

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR 3 BLM ALLOTMENTS
LOCATED IN THE PECOS HEADWATER WATERSHED
EA#NM-220-08-039**

PURPOSE AND NEED

One of the major uses of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has traditionally been the grazing of cattle, sheep or horses for the benefit of individuals and communities throughout the western United States. This use is regulated by public land legislation, including the Taylor Grazing Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act. This document provides information needed to determine whether BLM should renew permits for cattle grazing on 3 allotments within the Pecos Headwater watershed for an additional 10 years. The 3 allotments are being analyzed in one document in order to address the cumulative effects of livestock on the BLM parcels within the Pecos Headwater watershed and to reduce the volume of paper involved in the public notification process. The allotments addressed in this Environmental Assessment include: # 803 Cañon de las Mujeres, #904 Apache Canyon and #920 Curoco Allotment.

PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

Proposed Action: No Action Alternative

Re-issue a term grazing permit without any changes as outlined in Table 1. For additional information, refer to Allotment Evaluation documents available for each allotment at the Taos BLM Field Office.

Alternative 1, No Grazing:

Do not issue grazing permits for these allotments, thereby suspending livestock grazing (No Action).

Table 1. Outline of allotment guidelines for permit renewal

Allotment Number	Livestock Type	Livestock Number	Season of Use	Total Federal Acres	Pastures	Grazing System	Proposed Improvements
803	Cattle	5	3/01 - 2/28	494	1	Unknown	None
904	Cattle	13	3/01 - 2/28	937	1	Unknown	Possible vegetation manipulation by fire, herbicide, or mechanical means **
920	Cattle	2	3/01 - 2/28	208	1	Unknown	Possible vegetation manipulation by fire, herbicide, or mechanical means **
Monitoring: BLM would continue the rangeland monitoring study program, continue to consult with the grazing permittee on placement of mineral and supplemental feed and continue monitoring for new populations of noxious weeds.							
** These will be addressed in an amendment or in a later NEPA document if and when funding is available.							

Location and Maps

803 - Located approximately 15 miles southeast of Las Vegas, in the San Miguel County, New Mexico. Elevation on this allotment is roughly between 6,000 and 6,600 feet. The allotment is located on the USGS Mesa Chupinas 7.5 minute series topographic map. T. 13 N., R. 17 E. Sec 10-13 and 24. This allotment has three parcels.

904 - Located approximately 5 miles northwest of San Jose, in San Miguel County, New Mexico. Elevations run from 6,200 to 7,000 feet. The allotment is located on the USGS North San Ysidro and San Jose Quadrangle 7.5 minute series topographic maps. T. 14 N., R. 13 E. Sec 1, 12, 13 and 23 and T. 14 N., R. 14 E. Sec 7. This allotment has three parcels

920 - Located approximately 1 mile southeast of Ribera, in San Miguel County, New Mexico. Elevations run from 4,900 to 5,600 feet. The allotment is located on the USGS Sena Quadrangle 7.5 minute series topographic map. T. 13 N., R. 14 E. Sec 10, 11, 14 and 15

See Figure 1 for the map. Individual allotment maps are available at the Taos Field Office and upon request.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern / Special Management Areas

There are no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern or Special Management Areas within or adjacent to the subject allotments, thus there would be no effect from **either alternative**.

Wilderness / Wilderness Study Areas

There are no wilderness or wilderness study areas within the subject allotments, thus there would be no effect from **either alternative**.

Air Quality

The Clean Air Act Amendments in 1990 required that all federal actions conform with State Implementation Plans for air quality. One non-attainment area has been designated in New Mexico. None of these areas are located on or near the allotment.

Although this allotment is not within a non-attainment area, greenhouse gas emissions from non-renewable sources often occur from ranching operations. Greenhouse gases (GHG), including carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄), and the potential effects of GHG emissions on climate, are not regulated by the EPA under the Clean Air Act. However, greenhouse gas emissions are linked to climate change.

Under the **proposed action**, GHG emissions are expected to be generated primarily from vehicles used to manage cattle operations and may be estimated to be about 10 tons of relevant emission. The BLM recommends using best management practices to reduce these emissions, such as reducing number of trips, keeping vehicle well maintained, purchasing more fuel efficient vehicles. There would be no effect under the **no grazing alternative**.

