

**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.:** A-028083

Proposed Action Title/Type: Drilling of a Natural Gas Well

Location of Proposed Action: Section 33, T. 7 N., R. 10 W., Seward Meridian

Description of the Proposed Action

Marathon Oil Company is proposing to drill a natural gas well in the Beaver Creek Unit. The surface location of the well will be 2,023' From the North Line (FNL) and 482' From the East Line (FEL) in Section 33, T. 7 N., R. 10 W., Seward Meridian. No new roads will be built in order to access the additional BC-12 well to be drilled on Pad BC-4. Existing facilities will be upgraded to handle the additional gas production, resulting from the installation of the BC-12 well. Water used in the mixing of drilling mud will be piped from a water supply well on Beaver Creek Pad 3 to the BC-12 well drilling location.

No construction is planned on the pad. A minimal camp will be established to house various supervisory and service company personnel. Approximately four trailer house type structures will be required for this purpose. Should minor leveling be required, sand and gravel will be supplied from an approved gravel pad in the SW¹/₄, NE¹/₄, Section 5, T. 6 N., R. 10 W., Seward Meridian. Other materials will be obtained from various vendors and suppliers in Alaska. Bottled water will be supplied for human consumption, while potable water will be supplied via the existing water well on the pad for other domestic purposes.

Drilling mud and cuttings will be dewatered on location using a shaker bed and collection trough system. Cuttings and excess mud will be hauled off-site to an Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC) approved Class II disposal well on Pad 41-18 in the Kenai Gas Field (AOGCC Disposal Injection Order No. 9, Permit #81-176). All household and approved industrial garbage will be hauled to the Kenai Peninsula Borough Soldotna Landfill. Clear fluids (drilling fluids free of debris) will be injected into an AOGCC approved disposal well, Beaver Creek #2 Disposal Injection Order No.4, or hauled to Pad 34-31 of the Kenai Gas Field and injected into another AOGCC approved (Permit #7-194) disposal well WD #1.

Pad reclamation will occur after all wells, including BC-12, have been abandoned. Reclamation plan approval will be obtained from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

(USF&WS) before any surficial or subsurficial reclamation work begins. Surface ownership in the Beaver Creek Unit falls under the jurisdiction of the USF&WS, while the subsurficial minerals are regulated by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

Applicant (if any): Marathon Oil Company

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

The BLM has not developed a land use plan for surface or subsurface oil and gas development in the Kenai Peninsula area. The USF&WS 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)).

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

Environmental Assessment AK-040-98-011, February, 1998; Application for Permit to Drill, Marathon Oil Company, Beaver Creek Unit (BC-12), 11/3/03.

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 Action is essentially the same action (drilling a natural gas well within the Beaver Creek Unit) as outlined within EA-AK-040-98-011. The current Proposed Action is located approximately one ½ section west of the same Township, Range and Section as outlined in the aforementioned EA.

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. Even though the EA was signed five years ago, the environmental issues and concerns have not changed.

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

The following critical elements have been analyzed and will not be affected:

- Air Quality
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
- Environmental Justice
- Farmlands (Prime or Unique)
- Floodplains
- Native American Religious Concerns
- Wastes (Hazardous or Solid)
- Water Quality (Drinking or Ground)
- Wetlands/Riparian Zones
- Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Wilderness

Cultural Resources; Invasive Non-Native Species; T& E Species; and Subsistence have all been analyzed and will not be affected. Compliance and Determination Reports have been submitted and are filed with AK-040-04-AD/DNA-008.

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

Yes

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 USF&WS, 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 Application for Permit to Drill was also provided to the USF&WS. Their representative, Claire Caldes, provided written comments and 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 and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

 /s/ June Bailey, Acting
Anchorage Field Manager

 12-03-03
Date