



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Glennallen Field Office
P.O. Box 147
Glennallen, Alaska 99588
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) WORKSHEET

Proposed Action Title/Type: Issuance of Commercial Special Recreation Permit to KME LLC

NEPA Register Number: DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2013-0013-DNA

Case File Number: AA-93542

Location / Legal Description: Gulkana and Delta Wild and Scenic River Corridors

Applicant (if any): Egil Fjellheim, KME LLC

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Bureau of Land Management, Glennallen Field Office proposes to grant a special recreation permit (SRP) for two guided river trips along the Gulkana and Delta Wild and Scenic Rivers. The river trips will be conducted by raft or canoe and will include camping and photography. The applicant, Egil Fjellheim, doing business as KME LLC, proposes to provide one guided river trip per year per river along the Gulkana and Delta rivers, between June 15 and September 15 annually. The Gulkana River trip will include no more than eight clients and two guides. The Delta River will have a maximum of five clients with one guide. "Leave No Trace" camping techniques would be utilized on all trips. Camps will be in previously inventoried, designated campsites, human waste would be collected and removed from campsites to a sanitary disposal site following BLM portable toilet recommendations for the Gulkana and Delta River trips.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable land use plan, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following land use plan decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

East Alaska Resource Management Plan (EARMP) of 2007

M. RECREATION

M-1: Goal

Manage recreation to maintain a diversity of recreational opportunities.

C. IDENTIFY APPLICABLE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) DOCUMENTS AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS THAT COVER THE PROPOSED ACTION.

AK-050-EA-03-001 *Revision of the 1983 Gulkana River Management Plan* (2003)

AK-050-EA-06-12 *Commercial Operations on the Gulkana National Wild River* (1996)

AK-050-EA-06-011 *Midnight Sun Council, Boy Scouts of America Special Recreation Permit for the Delta National Wild and Scenic River* (2006)

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 Proposed Action is similar to the alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents listed above. The current proposal is within the same analysis area. Specifically, the current Proposed Action is identical to the Proposed Action in assessed in AK-050-EA-06-011 for the Delta River. The current Proposed Action is essentially similar to the Proposed Action assessed in AK-050-EA-06-12 for the Gulkana River. (The Gulkana River EA assessed a Proposed Action consisting of approximately 10 permit authorizations.) The geographic and resource conditions are sufficiently similar in all locations.

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 ranges of alternatives in the EAs referenced above are appropriate with respect to the new Proposed Action. No new environmental concerns, interests, or affected resource values have been discovered since the analyses were completed in the area.

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, the existing analysis is valid. However, since the EAs referenced above were completed, the BLM has released updated policies regarding Lands with Wilderness Characteristics. The current Proposed Action has been reviewed for wilderness characteristics and was found to contain conditions for meeting lands with wilderness characteristics. However, the stipulations and conditions attached to this authorization will ensure existing wilderness characteristics, such

as size, naturalness; solitude and opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation will not be impaired. Otherwise, no new circumstances or information have been discovered within the project area or geographic vicinity.

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?*

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the new action are similar in scope but less intense in comparison to the previous projects. For example, the EA for the Gulkana River evaluated the effects of approximately 10 permit authorizations, whereas the current Proposed Action considers only one permit authorization (AK-050-EA-06-12, pp. 1-2).

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

Public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA documents are sufficient for the current Proposed Action.

E. PERSONS, AGENCIES, AND BLM STAFF CONSULTED

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Heath Emmons, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Bureau of Land Management
John Jangala, Archaeologist, Bureau of Land Management
Denton Hamby, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Bureau of Land Management
Sarah Bullock, Wildlife Biologist, Bureau of Land Management

F. CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation identified in Part C of this DNA Worksheet fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Elijah Waters, Acting Glennallen Field Manager

May 7, 2013

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR § 4 and the program-specific regulations.