Climate

Global mean surface temperatures have increased nearly 1.0°C (1.8°F) from 1890 to 2006 (Goddard Institute for Space Studies, 2007). However, observations and predictive models indicate that average temperature changes are likely to be greater in the Northern Hemisphere. Without additional meteorological monitoring systems, it is difficult to determine the spatial and temporal variability and change of climatic conditions, but increasing concentrations of GHGs are likely to accelerate the rate of climate change.

In 2001, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted that by the year 2100, global average surface temperatures would increase 1.4 to 5.8°C (2.5 to 10.4°F) above 1990 levels. The National Academy of Sciences (2006) supports these predictions, but has acknowledged that there are uncertainties regarding how climate change may affect different regions. Computer model predictions indicate that increases in temperature will not be equally distributed, but are likely to be accentuated at higher latitudes. Warming during the winter months is expected to be greater than during the summer, and increases in daily minimum temperatures is more likely than increases in daily maximum temperatures. It is not, however, possible to predict with any certainty regional or site specific effects on climate relative to the proposed lease parcels and subsequent actions.

However, potential impacts to natural resources and plant and animal species due to climate change are likely to be varied, including those in the southwestern United States. For example, if global climate change results in a warmer and drier climate, increased particulate matter impacts could occur due to increased windblown dust from drier and less stable soils. Cool season plant species' spatial ranges are predicted to move north and to higher elevations, and extinction of endemic threatened/endangered plants may be accelerated. Due to loss of habitat or competition from other species whose ranges may shift northward, the population of some animal species may be reduced or increased. Less snow at lower elevations would likely impact the timing and quantity of snowmelt, which, in turn, could impact water resources and species dependant on historic water conditions. Forests at higher elevations in New Mexico, for example, have been exposed to warmer and drier conditions over a ten year period. Should the trend continue the habitats and identified drought sensitive species in these forested areas and higher elevations may also be more affected by climate change.

In New Mexico, a recent study indicated that the mean annual temperatures have exceeded the global averages by nearly 50% since the 1970's (Enquist and Gori). Similar to trends in national data, increases in mean winter temperatures in the southwest have contributed to this rise. When compared to baseline information, periods between 1991 and 2005 show temperature increases in over 95% of the geographical area of New Mexico. Warming is greatest in the northwestern, central, and southwestern parts of the state.

We anticipate that monitoring efforts will help indicate vegetation shifts, allowing for management modifications to address global climate change.

Soils

The following soils are identified as occurring on the allotments analyzed in the watershed:

Laporte-Escabosa association, hilly. These soils consist of channery loams, with rooting depth 10 to 40 inches. Parent materials of alluvium and colluvium derived dominantly from sandstone and limestone comprise these soils. Average annual precipitation ranges between 16 and 20 inches. Vegetation is characterized by blue grama, sideoats grama, pinyon, juniper, little bluestem and pinyon ricegrass.

Laporte-Rock outcrop complex, steep. These soils consist of channery loams, with rooting depths between 10 to 20 inches. Parent materials of alluvium and colluvium derived dominantly from sandstone and limestone comprise these soils. Average annual precipitation ranges between 16 and 20 inches. Vegetation is characterized by pinyon, juniper, blue grama, oak, sideoats grama, and little bluestem.

Tinaja gravelly loam, hilly. This soil consists of gravelly loams, with rooting depths over 60 inches. Parent materials of alluvium derived from mixed sources comprise this soil. Average annual precipitation ranges between 14 and 18 inches. Vegetation is characterized by sideoats grama, blue grama, little bluestem, New Mexico feathergrass, oak, juniper and threeawn.

Tuloso-Sombordoro-Rock outcrop complex, moderately sloping. These soils consist of stony sandy and stony loams with rooting depths ranging from 8 to 20 inches. Parent materials are primarily derived from sandstone. Average annual precipitation is about 16 inches. Vegetation is characterized by pinyon, juniper, blue grama, hairy grama, sideoats grama, and pinyon ricegrass.

Vibo-Ribera association, undulating. These soils consist of sandy loams, with rooting depths over 60 inches. Parent materials of alluvial and eolian material derived from mixed sources comprise these soils. Average annual precipitation ranges between 16 and 20 inches. Vegetation is characterized by pinyon, juniper, blue grama, sideoats grama, little bluestem, pinyon ricegrass and Indian ricegrass.

