

# **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 Field Office**

**Alsea Falls Campsite Improvements  
DOI-BLM-ORWA-S050-2016-0021-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 several projects in the Alsea Falls Recreation Area Management Plan Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-OR-S050-2013-0001) in 2012. Projects included in Phase 1 were designed to improve visitor experiences while protecting and restoring natural resources associated with user-created trails and expansion of campsites. Specific actions to accomplish these goals include the construction of barriers around each campsite, leveling and elevation of tent pads, and maintenance and planting of vegetative material between campsites.

Since the signing of the Decision Record (DR) in 2013, the Marys Peak Field Office has established a process for the implementation of projects analyzed in the Alsea Falls RAMP/EA. This process consists of an interdisciplinary review of the project-specific actions for compliance with the EA (through the completion of a DNA worksheet) and making the review available to the public prior to the commencement of the project. This site-specific review and notification provides the BLM the opportunity to review the action in light of the EA analysis, new information, or changed circumstances and keeps the public informed about the status of project implementation.

Due to a miscommunication between the operations staff and the Marys Peak Field Office, work on this project commenced prior to completing NEPA review and public notification. While this project was considered in a broad sense in the EA, it was not reviewed in a site-specific DNA worksheet. Several campsite barriers have been constructed; the Marys Peak Field Manager has suspended further work pending the completion of NEPA review and public notification through this DNA worksheet.

Future projects will follow the process outlined above; a project-specific DNA worksheet will be completed and provided to the public prior to the commencement of any on-the-ground implementation.

For this project, BLM staff determined that all of the campsites would benefit from fencing to reduce unauthorized campsite expansion, understory vegetation removal, and to stop the spread of social trails. The barriers around each site consist of concrete posts poured on-site using a dye and stamping method to resemble natural wood. The barriers are approximately four feet tall and have rough cut pole fencing between each post. Some grubbing and removal of vegetation is necessary for the installation. Native vegetation, including sword fern and other understory

vegetation that does not rapidly spread, will be planted after installation.

Tent pads will be leveled using a small excavator and hand tools. Gravel will be spread throughout the campsite and, when needed, elevated tent pads will be constructed using cement blocks or pressure treated lumber. The materials elevate the tent pad by a couple of inches, preventing water from pooling under the tent. Implementation will occur primarily during the camping season, though the exact timing will depend on site occupancy and staff availability.

**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 and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

The BLM signed a Record of Decision approving the Northwestern and Coastal Oregon Resource Management Plan (2016 ROD/RMP) on August 5, 2016. Revision of an RMP necessarily involves a transition from the application of the old RMP to the application of the new RMP. Allowing for a transition from the old RMP to the new RMP avoids disrupting the management of BLM-administered lands and allows the BLM to utilize work already begun on the planning and analysis of projects. The 2016 ROD/RMP does not affect implementation of projects for which the BLM has signed a project-specific decision prior to its effective date (2016 ROD/RMP, p. 10). As such, this project is consistent with the 1995 Salem District Resource Management Plan (1995 ROD/RMP).

The BLM completed the NEPA analysis for the Alsea Fall Recreation Area Management plan in conformance with the Salem District RMP (1995 ROD/RMP). The Alsea Falls Campsite Improvements DNA meets the 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). As stated in the Settlement Agreement, the “Exemptions for Recreation Projects” are as follows: “Projects covering less than five acres that improve an existing recreation site. Some examples of recreation site improvement include adding campsites to existing campgrounds, adding recreational structures or facilities in existing recreation sites, and expanding recreation sites.”

The project is in conformance with the 1995 ROD/RMP because it is specifically provided for in the land use plan:

- 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 Alsea Falls Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP). The RAMP specifically addressed the campsite improvements (p. 14): *“Incorporation of barriers and planting of vegetative material will be placed between individual campsites to provide privacy screening and enhance the landscape within the campground. This will return sites to a sustainable condition while reducing damage to resources and retaining site qualities necessary for potential future expansion. Activities will include increasing designated parking to accommodate additional vehicles, creating tent pads, and elevating selected campsites out of wet areas.”*

The EA (p. 21) addressed this action: *“Sixteen campsites would remain open. Bureau staff has noticed gradual and undesignated expansion of some campsites. To reduce resource issues associated with this expansion and to meet demand for more camping space, the footprint of some existing campsites would be widened. Activities would include increasing designated parking to accommodate more vehicles, creating tent pads, elevating some campsites out of wet areas, and planting additional privacy screening between sites. Where needed, as determined by Resource Area specialists, barriers would be installed in campsites to prevent further expansion.”*

##### **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 team 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. The Marys Peak Field Office has completed and published DNAs for each implementation-level action associated with the plan.

**Consultation**

As described in the 2013 DR, consultation was completed for this project for both fish and wildlife. This DNA does not introduce any factors that would trigger a need to reinstate consultation. This project will comply with current consultation requirements.

**E. Interdisciplinary Review**

Name	Specialty	Initial or Signature
Douglass Fitting	Hydrology and Soils	DWF
Scott Hopkins	Wildlife	DSH
Stefanie Larew	NEPA Coordinator	SNL
Scott Snedaker	Fisheries	SMS
Ron Exeter	Botany	RE
Fred Greateux	Archaeology	FG

**Prepared and Reviewed By**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Davis  
Recreation Technician

8-22-2016  
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.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Vigan  
Marys Peak Field Manager

8/30/2016  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Figure 1. Approximate location of Campsite Improvements (EA map, p. 22)

### ALSEA FALLS CAMPGROUND Alternative B (Proposed Action) - Phase 1

