



**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

- Notice of Proposed Decision – Porter Draw Lease No 02514, dated June 16, 1999
- Finding of No Significant Impact, dated June 16, 1999
- Environmental Assessment No. NM-030-99-134, dated June 10, 1999

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation and monitoring report.)

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the proposed action is to renew the term grazing lease for the same allotment that was analyzed in EA NM-030-99-134. The terms and conditions would be similar to those on the current term grazing lease. The resource conditions, such as forage availability, are sufficiently similar based on field inspections. Existing special designations, rights-of-ways or special species concerns are essentially similar to what was previously analyzed.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in EA NM-030-99-134 is appropriate with respect to the grazing lease renewal of the Porter Draw Lease. A proposed action and no action (denial of grazing lease) were analyzed in EA NM-030-99-134. The environmental concerns, resource values, circumstances and interests are not expected to be affected as a result of the proposed action.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

*Supplemental Feeding* – Supplemental feeding is currently not authorized on this lease, but it is not identified as such on the Terms and Conditions. To clarify, it will be added to the Terms and Conditions that supplemental feeding and maintenance feeding is prohibited on the public lands of this lease. The public lands comprise only a small part of this allotment.

The lease has been inspected on Jan. 19, 2011 and the vegetative resources appeared in good and stable condition. No resource conflicts were observed and resource management is occurring at an acceptable level.

*Wildlife* – A review of current special status species lists <http://nmrareplants.unm.edu>, <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/EndangeredSpecies/lists> and <http://www.bison-m.org/indes.aspx>, species habitat requirements, distribution information, habitats in the allotment/lease with information in the EA and DNA proposal indicate there is no new information that would substantially change the analysis. No other new information exists.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

No new projects have been completed on this allotment, the lessee is still the same and the management practices are not proposed to be changed, thus the methodology and analytical approach used in EA NM-030-99-134 continues to be appropriate. The direct, indirect and cumulative effects for the proposed action, in light of new information, are thus similar to those analyzed in aforementioned EA.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Yes, Environmental Assessment NM-030-99-134 was mailed to the interested public for a 30 day comment period. The subsequent Proposed Decision was also issued to the public for a 15-day protest and a 30-day appeal period. No comments, protests or appeals were received. In addition, a proposed decision will be issued to the lessee and interested public as part of the reissuance of the new term grazing permit and lease. The proposed decision will allow for a protest and appeal period in accordance with the grazing regulations.

**E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Resource Represented</b>
Tom Holcomb	Archeologist	Cultural
Steven Torrez	Wildlife Biologist	Botany (T & E)
Steven Torrez	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife (T & E)
Dona Rutherford	Range Technician	Range

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

**G. Mitigation Measures**

List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented:

In order to comply with existing policy and guidance, the new lease would incorporate the following terms and conditions:

- Grazing use will be in accordance with the proposed action and mitigation measures identified in NM-030-99-134 and DOI-BLM-NM- L000-2010-0168-DNA
- Placement of supplemental feeds such as salt, mineral, vitamins and protein, in block or liquid form, is prohibited on public land.
- Maintenance feeding of livestock with access to public land is prohibited. Maintenance feeding shall be defined as providing livestock with feed to assist in meeting their basic caloric needs, provided at a rate of 3 lbs/day/head or more.

### **H. Conclusion**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation cited herein fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Project Lead \_\_\_\_\_

NEPA Coordinator \_\_\_\_\_

Assistant District Manager: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.