

Decision for DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2011- 167 - DNA

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan, as amended, and was analyzed in DOI-BLM- EA-NM-060-00-032.

Table 1. Animal Units/Animal Unit Months							
Allotment Number	Allotment Name	Acres of Public Land	Percent Public Land	Animal Units Authorized	Animal Unit Months Authorized	Livestock	Livestock Number
64038	Pecos North Flat 3	300	100	7	84	Cattle	7
64538	Pecos North Flat 15	5615	100	96	1152	Cattle	96
Totals		5915		103	1236		

The Proposed Action is to offer a term grazing permit for:

64038 Pecos North Flat 03 7 Cattle 3/01-2/28 100% PL Active Use 84 AUM's

And The Proposed Action is to offer a term grazing lease for:

64538 Pecos North Flat 15 96 Cattle 3/01-2/28 100% PL Active Use 1152 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 2nd, 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/ Jerry Dutchover
 Jerry Dutchover
 Acting Assistant Field Manager, Resources

11/03/2011
 Date



PECOS NORTH FLAT 15 & 3 ALLOTMENTS #64538 & #64038



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.



**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- 167 - DNA

A. Roswell Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: Allotments 64038 & 64538

Proposed Action Title/Type: 10 year grazing permit/lease
Location of Proposed Action: Allotments 64038 & 64538
Description of Proposed Action: Renew the 10 year grazing permit & lease for Allotments #64038 & #64538

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
Other document: EA-NM-060-00-032	Date Approved: June 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-060-00-032	Date Approved: June 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 Assessment was conducted in July of 2011. In the Rangeland Health Assessment 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?

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

Kyle Arnold

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.

Kyle Arnold
Project Lead

08-22-2011
Date

/s/ Jerry Dutchover
Jerry Dutchover
Acting Assistant Field Manager, Resources

11/03/2011
Date

**Bureau of Land Management, Roswell Field Office
Environmental Assessment Checklist DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2011- 167 - DNA**

Resources	Not Present on Site	No Impacts	May Be Impacts	Mitigation Included	BLM Reviewer	Date
Air Quality			X	X	/s/ Michael McGee SWA Spec/Hydro.	8/22/2011
Soil			X	X		
Watershed Hydrology			X	X		
Floodplains			X	X		
Water Quality - Surface			X	X	/s/ Michael McGee Geologist/Hydrologist	8/22/2011
Water Quality - Ground			X	X		
Cultural Resources		X			/s/ Justin W. Peters Archaeologist	24 Aug 2011
Native American Religious Concerns	X					
Paleontology		X				
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		X			/s/ Glen Garnand Plan & Env. Coord.	10/4/2011
Farmlands, Prime or Unique		X			/s/ Tate Salas Realty	9/28/2011
Rights-of-Way		X				
Invasive, Non-native Species			X	X	/s/ Helen Miller Range Mgmt. Spec.	09/01/2011
Vegetation			X	X		
Livestock Grazing			X	X		
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid		X			/s/ Al Collar HMS/ EPS	9/14/2011
Threatened or Endangered Species		X			/s/ D Baggao Biologist	9/26/2011
Special Status Species		X				
Wildlife			X	X		
Wetlands/Riparian Zones			X	X		
Wild and Scenic Rivers	X				/s/ Bill Murry Outdoor Rec. Plnr.	9/13/2011
Wilderness	X					
Recreation		X				
Visual Resources			X	X	/s/ Bill Murry for Michael J. Bilbo Cave Specialist	10/05/2011
Cave/Karst		X				
Environmental Justice		X			/s/ Al Collar Env .Prot. Spec.	9/14/2011
Public Health and Safety		X				
Solid Mineral Resources		X			/s/ Jerry Dutchover Geo/SPS	09/06/11
Fluid Mineral Resources		X			/s/ John S. Simitz Geologist	09/07/2011