

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
Salem District, Oregon
Marys Peak Resource Area

Signage updates within the Alsea Falls Recreation Site
DOI-BLM-OR-S050-2015-0001-DNA

Alsea Falls Recreation Area Management Plan Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-OR-S050-2013-0001-EA

A. Background and Description of the Proposed Action

The BLM analyzed projects in the Alsea Falls Recreation Area Management Plan Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-OR-S050-2013-0001) in 2012 and specifically addressed signage improvements within the Alsea Falls Recreation Site (both day-use and campground areas). The BLM has identified six signs within the recreation site that need to be moved or removed (Figure 1). These signs have outdated or incorrect information. The signage updates are consistent with the activities analyzed to meet the Purpose and Need of the project. Work will begin in summer 2015 and is not expected to impact visitor use of the site.

Location: Alsea Falls Recreation Site, T. 14 S., R. 7 W., Section 25, Willamette Meridian, Benton County, Oregon.

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

The analysis documented in the EA is site-specific and supplements analyses found in the *Salem District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement*, September 1994 (RMP/FEIS). This project is authorized under the *Salem District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan*, May 1995 (1995 RMP) and related documents which direct and provide the legal framework for management of BLM lands within the Salem District. All of these documents may be reviewed at the Salem District office.

The signage updates conform to the Salem District Resource Management Plan/Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended by the 2001 *Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines* (2001 ROD).

The signage update project applies a 2011 exemption from pre-disturbance surveys. The project meets the provisions of the exemption, because it entails improving an existing recreation site (EA p. 7).

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

- Provide a wide range of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities that contribute to meeting projected recreation demand within the planning area. (RMP p. 41).
- Continue to operate and maintain developed recreation sites and trails (RMP p. 43).

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

Applicable NEPA Documents:

- Alsea Fall Recreation Area Management Plan EA (DOI-BLM-OR-S050-2013-0001-EA) – October 9, 2012.
- Alsea Falls Recreation Area Management Plan Decision Record – January 15, 2013.

Other NEPA documents and other related documents relevant to the proposed action:

- Salem District RMP/EIS – November 1994 and Record of Decision – May 1995
- Alsea Falls Recreation Area Management Plan project file

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. The action will be completed as described and analyzed in the EA (pp. 20-32). The EA specifically addressed signage updates throughout the recreation area. The signs in need of replacement or removal are located within the day use and camping areas.

Theme 4: Visitor Information and Interpretation (EA p. 31)

Signs would be consolidated and be designed to blend into the environment as much as possible. Signage, kiosks, bulletin boards, websites, and brochures would be updated to reflect public information needs and help promote the site as a destination for non-motorized recreation opportunities. Additional bulletin boards or kiosks would be installed throughout the Alsea Falls Recreation Site.

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?

The EAs analyzed the No Action and the Proposed Action alternatives. No other reasonable alternatives to achieving the purpose and need were identified by the Interdisciplinary Teams or the public. No new environmental concerns, interests, resource values, or circumstances have arisen since the EAs were published that would require the development of additional alternatives. A full description of the alternatives can be found in Chapter 2 of the EA (pp. 13-32).

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 of the proposed action?

Yes. The existing analysis and conclusions are adequate. There is no new significant information or circumstances relative to the analysis in the EA or the current action. The analysis and conclusions in the EA are appropriate and adequate.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the current proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

The EA analyzed direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed action on affected resources (fisheries/aquatic habitat, water quality, vegetation, soils, fuels, and wildlife). The project will adhere to best management practices and project design features in the EA to minimize effects to the aforementioned resources. There are no substantial changes from those addressed in the analyses to the present.

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

Public involvement for the EA has been adequate. The BLM sent scoping letters in 2010 to 86 federal, state, and municipal government agencies, nearby landowners, tribal authorities, and interested parties. The BLM received 30 comments during this period.

The EA and FONSI were made available for a 30 day public review on October 9, 2012. The BLM received 13 comment letters on the EA. Comments were generally favorable for the plan and the proposed activities.

Consultation

Fish: Effects to OC Coho or its designated Critical Habitat from proposed recreation maintenance activities are covered under the Endangered Species Act Programmatic Biological Opinion and Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Essential Fish Habitat Conservation Recommendations for the Programmatic Activities of USDA Forest Service, USDI Bureau of Land Management, and Coquille Indian Tribe in Western Oregon (2010/02700). No additional consultation is necessary.

Wildlife: This action is covered under a 2013 Letter of Concurrence from the US. Fish and Wildlife Service: Informal programmatic consultation for activities with potential to disturb spotted owls and marbled murrelets within the North Coast Planning Province for FY 2014-2017. Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office, Portland, Oregon. Tracking Number: 01EOFW00-2013-I-0190 (dated 9/18/2013). Unpublished Document received as formal response to BLM and FS request for Section 7 Consultation on project activities that may affect federally listed wildlife species and/or their critical habitat.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis

| Name | Specialty |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Tim Fisher | Site Manager |
| Douglass Fitting | Hydrology and Soils |
| Scott Hopkins | Wildlife |
| Stefanie Larew | NEPA Coordinator |
| Scott Snedaker | Fisheries |

Prepared and Reviewed By

| | |
|---------------------------|----------------|
| <u>/s/ Stefanie Larew</u> | <u>4/23/15</u> |
| Stefanie Larew | |
| NEPA Coordinator | Date |

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

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| <u>/s/ Rich Hatfield</u> | <u>4/24/15</u> |
| Rich Hatfield | Date |
| Marys Peak Field Manager | |

Figure 1. Approximate location of signs to be moved or removed

