

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
DNA-CA-660-06-29**

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office

Proposed Action Title: Road improvement through La Gloria and Smith Canyons

Location of Proposed Action: T. 18 S., R. 5 E., Section 13 SE1/4, 23 SE1/4, 24 All and T.18S., R.6E., Section 19 All, SBBM, San Diego County, San Diego California.

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: ROW Grant CA-38154

Applicant: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (Border Patrol) – San Diego Sector

Background Information: The Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (Border Patrol) proposes to continue with the construction of their border (U.S.-Mexico) infrastructure projects in 2006. The border projects were first identified in the “Final Environmental Assessment border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G” (1994). ROW Grant CA-38154 was issued to the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection on May 30, 1997 for construction of portions of the border fence and road west and east (Section B and C) of Campo, California. The Bureau of Customs and Border Protection proposes to complete the road maintenance through La Gloria and Smith Canyons, described in Section D in the EA.

A. The proposed action is to amend right of way CA-38154 to allow maintenance of the border road through La Gloria and Smith Canyons. Maintenance would include the installation of culverts in the road, widening of the existing road in several locations to 20-24 feet, and construct water bars and rock trenches for drainage. Construction equipment would include a grader, backhoe and dump truck, extractor, water truck. Construction personnel would not exceed 50 people. Equipment would be staged at an authorized storage site.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance.

The applicable land use plan for this area is the 1994 South Coast Resource Management Plan.

C. Applicable documents that cover the proposed action.

In approving R/W CA-38154 the BLM relied on the Final Environmental Assessment for the Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G (June 1994) (CA-066-98-48).

Environmental Assessment Smith Canyon Road Realignment CA-660-06-27 (April 2006).

Categorical Exclusion Review and Decision Record (CA-660-00-20) - Campo to Jacumba International Border Road Storage Yard. Right of Way CA-38154 amended to include storage yard and staging area for construction equipment.

An Archaeological Survey for the La Gloria/Smith Canyon Project – San Diego County, California, Prepared by Seth A. Rosenberg and Brian F. Smith of Brian F. Smith and Associates (March 1, 2006).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria.

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

The proposed action is essentially the same action as approved under R/W CA-38154 of May 30, 1997 and as amended on July 27, 1998. Road maintenance and realignment was addressed for the entire border road from Campo to Jacumba in the Final Environmental Assessment Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G. Road work for La Gloria and Smith Canyons was addressed in section D. Construction equipment, personnel, and road width would not vary from what was identified in the environmental assessment listed in C above for construction and maintenance of the border road (Described for Segments B & C in the EA).

The environmental consequences of the border road construction and maintenance of R/W CA-38154 were specifically analyzed in the environmental assessment listed in C. above.

The Categorical Exclusion for the storage yard addresses the location for the staging and storing of equipment during the construction activities.

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

The range of alternatives analyzed in the Final Environmental Assessment for the Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G (June 1994) remains appropriate with respect to the proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances? There is no new information that invalidates the analysis completed in the documents listed in

C. above. A cultural survey of the area conducted in February of 2006 by Brian Smith & Associates revealed no new cultural information or sites within the area of the proposed action.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action? The analytical approach used in the Final Environmental Assessment for the Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G (June 1994) and Environmental Assessment for the Realignment of the Road in Smith Canyon (April 2006) developed conditions and stipulations to R/W CA-38154. The majority of these conditions and stipulations would be valid under this proposed action. The methodology and analytical approach from the existing NEPA remains reasonable and appropriate.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the currently proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Since the expected use of R/W CA-38154 would not change as a consequence of this proposed action, the direct and indirect impacts of again amending the R/W are essentially unchanged from the impacts considered in the Final Environmental Assessment for the Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G (June 1994).

The final EA analyzed site specific impacts of granting R/W CA-38154. These impacts are identical to this proposed action.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document? The Final Environmental Assessment for the Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G (June 1994) analyzed the cumulative impacts of the project granted in R/W CA-38154. The Environmental Assessment for the Road Realignment in Smith Canyon also analyzed cumulative impacts that would be similar to the proposed action. The amending of the R/W to cover this proposed action would not result in any cumulative impacts that were not analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents adequate for the current proposed action. The border road and fence construction projects addressed in Environmental Assessment for the Border Road and Fence: Construction and Repair Campo to Jacumba, San Diego County, California JT041-94B/C/D/E/F/G (June 1994) were not highly controversial projects. The EA was reviewed by numerous publics and agencies. BLM approved components of the project in 1997 and 1998.

The prior public involvement and interagency review remains valid and adequate to amend R/W CA-38154 to include road maintenance and widening within La Gloria and Smith Canyons.

E. Interdisciplinary analysis: The following team members participated in the preparation of this worksheet:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Janaye Byergo	San Diego Project Manager
Rolla Queen	Archaeologist
Joyce Schlachter	Wildlife Biologist
Greg Hill	Planning and Environmental Coordinator

Conclusion

- Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposed action conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Gail Acheson, Field Manager

Date