

**Decision for DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2010- 39 - DNA**

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan, as amended, and was analyzed in EA-NM-060-00-029. The Proposed Action will authorize 22 Animal Units yearlong at 100% Public Land for 264 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) on allotment 63080 and 1 Animal Unit yearlong at 100% Public Land for 12 AUMs on allotment 63096.

If you wish to protest this proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160.2, you are allowed 15 days to do so in person or in writing to the authorized officer, after the receipt of this decision. Please be specific in your points of protest.

The protest shall be filed with the Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, 2909 West 2<sup>nd</sup>, Roswell, NM 88201. This protest should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the proposed action is in error.


In the absence of a protest within the time allowed, the above decision shall constitute my final decision. Should this notice become the final decision, you are allowed an additional 30 days within which to file an appeal for the purpose of a hearing before the Interior Board of Land Appeals, and to petition for stay of the decision pending final determination on the appeal (43 CFR 4.21 and 4.410). If a petition for stay is not requested and granted, the decision will be put into effect following the 30-day appeal period. The appeal and petition for stay should be filed with the Field Manager at the above address. The appeal should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the decision is in error. The petition for stay should specify how you will be harmed if the stay is not granted.

/s/ J H Parman  
J H Parman  
Assistant Field Manager, Resources

9/2/2010  
Date




# Coyote Springs Allotment



**Legend**


- Allotment Boundary
- Surface Ownership**
  - Bureau of Land Management
  - Private
  - State




No Warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual use or aggregate use with other data, or for purposes not intended by the BLM. Spatial information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This information is subject to change without notification.



# Coyote Springs North Allotment



- Allotment Boundary
- Surface Ownership**
- Bureau of Land Management
- Private
- State



No Warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual use or aggregate use with other data, or for purposes not intended by the BLM. Spatial information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This information is subject to change without notification.

Printing Date: 10/13/2009 Prepared By: psw/als File: V:\CONFLICT\_MAP\INFO Conflict\_091009.mxd





#### 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 current Proposed Action was analyzed in the above mentioned Environmental Assessment (EA). The proposed action is the same action analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

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 existing NEPA documents analyzed the proposed action as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The EA was reviewed by identified public interests and no conflicts or concerns were identified. The same applies to the current proposed action given current concerns, interests, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, 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?

Yes. The proposed action is the same as the proposed action as analyzed in the EA. The EA was recently completed and there is no new information or circumstances in regard to this allotment which would warrant further analysis.

In support to the existing document Rangeland Health Assessments were conducted in November of 2009. In the Rangeland Health Assessments it was found that both Upland and Biotic Indicators, "meets" the standards of Rangeland health.

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? [Document and explain]

Yes, the direct, indirect and cumulative effects would be the same as stated in the existing NEPA document. The effects would not be changed considering the proposed action is the same as the proposed action as analyzed in the EA, along with no change in management.

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

Shane Trautner

Rangeland Management specialist-BLM-RFO

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.

**Conclusion:**

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

Shane Trautner  
Project Lead

01-04-2010  
Date

/s/ J H Parman  
J. H. Parman  
Acting Assistant Field Manager

09-02-2010  
Date

**Bureau of Land Management, Roswell Field Office  
DNA Checklist, DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2010- 39 - DNA**

Resources	Not Present on Site	No Impacts	May Be Impacts	Mitigation Included	BLM Reviewer	Date
Air Quality			X	X	SWA Spec/Hydro. /s/ Michael McGee	2/16/10
Soils			X	X		
Watershed Hydrology			X	X		
Floodplains			X	X		
Water Quality - Surface			X	X		
Water Quality - Ground			X	X	Geologist/Hydrologist /s/ Michael McGee	2/16/10
Cultural Resources		X			/s/Rebecca L. Hill	3Feb2010
Native American Religious Concerns	X				Archeologist	
Paleontology	X					
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	X				/s/J H Parman Plan & Env. Coord.	1/20/10
Farmlands, Prime or Unique		X			Realty	2/11/10
Rights-of-Way		X			/s/Sanderford	
Invasive, Non-native Species	X				Helen C.J. Miller Range Mgmt. Spec.	08/06/2010
Vegetation		X				
Livestock Grazing			X	X		
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid		X			/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	3/29/2010
Threatened or Endangered Species	X				/s/Dbaggao Biologist	2/28/10
Special Status Species	X					
Wildlife			X	X		
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	X					
Wild and Scenic Rivers	X				/s/Bill Murry Outdoor Rec. Plnr.	2/3/10
Wilderness	X					
Recreation		X				
Visual Resources		X				
Cave/Karst		X				
Environmental Justice	x				/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	3/16/2010
Public Health and Safety		x				
Solid Mineral Resources		√			/s/ Jerry Dutchover Geo/SPS	01/28/10
Fluid Mineral Resources		X			/s/ John S. Simitz Geo	02/02/2010