

# ***Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)*** **Worksheet**

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

## ***Arctic Ground Squirrel Research Renewal***

### **Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures**

Dr. Brian Barnes is authorized by permit F-94817 (2006) to conduct research on arctic ground squirrels in the Toolik and Atigun River areas. The proposed action is to convert the permit to a site right-of-way the authorization that is appropriate for long term projects.

The research involves trapping and radio-collaring squirrels in the above described areas and marking burrows with two (2) or three (3) feet rebar. Data loggers with air samplers or buried thermistor probes are placed at some of the posts. Some trapping occurs in the early spring and requires the use of snow machine. The traplines are run out of Toolik Lake Field Station as frequently as every hour in order to avoid overheating the squirrels in the traps. Radio receivers and antennas at each site receive data transmitted by the radio collars. The coordinates of the Toolik site is N 68°38'08' -149°34'49'W and Atigun is N 68°27'21' -149°21'22'.

None of these activities are new and are occurring in the same area as the prior permit.

### **Land Use Plan Conformance**

<b>LUP Name/ Other Document(s)</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Utility Corridor Resource Management Plan	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).

5. Make lands available for Federal and State agencies and research organizations for needed administrative and support facilities, including the existing research site at Toolik Lake. Locate facility development to minimize environmental impacts with emphasis given to previously disturbed sites.

### **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: DOI-BLM-AK-F030-2006-0043 dated April 1, 2006 and DOI-BLM-AK-F030-2008-0036 dated April 29, 2008.

Essential Fish Habitat Report dated: April 7, 2008

Archeological, Historic and Paleontological Resources report dated: April 20, 2006 and April 29, 2008

ANILCA 810 Assessment dated: April 30, 2006 and April 10, 2008

### 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, none of these activities are new and are occurring in the same area as the prior permit.

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 previously analyzed data still pertains to this DNA.

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, all the analysis remains the same, we will complete a wilderness assessment and there will be no impact.

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 new actions are proposed.

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

Yes, there was no prior public involvement as the area is too remote.

### BLM Staff Consulted

#### List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Robin Walthour	Realty, Wilderness	Lands
Dave Parker	Fish Biologist	Air, Fish, Greenhouse, Floodplains
Erin Julianus	Wildlife Biologist	Biologist Wildlife, Invasives, Vegetation, Endangered Species
Darrel VandeWeg	Geologist	Geology, Minerals

Erica Lamb	Hydrologist	Hydrologic Conditions
William Hedman	Archaeologist	Archaeologist Cultural, Paleontology, Native American Concerns
Kevin Church	Hazmat Specialist	Wastes solid or hazardous
Kelly Egger	Outdoor Rec Planner	Recreation, WSR, WSA, VRM
Jennifer McMillan	Ecologist	Botany, Invasive Species
Michael Schoder	Survey	Boundary Risk Assessment
Thomas St. Clair	Fire Management Officer	Fuels, Fire Management

## 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.

/s/ Robin Walthour  
Signature of Project Lead

April 28, 2016  
Date:

/s/ Timothy J. La Marr  
Field Manager, CYFO

May 10, 2016  
Date: