

Summary

THIS summary of the Long-term Miscellaneous Purposes Contract Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) briefly summarizes the analysis of the potential environmental consequences of the Proposed Action—a proposed long-term miscellaneous purposes contract and any related contracts—in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Reclamation and the Carlsbad Irrigation District (CID) propose to enter into a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract to use Carlsbad Project water for purposes other than irrigation. Reclamation and CID have entered into three previous short-term miscellaneous purposes contracts; the FEIS addresses the effects of a long-term contract. The FEIS also addresses Reclamation’s proposed review of related third-party contracts between the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission (NMISC) and the CID to use Carlsbad Project water for state line deliveries.

Because Carlsbad Project water was authorized by the Secretary of the Interior for irrigation use only, a miscellaneous purposes contract is required for the NMISC to use Carlsbad Project water for

purposes other than irrigation. Execution of a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract and review of any related third-party contracts are Federal actions requiring analysis under NEPA. The Sale of Water for Miscellaneous Purposes Act of 1920 (“1920 Act”) allows the Secretary of the Interior to supply water from a Reclamation irrigation project for purposes other than irrigation. The 1920 Act includes four conditions: 1) irrigation water users’ association approval, 2) proof of no other practicable water source to meet the other purposes, 3) the delivery of water for other purposes is not detrimental to the irrigation project or other prior appropriated rights, and 4) funds derived from the contract be credited to the project from which the water originated.

Lead Agencies

Reclamation and NMISC are the joint lead agencies in preparing this FEIS. The joint lead agencies are responsible for all decisions involving preparation of the FEIS and issues arising during the NEPA process. Reclamation is the lead federal

Summary

agency and is responsible for the Record of Decision.

The Secretary of the Interior authorized the Carlsbad Project for the purpose of irrigation in 1905. Reclamation diverts to storage and delivers Carlsbad Project water to CID. Reclamation also owns Sumner, Brantley, and Avalon Dams. The CID operates the dams and reservoirs under an operation and maintenance contract and a repayment contract with Reclamation.

NMISC oversees interstate stream compacts and interstate stream litigation, and cooperates in the planning of Federal water projects. The New Mexico Office of the State Engineer administers water rights in the State, including the apportionment, measurement, and distribution of water. Together, NMISC and New Mexico Office of the State Engineer (NMOSE) conduct investigations of water supply, and protect, conserve, and develop the underground and stream systems of the State. NMISC is responsible for ensuring that the State of New Mexico meets its water delivery requirements to Texas as measured at the state line, and for complying with the 1948 Pecos River Compact and the 1988 *Texas v. New Mexico* U.S. Supreme Court Amended Decree (485 U.S. 388).

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to allow the use of Project water for purposes other than irrigation. This long-term conversion and delivery includes but is not limited to: 1920 Sale of Water for Miscellaneous Purposes Act Contract, subsequent third-party contracts, CID membership agreements and any tool or agreement for the conversion and delivery of project irrigation water for NMISC purposes. This FEIS analyzes the effects of a long-term conversion and delivery of

Project water for Pecos River Compact purposes, as required by the Settlement Agreement executed to resolve some of the water rights litigation (*Lewis Case-Carlsbad Project Phase*) in the Pecos River basin. The litigation is continuing to adjudicate (determine through the court system) the elements of water rights, such as priority date and authorized uses, of the Pecos River Basin (*State of New Mexico ex rel. State Engineer v. L.T. Lewis, Nos. 20294 and 22600 Consolidated*). The proposed long-term miscellaneous purposes contract and any related third-party contracts would address three primary needs along the Pecos River. The NMISC needs to:

- Maintain long-term compliance with the Pecos River Compact (“Compact”) and the United States Supreme Court Amended Decree in *Texas v. New Mexico*
- Use up to 50,000 acre-feet per year of Project water for purposes other than irrigation, specifically for state line delivery to maintain long-term compliance with the Pecos River Compact
- Partially fulfill requirements of the Settlement Agreement that the NMISC, CID and Reclamation, and other parties executed in 2003.

Background

The CID operates the Carlsbad Project to provide water for CID water users. Within the CID, 25,055 acres of land are authorized for irrigation, with about 70 to 80 percent actively irrigated each year.

