



Martinez, Frances <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fwd: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP Comments

1 message

LCDO_Comments, BLM_NM <blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov>

Mon, Jan 27, 2014 at 10:30 AM

To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Gilbert Amezquita** <gmatucson@yahoo.com>

Date: Sun, Jan 26, 2014 at 2:25 PM

Subject: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP Comments

To: "BLM_NM_LCDO_Comments@blm.gov" <BLM_NM_LCDO_Comments@blm.gov>

To Whom it May Concern:

Based on the information made available for comment regarding said subject, I fully support the proposed plan by City of Las Cruces to acquire the 346.59 acres of BLM land under the provisions of the R&PP Act, for a public safety complex and recreation park center as stipulated in BLM's letter mailed out December 12, 2013. Specifically, I support this project because the safety complex and park will provide numerous benefits to residents living in close proximity, as well as to the Las Cruces community at large:

- 1) First, it provides a park and sports complex that is easily accessible to those who live in close proximity, i.e., within walking distance.
- 2) It will sustain, if not increase, the property values of residential homes in close proximity to the park.
- 3) It provides for a Police Station that will enhance police presence and protection.
- 4) It provides for a Fire Department that will enhance fire department response.
- 5) It designates and protects some of the natural environment ("Habitat Preservation Area") for the future within the community as housing development continues expanding.
- 6) It helps preserve the scenic view of the Organ Mountains for numerous residents living adjacent to the park.
- 7) And it helps provide relief for other currently stressed city park and sports facilities while providing an alternative for all Las Cruces residents.

The only consideration requested is that the City of Las Cruces seek the means to mitigate the light pollution that would be produced by the sports complex fields when in use during evening hours, e.g., affix panels to light fixtures.

Finally, I would like to thank the BLM Office for giving those of us who will live in close to the park an opportunity to express our opinions regarding the proposed plan.

Respectfully,

G. M. Amezquita Las Cruces Resident (Solicited Reponse to BLM letter, dated Dec 12, 2013)

January 23, 2017

RE: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP

Frances Martinez
Project Lead
1800 Marquess Street
Las Cruces, NM 88001

Frances Martinez:

We are writing in support of the Safety Complex and Recreation Park Center proposed for Eastern Dona Ana County. As a home owner residing adjacent to the proposed property, we feel that this project would be very beneficial not only to our neighborhood, but to the entire Las Cruces community. The Safety Complex would efficiently address the safety issues created by a rapidly growing area, and it is critical for growing cities to establish open areas of outdoor recreation to support the mental as well as physical health of their community.

We do have, however, two major concerns that we have not been able to find ample information to address. The first concern is the width of the area that will be considered "open space" or a buffer zone. Since our home is adjacent to the proposed property, we would like to be assured that there will be an appropriate non-use space between our property line and areas that will engage large numbers of people or loud activities. We have frequently experienced four-wheel-drive enthusiasts suddenly coming to the hill outside of our yard and peering directly into our front room. We have often held our breath in fear that they will topple over and into our backyard.

Our second concern is the location of the parking areas and the entry or exit areas. Even though it is not likely that these areas would impact our home directly, it is our hope that every consideration will be given to the security and privacy of our neighbors.

As retired members of the Las Cruces Community, we believe the Safety Complex and Recreation Park would be an asset to the City of Las Cruces. Not only would we look forward to utilizing the proposed walking trails and occasionally observing any possible athletic activities, we believe many of our neighbors would do the same. We look forward to hearing from you concerning the progress of this project as well as the time and location of any public meetings focusing on this issue.

Respectfully,



Ronald H. Jones
4127 Calle Belleza
Las Cruces, NM 88011



Karen R. Jones
4127 Calle Belleza
Las Cruces, NM 88011



Martinez, Frances <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fwd: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP Comments

1 message

LCDO_Comments, BLM_NM <blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov>
To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>

Mon, Jan 27, 2014 at 10:32 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Karen** <krjones@zianet.com>

Date: Thu, Jan 23, 2014 at 3:20 PM

Subject: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP Comments

To: BLM_NM_LCDO_Comments@blm.gov

ATTN: Frances Martinez

Attached is a letter with comments concerning the Las Cruces Public Safety Complex and Recreation Park Proposal.

