



Bureau of Land Management

Anchorage Field Office
6881 Abbott Loop Road
Anchorage, AK 99507
<http://www.anchorage.ak.blm.gov>

**Administrative Determination (AD)/Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
Filming Permit**

Applicant: Buckmasters, Ltd.
Case File No.: AA-087544
AK-040-07-AD/DNA-035



Location:

Kateel River Meridian, T. 16 S., R. 4 W., T. 16 S., R. 5 W., and
T. 17 S., R. 6 W.

Prepared By:

David Krantz
Realty Specialist
August 2, 2007

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 **Serial Case File No.:** AA-87544

Proposed Action Title/Type: Issuance of a film permit, under 43 CFR § 2920

Location of Proposed Action:

Kateel River Meridian, T. 16 S., R. 4 W., T. 16 S., R. 5 W., and T. 17 S., R. 6 W. More specifically, filming activity will occur along the Unalakleet River, from approximately 20 River miles upstream of Old Woman Creek down to the confluence of Old Woman Creek and the Unalakleet River.

Description of the Proposed Action

Buckmasters Ltd., of Montgomery Alabama, proposes to send two cameramen to videotape a grizzly bear hunt being carried out by Vance Grishkowsky in the Unalakleet River watershed, located in western Alaska. Because the video footage obtained will be used for commercial purposes, Bushman Ltd. is required to obtain a commercial filming permit.

Vance Grishkowsky, who is permitted by BLM to conduct guiding and outfitting in this area, will be coordinating all aspects of the hunt. Mr. Grishkowsky is permitted, under a special recreation permit, to conduct guided hunting activities, and utilize various spike camps on public lands in the above-described areas. The cameraman will shoot hunting footage over the hunter's shoulder, or position himself a few yards away.

Applicant: Buckmasters Ltd., 10350 Hwy. 80 East, Montgomery, AL 36117.

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

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan: Management Framework Plan, Southwest Planning Area dated November 1981. The Proposed Action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5-3(a)). Under objective WL-4 of the Management Frame Work Plan, the objective is to maintain high grizzly/brown bear productivity, and the rationale states that grizzly/brown bears are very abundant in the Unalakleet River Drainage. The State of Alaska, Department of Fish and Game, would like to insure continued high bear productivity, while increasing the opportunity

for sport hunters to take trophy bears. This objective does not directly address filming hunting activities but does recognize that hunting is a legitimate use of public lands; therefore, any incidental filming activity associated with bear hunting is an allowed use under the Management Frame Work Plan.

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

Environmental Assessment AK-040-00-EA-00-026 and the associated FONSI adequately cover all environmental issues associated with the filming of the commercial guided big game hunt.

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 commercial filming of a big game hunt is a similar action to the actions analyzed in AK-040-EA-00-026. From BLM's perspective, exclusive of the impacts associated with the taking of game, there is no discernable difference in the environmental impacts associated with providing guide services for the purpose of filming game and providing guide services for the purpose of taking game. Often guides have more than one client on the same trip and the cameraman would have the same impact on the environment as a hunter. The cameraman carries all equipment used (batteries, tape, tripod) into and out of the field on a daily basis. The cameraman will shoot footage in close proximity to a hunter and will create no additional impact.

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-040-00-026 is the same as the range of alternatives that would be analyzed for the proposed action.

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

No new information or circumstances have 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-040-00-026 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, indirect and site-specific impacts identified in AK-040-00-026 are the same as would be anticipated for the proposed action because the videographer would have the same impacts as a guided hunter.

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 that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially the same as 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?

There was little public interest in the actions analyzed in the existing NEPA document. It is anticipated that this action would likewise generate little public interest.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

An interdisciplinary analysis was conducted by the AFO Lands and Resources staff.

F. Mitigation Measures:

In addition to the terms included on the back of the special recreation permit, the attached general terms and stipulations are applicable.

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.

Mike Zaidlicz
Anchorage Field Manager

August 24, 2007
Date