

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

**Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

,

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) 1

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 1.1. List of Preparers 3

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

This page intentionally
left blank

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

Office: Central Yukon Field Office

Tracking Number: DOI—BLM—AK—F0300—2014—0007—DNA

Case File No.: F-96734

Proposed Action Title: Scott Luber filming on public lands

Legal Description: Mile post 210 off the Dalton Highway, more particularly described as Secs. 13, T. 33 N., R. 10 W., Fairbanks Meridian, Alaska, containing approximately 640 acres.

Applicant: Scott Luber

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The applicant proposes to film a walking camping and hunting trip for seven (7) days from August 8 to August 15, 2008. The applicant already filmed his trip and now proposes to sell the video and therefore, is seeking a permit for filming. No stipulations or mitigations were proposed as this permit is after the trip has already taken place.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	<u>Utility Corridor RMP</u>	Date Approved:	<u>January 11, 1991</u>
Other Document	<u>DOI-BLM-AKF0300– 2012–0023–CX</u>	Date Approved:	<u>August 17, 2012</u>

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

Utility Corridor Resource Management Plan approved January 11, 1991.

The proposed action is in conformance with the plan because is it specifically provided for in the following planning decision (objectives, terms and conditions):

Appendix N Lands Program Objectives (pages N 7–9)

7. Process applications for land use authorizations from the general public Federal and State agencies and research organizations on a case-by-case basis.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

A categorical exclusion (DOI-BLM-AK-F0300–2012–0023) was prepared and signed on August 17, 2012, for the exact same use of public land, location and applicant.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

An Essential Fish Habitat assessment, Wilderness Characteristic assessment, Risk Boundary Assessment, Sections 106 and 108 evaluations were completed for the above listed categorical exclusion.

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?

The proposed action is for the same use, location and by the same applicant as described in the 0023–CX. The only difference is the year, previously approved in 2009 and now seeking approval for 2008 filming.

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 value?

Yes, all were analyzed in the previous categorical exclusion

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, 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 or circumstances that would substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action. The previous CX had a wilderness characteristics assessment, Essential Fish Habitat assessment, and 810 clearance so everything is current.

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

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

Yes, no public involvement or interagency reviewers were necessary in previous proposed action or current proposed action

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Robin Walthour	NEPA drafter	Realty Specialist
David Esse	Reviewer	Fisheries Biologist
William Hedman	Reviewer	Archeologist
Lisa Shon Jodwalis	Reviewer	Interpretive Park Ranger
Kelly Egger	Reviewer	Outdoor Rec Planner
Cal Westcott	Reviewer	Outdoor Rec Planner (VRM)
Erin Julianus	Reviewer	Wildlife Biologist
Darrel VandeWeg	Reviewer	Geologist
Rebecca Hile	Reviewer	Hazmat Specialist
Jennifer McMillan	Reviewer	Economist (Invasives)
Michael Stephens	Reviewer	Surveyor
Michael Schoder	Reviewer	Surveyor
Gary Foreman	Reviewer	Manager
Shelly Jacobson	Signer	Field Manager

Note

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

Conclusion

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

February 10, 2014

/s/ Robin Walthour

Signature of Robin Walthour, Project Lead

N/A

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

February 12, 2014

Gary M. Foreman

Signature of the Acting Field Manager

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 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 Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.