

NEPA No.: AK-040-AD01-013

Administrative Determination (AD)
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

A. **BLM Office:** Anchorage Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** AA- 77513

Proposed Action Title/Type: Mining Plan of Operations

Location of Proposed Action: Goodnews Bay Platinum Mine; Salmon River near
Platinum Alaska

T. 14 S., R. 75 W., Section 36 SM

T. 15 S., R. 75 W., Section 12 SM

Description of the Proposed Action:

Hanson Industries Inc. plans to work in two mining sites along the Salmon River in the summer of 2001. One area will be dredged using an existing placer dredge (Yuba Dredge) used in previous mining in the area and the other will utilize a clay miner pilot processing plant. They will be mining for platinum, gold and black sand. The total area to be mined is 20.5 acres, 15.5 acres for the dredge and 5 acres for the pilot plant. Also, an exploration program will be conducted using a reverse circulation in unmined ground and a cable tool drill in previously mined areas within the specified 2001 mining area. All areas mined will be reclaimed during and following mining.

Applicant (if any): Hanson Industries, Inc.

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

LUP Name: Southwest MFP

Date Approved: November 1981

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Southwest MFP, Objective M-2, is to provide opportunities for the development of locatable minerals throughout the planning area.

C. **Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

EA for R.A. Hanson Mining Company's Placer Mining Operations in the Salmon River Watershed, Goodnews Bay, Alaska (Multi-Year 1990-1993). Date Approved: May 2, 1990

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

Administrative Determination for 1994. Date Approved: January 27, 1994

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

The current proposed action is for the same two sites as those previously analyzed in the 1993 EA and the 1994 AD. The same bucket line dredge and clay miner wash plant will be used for mining and the same drills will be used for exploration.

- 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, resource values, and circumstances?**

The range of alternatives analyzed is the same with respect to environmental concerns, interests and resource values. The Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative were analyzed.

- 3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the Proposed Action?**

The existing analysis is valid since no new information or circumstances exist that would affect the analysis. Minor changes may be made in basic operations but are expected to fall within the scope of the analysis.

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

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

Our methodology and analytical approach continues to be appropriate because the same fish passage issue exists today that existed during the initial analysis and considering fish passage a priority over terrestrial reclamation remains the focus of our reclamation efforts.

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 sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?

All impacts are substantially unchanged and the existing NEPA document analyzes site specific impacts related to the current proposed action.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Cumulative impacts were analyzed in the initial EA and are substantially unchanged. Cumulative impacts were centered around cumulative surface disturbance in the Salmon River valley.

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

Interagency review involved primarily the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Both agencies were involved in protecting and enhancing the salmon fishery in the Salmon River.

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

See the interdisciplinary worksheet and NEPA routing form in Case File AA-77513.

Administrative Determination (AD) (Cont'd.)

- F. Mitigation Measures:** List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

The mitigating measures (see attached) from the original EA will be incorporated and implemented.

G. Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Peter Ditton, Acting
Anchorage Field Manager

May 2, 2001
Date

Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet and Evaluating the NEPA Adequacy Criteria

These guidelines supplement the policies contained in the Instruction Memorandum entitled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy.” During preparation of the worksheet, if you determine that one or more of the criteria are not met, you do not need to complete the worksheet. If one or more of these criteria are not met, you may reject the proposal, modify the proposal, or complete appropriate NEPA compliance (EA, EIS, Supplemental EIS, or CX if applicable) and plan amendments before proceeding with the Proposed Action.

Criterion 1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Explain whether and how the existing documents analyzed the Proposed Action (include page numbers). If there are differences between the actions included in existing documents and the Proposed Action, explain why they are not considered to be substantial.

Criterion 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? Explain whether the alternatives to the current Proposed Action that were analyzed in the existing NEPA documents and associated records constitute appropriate alternatives with respect to the current Proposed Action, and if so, how. Identify how current issues and concerns were addressed within the range of alternatives in existing NEPA documents. If new alternatives are being raised by the public to address current issues and concerns, and you conclude they do not need to be analyzed, explain why.

Criterion 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? If new information or new circumstances, including the items listed below, are applicable, you need to demonstrate that they are irrelevant or insignificant as applied to the existing analysis of the Proposed Action. New information or circumstances could include the following:

- a. New standards or goals for managing resources. Standards and goals include, but are not limited to, BLM’s land health standards and guidelines, recovery plans for listed species prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service, requirements contained in agency habitat conservation strategies, a biological opinion, or a conference report related to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act; Environmental Protection Agency water quality regulations for Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) (40 CFR 130); and the requirement to address disproportionate impacts on minority populations and low income communities (E.O. 12898).
- b. Changes in resource conditions within the affected area where the existing NEPA analyses were conducted, for example, changes in habitat condition and trend; changes in the legal status of listed, proposed, candidate, and BLM-designated

sensitive species; water quality, including any identified impaired water bodies under Section 303 of the Clean Water Act; air quality; vegetation condition and trend; soil stability; visual quality; cultural resource condition; wildlife population trend(s); etc.

- c. Changes of resource-related plans, policies, or programs of State and local governments, Indian tribes, or other Federal agencies, such as, State- or Environmental Protection Agency-approved water quality restoration plans.
- d. Designations established in the affected area since the existing NEPA analysis and documentation was prepared. Designations include, but are not limited to, designated wilderness, wilderness study areas, National Natural Landmarks, National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, National Register properties, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Research Natural Areas, areas designated under the source Water Protection Program of the State or the Environmental Protection Agency, and listing of critical habitats by the Fish and Wildlife Service.
- e. Other changed legal requirements, such as changes in statutes, case law, or regulations.

Criterion 4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the proposed action? Explain how the methodologies and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) are current and sufficient for supporting approval of the Proposed Action. If valid new technologies and methodologies exist (e.g., air quality modeling), explain why it continues to be reasonable to rely on the method previously used.

Criterion 5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document(s) analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action? Review the impact analysis in the existing NEPA document(s). Explain how the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action are analyzed in the existing NEPA documents, and would, or would not, differ from those identified in the existing NEPA document. Consider the effect new information or circumstances may have on the environmental impacts predicted in the existing NEPA document. Consider whether the documents sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action.

Criterion 6. Are the reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Would the current Proposed Action, if implemented, change the cumulative impact analysis? Consider the impact analysis in existing NEPA document(s),

the effects of relevant activities that have been implemented or projected since existing NEPA documents were completed, and the effects of the current Proposed Action.

Criterion 7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current Proposed Action? Explain how the nature of public involvement in previous NEPA documents remains in compliance with NEPA public involvement requirements in light of current conditions, information, issues, and controversies