

**Administrative Determination (AD)**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management  
Anchorage Field Office

---

**A. BLM Office:** Anchorage Field Office      **Lease/Serial Case File No.:** AA-85178

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Emerald Air Service Film Permit, 2920

**Location of Proposed Action:** Section 15, 20-22, T. 11 S., R. 29 W., Seward Meridian, located primarily on either side of the Chenik River, from Chenik Lake easterly to Kamishak Bay.

**Description of the Proposed Action**

Emerald Air Service has applied for a Minimum Impact Film Permit to film bears on public lands near Chenik Lake. They plan to access the area by floatplane, landing on Chenik Lake and setting up camp near Chenik Lake and the outflow of the Chenik River. One landing for delivery of the filming group and one for pick-up will occur. Five members will comprise the group: two camera men, a lead guide and two support guides. The group will camp and film from July 1 to July 5.

A small camping area, about 20' by 20' with three free standing tents for sleeping and one free standing tent for meal preparation will be set up. The entire camp will be surrounded by an electric fence. The fence stakes are fiberglass and will be driven into the ground approximately six inches, and be spaced approximately three feet apart. The electric wire is encased in vinyl and emits an intermittent pulse. The fence is powered by a sealed marine battery. Two batteries will be at the site and will be stored in a plastic container for the duration of the trip.

The latrine will be a pit latrine; the sod will be removed for the pit and will be replaced when the camp is taken down. The Pit privy will be located a minimum of 100 feet from the mean annual high water level of any water body as required by State of Alaska standards detailed in 18 AAC 72.030.

The group will cook on propane Coleman camp stoves and no open fires will be built. Standard propane fuel containers will be used. All food and garbage will be stored in bear proof containers within the perimeter of the fence, and removed at the end of the trip. All food will be brought in and some of the water. Additional drinking water will be taken from Chenik Lake and filtered.

The crew will walk from the camp along the existing trail from the lake to Kamishak Bay, and film bears as they are encountered. Once bears are spotted the camera men will

set up a remote control camera and retreat to view and operate the camera from a distance. Filming will take place on all five days and no ground clearing will take place.

**Applicant (if any):** Emerald Air Service

**B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

LUP Name Southcentral MFP Date Approved March 1980

The Proposed Action has been reviewed and determined to be in conformance with the Southcentral Management Framework Plan (MFP). Activity Objective R-4 of the MFP states the BLM will “Provide for the needs of visitors seeking an experience through sightseeing, photography, observation and/or interpretation.” Activity Objective L-1 of the MFP states that the BLM will “satisfy state and local government needs as well as public and/or private demonstrated needs for lands as they arise.”

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.**

Environmental Assessment AK-040-00-EA-025, for the filming of bears in the Chenik Area.

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

Yes, the previous environmental assessment analyzed substantially the same action in the same area. The main difference is that the campsite is located near Chenik Lake, whereas the previous camping took place near the mouth of the Chenik River.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

The alternatives analyzed are appropriate and adequate.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?**

The existing analysis is adequate. No New information or circumstances has been discovered to change the outcome of the existing analysis.

**4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?**

The methodology and analytical approach are appropriate for the current Proposed Action.

**5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?**

Impacts of the current Proposed Action are substantially less than those identified in the existing NEPA document. The group size is 1/4 that of the previous users, and the campsite location is no longer near known archeological sites. Because of the proximity to archeological sites the previous applicant was required to collect human waste in above ground toilet facilities. In this case, because the difference in location and smaller group size, a pit latrine will be used with the requirement that the location meet State of Alaska standards as contained in 18 AAC 72.030. No impacts will occur which will affect Vegetation, Wildlife, Visual Resources, or Soils.

**6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

No cumulative impacts were identified in the existing NEPA document, and implementation of the current Proposed Action would not result in cumulative impacts.

**7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?**

The public involvement associated with the previous NEPA document was adequate. No additional public involvement or review is necessary.

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Rodney Huffman	Realty Specialist	Lands/Realty
Donna Redding	Archeologist	Cultural
Bruce Seppi	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Species
Debbie Blank	Botanist	T&E Species
Larry Beck	Env Prot Spec	Wastes, Hazardous and Solid
Jeff Denton	Wildlife Biologist	Subsistence

**Document No.: AK-040-03-AD-025**

**Case file No.: AA-85178**

**F. Mitigation Measures:**

The permit will have attached stipulations requiring the pit latrine to be located to comply with 18 AAC 72.030.

**G. 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 requirements of NEPA.

/s/ June A. Bailey, Acting  
Anchorage Field Manager

06-27-03  
Date