

Decision and Finding of No Significant Impact Feral Swine Damage Management in New Mexico

United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
Wildlife Services

August 2021

1. Introduction

Feral swine (*Sus scrofa*) can cause significant damage to property, agriculture (crops and livestock), native species, ecosystems, and historic and cultural resources. They can also pose a threat to the health of wildlife, domestic animals, and humans. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services (WS) program in New Mexico receives requests for assistance to reduce or prevent damage to crops, pastures, natural resources, property and threats to human health and safety caused by feral swine. In New Mexico, WS conducts its activities at the request of, and in cooperation with, other federal, state, tribal, and local agencies, as well as private organizations and individuals.

WS prepared an environmental assessment (EA) to evaluate alternative approaches to managing damage caused by feral swine (*Sus scrofa*) in the state of New Mexico. The EA evaluated the issues and alternatives associated with WS' managing damage and threats caused by feral swine in the state. This EA was prepared to determine if the alternatives could have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Specifically, the EA was prepared to: 1) facilitate planning, 2) facilitate interagency coordination, 3) streamline program management, 4) evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the alternatives related to the issues associated with managing damage caused by feral swine, and 5) clearly communicate to the public the analysis of individual and cumulative impacts.

2. Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed action is to reduce conflicts and damage to agricultural, natural, cultural resources, property, and risks to human and animal health caused by feral swine. The damage from feral swine to natural and agricultural resources can be substantial (Seward et al. 2004). Pimentel (2007) estimated damage caused by feral swine could be \$300/animal/year. The EA documents the need for damage management in the state and assesses potential impacts to the human environment of four alternatives to address that need. The proposed action alternative in the EA would enable WS to continue the current integrated feral swine damage management program in New Mexico.

3. Public Involvement

Issues related to managing damage caused by feral swine in New Mexico were initially developed by WS, New Mexico Department of Agriculture (NMDA), New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF), New Mexico Livestock Board, New Mexico State Land Office, United States Forest Service (USFS), United States Bureau of Land Management (USBLM), and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Issues were defined and preliminary alternatives were identified through an internal scoping process. As part of public involvement, the EA was made available for 30 days to the public for review and comment by a legal notice published daily in the Albuquerque Journal from July 24, 2020 through July 26, 2020, and the Santa Fe New Mexican from July 22, 2020 through July 24, 2020. The document was made available for viewing and electronic commenting on Regulations.gov, <https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=APHIS-2020-0074> on July 17, 2020. A notice of availability and the EA were also made available for public review on the APHIS website beginning on July 20, 2020. Additionally, WS-New Mexico sent a notice of availability directly to agencies, organizations, and individuals with probable or stated interest in feral swine damage management. The public comment period ended on August

31, 2020. WS-New Mexico received 5 comment letters during the public comment period. The comment letters received during the public involvement process were reviewed for substantive issues and alternatives, which were considered in developing this Decision for the EA. The pre-decision EA was revised to provide clarification in response to agency and public comments, however no substantive changes were made to the document. A summary of the comments received and responses to the comments are provided in Appendix B of the final EA.

4. Related Analyses

This Decision and FONSI, and the final 2021 EA on Feral Swine Damage Management in New Mexico will replace the 2009 EA and Decision/FONSI for Feral Swine Damage Management in New Mexico.

5. Affected Environment

The proposed action in this EA is to continue implementation of an integrated feral swine damage management program and ultimately extirpate feral swine from forests, watersheds, wetlands, agriculture, parks, and residential and commercial properties in New Mexico. The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed action are individually analyzed by the effected resource in 3.1.1. Based on those analyses, WS believes no significant negative impacts would be expected from the implementation of the proposal. WS' proposed action is intended to provide benefit to New Mexico's economy and ecology by reducing negative economic and environmental impacts from feral swine damage. The proposed action will allow WS-New Mexico continue to provide information to resource management agencies regarding the nature and extent of feral swine damage and the prevalence of brucellosis, pseudorabies and other diseases potentially transmitted by swine. The information will be used to assess the need for future control efforts. Wildlife Services' proposal includes the potential to continue a FSDM assistance program, depending upon the need for continued federal assistance, and if funding is made available by other sources.

