

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-12479

Proposed Action Title/Type: Fort Richardson Fish Hatchery R&PP Lease

Location of Proposed Action: Located by a metes and bounds description, primarily in the N½ of the SW¼, Section 6, T. 13 N., R. 2 W., Seward Meridian.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) proposes to drill three test wells within the fish hatchery lease area they operate on Fort Richardson Military Reservation. These wells will supplement existing wells already located within the lease boundary. Drill depths will be at least 100 feet to a maximum of 200 feet, depending on depth of the aquifer encountered. Drill sites are located within currently developed areas and will allow for discharge of pump test water into the existing hatchery effluent system. If sufficient water is located and development of the well system is determined not to affect three Army standby water wells in the area, ADF&G plans to improve the test wells sufficiently to deliver the water to the hatchery for use.

Applicant (if any): The State of Alaska, Department of Fish & Game

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

LUP Name	<u>Southcentral MFP</u>	Date Approved	<u>March 1980</u>
LUP Name	<u>Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan for Fort Richardson</u>	Date Approved	<u>June 2001</u>

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Southcentral MFP, because it meets Objective Number L-1; "Satisfy state and local government needs as well as public and/or private demonstrated needs for land as they arise."

The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan for Fort Richardson addresses the requests for long-term use of military lands for non-military purposes. The general position of the military is to deny future requests unless the use will clearly result in tangible benefits to the military training mission or to the environment.

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

Environmental Assessment AK-040-02-EA-019, for the drilling of four test wells on the South Post of Fort Richardson Military Reservation.

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 an area 1.2 miles south of this location. The main difference is that the previous drill sites occurred in undisturbed areas and the water from the pump tests was dispersed over the forest floor. With this action the drill sites are on previously disturbed ground, and the pump test water will be discharged into the existing hatchery effluent system

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. New information or circumstances do not support a conclusion of a significant difference from what was previously assessed.

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. 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)?

Yes, the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

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

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

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Rodney Huffman	Realty Specialist	Lands/Realty
David Kelley	Natural Resource Spec.	Surface Protection
Bruce Seppi	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Species
Debbie Blank	Botanist	T&E Species
Donna Redding	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
Jeff Denton	Wildlife Biologist	Subsistence

F. Mitigation Measures:

To minimize introduction of invasive non-native plant-species, equipment, and other materials brought on site should be free of weed sources. Disturbed sites should be monitored to determine if non-native species become established and if found they should be removed.

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