



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: Off Road Warriors

NEPA Register Number: DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2014-0019-DNA

Case File Number: AA093824

Location / Legal Description: Coal Mine Road, Sections 4-5, 8-9, 16, 21, 28, and 33, T. 14 S., R. 10 E., Fairbanks Meridian. This trail is located approximately 35 miles south of Delta Junction, Alaska.

Applicant (if any): Original Productions

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Original Productions LLC has applied for a land use permit to film a show for television production entitled Off Road Warriors. Proposed dates of filming run from July 7 through July 18, 2014. Up to fifteen (15) 4x4 vehicles, six ATV/UTV/OHV's, and a maximum crew of 45 people would be authorized to film and travel upon the Coal Mine Road. Filming will be up to 4 days. Additionally a basecamp at the trailhead may be utilized to accommodate up to 45 personnel. If permitted, a 2920 Land Use Authorization would be granted to Original Productions for commercial filming on public lands.

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):

The East Alaska Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (RMP/ROD) provide the overall long-term management direction for lands encompassed by the proposed project (BLM 2007). The proposed action and alternatives are consistent with the RMP/ROD. Specifically, the proposed action is consistent with the following decisions in the RMP/ROD:

I. LANDS AND REALTY

I-2: Land Use Authorizations

- Land use authorizations include various authorizations and agreements to use BLM lands such as right-of-way grants, road, and temporary use permits under several different authorities including leases, permits, and easements under section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA)

T. TRAVEL MANAGEMENT AND OHV USE

T-5 Management Actions

- Permitted activities and uses that involve OHV use would contain stipulations stating that OHV use would be consistent with management in limited and closed areas. If necessary, permitted cross-country travel would be stipulated in a manner that minimizes impacts (i.e. winter use or low ground pressure tires). Specific operating procedures related to OHV's can be found in Appendix A: Required Operating Procedures.

APPENDIX A: REQUIRED OPERATING PROCEDURES (ROPs), STIPULATIONS (Stips), and STANDARD LEASE TERMS

A-1 Required Operating Procedures

- ROPs are requirements, procedures, management practices, or design features that the BLM adopts as operational requirements. ROPS would apply to all permitted activities including FLPMA leases and permits, special recreation permits, oil and gas operations, mining Plans of Operation, and Right-Of-Way authorizations. Obviously not all ROPs would apply to all permitted activities. ROPs are selected as part of the site specific analysis that occurs during activity level planning. They are applied as stipulations to permits. The Authorized Officer (AO) or his/her representative is responsible for seeing that the permittee is complying with stipulations of the permit.

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

DOI-BLM-AK-A020-2014-0016-EA Signed June 20, 2014

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 original EA looked at this activity on Coal Mine Road. The only difference is the number of vehicles that will be traveling along this route. There will be up to fifteen 4-wheel drive vehicles instead of the original five. This will not cause any more impact than the original request, as the applicant was not limited in the number of runs on Coal Mine Road.

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. There were no restrictions on Coal Mine Road in terms of number of runs on this road, therefore increasing the number of vehicles is within the range of alternatives analyzed.

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 has the most recent information and the proposed action will not impact the current 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 only difference is the number of vehicles.

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

Yes. The public comments received during the EA process would not change.

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.

Sarah Bullock	Wildlife Biologist / Subsistence Biologist
Marnie Graham	Planning and Environmental Coordinator
John Jangala	Archaeologist
Cory Larson	Outdoor Recreation Planner
Ben Seifert	Natural Resource Specialist
Mike Sondergaard	Hydrologist
Brenda Becker	Realty Specialist

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/ Dennis C. Teitzel

July 7, 2014

Dennis C. Teitzel, Glennallen 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.