6. Issues

The following issues were identified during the interagency and public involvement processes during the development of the EA. These issues were determined to be important to the analysis and were used to drive the environmental analysis and compare the impacts of the alternatives.

- Issue 1 - Effects on Feral Swine Populations
- Issue 2 - Effects on Non-Target and Threatened and Endangered (T&E) Species
- Issue 3 - Effects on Social and Cultural Values
- Issue 4 - Effects on Human Health and Safety
- Issue 5 - Humaneness / Ethics of Feral Swine Damage Management (FSDM) Methods

Other issues considered but not analyzed in detail, with rationale, are discussed in the EA Section 2.8.

7. Alternatives Analyzed in Detail

WS-New Mexico considered four alternatives including the proposed action to continue the current FSDM program. These alternatives are defined in detail in Chapter 2 of the EA and are summarized below. Other alternatives were considered but rejected from detailed analysis for the reasons presented in the EA, Section 2.8. The following is a summary of the alternatives and the associated effects of the four alternatives evaluated in detail in the EA. Table 4 in the final EA presents a summary and comparison of the environmental consequences of each of the alternatives for each environmental issue.

Alternative 1 – Continue the Current Program – No Action

The No Action alternative is a procedural NEPA requirement (40 CFR 1502), is a viable and reasonable alternative that could be selected, and serves as a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives. The No Action alternative is the continuation of an ongoing program and, as defined here, is consistent with the CEQ's definition (CEQ 1981). An integrated methods strategy is recommended and used, encompassing the use of practical, legal, and effective methods of preventing or reducing damage while minimizing harmful effects of damage management measures on people, other species, and the environment. WS-New Mexico may use or recommend a combination of non-lethal and lethal methods as described in Section 2.5 of the EA to alleviate damage caused by feral swine. However, non-lethal methods would not always be applied as a first response to each damage problem because feral swine eradication is the goal of the State of New Mexico.

Most WS-New Mexico FSDM projects involve protecting property, health and safety and are generally in agricultural areas. Before FSDM activities are conducted in natural areas or wildlife areas managed by state, federal or military agencies, WS requires the requester to comply with NEPA and the ESA by consulting with USFWS. WS-New Mexico has consulted with USFWS on all FSDM project areas and implement a variety of measures to ensure no T&E species are negatively impacted by FSDM.

Continuing the current program is intended to temporarily alleviate economic damages on properties where crops, landscaping and other resources are being damaged by feral swine, therefore the proposed action would provide some economic benefit by stopping or reducing further damages. WS FSDM in New Mexico is not expected to have any adverse effects on cultural uses of feral swine. Removal of feral swine that cause damage to cultural resources by destroying native habitats and cultural sites is expected to benefit cultural resources in New Mexico. The proposed action would have little to no impact on hunting on private lands since landowners decide how they will address FSDM and WS only works on property when requested.

The proposed FSDM methods pose minimal threat to human health and safety. No adverse effects on human health and safety have occurred or have been reported to occur from WS' use of FSDM methods. WS employees who conduct FSDM activities are knowledgeable in the safe and effective use of the methods and use them under specific WS Directives. Current considerations for the perspectives on the ethics or humaneness of feral swine control activities would continue under this alternative. WS-New Mexico would continue to follow all applicable policies, guidelines, directives, and general field operating procedures when conducting any future feral swine damage management. The current FSDM program in New Mexico is ethical and humane. Under this alternative, there would be no change to the current activities that are being conducted to control feral swine in New Mexico.

Alternative 2 – No Wildlife Services Program

This alternative would eliminate WS involvement in FSDM in New Mexico. WS would not provide direct operational or technical assistance and requestors of WS services would have to conduct their own FSDM without WS involvement. Under this alternative, WS would have no effect on the feral swine population in New Mexico. Feral swine populations that could not be hunted by private or public hunters or removed by private or other government persons would continue to thrive in areas where they cause damage to residential and commercial property and agriculture. Relocation of feral swine by private efforts could spread the problem to other areas and increase the risk of disease transmission to unaffected populations.