Vibo-Rock outcrop complex, undulating. These soils consist of sandy loams, with rooting depths over 60

inches. Parent materials of alluvial and eolian material derived from mixed sources comprise these soils. Average annual precipitation ranges between 16 and 20 inches. Vegetation is characterized by pinyon, juniper, blue grama, sideoats grama, little bluestem, pinyon ricegrass and Indian ricegrass.

The **proposed action** could cause both positive and negative impacts to the soils. Livestock impacts to soils are dependent on management, soil properties and weather. For example, livestock movement over wet soils can result in increased erosion and soil compaction. Proper distribution of livestock minimizes the negative impacts while still providing the positive impacts, such as loosening of compacted soils and breaking up hydrophobic crusts resulting in increased infiltration. It is important that livestock are managed so that density and diversity of vegetation cover are maintained to limit soil loss.

Under current management, soil indicators for the allotments point to good soil condition (Average = 84%) with the lowest Soil and Site Stability rating being 72% (see the ‘Standards for Rangeland Health’ portion later in this document for further information and explanations).

Based on current knowledge, the **proposed action** will result in no impact or have a positive impact. The **no grazing alternative** would remove livestock from the area and eliminate both the positive and negative impacts of livestock.

Wetlands/Riparian Areas

Riparian vegetation exists along both Cow Creek and the Pecos River in allotment #904. The Pecos River section contains thick willow bars adjacent to the stream approximately 10m in length and 7m wide on both sides of the river. Cow Creek has less surface flow and, therefore, a diminished riparian zone, with scattered hydrophilic vegetation along the reach. The Taos Field Office Riparian and Aquatic Habitat Management Plan calls for Cow Creek to be managed for a grazing plan to protect the riparian habitat. The riparian area was assessed as Functioning at Risk in 1994.

The **proposed action** should not impact the riparian zone due to the small numbers of livestock and the small area of riparian areas on the BLM lands relative to the ranch in which the allotment parcels are included. Future monitoring will determine if BLM lands need to be grazed strictly during the dormant season. Streambank vulnerability to trampling damage often is more related to soil type and how wet the soils are than to the number of livestock. A small number of animals on easily erodible or wet streambanks can cause more damage than a large number on stable, frozen or dried out streambanks (Chaney and Elmore, et al. 1993). Dormant season grazing provides total growing season rest which promotes plant vigor, seed and root production. The **no grazing alternative** would remove livestock from the area and eliminate both the positive and negative impacts of livestock.

Water Quality

Subsurface water – Current impairments are not identified and ground water is not likely to be impacted by the proposed cattle. Therefore, based on current knowledge, there would be no impact from **either alternative**.

Surface – These allotments are located in Hydrologic Unit (HUC) 13060001, which comprise 1,294,920 acres along the Pecos River and its tributaries and is further divided into smaller HUCs. The allotments analyzed in this document occur in four of these smaller HUCs (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of BLM allotments by 10 Digit HUC (subwatershed and NMED evaluation unit).

NMED Assessment Unit	Subwatershed	Allotments	BLM Acreage	Percent of Subwatershed
NM-2213_00	Cow Creek – Pecos River	904	84	0.04%
NM-2213_00	Tecolote Creek – Pecos River	904, 920	315	0.2%

NM-2213_20	Outlet Gallinas River	803	338	0.2%
NM-2214.A_090	Cow Creek	904	746	0.9%

The New Mexico Environment Department surveyed and evaluated perennial reaches in the Pecos Headwater watershed in 2002 and identified impairments for stream reaches not meeting water quality standards for designated uses. There are 2 Assessment Units in common with the subject allotments as outlined in Table 2. The following impairments are identified for these units:

NM-2214.A_090, Cow Creek (Pecos River to headwaters) – Includes 746 acres of BLM in allotment 904. This unit was assessed in 2002 and categorized as 5/5A, partially supporting high quality coldwater fishery. Probable cause was stream bottom deposits, with probable sources being removal of riparian vegetation, range grazing, grazing related sources, natural sources, highway maintenance and runoff, habitat modification, bank or shoreline modification/destabilization and agriculture.

