

**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. Describe the Proposed Action**

Marathon has proposed drilling a development gas well on Federal Lease A-028083 in the Beaver Creek Unit. Drilling this well is necessary to further develop the known gas reserves in this Federal Unit. No new surface disturbance is proposed. The well will be named the Beaver Creek No. 11 and will be located in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Section 34, T. 7 N., R. 10 W., S.M., about 11.5 miles northeast of Kenai, Alaska.. The well will be drilled on an existing Marathon well pad, 65 feet south of the Beaver Creek Unit No. 10 well and will be cased with the casing cemented from the total depth of the well to the surface to ensure the protection of subsurface resources. The well will be directionally drilled to a true vertical depth of 8,679 feet and a measured depth of 8,931 feet. It will be completed in the Beluga formation. Surface estate is within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and is managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Mineral estate is owned by the United States and managed by the BLM.

Drilling is proposed to begin in mid August 2002 and should take 2-3 weeks to complete. Water used in the drilling process will come from an existing water well on location. All drilling fluids will be contained within a closed steel tank system. The tanks contain equipment to remove the drilled cuttings from the drilling fluid. The cuttings and excess drilling fluid will be trucked to the Kenai Gas Field for disposal into KU No. 24-7 well, an approved Class II disposal well. Completion fluids will be disposed of either in the Beaver Creek No.2 or Kenai Unit WD No.1. Both are approved Class II disposal wells.

If the well is successful, the gas will be produced and processed through existing facilities in the Beaver Creek Unit. If the well is not successful it will be plugged and abandoned in accordance with BLM regulations. Surface reclamation will occur when the pad is no longer needed and will be in accordance with the requirements of USFWS.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

The BLM has not developed a land use plan for surface or subsurface oil and gas development in the Kenai Peninsula area. The USFWS has identified and described oil and gas development in this area in the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan (1985).

The Proposed Action is nearly identical to the Proposed Action described in EA No. AK-040-98-011. This EA addressed the impacts of drilling the BC-10 well. The FONSI/Decision Record was signed on March 20, 1998. The BC-10 was nearly identical to this proposal. It was drilled about 65 feet north and east of the proposed location for this well. The impacts are assumed to be identical. Therefore, EA-040-98-011 provides a basis for a decision on the proposal in accordance with federal regulations (Title 43 CFR Part 1610.8(b)(1)).

**Administrative Determination (Cont'd.)**

**Document No.: AK-040-02-DNA-025**

**Case File No.: A-028083**  
**Well # Beaver Creek No. 11**

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

EA No. AK-040-98-011; Application For Permit to Drill, Beaver Creek #10, March 20, 1998.

**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?**

As described above, the Proposed Action is nearly identical to that described in EA No. AK-040-98-011.

- 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 in the referenced EA were; allow the drilling and deny the drilling. The EA was signed less than three years ago and the environmental issues and concerns have not changed.

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

There is no new information or circumstances that would effect the validity of 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?**

Yes.

**Administrative Determination (Cont'd.)**

**Document No.: AK-040-02-DNA-025**

**Case File No.: A-028083  
Well # Beaver Creek No. 11**

- 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 the referenced EA are the same as would be anticipated for the Proposed Action. The setting, effected resources, and location are so similar, that the existing EA provides a reasonable basis for making a decision on 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)?**

Yes, they are identical.

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

The existing EA was written in consultation with the USFWS, State of Alaska Department of Natural Resources, and State of Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission. The current proposal has also been posted for 30 days with no comments received.

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:**

See the NEPA routing sheet and specialists' worksheets. A copy of the proposal was also provided to the USFWS. Their representative, Claire Caldes, chose to not provide written comments but expressed their desire to have the project approved as proposed.

**F. Conclusion**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan or is in accordance with federal regulations (Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1610.8 (b)(1)) and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Peter J. Ditton  
Anchorage Field Manager

July 11, 2002  
Date