WS would have no effect on non-target species or T&E species. Negative impacts to livestock or native species may increase without WS control actions. Private individuals are not required to consult with the

USFWS when engaged in FSDM activities on private lands frequented by T&E species and may cause more disturbances to these species. WS would have no effect on the social or economic resources associated with feral swine under this alternative. Because wildlife is a public resource, some members of the public expect government agencies to assist with wildlife damage management. This alternative would not fulfill that expectation in terms of providing a federal source for assistance. Economic damages would be expected to continue or increase without assistance.

Under this alternative it is possible that less experienced personnel implementing FSDM methods could lead to greater risk to human health and safety than a federal FSDM program. WS personnel are required to adhere to specific requirements for training and certification in the use of several FSDM methods. Hazards to human health and safety could be greater under this alternative if the personnel implementing FSDM do not have the same level of training or expertise as WS personnel. The use of traps, snares and shooting by private individuals would probably increase. This could result in less experienced persons doing the control work and consequently could cause an increase in non-target take of wildlife and potentially greater animal suffering. The use of illegal or ill-advised methods to control feral swine would likely be the highest under this alternative and could lead to unknown impacts on the feral swine population. As noted in the EA, FSDM is also conducted in some areas to reduce risks to human and pet health and safety from feral swine-vehicle collisions, transfer of zoonotic diseases and aggressive feral swine. It is possible that these risks may not be addressed as effectively under this alternative.

Alternative 3 – Only Nonlethal FSDM Methods Used by WS

This alternative would not allow for lethal WS operational FSDM in New Mexico. This alternative would require WS-New Mexico to use only non-lethal methods to resolve feral swine damage problems. The effect on feral swine populations from private control efforts is unregulated and therefore unknown, however, it is likely that this take could increase slightly over alternative 2 (No WS program) because WS-New Mexico would be available to provide technical assistance to other entities conducting lethal control operations. The impact on non-target species through private control efforts is unknown because these efforts are not regulated and there is no government oversight of feral swine take on private property. The impact on non-target species could be higher without the involvement, expertise, and professionalism of WS-New Mexico personnel.

Without the ability to use lethal control, resource damages could be higher or cost the cooperators more if reliance on private providers is the only choice. Using non-lethal methods only would not eliminate problem animals or reduce the feral swine population resulting in the potential for the damage to continue. WS-New Mexico would not be expected to continue the current level of disease surveillance activities under this alternative, since a large part of disease surveillance is a by-product of an active direct control program with lethal take.

This alternative will decrease the number of feral swine lethally removed by WS-New Mexico compared to the current program (Alternative 1), however, other entities, including landowners/managers and private operators, would implement lethal control in place of WS. Due to the lack of WS involvement in lethal control, results could be similar to alternative 2 (no WS program) in that if inexperienced personnel conduct lethal control, use of illegal, inhumane or unethical methods could increase.

Alternative 4 – Technical Assistance Only

Under this alternative, WS-New Mexico would cease from conducting direct control operations on behalf of cooperators to control feral swine damage and would only provide technical assistance or information.

WS would have no effect on feral swine populations in New Mexico because WS' action would be limited only to providing information on FSDM. The effects on the population by other entities conducting operational work in the absence of WS operations would be similar to Alternatives 2 and 3. WS-New Mexico would have no impact on non-target or T&E species, however, other entities conducting the work may have an increased impact on non-target and T&E species.

Without the ability to use lethal control, WS' effects would be very similar to alternative 3. Damage to resources could be higher under this alternative. The effects on disease issues would be similar to Alternative 3 where WS-New Mexico would not be expected to continue the current level of disease surveillance activities, since a large part of disease surveillance is a by-product of an active direct control program that includes lethal take. WS would only provide technical assistance to individuals requesting assistance with feral swine damage. Therefore, WS would not use those methods that individuals may consider inhumane; however, such methods are still likely to be employed by private individuals. Under this alternative, it is possible that frustration caused by the inability to reduce feral swine damages could lead to illegal use of chemical toxicants or other illegal methods which might result in increased nontarget take and animal suffering.

