

DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Eastern Interior Field Office (AKF020)

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AK-F020-0030-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: FF096487

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: The proposed action will occur on lands within Township 12 North, Range 27 East, Fairbanks Meridian approximately 40 miles northeast of Snowy Peak in the Black River drainage, Alaska.

APPLICANT: Warm Springs Productions, LLC

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Warm Springs Productions, LLC has applied for a Land Use Permit to authorize their filming of an Alaska trapper while engaging in his normal activities of setting traps, checking traps and removing traps. Their filming is for commercial purposes and they plan to use the video footage in a TV documentary about the activities of an Alaska trapper. Filming is planned to begin in early November, 2012 and end sometime in the spring of 2013.

BLM will decide whether or not to authorize the proposed action by issuing a Land Use Permit for a period of approximately 5 months.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: N/A

Date Approved: N/A

The proposed action is located within an area that is not covered by any Land Use Plan. However, an environmental assessment (DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0001-EA) was completed for this same action by the same applicant one year ago as required by 43 CFR 1610.8(b)(1).

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0001-EA approved November 21, 2011 for a Land Use Permit (FF095971) to Warm Springs Productions, LLC for commercial filming purposes on BLM managed lands.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. The current proposed action is substantially the same action analyzed in DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0001-EA. It is located in the same analysis area. The only difference is that the current proposal will occur approximately one year later in time.

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

Yes. The DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0001-EA analyzed the proposed action alternative and a no action alternative which are appropriate for the current proposed action. The current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances do not differ substantially from those considered in the EA.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes. There is no new information that would substantially change the analysis. There are no threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species and no new BLM sensitive species in the vicinity of the proposed action. No changes have been made to resource-related plans of State, local or Tribal governments or other federal agencies that would affect the current proposal.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes. No direct, indirect or cumulative impacts were identified in DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0001-EA. The potential impacts (or lack thereof) for this proposed action are essentially unchanged. The potential impacts of the proposed commercial filming activities are negligible.

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

Yes. Internal review by an interdisciplinary team was determined to be sufficient for the referenced EA. The current proposed action creates no new concerns that would require public involvement or interagency review. The internal scoping process and the interdisciplinary team analysis of DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0001-EA continues to be adequate for the current proposed action. Additionally, this proposed action is available to the public on the Eastern Interior Field Office NEPA register. When completed, this DNA and related Decision Record will also be available to the public on the NEPA register.

*Note: Refer to DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2012-0005-EA for a complete list of team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Robin Mills	Archaeologist	BLM
Jim Herriges	Wildlife Biologist	BLM
Rebecca Hile	Physical Specialist	BLM
Jason Post	Fisheries Biologist	BLM
Colin Cogley	Outdoor Rec Planner	BLM
Michael Gibson	Supervisor/Coordinator	BLM