Please provide us with any additional information that becomes available or the organization date, place and time of any hearing or meeting concerning this issue.

Respectfully,

Karen R Jones

4127 Calle Belleza

Las Cruces, NM 88011

575 642 6572

krjones@zianet.com

 **Ltr for safety ctr.pdf**
359K

January 23, 2017

RE: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP

Frances Martinez
Project Lead
1800 Marquess Street
Las Cruces, NM 88001

Frances Martinez:

We are writing in support of the Safety Complex and Recreation Park Center proposed for Eastern Dona Ana County. As a home owner residing adjacent to the proposed property, we feel that this project would be very beneficial not only to our neighborhood, but to the entire Las Cruces community. The Safety Complex would efficiently address the safety issues created by a rapidly growing area, and it is critical for growing cities to establish open areas of outdoor recreation to support the mental as well as physical health of their community.


We do have, however, two major concerns that we have not been able to find ample information to address. The first concern is the width of the area that will be considered "open space" or a buffer zone. Since our home is adjacent to the proposed property, we would like to be assured that there will be an appropriate non-use space between our property line and areas that will engage large numbers of people or loud activities. We have frequently experienced four-wheel-drive enthusiasts suddenly coming to the hill outside of our yard and peering directly into our front room. We have often held our breath in fear that they will topple over and into our backyard.

Our second concern is the location of the parking areas and the entry or exit areas. Even though it is not likely that these areas would impact our home directly, it is our hope that every consideration will be given to the security and privacy of our neighbors.

As retired members of the Las Cruces Community, we believe the Safety Complex and Recreation Park would be an asset to the City of Las Cruces. Not only would we look forward to utilizing the proposed walking trails and occasionally observing any possible athletic activities, we believe many of our neighbors would do the same. We look forward to hearing from you concerning the progress of this project as well as the time and location of any public meetings focusing on this issue.

Respectfully,


Ronald H. Jones
4127 Calle Belleza
Las Cruces, NM 88011


Karen R. Jones
4127 Calle Belleza
Las Cruces, NM 88011



Martinez, Frances <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fwd: "City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP"

1 message

LCDO_Comments, BLM_NM <blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov>
To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>

Mon, Jan 27, 2014 at 10:31 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kristina Wroblewski** <kriswroblew@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jan 23, 2014 at 3:25 PM
Subject: "City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP"
To: BLM_NM_LCDO_Comments@blm.gov

To Whom It may Concern.

I have no objection to the Public Safety Complex being built on this land package.

I do object to having this area developed for recreational purposes so close to the mountains and a developed housing area.

There is another parcel of BLM land up Lohman that would not interfere with other home owners and there is plenty of land out there that would not impact current homeowners

When there is so much undeveloped land why is this land being considered for recreational development?

If this area is to be developed for recreation than I would strongly advise these fields be used for day time use only. It is a crime to destroy the night skies with "light blight," when so many have bought homes in this area and for anyone trying to enjoy the serenity and darkness of this glorious desert.

If this is already a done deal, I suggest that some one advocate for day use only. At the very least, I suggest that the "green" lights be used that do not destroy the night skies.

I strongly object to this land, so close to developed homes be used in this manner. Regardless, there should be individuals involved that look at the environmental impact of such a development.

Respectfully,
Kristina Wroblewski



Martinez, Frances <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fwd: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP Comments

LCDO_Comments, BLM_NM <blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov>
To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>

Wed, Feb 5, 2014 at 4:50 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Martin Pavletich** <mpartnm@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, Jan 27, 2014 at 2:11 PM

Subject: City of Las Cruces Public Safety Complex R&PP Comments

To: "BLM_NM_LCDO_Comments@blm.gov" <BLM_NM_LCDO_Comments@blm.gov>

My name is Martin Pavletich and I have a residence at 4156 La Purisima. I have not sure what the intended use of the recreation park center and surrounding land is, but my concern is that motorized vehicles (ATV's/motorcycles), if allowed, will be a great noise nuisance to our area. I also am unclear as to the location for the proposed buildings, but assume they will be on the higher ground in the area identified. Thank you.