In 1948, New Mexico and Texas entered into the Pecos River Compact. In 1974, Texas filed a lawsuit against New Mexico for under-delivery of water required by the Compact. In 1988, the Supreme Court entered an Amended Decree, which appointed a federal River Master and established an accounting method to verify proportioning of

Pecos River flows between New Mexico and Texas. Under the Amended Decree, New Mexico cannot have a net shortfall in its water deliveries to Texas. However, New Mexico is permitted to accrue a positive state line credit, which can be used for water delivery in years when there is a shortfall.

The NMISC began leasing Project water in 1992 as part of its Water Resource Conservation Project to ensure continued compliance with the Pecos River Compact; the leasing has continued through the present. To allow the NMISC to use project water for state line delivery, Reclamation and the CID entered into the first short-term miscellaneous purposes contract in 1992. The contract was renewed in 1999 and again in 2004. The short-term contract expires in 2009. The NMISC is the only entity allowed under the existing short-term miscellaneous purposes contract to enter into lease agreements with the CID to use the water for purposes other than irrigation and such agreements are subject to Reclamation's review. The short-term miscellaneous purposes contract allows Project water to be released directly into the Pecos River immediately downstream of Avalon Dam, the last dam on the river in New Mexico, for delivery to the state line. Since implementation of the leasing program in 1992, release of leased water from Avalon Dam has contributed significantly to New Mexico's efforts to comply with the Compact and Amended Decree. Without the leasing program, New Mexico may have defaulted on its Compact obligations as early as 1995.

Between 1987 and the present, New Mexico has satisfied its water delivery obligations to Texas under the Compact and Amended Decree. In some years, New Mexico has over-delivered water to the state line and, in other years, it has under-delivered. New Mexico currently maintains a small delivery

credit at the state line. New Mexico has been able to satisfy its Compact obligations in large part because of its leasing program and the fallowing of irrigated land within CID. The amount of Project water NMISC leased from CID members for delivery to the state line ranged from 5,600 acre-feet in 2003 to 44,800 acre-feet in 1997.

In 2003, NMOSE, NMISC, Reclamation, CID, and the PVACD entered into a Settlement Agreement that resolves water issues (*Lewis Case-Carlsbad Project Phase*), implements a plan to ensure delivery of water to the CID and state line, and settles many water management issues on the Pecos River. The Settlement Agreement requires Reclamation and the CID to enter into a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract that would allow the NMISC to use Project water for miscellaneous purposes, specifically delivery to the state line. A long-term miscellaneous purposes contract, with or without the Settlement Agreement, would allow the NMISC to continue using Project water for long-term Compact compliance. The water users in the lower Pecos River basin have determined that the most effective, long-term solution to ensure Compact compliance includes continued use of Carlsbad Project water for state line delivery.

In attempting to comply with the Compact without a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract, the New Mexico State Engineer is more likely to be forced to issue a priority call. A priority call is a curtailment of water use by priority date of the water right. The priority call would be issued to correct a net shortfall in accordance with a Pecos River Master's approved plan or in response to a valid call by a senior water right owner. A basin-wide priority call would likely have substantial adverse economic effects in the Pecos River basin. A long-term miscellaneous purposes contract would assist the NMISC in achieving long-term

Summary

Compact compliance and avoiding a basin-wide priority call.

Alternatives

Two alternatives, the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action, are analyzed in detail in this FEIS. The lead agencies considered two additional alternatives to a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract, but eliminated them from detailed analysis. Neither alternative would provide the NMISC with adequate assurance that it could meet state line delivery requirements over the long term for the State's goal of maintaining long-term Compact compliance. In addition, both alternatives would have the same environmental effects as a 40-year contract but for a shorter period.

The No Action Alternative represents a projection of current conditions to the most reasonable future responses or conditions that could occur during the life of the project without the action alternative being implemented. For FEIS analysis purposes, it is assumed in the No Action Alternative that Reclamation would neither renew the existing short-term miscellaneous purposes contract when it expires in 2009, nor enter into a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract. Under the No Action Alternative, the NMISC would continue using the existing short-term miscellaneous purposes contract for delivery of Project water either leased or allotted to NMISC-owned lands to the state line until it expires in 2009. CID would not release Project water to the state line after the existing short-term contract expires in 2009. In attempting to comply with the Compact without a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract, the New Mexico State Engineer is more likely to be forced to issue a priority call. The priority call would be issued to avoid an imminent shortfall, or to correct a net shortfall in accordance with the

Pecos River Master's approved plan. The New Mexico State Engineer, not the NMISC, has the direct authority to issue a priority call. The likelihood of a priority call would be considerably greater with the No Action Alternative than with the Proposed Action.