Based on Rangeland Health Evaluation surveys, there is not likely to be any increased water quality impairments resulting from the **proposed action**. This opinion is based on the fact that BLM land surface in these subwatersheds comprise a low percentage of the total area. Allotment 904 had below satisfactory ratings for Soil/Site Stability and Hydrologic Function, while the other two allotments average over 90% similarity to ecological site descriptions. The survey team identified three likely reasons contributing to reduced health: historic overuse, drought and altered fire regimes. It is recommended that all allotments not averaging at least 80% for any category manipulate grazing or implement range improvements to improve conditions (See section Fundamentals for Rangeland Health and Table 5). The **no grazing alternative** may or may not reduce impairments on these reaches.

Floodplains

Surveys occurring during 2007 indicated that flood plains mainly occur within ephemeral channels or arroyos. There are not mapped by FEMA and their frequency and extent of inundation are difficult to estimate due to a lack of gauge data. However, significant flow can occur resulting in channel scouring. Upslope conditions and hydraulic alteration of these channels can degrade the floodplain resulting in excessive erosion and increased flow rates. Any permittee alteration planned within these channels will require a separate NEPA analysis and permits from other regulatory agencies.

Allotment 904 contains floodplain areas adjacent to the Pecos River and Cow Creek. Grazing within these floodplains appears to be infrequent, although invasive species are present, most likely due to historic grazing. Also, upstream hydrologic alteration may have and still be contributing to impairment.

BLM land jurisdiction covers only a small portion of the floodplain on both waters, thus we recommend that the livestock operator develop a plan to improve functionality of the riparian area, which would improve floodplain river interaction. Grazing in compliance with the **proposed action** and the development of a improvement plan will have minimal adverse effect on floodplain. The **no grazing alternative** would have no direct negative effect on ephemeral floodplains.

Hazardous or Solid Wastes

There were no hazardous or solid wastes identified on the allotments or will result from the proposed action. There would be no effect under **either alternative**.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

There are no Wild and/or Scenic rivers identified within or near the allotments, consequently there is no effect under **either alternative**.

Prime or Unique Farmland

There have been no prime or unique farmlands identified within the Taos Field Area, to there would be no effect under **either alternative**.

Vegetation

Vegetation expected for the soils identified in the allotments include: western wheatgrass, Rio Grande cottonwood, wheatgrass, alkali sacaton, willow, fourwing saltbush, pinyon, juniper, blue grama, squirreltail, June grass, oak, sagebrush, Indian ricegrass, Galleta, side oatsgrama, muttongrass, black grama, needle and thread, bottlebrush squirreltail, threeawn, Sand sagebrush, winterfat, oak, pasture grasses, mahogany, wheatgrass, inland saltgrass, wild rose and other species in smaller amounts.

Grazing may impact vegetation. Other impacts to vegetation have been the lack of natural disturbance. The interdisciplinary resource team concluded that the allotments are in better ecological condition than in the past. Therefore, under the **proposed action**, no additional impacts to vegetation are expected. Under the **no grazing alternative**, there would be no measurable vegetative removal from the allotment.

Noxious Weeds

Any time livestock are grazed in other areas and then returned to the allotment or fed non-certified feed there is a risk of introducing exotic or noxious plant species to the allotment. The **proposed action** would not pose additional risks of introduction or spread of noxious weeds beyond those already occurring. Under both the **proposed action** and **no grazing alternative**, weeds could be introduced by road maintenance equipment or recreational activities.

Under the **proposed action**, weeds could be introduced to the allotment through livestock feces, emergency feed, watering equipment or vehicles associated with the management of livestock. The **no grazing alternative**, would limit the risk of new infestation to those caused by human activities and wildlife.

Cultural Resources

All allotments were visited and Class 2 surveys were completed to identify sites to determine the impacts grazing may have on the sites located. Results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of cultural resource surveys by allotment

Allotment Number	Total Federal Acres	Survey Date	Sites Recorded	Site Type	Adverse Affects
803	338	5/13/2008	0	N/A	NONE
904	937	7/16/2007 & 7/23/2007	0	N/A	NONE
920	208	7/16/2007	6	Lithic Scatters (LA 109298) (LA 106108) (LA 106109) (LA 106110) (LA-106111) (LA 106112)	NONE*

* National Register Eligible sites require continued monitoring, but these show no adverse affects to grazing at this time.