Martin Pavletich
575-635-2829



Fwd: CITY OF LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SAFETY COMPLEX R&PP COMMENTS

LCDO_Comments, BLM_NM <blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov>
To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fri, Jan 10, 2014 at 1:49 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **MONTE SHRIVER** <monte_15@msn.com>

Date: Tue, Jan 7, 2014 at 4:52 PM

Subject: CITY OF LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SAFETY COMPLEX R&PP COMMENTS

To: "blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov" <blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov>

I approve of the plan in general to lease the land in question to the City of Las Cruces; however I do have the following comments.

1. The Off Road Bike Area should be limited to Mountain Bikes only. No Dirt Bikes as they would make too much noise.
2. The ball fields should be moved to the south side of the area because of "light pollution".

These may be issues to discuss with the City so I would appreciate if you would forward these comments to the City.

Monte Shriver
4523 Maricopa Circle
Las Cruces, NM 88011
575-522-4908
monte_15@msn.com



Re: Proposed City of Las Cruces R&PP

Charles Overhiser <ceoverhiser@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: Charles Overhiser <ceoverhiser@yahoo.com>
To: "fmartine@blm.gov" <fmartine@blm.gov>

Mon, Jan 20, 2014 at 3:46 PM

Dear Ms. Martinez:

We are in agreement with the overall intent of the project to provide land for public safety, nature preservation, and recreation. We are, however, very concerned about some of the details of the implementation.

1. **Concern with the proposed location of the southwest corner entrance/trail head.** The proposed location is very close to existing residential development - - - infringing on the 500 ft natural buffer and bringing traffic, noise, trespassing, litter etc. to close proximity to the local residents. How will traffic get to the trail head? There are several other locations that appear to be less disruptive to existing residents.
2. **Concern with the proposed use of dirt bikes and off-road vehicles.** This activity creates many problems including noise, dust, litter, destroying natural vegetation and most importantly, habitats for our local wildlife. There are a great number of roadrunners, desert cottontails, jack rabbits, snakes, quail, and various other animals that make their home in this particular area. The BLM and the State of New Mexico both have many parcels of land that have already been destroyed by these off-road vehicles.

This activity tends to creep outside the designated limits and would benefit very few to the detriment of the vast majority of the residents of this area - both human and wildlife. If asked, we are sure that the vast majority of our community would prefer that this area remained in its natural state as much as possible.

3. Concern that as the "Safety Complex Concept" materializes there is proper concern and consideration for the quite enjoyment of the existing residential occupants. That means, the "storage area" for the safety complex does not become a trash area and there are no disruptive towers, antennas, lights, etc.

We would greatly appreciate a response to our concerns and an invitation to any public hearings or workshops regarding this project.

Sincerely,
Charles & Dorothy Overhiser
4147 Calle Belleza
Las Cruces NM 88011
Res: (575) 532-9492
Cell: (575) 202-2651
Email: ceoverhiser@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Martinez, Frances" <fmartine@blm.gov>

David D. Langley
4139 Calle Belleza
Las Cruces, NM 88011
575 532 2076

RECEIVED
LAS CRUCES DISTRICT OFFICE
2014 JAN 27 AM 11:55
LAS CRUCES, NM 88005

January 26, 2014

Dear Ms. Martinez,

We approve the transfer of land to the city of Las Cruces for the purpose of building a public safety complex, for nature preservation and recreation, but we have some concerns about what has been presented on the Plan of Development and the 2 Site Maps.

Note: Our back yard is next to the BLM land that we are discussing. My wife and I hike the area back there frequently during the colder months and have for over 5 years. We also keep “**our vision area**” from the back of our home clean of discarded junk and plastic bags blown in by strong winds.

