U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Anchorage Field Office
4700 BLM Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99507
(907) 267-1246
http://www.blm.gov/ak/st/en/fo/ado.html

Determination of NEPA Adequacy
Communication Site Amendment

Applicant: AT&T Mobility
Case File No: AA-090827
DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0030-DNA

Location:
SW¼, sec. 3, T. 12 N., R. 3 W.
Seward Meridian, Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska

Prepared By:
Anchorage Field Office
June 2011

Determination of NEPA Adequacy
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Office: **Anchorage Field Office**

Environmental Document No: **DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0030-DNA**

Lease/Serial Case File No: **AA-090827**

Proposed Action Title/Type: **Amended Right-of-Way Grant to add cabinets and antennas to an existing communication site.**

Location/Legal Description:

Seward Meridian, Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska
T. 12 N., R. 3 W.,
sec. 3, SW¼ (within).

Applicant (if any): **AT&T Mobility, 4711 Business Park Blvd, Building 1, Suite 10, Anchorage, Alaska 99503**

A. Description of the proposed action and any applicable mitigation measures:

AT&T Mobility (Applicant) proposes to add three radio cabinets and three new LTE panel antennas/power/fiber cable/6 tower mounted remote radios onto the existing Self Support Tower, located on Campbell Tract Facility (CTF) lands, behind the warehouse.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) conformance:

CTF is within the planning boundary of BLM-Alaska's Ring of Fire Resource Management Plan. The Ring of Fire Resource Management Plan was approved by BLM-Alaska's State director on March 21, 2008. The Ring of Fire Resource Management Plan incorporates the provisions of *A Management Plan for Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility* (BLM June, 1988) as management guidance for the authorization of public use of the Tract.

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

DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2010-0042-EA, finding of no significant impact and decision signed September 3, 2010.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

The proposed action is essentially the same as or similar to one of the features evaluated in the previously completed environmental assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2010-0042-EA. The EA evaluated the potential environmental effects of building an 80-foot self supporting tower with associated antennas and cellular equipment panel box situated on a concrete foundation. The proposed action is to add cabinets for containing electronic equipment and LTE panel antennas to the existing tower. There will be no additional ground disturbance.

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?

Yes, the alternatives analyzed in the existing EA are appropriate with respect to the current proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes, since there is no additional ground disturbance and the work will take place on the existing foundation and tower, there is no new information or circumstances that would substantially change analysis of the new proposed action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

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

Yes, all interagency review and public involvement associated with the existing NEPA documents are adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM staff consulted:

Jenny Anderson,	Realty Specialist,	Bureau of Land Management
Douglas Ballou,	Resources Branch Manager	Bureau of Land Management
Stephen Fusilier,	Lands Branch Manager	Bureau of Land Management

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.

Acting

Anchorage Field Manager

6/24/11

Date