Under the **proposed action**, grazing intensity would remain at current levels. Allotment803 was not visited by

an archeologist but based upon a literature, site and survey files review and the reconnaissance inventory, it is likely that little or no damage to anything that may be in this allotment would result from grazing. But, continued grazing in these subject allotments could impact cultural resources in two ways. First, grazing could cause some trampling of artifacts and features. Second, natural erosion due to ground disturbance could damage sites. These effects would be slightly less under the **no grazing alternative**. As seen in the Table 3, no impacts to cultural resources were discerned during the surveys of the allotments. Therefore, there would be little or no damage to cultural sites from grazing. The **no grazing alternative**, would have no effect on cultural resources by removing livestock from the allotment.

Native American Religious Concerns

There have been no areas of concern identified within these allotments. As part of the EA process, all tribes within the Field Office boundary will receive the opportunity to provide information on any areas of concern in or near the allotments.

Fish and Wildlife

Existing habitat with the allotments include pinyon-juniper woodlands and riparian areas (a key wildlife habitat type as identified in the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy [2005] of the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish), and supports seasonal home ranges for elk, mule deer, mountain lion, black bear, bobcat, fox, coyote, small mammals, bats, raptors, turkey vulture, songbirds, amphibians, and a variety of insects. Riparian areas provide potential winter foraging habitat for the bald eagle and represent an important migratory corridor for all wildlife species.

Impacts of improper grazing practices on wildlife and habitat include: increased competition for limited water, forage, and space; alteration of vegetative composition and structure; impacts to stream hydrology and water quality; and reduced soil permeability and potential to support plants due to soil compaction. Judicious grazing practices can have positive affects on wildlife and be a beneficial management tool; these include: increases in vegetation composition diversity and improvement of forage availability and quality for early to mid-successional wildlife species; creation of patchy habitat with high structural diversity for feeding, nesting and hiding; opening up areas of dense vegetation to improve foraging areas for a variety of wildlife; removing rank, coarse grass that will encourage regrowth and improve abundance of high quality forage for wild ungulates; stimulating browse production by reducing grass biomass; and improving nutritional quality of browse by stimulating plant regrowth (NMDGF 2005).

Studies in northern New Mexico have indicated that total elimination of grazing did not improve range condition on upland or lowland sites when compared with adjacent moderately grazed areas (Holecheck and Stephenson 1985). There are examples that suggest many wildlife species are tolerant of moderate grazing and many appear to benefit from light to conservative grazing. Smith et al. (1996) found that lightly grazed climax rangelands and conservatively grazed late seral rangelands had similar songbird and total bird populations. They also concluded that wildlife diversity was higher on the conservatively grazed late seral than the lightly grazed climax rangeland. Studies in southeastern Arizona by Bock et al. (1984) support the hypothesis that conservatively to moderately grazed areas in mid or late seral condition supported greater diversity of wildlife than ungrazed areas in climax condition. Livestock grazing was also shown to enhance forage for elk and manage their distribution by increasing availability and nutritional value of preferred grasses in early growth stages (Holechek et al. 2004).

Fish species found in the Pecos River and Cow Creek are: Longnose dace, white sucker, Rio Grande chub and brown trout. None of these species are threatened or endangered.

Best management practices would ensure that forage production within this area can support fish, wildlife and livestock on a sustained basis. The functionality assessment of habitat components is as outline in Table 4.

Table 4. Functionality assessment for Biotic Fauna.

Allotment	Biotic Fauna Rating	Summary
803	Proper Functioning Condition	N/A
904	Functioning at Risk-Static	Pinyon and Juniper dominance
920	Proper Functioning Condition	N/A

The **proposed action** would not have a notable adverse impact on wildlife. The **no grazing alternative** would remove all possible competition between wildlife and livestock.

Threatened or Endangered Species

Federally listed threatened (T) and endangered (E) species in San Miguel County, New Mexico, include: black-footed ferret (*Mustela nigripes*) (E); Southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*) (E); Holy Ghost Ipomopsis (*Ipomopsis sancti-spiritus*) (E); Arkansas river shiner (*Notropis girardi*) (T); and Mexican spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis lucida*) (T). Although there is potential habitat for Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat on the Pecos River, the area has not been surveyed and its presence is unknown and not documented in the area. It is determined that there are no federally listed threatened or endangered species likely to be found in the subject allotments. There is one state-listed threatened species which may be found in the area, the Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), during winter months. There is no designated critical habitat for any species listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) within the allotments. It is determined that the **proposed action** and **no grazing alternative** will have no affect on federally listed proposed, candidate, threatened or endangered species, and minimal to no affect on state-listed threatened or endangered species.