8. Monitoring

Under the proposed action, Alternative 1, WS-New Mexico will monitor FSDM activities annually to determine whether the analyses and determinations in the EA adequately address current and anticipated future activities, and to determine whether new information warrants supplementing or replacing the EA. Under Alternative 1, WS-New Mexico would provide data to all applicable natural resource management agencies (including NMDGF, USFWS, USBLM, and USFS) on the take of target and non-target animals if requested. The data will help monitor the impacts on wildlife populations.

9. New Information

New information has become available since WS-New Mexico made the EA available to the public. We reviewed the new information and incorporated it into the final EA, as appropriate. This new information is consistent with conclusions and material presented in the EA, and it did not change the analysis.

- On July 22, 2021, USFWS issued a final rule to comply with a court order to vacate Unit 6 and the New Mexico portion of Unit 5 from the March 5, 2014, final rule designating approximately 764,207 acres of land in New Mexico and Arizona as critical habitat for the jaguar (*Panthera onca*) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. This final rule removes approximately 110,438 acres of land within New Mexico from the designation of critical habitat for the jaguar. This ruling removes all jaguar critical habitat in New Mexico. WS will continue to cooperate with the Service and, if possible, the Jaguar Conservation Team and NMDFG, to investigate any reports of jaguars in occupied range. Therefore, this new information does not change the analysis in the EA.

10. Clarifications and Additions to the Pre-Decisional Draft EA

WS-New Mexico has made general edits to the Pre-Decisional Draft EA and made some clarifications in response to comments and review of available information. These clarifications are consistent with the analyses, conclusions, and material presented in the Pre-Decisional Draft EA and more fully describe potential effects of WS-New Mexico FSDM under the alternatives.

11. Use of the Best Available Science

In order to conduct efficient and effective FSDM and stay aware of new information, WS-New Mexico used the best available data and information from wildlife agencies having jurisdiction by law (e.g., NMDGF and USFWS), as well as scientific literature, especially peer-reviewed scientific literature, to inform its decision-making. The EA uses the best available information from those sources to provide estimates of wildlife population size and status, assess risks to human safety, discuss FSDM strategies and tools, and discuss ecological impacts.

12. Review of Alternatives

The EA conducted a detailed analysis of the alternatives based on the issues identified in Section 2.1. Chapter 3 of the EA details the environmental effects from the alternatives and issues identified in Chapter 2. Our analysis showed that none of the alternatives would have a significant impact on the human environment. After reviewing the EA and carefully evaluating all alternatives, WS-New Mexico has determined that Alternative 1 offers the greatest opportunity to meet our purpose and need for action within current regulatory constraints. Alternative 1 enables development of effective site-specific FSDM strategies that accommodate resource owner/manager objectives and minimize the risk of adverse impacts on the human environment.

The restrictions on WS-New Mexico's ability to use any strategy or combination of methods to alleviate human-wildlife conflicts under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 could result in less effective and less environmentally responsible resolution of FSDM issues, as described in Section 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4 of the EA, and throughout Section 3.0 of the EA. Non-WS entities may provide FSDM (EA Sections 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4), but there is large variability in the quality of the services and the accountability to the public. Should WS-New Mexico be unable to provide FSDM, some level of FSDM would likely be available to those experiencing damage, and WS-New Mexico has analyzed the effects of reasonably foreseeable non-WS participation in these sections and compared how other entities may meet the need for FSDM when WS-New Mexico assistance is limited or absent.

Impacts on Target Species (EA Section 3.1.1)

The EA identifies the authority for management of feral swine as the New Mexico Livestock Board and NMDA. These agencies and other State agencies such as NMDGF would prefer that feral swine be eradicated from the State because it is an invasive species and as noted in section 1.2 have caused considerable damage in the state. Feral swine are a non-native species that cause damage to a variety of resources and negatively impact and compete with native flora and fauna, are considered by many wildlife professionals to be an undesirable component of North American wild and native ecosystems. Any reduction in feral swine populations in North America, even to the extent of complete eradication, is desirable (in most states) and would have a beneficial impact to native wildlife and the agricultural community.

