

# DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA)

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

OFFICE: Eastern Interior Field Office (AKF020)

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AK-F020-2016-0008-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: FF097090

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Within T.12N., R.27E., FM approximately 31.5 miles  
northeast of Snowy Peak, Alaska

APPLICANT: Warm Springs Productions, LLC

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

Warm Springs Productions plans to film a local trapper while engaging in his normal activities of setting, checking and removing traps. The applicant anticipates spending a total of ten (10) days in the area; approximately three days of filming is planned for each activity. Their plan is to conduct filming sometime in late winter (2016) for checking traps and sometime in the spring (2016) for removing traps. The film crew will consist of one cameramen and one producer. They will charter a private fixed-wing aircraft to travel between Fairbanks and the general area where filming will be conducted. The trapper normally uses frozen, snow-covered lakes for landings and take-offs with his airplane. While some filming may occur in flight, the majority will take place on land. Snowmachines will be the primary mode of transportation on the ground. The snowmachines will be provided by the trapper and are already on site in the general area. The film crew does not intend to camp, so no overnight stays are planned. No fuel will be stored or transferred on BLM-managed land.

### **B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

The lands in question are not currently covered by any Land Use Plan.

Other Document: DOI-BLM-AK-02000-2012-0001-EA

Date Approved: 11-21-2011

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

DOI-BLM-AK-02000-2012-0001-EA

**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 of filming a local trapper while he is engaged in his normal activities of setting, checking and removing traps is essentially the same as that which was analyzed in the EA mentioned above. The location and land status remain the same. The only real difference is the amount of anticipated time for filming. The new application anticipates a total of ten days rather than three days mentioned in the original EA.

**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 DOI-BLM-AK-2012-0001-EA analyzed the proposed action and a no action alternative which are appropriate for the current proposed action. The current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances do not differ substantially from those considered in the 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. Based on internal review and scoping of the proposed action by BLM resource specialists, there is no new information or circumstances currently recognized that would change the analysis of the proposed action. There are no threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species and no new BLM sensitive species in the vicinity of the proposed action. No changes have been made to resource-related plans of State, local or tribal governments or other Federal agencies that would affect the current proposal.

**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. No direct, indirect or cumulative impacts were identified in DOI-BLM-AK-02000-2012-0001-EA. The potential impacts (or lack thereof) for this proposed action are essentially unchanged. The potential impacts of an additional seven days of filming are negligible.

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

Yes. Internal review by an interdisciplinary team was determined to be sufficient for the referenced EA. The current proposed action creates no new concerns that would require public involvement or interagency review. The internal scoping process and the interdisciplinary team analysis of DOI-BLM-AK-02000-2012-0001-EA continue to be adequate for the proposed action.

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Lenore Heppler	Eastern Interior Field Office Manager	BLM/EIFO
Michael Gibson	EIFO Assistant Manager	BLM/EIFO
Jeanie Cole	FDO Planning/Environmental Coordinator	BLM/FDO
Robin Mills	EIFO Archaeologist	BLM/EIFO
Ruth Gronquist	EIFO Wildlife Biologist	BLM/EIFO
Jason Post	EIFO Fish Biologist	BLM/EIFO
Lisa Hedman	FDO Legal Instruments Examiner	BLM/FDO

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