The Proposed Action (also Reclamation's Preferred Alternative) analyzed in this FEIS is Reclamation's execution of a long-term miscellaneous purposes contract with the CID, and review of any related separate third-party contracts between the CID and the NMISC. The long-term miscellaneous purposes contract would allow the NMISC to use Project water for purposes other than irrigation. Water allotted to land within the CID boundaries either leased from other CID members or allotted to NMISC-owned lands would be used for state line delivery. The long-term miscellaneous purposes contract would replace an existing short-term miscellaneous purposes contract (which allows the same uses of Project water under a 5-year term that expires in 2009).

Under the Proposed Action, the proposed long-term miscellaneous purposes contract would be executed in 2006, have a term of 40 years, and would limit NMISC to the use of no more than 50,000 acre-feet per year of Project water. Under the Proposed Action, it is assumed that NMISC would fallow 3,580 acres of CID lands over the next 40 years (164 acres currently owned by NMISC, plus the average of 3,416 acres fallowed by leases with other CID members). It is assumed that an additional 5,170 acre-feet of Project water would be leased annually for delivery to the state line (5,170 acre-feet of leased Project water plus adjustments would result in releases of 6,080 acre-feet). In years with a full allotment, state line delivery of Project water either leased to the NMISC or allotted to NMISC-owned lands would total about 21,600 acre-feet per year. Actual leases

and water releases would continue to vary from year to year. For example, total amounts of Project water leases have varied from 5,600 acre-feet in 2003 to 44,800 acre-feet in 1997. Similarly, the amount of land fallowed due to water leasing has varied from 0 acres in 2004 to 5,133 acres in 1993. Such variation would continue with the Proposed Action. Because water could be leased on a year-by-year basis, and fallowed lands potentially irrigated the following year, maintenance of the fallowed land would be the responsibility of the individual landowner from whom water is leased. The likelihood of a priority call would be considerably less with the Proposed Action than with the No Action Alternative.

The lead agencies considered using a series of short-term miscellaneous purposes contracts instead of one long-term miscellaneous purposes contract. This alternative was eliminated because it would not fulfill the project purpose and need. The lead agencies considered a contract term of 25 years instead of 40 years. The lead agencies eliminated this alternative from detailed analysis because it would not fulfill the project purpose and need.

Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives

Direct and Indirect Impacts

A comparison of direct and indirect impacts for the two alternatives for all resources and resource indicators is presented in Table S-1. Additional details of the affected environment and impacts are in Chapter 3.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts of eight reasonably foreseeable independent actions were analyzed. Reasonably foreseeable actions considered in this FEIS are

those future actions and activities independent of the Proposed Action that could result in cumulative effects when combined with the effects of the Proposed Action. These actions are anticipated to occur regardless of which alternative is selected. The reasonably foreseeable actions evaluated in this FEIS are: the Pecos River Settlement Agreement, NMOSE's Active Water Resource Management, actions analyzed in the Carlsbad Project Water Operations and Water Supply Conservation EIS (Operations EIS), Vegetation Management Projects, Brantley and Avalon Reservoirs Resource Management Plans, the Malaga Bend Salinity Alleviation Project, NMISC's Water Conservation Project, and the Calloway Culvert Reconstruction. None of these actions would result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources. Other cumulative impacts are summarized in Table S-2 and additional details are provided in Chapter 4.

