

DNA-NM-060-2003-050
Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance
and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

A. BLM Office: Roswell

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: Overflow Wetlands ACEC - Lower East Pecos River Salt Cedar Control

Location of Proposed Action: Overflow Wetlands ACEC – T. 12 S., R. 26 E., Section 17 & 20

Description of Proposed Action: The proposed action is to mechanically remove saltcedar growing on public land in a dense band along the east bank and floodplain of Pecos River, and to remove saltcedar growing singly or in clumps along the south outflow channel of the wetlands (see map). Access to the area would be via Highway 380 East to the Highway 409 cutoff to Bottomless Lakes State Park, and then to the southern access route of the ACEC. A Komatsu excavator would be off-loaded from the transport in the vicinity of the project area and walked to the site requiring clearing. Salt cedar removal would occur between February and May. It is expected that seven to nine days would be required to clear the majority of salt cedar from the project area. Subsequent treatment with prescribed fire to remove slash, and follow-up treatments with an approved herbicide would be conducted (refer to EA referenced below).

Applicant (if any): BLM-proposed Project

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name: Roswell RMP

Date Approved: October 1997

Other document: Overflow Wetlands HMP

Date Approved: September 1992

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the Proposed action.

West Overflow Wetlands ACEC Salt Cedar Control Project NM-060-2003-010 & ROD November 14, 2002

Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen States, Final Environmental Impact Statement of May 1991 & New Mexico Record of Decision dated July 1991

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes. It is essentially the continuation of the above referenced saltcedar control project completed on the west side of the Pecos River between December 2 – 9, 2002, by the same contractor and specialized equipment.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances?

Yes. Current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances remain the same as when the above reference EA was prepared.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant

with regard to analysis on the proposed action?

No new information or circumstances have arisen with respect to this method of saltcedar control and location of the proposed project within the Overflow Wetlands ACEC. The existing analysis and conclusions are adequate.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes. The proposed action is essentially identical with the above referenced EA, other than location and amount of saltcedar control to be conducted on public land. About one-third more area is involved along the east side of the Pecos River. The total area of proposed treatment is approximately 140 acres. The methodology and analytical approach is appropriate for the current proposed action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes. The above referenced EA addressed saltcedar control along the west bank of the Pecos River. The proposed action is directly across the river and is essentially the same site, environmentally speaking. Impacts to resources resulting from the proposed action are unchanged.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes. Saltcedar control is an ongoing activity conducted on many land parcels along the Pecos River by the Bureau of Reclamation through vegetative treatment withdrawals. In addition, large scale chemical treatment of saltcedar on private and state land along the Pecos River from Ft. Sumner downstream to the Carlsbad area occurred in 2002. Within the context of these activities occurring on lands other than federal ownership, the impact of the BLM's endeavor to control saltcedar along the Pecos River would not add substantially to cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed action, and is unchanged from the analysis conducted in the referenced EA.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. BLM's endeavor to improve wetland-riparian habitat along the Pecos River is known to the various publics and agencies through various public meetings held to discuss wetland-riparian area management, among other resources, during the development of the Roswell RMP. Prior to the RMP, the Overflow Wetlands Habitat Management Plan received signatory approval from various federal and state agencies. And recently, during several public meetings to obtain information and support from the local public for the development of the pending Overflow Wetlands ACEC implementation plan.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Refer to EA Checklist prepared as part of this DNA.

F. Mitigation Measure: Refer to the above referenced EA.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action. This constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

[If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made.]

/s/ T. R. Kreager

2/04/03

Signature of the Responsible Official
Assistant Field Manager

Date