Impacts on Non-Target Species (EA Section 3.1.1)

We have concluded that none of the four alternatives have a significant impact on non-target species. Under alternatives where WS-New Mexico does not provide the full range of FSDM assistance to all requesters (Alternatives 2-4), non-WS entities may conduct FSDM and do not have the same skill levels, equipment, experience, or obligations under NEPA. Under these alternatives, there is likely to be slightly greater or unreported impacts to non-target species (EA Sections 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4). WS-New Mexico activities have a high level of selectivity in the application of FSDM strategies and methods. WS-New Mexico took 2 non-target animals from FY10 to FY18 during FSDM activities, which is approximately 0.09% of the average annual WS-New Mexico lethal take total for FSDM activities in the state (EA Section 3.1.1). Unintentional capture and take of nontarget species while conducting FSDM activities would not have a negative effect on nontarget species' populations, and beneficial effects from the removal of feral swine to protect native habitat is expected to outweigh any negative effects of nontarget take. WS works with federal, state, or tribal natural resource managers, communicating the

risks of FSDM and evaluating effects on nontarget species to further ensure that cumulative take of any species would not have negative effects on the population. For these reasons, there would not be adverse cumulative effects on nontarget species populations.

Impacts on T&E Species (EA Section 3.1.1)

We have concluded that none of the four alternatives have a significant impact on T&E species. WS-New Mexico completed ESA consultations under Section 7 with USFWS for activities in the EA, ensuring there will not be significant effects to those species. These consultations and the protective measures associated with them apply to WS-New Mexico FSDM activities under Alternatives 1,3-4 (Alternative 2 is no WS-New Mexico FSDM). Non-federal entities are not required to conduct ESA consultations on their actions, nor are they bound by these protective measures, and their activities may have a greater impact on state-listed threatened or endangered species or ESA-listed species.

Therefore, Alternatives 2-4 present a greater risk to both state-listed and ESA-listed threatened and endangered species than Alternative 1. Risks are greatest under Alternative 2 because, in addition to increased potential for unintentional take, other entities may not be able to conduct lethal FSDM activities to protect T&E species from predation, unless authorized by USFWS.

Ethics and Humaneness (EA Section 3.1.1)

WS-New Mexico evaluated FSDM methods for humaneness, specifically evaluating how humane FSDM conducted under each alternative, by any entity. The analysis in Section 3.1.1 of the EA determined that Alternative 1 is likely to be the most humane, with Alternatives 2-4 being less humane/ethical, corresponding to the amount of FSDM that would likely be conducted under each alternative by less skilled, non-WS personnel. We based this determination largely on the professional skills and commitment of the APHIS-WS to humaneness (WS Directive 1.301) that are less likely to be consistently replicated by non-WS entities. The EA discussed perspectives on humaneness and ethics related to feral swine damage management, and it evaluated each FSDM method for humaneness and selectivity. Although ethical perspectives and perceptions of humaneness vary depending upon individual values and experiences, the EA considered the available science and professional guidance (e.g., American Veterinary Medical Association) on the subject.

Impacts on the Environment and Risks to Human and Pet Safety (EA Section 3.1.1)

We have determined that none of the alternatives have a significant impact on the environment (soil, water, and terrestrial and aquatic species) or human and pet safety. Alternatives that limit WS-New Mexico's involvement in FSDM (Alternatives 2-4) may result in increased FSDM by less skilled non-WS entities, which could result in increased adverse effects compared to Alternative 1, the Proposed Alternative. We determined that WS-New Mexico's actions would not have a significant impact on the risks to human health and safety under any of the alternatives. The EA analyzed the potential effects of FSDM methods on the environment and public safety by analyzing several issues including shooting, use of aircraft, trapping, carcass disposal and euthanasia methods. We found each of them to have low impact on environmental resources and human pet safety in all the alternatives. WS-New Mexico adheres to a variety of protective measures, which further reduces risks to humans and the environment from these methods, as described in EA Section 2.6.

13. Accomplishments of Goals and Objectives

The objectives analysis is distinct from the analysis of environmental consequences of the alternatives. By evaluating the ability of the alternatives to meet the overall goals and objectives, we were able to compare the results to the environmental consequences of the alternatives on the human environment to help make an informed decision that would best meet the competing needs for FSDM. The goal of WS-New Mexico is to

respond in a timely and appropriate way to all requests for assistance. WS-New Mexico also developed objectives for implementing FSDM to protect various resources and evaluate impacts on the human environment. The EA incorporates these objectives (Section 1.4) throughout the document.

