

# 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

Eckman Creek Large Woody Debris Placement  
DOI-BLM-OR-S050-2013-0004-DNA

Salem District Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Restoration Environmental Assessment  
DOI-BLM-OR-S000-2012-0001-EA

---

## A. Background and Description of the Proposed Action

The BLM analyzed restoration projects in the Salem District Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Restoration Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-OR-S000-2012-0001-EA) in 2012.

The purpose of this Proposed Action is to improve aquatic and riparian habitat on BLM and non-BLM-administered lands. Aquatic and riparian restoration activities identified in the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (2008) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (2007) Biological Opinions (NMFS:2008/03506; USFWS: 13420-2007-F-0055) for Programmatic Consultation on Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington, CY2007-CY2012 (ARBO) will be completed. Analyzed activities include:

- Large Wood, Boulder, and Gravel Placement
- Reconnection of Existing Side Channels and Alcoves
- Streambank Restoration
- Fish Passage Culvert and Bridge Projects
- Head-cut Stabilization and Associated Fish Passage
- Riparian vegetation treatments
- Road Treatments

The Eckman Creek Large Woody Debris Placement project is consistent with the activities analyzed to meet the Purpose and Need of the project. The project entails placement of several large logs in Eckman Creek, downstream of a culvert replacement action being implemented by the Siuslaw National Forest on BLM lands.

**Location:** T. 14 S., R. 11 W., Section 5; Willamette Meridian within the Lower Alsea River fifth field watershed in Lincoln 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). The Eckman Creek Large Woody Debris Placement 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 Eckman Creek Large Woody Debris Placement project is consistent with the Salem RMP 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 project meets the provisions of the 2006 Pechman Exemption C (EA, p. 10).

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

- Design and implement fish habitat restoration and enhancement activities in a manner that contributes to attainment of Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives. (RMP, p. 27)
- Rehabilitate streams and other waters to enhance natural populations or anadromous and resident fish. Rehabilitation measures may include, but not be limited to fish passage improvements; instream structures using boulders and log placement to create spawning and rearing habitat; placement of fine and course materials for overwintering habitat; and establishment or release of riparian coniferous trees. (RMP, pp. 27-28).

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

Applicable NEPA Documents:

- Salem District Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Restoration EA (DOI-BLM-OR-S000-2012-0001-EA) – Signed March 22, 2012.

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

- Salem District RMP/EIS – November 1994 and Record of Decision – May 1995
- Lower Alsea River Watershed Analysis – 1999
- Salem District Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Restoration 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 proposed action would be completed as described and analyzed in the EA (pp. 13-14). EA excerpt (p. 14):

*Instream structure and gravel placement*

Place large wood and/or boulders in stream channels and adjacent floodplains to increase channel stability, rearing habitat, pool formation, spawning gravel deposition, channel complexity, hiding cover, low velocity areas, and floodplain function. Large wood (LW) and boulder projects would be designed to allow fish passage through or over structures at all stream flows.

**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 EA analyzed the No Action and the Proposed Action alternatives. No other reasonable alternatives to achieving the purpose and need were identified by the Interdisciplinary Team or the public. No new environmental concerns, interests, resource values, or circumstances have arisen since the EA was 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. 12-17.

**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 proposed action.

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

Yes. The methodology and analytical approach continue to be appropriate. There are no changes in resource conditions since the EA was published in 2012 that would render the data or analysis insufficient.

**5. 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, botany, invasive plants, and wildlife). There are no substantial changes from those addressed in the analyses to the present.

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