Migratory bird species of conservation concern (BLM Interim Management Guidance 2008-050) that have the potential to occur on the allotment include prairie falcon, golden eagle, mourning dove, and pinyon jay. The **proposed action** has the potential to have a negative affect upon individual birds, eggs, young and/or the nesting habitat of ground nesting birds, however, it is unlikely there would be a notable impact to the population or species level. The **no grazing alternative** could have either a beneficial or detrimental affect on individual migratory bird species of concern, depending on the response of range condition and individual species requirements, but affects at the population or species level would not be adverse.

Species of Greatest Conservation Need (NMDGF 2005) that have the potential to occur on the allotment include: mourning dove, bald eagle, golden eagle, olive-sided flycatcher, pinyon jay, yellow warbler, mule deer, tiger salamander, and collared lizard. It is determined that the **proposed action** and **no grazing alternative** will have minimal impacts on Species of Greatest Conservation need.

Social / Economic Issues

BLM permits/leases are transferred to qualified applicants at the request of the current permittee/lessee; the BLM has had no influence on the social makeup of those who currently hold these permits. Therefore, it has been determined that neither the **proposed action** nor the **no grazing alternative** would be likely to result in impacts which would occur disproportionately in low-income groups, minorities or Indian tribes. With regard to economics, the **proposed action** would allow the permittee to continue the lifestyle they have known and earn money from cattle operations on federal lands. Suspension of the grazing permit under the **no grazing alternative** would cause monetary losses to the permittee/lessee, in the form of increased costs to rent additional pasture or in purchasing feed.

Recreation

There are no developed recreation sites on the subject allotments, thus neither the **proposed action** nor the **no**

grazing alternative would have measurable impacts on recreation.

Standards for Rangeland Health

Field crews completed the Rangeland Health Evaluation Summary Worksheet for all the subject allotments, with subdivision by parcel or distinct Ecological Site. Results are summarized in Table 5 by Soil/Site Stability, Hydrologic Function and Biotic Integrity and totals by site and indicator group. The percent similar indicator score was created by multiplying an assigned value for departure from site descriptions/reference areas by the number of indicators at the level. Departure scores are categorized as: none to slight = 5, slight to moderate = 4, moderate = 3, moderate to extreme = 2 and extreme = 1, thus giving the most similar sites the highest score.. For example, if all indicators under Soil/Site Stability were rated none to slight (best condition), the equation would be $5(\text{score}) \times 9(\text{indicators}) = 45/45 \times 100 = 100\%$ similarity, or what is expected based on an Ecological Site Description.

The Standards are a tool for assessing range condition and are not analyzed under **either alternative** here. If an allotment or pasture falls below 80% in the Soil Site Stability, Hydrologic, or Biotic indicators, monitoring should be established to determine the cause/s of the low rating. The BLM in consultation with the permittee and various other agencies, through an interdisciplinary effort would develop goals and objectives for the areas that are falling below 80% to improve the condition.

Table 5. Summary of indicators by allotment.

Allotment Number	Observers	Survey Date	Percent of Soil/Site Stability	Percent of Hydrologic Function	Percent of Biotic Integrity	Average Percentage
803	Harmon, Riehn, Young	5/13/2008	98%	98%	98%	98%
904	Dean, Dicks, Lopez, Meyer, Riehn, Young	7/16/2007 & 7/23/2007	72%	70%	80%	74%
920	Dean, Dicks, Lopez, Meyer, Riehn, Young	7/16/2007	82%	80%	86%	83%

Residual Impacts

Residual impacts of livestock grazing would not change under the **proposed action**. There would continue to be moderate removal of current years growth on forage species. This removal may be detectable by visitors to the area but is within the acceptable range. Livestock would be visible on the allotment during their season of use. This can be positive or negative depending on the perspective of each visitor. There would be no measurable impact from the **no grazing alternative**.

