Document No.: AK-040-04-AD-020

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-75672

Proposed Action Title/Type: Commercial Guiding Permit

Location of Proposed Action: Guide Use Areas 19-08, 19-09
Section 25, T. 27 N., R. 27 W., SM

Description of the Proposed Action:

John Runkle has applied to conduct commercial guided big game hunts in GMU 19-08 and 19-09. A FLPMA lease site, AA-64705, located in Section 25, T. 27 N., R. 27 W., Seward Meridian, will serve as a base camp for guiding operations. A temporary tent camp on BLM managed lands is located in Section 5, T. 30 N., R. 28 W., SM. It consists of one 10' x 12' wall tent with a floor. An outhouse is located well over 100 ft. from any body of water. (See the available map in the case file.)

Mr. Runkle's season of operation usually takes place in March, May, August, and September. Species hunted may include grizzly and black bear, wolf, Dall sheep, moose, caribou, bison, and wolverine. The maximum number of clients is 12.

Access to the main camp is by ATV and wheeled aircraft at an airstrip located ¼ mile south of the main camp (N 62°23'48.4", W 154°13'21.6"). Access to the tent camp is on pre-existing roads and trails by snowmobile, ATV, and foot.

Mr. Runkle requests the continued use of the Windy Creek BLM cabin (62.7233° N, 154.0767° W) for his operation.

Applicant (if any): John Runkle, Alaskan Outdoor Adventures

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

This action is in conformance with the Southwest Management Framework Plan (MFP) dated November 1981, activity objectives Wildlife (WL-4), Recreation (R-3), and Minerals (M-2). These decisions do not directly address special use permitting, but recognize that hunting, fishing, and trapping are legitimate uses of public land.

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

Environmental Assessments AK-040-89-EA-9019, AK-040-97-EA-015 and AK-040-03-EA-003 and the associated FONSIs adequately cover all environmental issues associated with the commercial guided big game hunts.

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?

The proposed action and location described for John Runkle's guided hunting are identical to that for Phillip Esai (hunting guide on lease site AA-64705) described in AK-040-03-EA-003, page 8.

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 range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents adequately address impacts the Proposed Action will have with the human and natural environment in respect to the Southwest Management Framework Plan (MFP). The Proposed Action to conduct commercial big game guiding and/or guided hiking, float trips, and sightseeing on public lands are identical to the previously proposed activities stated in AK-040-97-EA-015 and AK-040-03-EA-003.

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

No new information or circumstances has become available that would change 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 existing NEPA documents have covered the Proposed Action appropriately for the safety of visitors and the protection of federally administered resources. The resources and values that BLM analyzed in EA-AK-040-89-9019, AK-040-97-EA-015 and AK-040-03-EA-003 address maintaining balance between people and nature. This includes wildlife protection, water quality, vegetation resources, wilderness values, recreational opportunities, fire, human waste, and garbage, and all other critical and non-critical resources.

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?

The direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action were analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The Proposed Action does not differ from previously analyzed actions, therefore, new impacts to the environment are found to be unchanged.

ATV trails originating from Mr. Runkle's base camp have been used for approximately 21 years. The most prominent trail runs from the town of Nikolai to his base camp on the Khuchaynik River. This trail, as well as major spur trails, are well used yet have remained stable and unchanged over the last 15 years. All previous EAs have acknowledged these ATV trails which have been documented over the last several years. Primary concern is peripheral use of established ATV use by public users.

Hazardous waste could bring potential harm if improper management of fuel, oil/grease, wastewater, human waste and trash is not properly disposed of by the permittee(s). Compliance checks are performed upon completion of the operations to determine if actions will be taken to either warn the operators of any future waste build up and precautions necessary to prevent generated waste or to cease the issuance of permits in the future.

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)?

The cumulative impacts from the Proposed Action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. This action will add little to the impacts occurring in the area.

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

There was little public interest in the actions analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. This action likewise would generate little public interest.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Interdisciplinary analyses were conducted by AFO Lands and AFO Resources staff (see the attached NEPA routing sheet).

F. Mitigation Measures:

The mitigation measures required for existing NEPA documents are appropriate for this Proposed Action.

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/ Clinton E. Hanson, Acting	08-18-04
Anchorage Field Manager	Date