Issues Raised by Public and Agencies

A public scoping meeting was held on February 12, 2004 in Carlsbad, New Mexico. Nine members of the public and local agency representatives attended the meeting. Based on comments received during the public scoping meeting, seven major issues or concerns were identified. The issues were:

- Surface water flow and state line delivery
- Ground and surface water hydrology
- Management of fallowed land
- Wildlife
- Socioeconomic conditions
- Recreation resources
- Cultural resources

Areas of Controversy

The two areas of most concern identified during scoping are impacts of land fallowing and the Pecos River Settlement Agreement (see Scoping Report in Appendix B). The Pecos River Settlement Agreement is a reasonably foreseeable action that is independent of the long-term miscellaneous purposes contract. The long-term miscellaneous purposes contract has separate and independent utility for the NMISC, whether or not the Settlement Agreement is implemented. If the long-term miscellaneous purposes contract is not approved (i.e., the No Action Alternative), the

NMISC will continue to implement the other components described in the Settlement Agreement. Under the Proposed Action, management of fallowed land in CID would not change, and about the same number of acres of land would be fallowed each year as under current conditions. Because water could continue to be leased from CID members on an annual basis, weed and erosion management would be the responsibility of the lessor and CID. Under the No Action Alternative, it is assumed an additional 3,416 acres would be irrigated and no longer fallowed.

There are no unresolved issues for the FEIS.

Table S-1. Comparison of direct and indirect effects.

Resource and Indicator	Existing Conditions	No Action Alternative		Proposed Action
		Until 2009	After 2009	
Hydrology				
Pecos River flows below Avalon Dam	No flow about 88 percent of the time (321 days/year)	Same as existing conditions	Decrease from existing conditions by up to 21,600 acre-feet per year in full allotment years; flow of 600 cfs exceeded up to 18 fewer days each year	After 2009, an increase of up to 21,600 acre-feet per year in full allotment years; Flows of 600 cfs exceeded up to 18 more days than the No Action Alternative; potential for increase to 50,000 acre-feet
Pecos River flows at Red Bluff gauge	River is rarely, if ever, dry due to base inflows from Carlsbad Basin aquifers. Flows are 200 cfs or more 10% of the time.	Same as existing conditions	Decrease from existing conditions; flow of 600 cfs exceeded up to 18 fewer days each year	After 2009, flow of 600 cfs exceeded up to 18 more days than the No Action Alternative
Flows in CID Main Canal and changes to Project efficiency	Diversions based on allotment and delivery to about 18,000 irrigated acres. CID assumes average transmission losses from Avalon Dam to farm headgate is 35% of farm delivery.	Same as existing conditions	Slight increase in CID Main Canal flows and slight increase in Project efficiency, as currently fallowed lands are returned to irrigation	After 2009, slightly lower CID Main Canal flows and Project efficiency compared to the No Action Alternative
Base inflows to the Pecos River	Average base inflows of about 26,500 acre-feet/yr. Base inflows are affected by irrigation return flows, which are in turn a function of allotment, crop type, precipitation.	Same as existing conditions	Increase in Pecos River base inflows (about 5,000 acre-feet per year), due to fallowed lands being returned to irrigation	After 2009, less Pecos River base inflows (about 5,000 acre-feet per year) compared to the No Action Alternative
Water Quality	Salinity in Pecos River range from 3,900 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ below Dark Canyon to 9,200 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ at Pierce Canyon Crossing.	Same as existing conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pecos River below Dark Canyon, reduction in salinity (-1,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) • Pecos River near Malaga, increase in salinity (+1,200 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$), • Near Pierce Canyon Crossing, increase in salinity (+3,400 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) • Red Bluff gauge, increase in salinity (+4,600 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pecos River below Dark Canyon, slight increase in salinity (+100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) • Pecos River near Malaga, decrease in salinity (-100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) • Near Pierce Canyon Crossing, decrease in salinity (-100 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$) • Red Bluff gauge, not enough data to estimate changes. • With a potential maximum 50,000 acre-feet annual release, salinity would decrease by up to 800 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$.

Table S-1. Comparison of direct and indirect effects (cont'd).