We also evaluated the ability of WS-New Mexico to implement FSDM and achieve stated goals and objectives. Only Alternative 1, the Proposed Action, met all objectives. Alternative 1 meets all the EA's objectives for implementing FSDM. Alternative 2 would eliminate WS involvement in FSDM in New Mexico. WS would not provide direct operational or technical assistance and requestors of WS services would have to conduct their own FSDM without WS input, or possibly seek assistance through New Mexico Livestock Board, Department of Agriculture or New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Alternative 3 would not allow the use of the Decision Model to develop a strategy using lethal methods for managing feral swine damage and non-lethal methods would not accomplish the goal of eradication. Alternative 4 only allows WS-New Mexico to provide technical assistance. This alternative would not restrict other agencies or private individuals/hunters from using lethal or non-lethal control methods but would not likely meet the goals and objectives stated in Section 1.4.

14. Decision

I have carefully reviewed the EA prepared to meet the need for action. I find the Proposed Action alternative (Alternative 1) to be environmentally acceptable, addressing the issues and needs while balancing the environmental concerns of management agencies, landowners, advocacy groups, and the public. The analyses in the EA adequately addresses the identified issues, which reasonably confirm that no significant impact, individually or cumulatively, to the quality of the human environment are likely to occur from the proposed action, nor does the proposed action constitute a major federal action. Therefore, the analysis in the EA does not warrant the completion of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Based on the analyses in the EA, the issues identified are best addressed by selecting Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) and applying the associated general field operating policies discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA. Alternative 1 would successfully address feral swine damage management using a combination of the most effective methods and would not adversely affect the environment, property, human safety, and/or non-target species, including threatened or endangered species. Alternative 1 would offer the greatest chance of maximizing effectiveness and benefits to resource owners and managers while minimizing cumulative effects on the quality of the human environment that might result from the program's effect on target and non-target species' populations. In addition, Alternative 1 would present the greatest chance of maximizing net benefits while minimizing adverse effects to public health and safety. Alternative 1 would also offer a balanced approach to the issues of humaneness and aesthetics when all facets of those issues were considered. Further analysis would be triggered if changes occur that broaden the scope of damage management activities that affect the natural or human environment, or from the issuance of new environmental regulations. Therefore, it is my decision to implement the proposed action alternative (Alternative 1) as described in the EA.

15. Finding of No Significant Impact

The analysis in the EA indicates that Alternative 1, the Proposed Action, does not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting, individually or cumulatively, the quality of the human environment. I agree with this conclusion and, therefore, determine that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared. This determination is based on consideration of the following factors:

- A. The proposed activities will occur on sites across the state of New Mexico as requested by landowners and managers. The proposed activities are not national or regional in scope.

- B. The proposed activities will not significantly affect public health and safety. The methods used to control feral swine are target specific and not likely to affect public safety.
- C. The proposed activities will not have an impact on unique characteristics of the geographic area such as historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical areas. The nature of the methods proposed for reducing feral swine damage do not affect the physical environment.
- D. The effects on the quality of the human environment of the proposed activities are not highly controversial. Although some people may oppose lethal feral swine management, the methods and impacts are not controversial among experts, are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risks because methods and techniques have been successfully deployed.
- E. The proposed activities do not establish a precedent for actions with future significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration and activities will not threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment
- F. There are no significant cumulative effects identified by this assessment. Feral swine activities will be coordinated with NMDGF and other land management authorities, EA section 1.7. There are no irreversible or irretrievable resource commitments identified by this assessment, except for a minor consumption of fossil fuels for routine operations.
- G. The proposed activities will fully comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. The proposed activities would either have no effect, or would not be likely to adversely affect, or not likely to jeopardize federally listed threatened and endangered species, EA section 3.1.1.
- H. The proposed activities will not affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places nor will it cause a loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

For additional information concerning this decision, please contact Jon Grant, New Mexico State Director, USDA/APHIS/Wildlife Services, 8441 Washington St NE, Albuquerque, NM 87113.

Keith Wehner
Director, Western Region
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
Fort Collins, CO 80521.

Date