

## Decision for DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2011-0070- DNA

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan, as amended, and was analyzed in EA-NM-060-00-184. The Decision Record for EA-NM-060-00-184 as well as the Proposed Action within the EA had a typographical error that misstated the percent public land in this allotment. That Decision Record stated that there was 100 percent public land on this allotment when there is actually 57 percent public land. Thus, the Proposed Action for this DNA is to authorize a term grazing permit:

65185 Caprock West-M 41 Cattle 3/01-2/28 57% PL Active Use 280 AUM's

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

4/4/11  
Date

**U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management  
Pecos District - Roswell Field Office**

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)  
DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2011-0070-DNA**

A. Roswell Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: 10 year grazing permit for allotment #65185

Location of Proposed Action: Allotment #65185

Description of Proposed Action: Renew the 10 year grazing permit for Allotment #65185

Applicant (if any): Medlin & Sons, B.M.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: *Roswell Resource Management Plan*

Date Approved: October 1997

LUP Name: *New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*

Date Approved: January 2001

LUP Name: *Special Status Species RMP Amendment*

Date Approved: May 2008

Other document: *EA-NM-060-00-184*

Date Approved: January 2001

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

*Roswell Resource Management Plan. Date Approved: October 1997*

*New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management*

Date Approved: January 2001

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

*EA, NM-060-00-184. Date Approved: January 2001*

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 a Rangeland Health assessments were conducted on all three allotments. In the Rangeland Health assessment it was found that both Upland and Biotic Indicators, "meets" the standards of Rangeland health.*

<i>Allotment</i>	<i>Date RHA completed and signed</i>
65185	03/11/2011

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.*

5. Cultural resources are not usually adversely affected by livestock grazing, although concentrated livestock activity such as around livestock water troughs can have adverse effects on the cultural resource. Prior to authorizing range improvements, a Class III Cultural Survey must be completed ensuring cultural resources will not be affected. There are several known cultural resources within the allotment.

#### 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 constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Shane Trautner  
Shane Trautner  
Project Lead

4/5/11  
Date

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


4/4/11  
Date



# Caprock West - M #65185



0 0.4 0.8 1.6 Miles



- 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: 7/13/2010 Prepared By: pwatts File: V:\CONFLICT\_MAP\FPO\_Conflict.mxd

**Bureau of Land Management, Roswell Field Office  
Environmental Assessment Checklist, DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2011-0070-DNA**

<b>Resources</b>	<b>Not Present on Site</b>	<b>No Impacts</b>	<b>May Be Impacts</b>	<b>Mitigation Included</b>	<b>BLM Reviewer</b>	<b>Date</b>
Air Quality			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	Hydrologist /s/ Michael McGee	2/8/11
Soil			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Watershed Hydrology			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Floodplains	<b>X</b>					
Water Quality - Surface			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Water Quality - Ground			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	Hydrologist /s/ Michael McGee	2/8/11
Cultural Resources		<b>X</b>			/s/ Justin W. Peters	25 JAN 2011
Native American Religious Concerns	<b>X</b>				Archaeologist	
Paleontology	<b>X</b>					
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	<b>X</b>				/s/ Phil Watts For Plan & Env Coord	Jan 25, 2011
Farmlands, Prime or Unique	<b>X</b>				/s/Tate Salas Realty Specialist	2/10/2011
Rights-of-Way		<b>X</b>				
Invasive, Non-native Species			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	/s/ Helen Miller Range Management Specialist	04/04/2011
Vegetation			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Livestock Grazing			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	<b>X</b>				/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	02/08/2011
Threatened or Endangered Species	<b>X</b>				/s/ Randy Howard	2/16/2011
Special Status Species			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Wildlife			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	<b>X</b>				/s/Bill Murry Outdoor Rec Planner	2/7/2011
Wild and Scenic Rivers	<b>X</b>					
Wilderness	<b>X</b>					
Recreation		<b>X</b>				
Visual Resources			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		
Cave/Karst		<b>X</b>			/s/ Michael J. Bilbo Cave Specialist	3/2/2011
Environmental Justice		<b>X</b>			/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	02/08/2011
Public Health and Safety		<b>X</b>				
Solid Mineral Resources		<b>X</b>			/s/ Jerry Dutchover	01/13/11
Fluid Mineral Resources		<b>X</b>			/s/ John S. Simitz Geologist	Jan 23, 2011