Resource and Indicator	Existing Conditions	No Action Alternative		Proposed Action
		Until 2009	After 2009	
<i>Geomorphology</i>	Stable river channel, typically armored by thick stands of salt cedar. Channel degradation due primarily to downcutting	Same as existing conditions	Reduction in capacity for sediment transport, particularly below Avalon Dam	No change in existing conditions. Compared to the No Action Alternative after 2009, slightly higher capacity for sediment transport.
<i>Wetlands</i>	Three types of wetlands exist within the analysis area, primarily within the Pecos River floodplain	No change from existing conditions; maximum possible release may support additional wetlands	Increased irrigation return flows may increase wetlands within and along the Pecos River channel below CID; wetlands directly below Avalon Dam may decrease slightly.	No change from existing conditions. Compared to the No Action Alternative after 2009, wetlands within and along the Pecos River channel below CID may be less; wetlands directly below Avalon Dam may be more; maximum possible release may support additional wetlands.
<i>Vegetation</i>	Three vegetation communities exist within the analysis area with riparian scrubland along the Pecos River corridor	No change from existing conditions; maximum possible release may support additional riparian vegetation	Emergent annual vegetation in riparian areas below CID may increase with increased irrigation return flow; riparian vegetation directly below Avalon Dam may decrease slightly.	No change from existing conditions. Compared to the No Action Alternative after 2009, emergent annual vegetation in riparian areas below CID would be less; riparian vegetation directly below Avalon Dam would be more; maximum possible release may support additional riparian vegetation.
<i>Wildlife</i>	Different types and densities of wildlife exist within the three vegetation communities within the analysis area	No effect	No effect	No effect
<i>Threatened and Endangered Species</i>	Various listed species exist within Eddy County. Table 11 in Section 3.8 lists the species potentially in the analysis area	No effect	No effect	No effect
<i>Cultural Resources</i>	Portions of the Carlsbad Project are designated as the Carlsbad Irrigation District National Historic Landmark	No effect	No effect	No effect

Table S-1. Comparison of direct and indirect effects (cont'd).

Resource and Indicator	Existing Conditions	No Action Alternative		Proposed Action
		Until 2009	After 2009	
Socioeconomic				
Crop Production	Irrigated crops in Eddy county total 45,489 acres; for Chaves county total 69,789 acres. CID average cropped acres is 18,044	No change from existing conditions	Net increase in irrigated crops (3,416 acres) and increase in annual crop revenue of \$492,000	\$492,000 less annual crop revenue compared to the No Action Alternative after 2009; potential for decrease in irrigated crops
Regional Economy	Total annual earnings (1999) for Chaves and Eddy County of about \$771 and \$699 million respectively; average per capita 2001 income of \$22,637 in Eddy County and \$20,769 in Chaves County. Water lease revenue is \$1.4 million. 2003 unemployment rate in Eddy and Chaves County 7 to 8%	No change from existing conditions	Decrease in total value added of up to \$3.3 million over a 20-year period; decrease in gross value of up to \$5.8 million Considerably higher risk of priority call and associated adverse economic impacts (\$59.6 million in single-year costs); lower employment, income, taxes and value added	Compared to the No Action Alternative after 2009, considerably lower risk of priority call; similar to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative through 2009 in years without a priority call
Social Effects	Total population of Chaves and Eddy county is 111,316 people (2002). Population is concentrated in urban areas. Ethnic diversity is about 74% white and 26% non-white/Hispanic	No change from existing conditions	In years where a priority call would be necessary, agricultural community resources would be adversely affected No significant change in other years	Compared to the No Action Alternative, agricultural community resources are considerably less likely to be affected by priority call; similar to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative through 2009 in years without a priority call
Recreation	River recreation below Avalon Dam occurs at low levels; reservoir recreation occurs at Tansill Lake, which supports seasonal recreation levels of up to 15,000 people	No change from existing conditions	Recreational opportunity in Pecos River channel below Avalon Dam and at Tansill Lake slightly reduced	No change from existing conditions; after 2009, slightly more recreational opportunity in Pecos River channel below Avalon Dam and at Tansill Lake compared to the No Action Alternative
Land Use	Agriculture, recreation, wildlife habitat, mineral/oil and gas extraction are existing land uses	No change from existing conditions	Increase in irrigated land (3,416 acres) and decrease in fallowed land	No change from existing conditions; less irrigated land and potential for additional fallowed land compared to the No Action Alternative
Soils	Existing fallowed land (3,416 acres on average) subject to higher erosion and weed invasions	No change in prime farmland, erosion or weeds	Increase in prime farmland (up to 3,416 acres); decrease in water and wind erosion and noxious weeds	No change in prime farmland, erosion or weeds; less prime farmland and greater potential for increased erosion and weeds compared to the No Action Alternative

Table S-2. Summary of cumulative effects.

