



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Anchorage Field Office
4700 BLM Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99507-2591
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) WORKSHEET

Proposed Action Title/Type: Communication Site Lease Plan of Development
Amendment to Global Towers for the Fort Richardson GPT
System, JBER

NEPA Register Number: DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2014-0008-DNA

Case File Number: AA-82261

Location / Legal Description: Seward Meridian, Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska
T. 13 N., R. 2 W., Sec. 5, SE¹/₄NW¹/₄SW¹/₄NE¹/₄SW¹/₄.

Applicant (if any): Global Tower Partners (GTP)

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The BLM Anchorage Field Office has received a request from Global Tower Partners (GTP) to amend an existing communication system authorized by BLM that is operational year-round on Fort Richardson Army Base on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) for the addition of a Kohler generator and a 220 gallon fuel tank.

This existing communication site was authorized by BLM August 11, 2000. The communication facility was previously authorized by the Department of Army. Due to the current location of the system next to the Glenn Highway, GTP felt that an emergency backup power system needed to be installed to insure that customers service was not interrupted when the main power grid was offline.

GTP is requesting to install this new system to the existing communication lease that consists of a 10- by 24-foot equipment shelter within the fenced authorized lease footprint of 35' X 35'. The tower and equipment shelter cabin and associated cellphone equipment have been constructed; no additional construction is necessary. The site is accessible by existing frontage road known as Power-line Road off of the Glenn Highway.

The BLM Anchorage Field Office will accept the amended plan of development to the existing lease to GTP so that they may maintain and operate an existing communication system and to install a Kohler generator and 220 fuel tank at the existing cellphone system on the Fort Richardson Army Base, JBER.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

The proposed action is in conformance with the Ring of Fire Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (March 2008) because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decision(s):

I. Lands and Realty

I-2: Management Action

I-2n: Rights-of-Way

The BLM may issue rights-of-way for a variety of uses including but not limited to: roads, water pipelines, electric lines and communication sites under the authority of Title V of FLPMA. Oil and Gas pipelines are issued using the Mineral Leasing Act (1920).

Stipulations developed during the proposal's evaluation will include:

- Restoration, revegetation and curtailment of erosion along the right-of-way route;
- Compliance with air and water quality standards;
- Control or prevention of damage to the environment, public and private property and hazards to public health and safety;
- Protection of subsistence resources and the user's access to those resources.
- Protection of the natural resources associated with public lands.
- Utilization of right-of-ways in common with respect to engineering and technological compatibility will be promoted.
- Coordination with the State and Local governments, tribal entities and interested groups and individuals takes place to the fullest extent possible.

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

Joint Base Elmendorf – Richardson Communication Site Authorizations, Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2012-0013-EA, August 2012 (2012 EA)

This document is on file at the BLM Anchorage Field Office.

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 – for the installation of a Kohler generator and fuel tank at the existing GTP communication system at the Fort Richardson Army Base off of the Glenn Highway - is essentially similar to Alternative 2 in the 2012 EA. Specifically, the current proposed action is essentially similar to the, “fourth pending application [AA-092901]...for authorization of an existing tower in a developed area that has been authorized by the military, and the BLM,” (p. 7, 2012 EA). Although this site was not specifically analyzed in the 2012 EA, it is located within a developed area on JBER and is therefore consistent with the 2012 analysis of similar actions in other developed areas on JBER.

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 range of alternatives presented in the 2012 EA is appropriate and sufficient with respect to the current proposed action. There are no new issues and/or concerns that would prompt development or consideration of additional alternatives identified in the EA. The issues identified in the 2012 EA for developed areas on JBER (opportunities for co-locating communication site facilities, direct or indirect impacts to cultural resources, potential visual resource impacts, and risk of spills from heavy equipment) remain unchanged (p. 6, 2012 EA). There are no new issues around which to develop additional alternatives for the current proposed action. The current proposed action successfully addresses the section identified in 1.5 Communication Site Definition as to “Free-standing power supply, such as a battery pack or generator without linear overhead or underground conductors” within the programmatic 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 – the existing analysis is still valid and no new information or circumstances pertaining to the activity have been identified since the 2012 EA was prepared that would affect the applicability of the past analysis.

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 – the anticipated direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the current proposed action are similar both quantitatively and qualitatively to those effects analyzed in the 2012 EA. The 2012

EA analysis of AA-092901 evaluated the effect of a similar system that is existing on the ground, and is authorized by the BLM. Therefore, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the current proposed action – authorization of an existing system at the Fort Richardson Army Base – is adequately covered by the analysis in the 2012 EA (pp. 15-19, 2012 EA).

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

Yes – the public involvement and interagency reviews associated with the 2012 EA are adequate for the current proposed action for JBER. The 2012 EA was circulated for public review prior to a decision on the requested authorizations. No public comments were received. Given that no new information or circumstances have been identified and the fact that the current proposed action is identical to the 2012 EA proposed action, no additional public involvement or interagency review is necessary 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.

This EA was prepared by an interdisciplinary team consisting of the following staff:

Jenny Blanchard	BLM, Archaeologist
Brian Bourdon	BLM, Lands and Realty Specialist
Molly Cobbs	BLM, Planning and Environmental Coordinator
Jeff Kowalczyk	BLM, Outdoor Recreation Planner
Bruce Seppi	BLM, Wildlife Biologist
Laurie Thorpe	BLM, Natural Resources Specialist
Merben Cebrian	BLM, Subsistence Biologist
Marnie Graham	BLM, Acting Planning and Environmental Coordinator

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/ Alan Bittner

July 10, 2014

Alan Bittner, Anchorage 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. 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.