Decision for DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2016-0010-DNA

The proposed action is in conformance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan, as amended, and was analyzed in NM–060–00–083–EA, February 2001. The term grazing lease will be offered for 8 animal units from 03/01 to 02/28 (yearlong) at 100% public land for 96 animal unit months on allotment 63090 Byron Well. Class of livestock will continue to be cattle.

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 precisely, why you think the proposed action is in error.

In 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 CFR4.21 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/

Kyle S. Arnold
Assistant Field Manager
Resources

11/19/15
Date

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Roswell Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NM-P010-2016-0010-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 63090

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Term Grazing Lease

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lincoln County, New Mexico

APPLICANT (if any): Allottee of Allotment 63090

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The proposed action is to authorize the grazing lease on allotment #63090 for 8 Animal Units (AUs) year-long at 100 % pl for 96 animal unit months (AUMs). Class of livestock will continue to be cattle.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

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 (s): NM–060–00–086–EA

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

The Roswell Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (October 1997) has been reviewed to determine if the proposed action conforms with the land use plan's Record of Decision. The Roswell Resource Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) states a livestock grazing management goal of providing effective and efficient management of allotments to maintain, improve and monitor range conditions. The proposed action is consistent with the RMP/EIS.

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.

NM–060–00–086–EA, February 2001, Allotment 63090

List by name and date other documents 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? Documentation of answer and explanation:

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? Documentation of answer and explanation:

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? Documentation of answer and explanation:

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 was conducted on the allotment. In the Rangeland Health assessment it was found that both Upland and Biotic Indicators, "meet" the standards of Rangeland health.

Allotments	Date RHA completed
63090	12/03/2012

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? Documentation of answer and explanation:

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. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. Preparation of the EIS for the 1997 Roswell RMP included full participation of the public and government agencies consistency review. The 2000 EA was prepared based on scoping and review from the public and other agencies.

E. Cultural Resources

Concerning cultural resources, grazing has the potential for impacts. The Roswell Field Office reviews the local office and NMCRIS databases for every grazing permit or leasing action at both the Environmental Assessment level and this Documentation of NEPA Adequacy level. In situations where sensitive sites lie within an allotment, site specific visits may be conducted to assess the presence of effects. Four surveys and three sites have been reported in this allotment. Currently, there is no evidence that grazing activities at this intensity have adversely impacted any cultural resources; however, unforeseen impacts may occur. Any future range improvement involving earth disturbing activities will require a cultural inventory prior to approval.

G. Paleontology

Under the Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) System the surface formations of the allotment are designated as Class 2. Class 2 is comprised of geologic formations that are unlikely to yield any vertebrate fossils or any scientifically noteworthy invertebrate or plant fossils.

The allotment contains no known fossil sites and currently there is no evidence that grazing at these levels is likely to have any impact on fossil resources. However the potential for scientifically significant finds may occur as a result of surface disturbing activities. If the allottee encounters previously undocumented paleontological the allottee shall notify the paleontological monitor or BLM/RFO paleontology resource staff. The BLM would then evaluate the site. Should the discovery be evaluated as significant, it will be protected in place until mitigation measures can be developed and implemented according to guidelines set by the BLM.

F. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

NAME	TITLE	AGENCY REPRESENTED
Emily Metcalf	Rangeland Management Specialist	BLM
Michael McGee	Hydrologist	BLM
Laura Hronec	Archaeologist	BLM
Dan Baggao	Wildlife Biologist	BLM
Mike Bilbo	Recreation & VRM Specialist	BLM
Knutt Peterson	Cave Specialist	BLM
Glen Garnand	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BLM

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the existing 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 S. Arnold
Assistant Field Manager
Resources

11/9/15
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.



Allotment #63090 Byron Well

Fence
Allotments
BLM
Private
State

N

1:57,356

0 1.25 2.5 Miles

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 BLM. Spatial information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This information may be updated without notification.