Resource/Resource Indicator	Reasonably Foreseeable Action	Impact in Conjunction with Proposed Action
<i>Hydrology</i>		
Pecos River flows below Avalon Dam	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Net increase in Pecos River flow
	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	Net increase in release volume (culvert capacity to double); net decrease in number of days of releases from Avalon Dam
	Active Water Resource Management	No net change when in conjunction with Settlement Agreement
Pecos River flows at Red Bluff gauge	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Net increase in Pecos River flow volume
	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	Net increase in release volume (culvert capacity to double); net decrease in number of days of releases from Avalon Dam
	Active Water Resource Management	No net change when in conjunction with Settlement Agreement
Flows in CID Main Canal and changes to Project efficiency	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Net increase in CID allotment
Base inflows to the Pecos River	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Net increase in base inflows over the long-term, but inter-annual variability depending on land retirement, CID allotment, and Compact obligations
<i>Water Quality</i>		
	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Net benefit to water quality
	Malaga Bend salinity alleviation project	Net benefit to water quality
<i>Geomorphology</i>	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	Increased flow results in 26 percent more sediment transport at Red Bluff gauge
<i>Wetlands</i>		
	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Increased river flow may promote wetland expansion
	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	Potential increase in bank saturation at higher releases may promote wetland expansion
<i>Vegetation</i>		
	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Increased river flow may promote riparian area expansion
	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	Potential increase in bank saturation at higher releases may promote riparian area expansion
<i>Wildlife</i>		
	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Increased river flow may increase riparian habitat volume and quality
	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	Potential increase in bank saturation at higher releases may increase riparian habitat volume and quality
<i>Threatened and Endangered Species</i>		
	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Increased river flow may increase riparian and aquatic habitat volume and quality
	Calloway Culvert Reconstruction	No effect

Table S-2. Summary of cumulative effects (cont'd).

Resource/Resource Indicator	Reasonably Foreseeable Action	Impact in Conjunction with Proposed Action
<i>Socioeconomic</i>		
Crop Production	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Reduction in cropland of up to 2,584 acres in CID and up to 11,000 acres in RAB
	Carlsbad Project Operations EIS	Potential for 5,000 to 16,400 acre reduction in cropland
Regional Economy	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	<i>Employment</i> would increase in the short term (103 jobs) and decrease in the long term (loss of 16 to 17 jobs) <i>Income</i> would increase in short term (by \$8.0 million per year for years 1-2 and by \$5.9 million per year for years 3, 4, and 5) and decrease about \$0.6 million in years 6 to 20 <i>Indirect business taxes</i> would increase by \$260,000 per year for years 1-2, \$130,000 per year for years 3, 4, and 5, and about \$9,000 per year for years 6 to 20 <i>Value added</i> for the Settlement Agreement would result in a net increase over a 20-year period of about \$24 million <i>Gross output</i> for the Settlement Agreement would result in a net increase over a 20-year period of about \$59 million
	Carlsbad Project Operations EIS	<i>Employment</i> would follow the same pattern as Settlement Agreement (short-term gain of up to 52 jobs and long-term loss of 1 to 69) <i>Income</i> would increase up to \$1 million per year initially and decrease about \$20,000 to \$2.1 million per year in long-term <i>Indirect business taxes</i> ; small net tax revenue increases are expected <i>Value added</i> the Carlsbad Project Operations would likely result in a small net increase in value added over a 20-year period <i>Gross output</i> the Carlsbad Project Operations would likely result in a small net increase in gross output
Priority Call	Settlement Agreement	Reduction in risk of priority call
Social Effects	All Reasonably Foreseeable Actions	No significant change in social conditions
<i>Recreation</i>	All Reasonably Foreseeable Actions	No cumulative impacts
<i>Land Use</i>	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Reduction in cropland of up to 2,584 acres in CID and up to 11,000 acres in RAB
	Carlsbad Project Operations EIS	Potential for 5,000 to 16,400 acre reduction in cropland
<i>Soils</i>	Pecos River Settlement Agreement	Increased potential for wind and water erosion and weeds on fallowed lands; land management program would mitigate impacts
	Vegetation Management Projects	Net benefit to floodplain soils due to salt cedar removal
	Carlsbad Project Operations EIS	Increased potential for wind and water erosion and weeds on fallowed lands; land management program would mitigate impacts