

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

---

OFFICE: Socorro Field Office, 901 S. Highway 85, Socorro NM, 87801

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-NM-A020-2016-0015-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Merriman Playa Core Samples 2016

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Township 4 South, Range 4 East  
Township 5 South, Range 4 East  
Township 8 South, Range 1 East

APPLICANT (if any): Chris Merriman, University of New Mexico (UNM)

---

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

---

The proposed action is to implement collection of core soil samples in up to 5 playas (small dry lake beds) and 1 arroyo bottom for scientific research. In the arroyo bottom, samples would be collected with a truck mounted Giddings coring rig. The playa locations would be cored by hand with a bucket auger. Each core is approximately 10 centimeters in diameter. Up to 5 cores may be collected in each playa. Stipulations are attached.

---

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

---

LUP Name	<u>Socorro Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision</u>
Date Approved	August 2010 (BLM-NM-PL-10-03-1617)
Other Document	<u>The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 <i>As Amended</i></u>
Date Approved	October 2001
Other Document	<u>National Environmental Policy Act Handbook H-1790-1</u>
Date Approved	January 2008

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

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

Page 8 of the Socorro Resource Management Plan it states “within the capability of the Planning Area’s natural and cultural resources, provide tourism, recreational, educational, and research opportunities”.

Page 54 of the Socorro Resource Management Plan addresses the Mockingbird Gap Proprietary ACEC in which some of the locations are located. The following management decisions apply: Decision 5 “Apply Cultural Resource Use Category A: Scientific Use” and Decision 6 “Research, study, and protect cultural resources sites”.

---

### **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.

- DOI-BLM-NM-A020-2015-0036-EA - Chris Merriman Playa Core Samples

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

- N/A

---

### **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?**

The proposed action is the same. Locations are geographically identical or near prior locations. The proposal is a minor extension of the previous project to gather more research data, by the same proponent.

**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 alternatives are adequate.

**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 action is essentially the same and the previous EA is recent. The extension was reviewed by the Interdisciplinary Team. No new issues were identified.

**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

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

Yes

---

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

---

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Mark Matthews	Field Manager	
Carlos Coontz	Planner	NEPA Coordinator, ACEC, Environmental Justice, Soil/Water/Air
Kevin Carson	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Visual, Wilderness, Caves & Karst
Brenda Wilkinson	Archaeologist	Cultural, Paleontology, Tribal
Jeff Fassett	Project Manager	Engineering and Operations, Weeds
Lann Moore	Fuels Specialist	Fire and Fuels, Forestry
Virginia Alguire	Realty Specialist	Hazmat, Lands/Realty, Minerals
Chris Hill	Recreation Planner	Recreation
Denny Apachito	Wildlife Biologist	T&E/Migratory, Wildlife
Bethany Rosales	NRS – Range	Vegetation and Grazing

Note: 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** *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

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 constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Project Lead

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the Responsible Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
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.