

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-84187

Proposed Action Title/Type: Commercial Guiding Permit

Location of Proposed Action: Guide Use Area 22-7
USGS Quads 1:250,000: Unalakleet, Norton Bay, St. Michael

Description of the Proposed Action:

Mr. Tom Shankster has applied to conduct guided moose, grizzly and black bear, wolf, and caribou hunting on BLM administered land in GUA 22-7. The general time frame for guided hunts during the fall season is August through October and during spring from April to May. The estimated number of clients is three or four. Access to the area and spike camps will be by aircraft. There are no set spike camp locations and no storage of equipment in the field is requested. The form of travel during the guided hunts will be by foot.

Applicant (if any): Tom Shankster, Shankster Inc.

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 Assessment AK-040-EA-00-026 and AK-040-EA-96-012 and the associated FONSI 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 described for Tom Shankster's guided hunting is similar to the actions and sites analyzed in AK-040-EA-00-026 and AK-040-EA-96-012. They are for conducting guided big game hunts utilizing aircraft and remote camps.

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 AK-040-EA-00-026 and AK-040-EA-96-012 are the same as would be appropriate to the current Proposed Action.

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 AK-040-EA-00-026 and AK-040-EA-96-012 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 identified in AK-040-EA-00-026 and AK-040-EA-96-012 are the same as would be anticipated for the Proposed Action.

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)?**

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 the AFO Lands and Resources staff (see the attached NEPA routing sheet).

F. Mitigation Measures:

The mitigation measures required for the existing NEPA documents are appropriate for the 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
Anchorage Field Manager

08-18-04
Date