# Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
## Worksheet

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

Office: Central Yukon Field Office

Tracking Number: DOI-BLM-AK-F030–2015–0035–DNA

Ccase file number F-97000

Proposed Action Quintillion, Networks LLC proposes to install fiber optic cable within the transportation and utility corridor along the Dalton Highway from Coldfoot mile post 175 to Slope Mountain mile post 300, Alaska. They propose to install this line approximately five (5) feet from the approved BorTek, Incorporated fiber optic cable line. The proposed project would involve clearing using hydro-axes and/or a prime tech (a drum type clearing device propelled on tracks), trenching and/or excavation and replacement of soils to allow the burial of fiber optic cable. Construction of this cable is scheduled to begin October 2015 and continue through December 2017.

For major stream crossings, cable installation would be done by directional boring. Most minor drainages crossed will be worked during frozen conditions. Small streams crossed during thawed conditions will be completed using the plow method and by crossing at right angles, with the disturbed plow line immediately track walked.

The installation of the fiber optic cable will require the setting of handholes every 5,000 feet and manholes (splice vaults) every 20,000 feet along the project. These handholes and/or manholes would be installed by excavating a hole for placement using the “mini-excavators” and backfilling.

A regeneration site, 60 feet long by 100 feet wide, would be necessary to support the fiber optic line and is proposed at mile post 240.0 Dalton Highway (68°05"07.2' -149°33'39.9' )including associated structures and appurtenances. Site would be located approximately 200 feet from the centerline of the highway and the fiber optic cable line would be buried alongside the entrance access road to the site. A 6 foot high chain link fence would surround the site with three strands of barb wire on top. Improvements inside consist of: one building 12 feet x 16 feet housing two generators, a day tank, associated power, controls and fire suppression system. A 2nd building 12 feet x 20 feet would house communication equipment including two racks of -48v batteries, equipment racks, fire suppression system; and a 4,000 gallon diesel tank. The regeneration site would require a 4,000 gallon AST for diesel to supply the generators. The regeneration site AST ould be a secondary containment tank fitted with leak detection monitoring equipment.

A temporary camp would be necessary to house the crew and stage equipment and materials. Within the camps would be 12-15 personal camp trailers or RVs, 2 office trailers, 1 generator, one chemical toilet, up to 8,000 gallon diesel fuel tank, 3,000 gallon unleaded gasoline tank, dumpster, and parking for personal vehicles and trucks. A Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan will be prepared and maintained for the fuel storage for this project. This camp location s planned for the Atigun Camp at Dalton Highway MP 250.

A second location for use as a materials lay down yard would be planned for Dalton Highway MP 211 at an existing pull-out on the east side of the highway just south of an unnamed creek. This

site would not be used for camping or storage of fuels in secondary containment, but only for temporary storage of reels of duct, fiber, and manholes.

A hazardous material control plan would be developed in association with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project. A SWPPP would be developed in accordance with the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit (APDES CGP) for this project.

Legal Description: Mile post 175 Coldfoot to mile post 300 Slope Mountain on the Dalton Highway, Alaska

Applicant: Quintillion Networks, LLC

## A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

## B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name* Utility Corridor Date Approved: January 11, 1991

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

Utility Corridor RMP, Appendix N — Lands and Realty Program (Page N-8)

7. Process applications for land use authorization 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.**

Environmental Assessment dated April 2015

Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record dated May 26, 2015

**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).**

Essential Fish Habitat Report dated March 30, 2015

Archaeological, Historic and Paleontological Resources report dated September 18, 2015

ANILCA 810 Assessment dated April 1, 2015

Wilderness Characteristics Assessment dated March 16, 2015

Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan dated January 2015

## 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 footprint is five (5) feet from the lands identified in the Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-AK-F030–2015–0013 completed on April 2015.

**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, they analyze the proposed action as well as the no alternative action.

**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

**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

## E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

**Table 1. List of Preparers**

| Name | Role | Discipline |
|---|---|---|
| Shelly Jacobson | Field Manager | Wilderness Characteristics Lands |
| David Parker | Fish Biologist | Air, Fish, Greenhouse, Floodplains |
| Erin Julianus | Wildlife Biologist | Wildlife, Invasives, Vegetation, Endangered Animal Species |
| Darrel VandeWeg | Geologist | Geology, Minerals |
| Rebecca Hile | Hazmat Specialist | Wastes solid or hazardous |
| William Hedman | Archaeologist | Cultural, Paleontology, Native American concerns |
| Cal Westcott | Outdoor Rec Planner | Visual Resource Management |
| Erica Lamb | Hydrologist | Hydrologic Conditions |
| Thomas St. Clair | Fire Management Officer | Fuels, Fire Management |
| Kelly Egger | Outdoor Rec Planner | Recreation, WSR, WSA Determination |

## 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.

Robin Walthour

Signature of Project Lead

October 27, 2015

Nichelle W. Jacobson

Signature of the Responsible Official Date