Cumulative Impacts

BLM land comprises roughly 1.1% of the area within the Pecos Headwater watershed. (Percentages are relative to lands within Taos Field Office.) The subject allotments cover roughly 11% of the BLM land in this watershed and 0.1% of the total land mass of this watershed. Due to the relatively low percentages of federal land involved, and with no changes being made to livestock management on these allotments, there would be no significant impact. Livestock grazing is only one of several disturbance activities within the area. Some uses with similar impacts are off-road vehicles, other recreational use and road construction and maintenance. There would be no measurable cumulative impacts from the **proposed action** or the **no grazing alternative**.

Conformance with Plans

The proposed permit renewals within this document are in conformance with the Taos Resource Area Management Plan (1988). Livestock grazing impacts were analyzed on a Resource Area wide basis in the Taos

Resource Management Plan. An Allotment Evaluation (AE) document has been prepared for each allotment and is available for review at the Taos Field Office. Individual allotment maps are available at the Taos Field Office and upon request.

Consultation and Coordination

This Environmental Assessment will be mailed to all individuals or organizations who have notified the Taos Field Office of their interest. These individuals or organizations will be given 15 days to make comments on the accuracy of this document.

Preparers

This document was prepared and reviewed by a team from the Taos Field Office. They include:

Scott Draney - Department of Game and Fish
Greg Gustina – Fishery Biologist
Terry Humphrey - Multi-Resource Manager
Linus Meyer - Rangeland Management Specialist
Jonathan Riehn – Archeologist
Tami Torres - Outdoor Recreation Planner
Paul Williams – Archeologist
Valerie Williams – Wildlife Biologist
Lora Yonemoto - Realty Specialist
Jacob Young – Rangeland Management Specialist

References

Bock, C.E., J.H. Bock, W.R. Kenny, and V.M. Hawthorne. 1984. Response of birds, rodents, and vegetation to livestock exclosure in a semidesert grassland site. *Journal of Range Management* 37: 239-242.

Chaney, E., W. Elmore, W.S. Platts. 1993. *Managing Change: Livestock Grazing on Western Riparian Areas*. Northwest Resource Information Center, Eagle, Idaho. Produced for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 31 pp.

EPA Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2006. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

EPA, Natural Gas Star Program (2006 data) at: <http://www.epa.gov/gasstar/accomplish.htm>. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Enquist, Carolyn and Gori, Dave. Implications of Recent Climate Change on Conservation Priorities in New Mexico. April 2008.

Goddard Institute for Space Studies. 2007. Annual Mean Temperature Change for Three Latitude Bands. Datasets and Images. GISS Surface Temperature Analysis, Analysis Graphs and Plots. New York, New York. (Available on the Internet: <http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/graphs/fig.B.lrg.gif>.)

Holechek, J.L. and T. Stephenson. 1985. Comparison of big sagebrush vegetation in north central New Mexico under moderately grazed and grazing excluded conditions. *Journal of Range Management* 36: 455-456.

Holechek, J.L., T.T. Baker, and J.C. Boren. 2004. Impacts of controlled grazing versus grazing exclusion on rangeland ecosystems: what we have learned. New Mexico State University Cooperative Extension Service, Range Improvement Task Force Report 57. Las Cruces, New Mexico. 42 pp.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Basis (Summary for Policymakers). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, England and New York, New York. (Available on the Internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-spm.pdf>)

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Climate Change 2007, Synthesis Report. A Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.



National Academy of Sciences. 2006. Understanding and Responding to Climate Change: Highlights of National Academies Reports. Division on Earth and Life Studies. National Academy of Sciences. Washington, D.C. (Available on the Internet: <http://dels.nas.edu/basc/Climate-HIGH.pdf>.)

New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2005. Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Santa Fe, New Mexico. 526 pp + appendices.

Smith, G., J.L. Holechek, and M. Cardenas. 1996. Wildlife numbers on excellent and good condition Chihuahuan Desert rangelands: an observation. *Journal of Range Management* 49: 489-493.

Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of Taos County and parts of Rio Arriba and Mora Counties, New Mexico, 1982.

Water Quality and Water Pollution Control in New Mexico, State of NM Water Quality Control Commission, 2002.



T15N

T14N

T13N

T12N

T11N

R13E

R14E

R15E

R16E

R17E

904

904

904

920

803

803

803