Trail Head By Calle Belleza The plan for this trail head needs to be removed. It is at the end of a jeep trail that dead ends at two residences. No where to go. There are many homes north & south of those two residences and all these lots are right next to the park land. **These homes are supposed to be protected by a buffer area.** This jeep trail needs to be blocked from any motorized traffic to protect the homes. Maybe a sign placed in the middle of the jeep trail “**Buffer Area For Nearby Residents Only. No motorized traffic beyond this point**” or some wording like that.

Motorized Biking & Off Road Vehicles Area. There already is a large area where these types of vehicles have destroyed all vegetation and torn up the land. That should be their area. Restrictions need to be placed on these vehicles to keep them from entering the surrounding areas that still have some vegetation and is home to many roadrunners, jackrabbits, snakes, quail, coyotes and other various animals. Motorized bikes & vehicles need to stay on the jeep trails when entering and leaving their particular area. Designate these more Pristine areas for hiking only. (Note: Your map appears to show an area that is larger than the existing biking area.)

Safety Complex. Hopefully, this complex will be single story buildings hidden behind the hill and out of view from the nearby resident back yards that are located north of the Safety Complex.

We would appreciate a response to our concerns and a invitation to a public meeting regarding this project.

Sincerely,
Dave & Sandy Langley



Martinez, Frances <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fwd: UGLY UGLY B LM DESTROYIGN AMERICAN LAND OWNED BY NATIONAL TAXPAYERS

1 message

Penn, Kendrah <kpenn@blm.gov>

Wed, Jan 1, 2014 at 1:02 PM

To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>, Edward Seum <eseum@blm.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **jean public** <jeanpublic1@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Dec 25, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Subject: Re: UGLY UGLY B LM DESTROYIGN AMERICAN LAND OWNED BY NATIONAL TAXPAYERS

To: blm_nm_lcdo_comments@blm.gov, president <president@whitehouse.gov>, speakerboehner <speakerboehner@mail.house.gov>, americanvoices <americanvoices@mail.house.gov>, "RUSH.HOLT" <RUSH.HOLT@mail.house.gov>, KPENN@blm.gov

Cc: SCOOP <SCOOP@huffingtonpost.com>, AWHPC Contact <contact@wildhorsepreservation.org>

public comment on federal register

the national public wants to know what amount this town will pay for this national land, which belongs to 325 million people in financial deficit. i see no reason that national taxpayers should be taking a hit because this town wants property. they do not and should not qualify to be welfare queens looking for a giveaway. these are the same people who always tells us how "independent" they are. now they are lookign for a handout. i would prefer to see the land saved and protected for ecological purposes and for homes for birds/animals/vegetation than this purpose. the national taxpayers do have purposes for htis land that are purely ecological in purpose because we know those sites keep us all alive. blm constantly strives to wipe out all natural lands but that will kill us all. it is time to stop leaching like this. this is not 1935. this is 2013 when most land is concrete already. this is not a beneficial purpose for this nation. its time to take mgt of our national land out of the hands of blm, which is a bribe filled group of environmental destroyers. this comment isi for the public rec ord. please acknowledge receipt
jean public flemington

On Sun, Dec 22, 2013 at 7:34 PM, <bk1492@aol.com> wrote:

[Federal Register Volume 78, Number 246 (Monday, December 23, 2013)]

[Notices]

[Pages [77488-77489](#)]From the Federal Register Online via the Government Printing Office [www.gpo.gov]

[FR Doc No: 2013-30485]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLNML00000 L14300000.FR0000 NMNM 037574]

