:

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Kingman Field Office has prepared the *Golden Vertex Corp Right-of-Way Applications* Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the impacts of granting three right-of-ways (ROWs) and one Temporary-Use Permit (TUP) to Golden Vertex Corp., under the authority of Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The authorizations are for the upgrade and maintenance of an access road [AZA 037252]; for the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of a 24.9 kV overhead power line [AZA 037253] and a communication fiber optic cable [AZA 037478]; and a TUP for the short-term use of three work areas [AZA 037253 AA]. The project area is located in northwestern Arizona, east of Bullhead City, Arizona, on public lands managed by the BLM Kingman and Lake Havasu Field Offices. This project would encompass approximately 35 acres of public lands.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

The public was provided the opportunity to participate in the scoping and review of this EA in compliance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1506.6.

Public scoping for the EA was initiated for a 15-day period, from February 12, 2018 through February 26, 2018. A news release was issued, and notification letters were mailed to interested parties and special interest groups, local government and tribal entities. Scoping documents which included a description of the proposed action, visual simulations, drone video and map were made available on the project website. Four comment letters were received by email identifying potential issues. Each of these issues were considered and included, as appropriate into the document as described in Chapter 1.4 (Scoping and Issue Identification) of the EA.

The public was provided the opportunity to review and comment on the EA for a 15-day period, from May 3, 2018 to May 18, 2018. Tribal entities were provided an additional 7-days to provide comment. The full EA, appendices, and supplemental maps were made available on the project website during this period. A news release was issued and tribal entities were notified of the comment period. In addition, an electronic version of the press release was emailed to each individual who participated in during the initial scoping period. No further suggestions or recommendations were derived from the comments received.

LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

The project area is within BLM's Kingman Field Office (KFO) and Lake Havasu Field Office (LHFO) jurisdiction. The Proposed Action is in conformance with management decisions from the Kingman Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (KRMP/FEIS), approved March 1995, and the Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (LHFORMP/FEIS), approved May 2007, respectively.

AUTHORITY

This Decision is in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) as amended (72 USC 4321 et. seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and regulations under Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 2800.

RATIONALE

Upon analysis of the impacts of the Proposed Action and reviewing the public comments received on the EA, I have determined that implementing the Proposed Action as described in Chapter 2 of the EA, with incorporated project design features, will not have a significant impact to the human environment and that an EIS is not required. The rationale in the attached FONSI supports this decision.

DECISION

After reviewing the analysis presented in the *Golden Vertex Corp Right-of-Way Applications* Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2017-0046-EA, preparation of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and carefully considering the comments and input received from the public, it is my decision to approve the three rights-of-ways and one Temporary-Use Permit as described in the Proposed Action of the EA.

APPEAL OF THE DECISION

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA), Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR 4.400 et seq. If you decide to appeal, your Notice of Appeal (NOA) must be filed in writing and in accordance with Form 1842-1 at 2755 Mission Boulevard, Kingman, AZ 86401, and with Office of the Solicitor;

Department of the Interior; Office of the Field Solicitor; Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Court House #404; 401 W. Washington Street SPC44; Phoenix, AZ 85003-2151.

The required Statement of Reasons (see 43 CFR 4.412) may be filed with the NOA or, if not, it must be filed with the IBLA; U.S. Department of the Interior; MS 300-QC; Arlington, VA 22203, within 30 days after the NOA was filed. (See also required service at 43 CFR 4.413.) The decision, signed by the Field Manager, will remain in effect during the appeal unless a written request for a stay is granted.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulations 43 CFR 4.21 for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by IBLA, 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 this notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in the decision, to the IBLA, 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 for Obtaining a Stay

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

1. The relative harm to 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.
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

/s/ Amanda M. Dodson
Amanda M. Dodson
Field Manager
Kingman Field Office

5/30/2018
Date