Notice of Realty Action: Recreation and Public Purposes Act

waste and household hazardous waste as determined in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6901) and defined in 40 CFR 261.4 and 271.5. Although there is no indication these materials pose any significant risk to human health, or the environment, future land uses should be limited to those which do not penetrate the liner or final cover of the landfill unless excavation is conducted subject to applicable State and Federal requirements. 6. The purchaser (patentee), by accepting a patent, covenants and agrees to indemnify, defend and hold the United States harmless from any costs, damages, claims, causes of action, penalties, fines, liabilities, and judgments of any kind or nature arising from the past, present, and future acts or omissions of the patentee or its employees, agents, contractors, lessees, or any third party, arising out of or in connection with the patentee's use, occupancy, or operations on the patented real property. This indemnification and hold harmless [[Page 77489]] agreement includes, but is not limited to, acts and omissions of the patentee and their employees, agents, contractors, lessees, or any third party, arising out of or in connection with the use and/or occupancy of the patented real property which has already resulted or does hereafter result in (1) Violations of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations that are now, or may in the future become, applicable to the real property; (2) Judgments, claims or demands of any kind assessed against the United States; (3) Costs, expenses, or damages of any kind incurred by the United States; (4) Other releases or threatened releases of solid or hazardous waste(s) and/or hazardous substance(s), as defined by Federal or State environmental laws of, on, into or under land, property and other interests of the United States; (5) Other activities by which solid waste or hazardous substance(s) or waste, as defined by Federal and State environmental laws are generated, released, stored, used or otherwise disposed of on the patented real property, and any cleanup response, remedial action or other actions related in any manner to said solid or hazardous substance(s) or waste(s); or (6) Natural resource damages as defined by Federal and State law. This covenant shall be construed as running with the parcel of land patented or otherwise conveyed by the United States and may be enforced by the United States in a court of competent jurisdiction. Conveyance of this land to the City of Truth Consequences is consistent with applicable Federal and county land use plans, and BLM policy. On December 23, 2013, the land described above will be segregated from all other forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the general mining laws, except for conveyance under the R&PP Act, leasing under the mineral leasing laws, and disposals under the mineral material disposal laws. Classification Comments: Interested parties may submit comments involving the suitability of the land for a conveyance of a landfill. Comments on the classification are restricted to whether the land is physically suited for the proposal, whether the use will maximize the future use or uses of the land, whether the use is consistent with local planning and zoning, or if the use is consistent with State and Federal programs. Application Comments: Interested parties may submit comments regarding the specific use proposed in the application and plan of development, whether the BLM followed proper administrative procedures in reaching the decision to convey under the R&PP Act, or any other factor not directly related to the suitability of the land for use as an existing landfill. The public may submit comments in writing directly to the BLM using one of the methods listed in the ADDRESSES section above. Comments should be submitted on or before February 6, 2014. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. Any adverse comments will be reviewed by the BLM New Mexico State Director who may sustain, vacate, or modify this realty action. In the absence of any adverse comments, the classification of the land described in this notice will become effective on February 21, 2014. The land will not be available for conveyance until after the classification becomes effective. Authority: 43 CFR part 2740. Bill Childress, District Manager, Las Cruces. [FR Doc. 2013-30485 Filed 12-20-13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310-FB-P

—
Kendrah M. Penn
Realty Specialist
Las Cruces District Office
Bureau of Land Management
(575) 525-4382
Fax (575) 525-4412
kpenn@blm.gov



Martinez, Frances <fmartine@blm.gov>

Fwd: comment

1 message

Penn, Kendrah <kpenn@blm.gov>
To: Frances Martinez <fmartine@blm.gov>

Wed, Jan 1, 2014 at 1:06 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **jean public** <jeanpublic1@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 16, 2013 at 5:14 AM
Subject: Re: comment
To: KPENN@blm.gov, speakerboehner <speakerboehner@mail.house.gov>, americanvoices@mal.house.gov, INFO <INFO@taxpayer.net>, media <media@cagw.org>, info <info@earthjustice.org>, PETA Info <info@peta.org>, humanelines <humanelines@hsus.org>, info <info@idausa.org>, nfo@cok.net, INFO <INFO@farmsanctuary.org>, AWHPC Contact <contact@wildhorsepreservation.org>, foe@foe.org, Robin Perkins-Baiettini <info@earthshare.org>, SCOOP <SCOOP@huffingtonpost.com>, info@foxnews.com

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON FEDERAL REGISTER
DENY THIS SALE. THOSE LANDS ARE FOR OPEN SPACE AND ARE NECESSARY FOR BIRDS AND ANIMALS. LET LAS CRUCES BUY THE LAND THEY WANT. THIS COMMUNITY IS CERTAINLY A HOG TOO FOR WANTING 346 ACRES. NO WAY SHOULD THIS BE PERMITTED. THAT LAND IS NATIONAL TAXPAYERS LAND AND IT LOOKS LIKE LAS CRUCES WANTS NATIONAL TAXPAYERS TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR NEEDS. LET THEM PAY FOR THEIR OWN NEEDS AND NOT BE WELFARE QUEENS. I DO NOT THINK THIS SHOULD BE ALLOWED. THAT LAND IS NOT LOCAL LAND. IT BELONGS TO ALL PEOPLE IN THIS NATION AND WE WANT IT AS OPEN SPACE. AND WE DONT WANT TO ALLOW THE SELFISH PEOPLE IN LAS CRUCES TO LOOK TO NATIONAL TAXPAYERS TO BE THEIR SOURCE OF MONEY. THIS COMMENT IS FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD. PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT. JEAN PUBLIC**

On Sun, Dec 15, 2013 at 7:36 AM, jean public <jeanpublic1@gmail.com> wrote:

[Federal Register Volume 78, Number 239 (Thursday, December 12, 2013)]
[Notices]
[Pages 75577-75578]
From the Federal Register Online via the Government Printing Office [www.gpo.gov]
[FR Doc No: 2013-29671]

=====

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLNML003100 L14300000.ES0000; NMNM 128496]

Notice of Realty Action: Recreation and Public Purposes Act
Classification; Lease and Conveyance of Public Land, Do[ntilde]a Ana

would be in the public interest. The City of Las Cruces has not applied for more than the 640-acre annual limitation for public purposes other than recreation use and has submitted a statement in compliance with the regulation at 43 CFR 2741.4(b).

The lease and/or conveyance, when issued, will be subject to the provisions of the R&PP Act and applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior and will contain the following reservations to the United States:

1. Provisions of the R&PP Act and to all applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, including, but not limited to, the terms required by 43 CFR 2741.9.
2. A right-of-way for ditches and canals constructed by the authority of the United States, Act of August 30, 1890 (43 U.S.C. 945).
3. Lease and/or conveyance of the public land shall be subject to valid existing rights.
4. All minerals will be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove such deposits from the same under applicable law and such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.
5. Any other reservations that the authorized officer determines appropriate to ensure public access and proper management of Federal land and interests therein.

Subject to limitations prescribed by law and regulations, prior to conveyance, a holder of any right-of-way within the lease area may be given the opportunity to amend the right-of-way for conversion to a new term, including perpetuity, if applicable.

[[Page 75578]]

Detailed information concerning this proposed project, including, but not limited to documentation relating to compliance with applicable environmental and cultural resource laws, is available for review at the BLM Las Cruces District at the address above.

Upon publication of this notice in the Federal Register, the land described will be segregated from appropriation under the public land laws, including the general mining laws, except for lease or conveyance under the R&PP Act, and leasing under the mineral leasing laws.

Classification Comments: Interested parties may submit comments involving the suitability of the land for the proposed facility. Comments on the classification are restricted to whether the land is physically suited for the proposal, where the use will maximize the future use or uses of the land, whether the use is consistent with local planning and zoning, or if the use is consistent with State and Federal programs.

Application Comments: Interested parties may submit comments regarding the specific use proposed in the application and plan of development, whether the BLM followed proper administrative procedures in reaching the decision, or any other factor not directly related to the suitability of the land for R&PP use.

Any adverse comments will be reviewed by the BLM New Mexico State Director, who may sustain, vacate, or modify this realty action. In the absence of any adverse comments, the classification of the land described in this notice will become effective on February 10, 2014. The land will not be available for lease and/or conveyance until after the classification becomes effective.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment--including your personal identifying information--may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be