

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 Oil Company has proposed to plug back and drill a sidetrack to an existing gas well on Federal Lease A-028142 in the Kenai Gas Field. In an earlier attempt to perform well repair on the KU 21-6 well, Marathon lost some tools in the well. They propose to plug back and drill a sidetrack rather than face an expensive fishing job. The sidetracked well will be called KU 21X-6, and will be drilled to nearly the same depth and bottom hole location as the old 21-6 well. The well will be cased and the casing will be cemented from the total depth of the well to the surface casing to ensure the protection of subsurface resources. The well is located in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 31, T. 5 N., R. 11 W., S.M., about 6.5 miles south of Kenai, Alaska. The well will have a bottom hole location in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 6, T. 4 N., R. 11 W., S.M. No new surface disturbance is planned. The well is located on an existing Marathon well pad, the 34-31. The sidetrack will be directionally drilled to a vertical depth of 4,884 feet with a measured depth of 5,650 feet and completed in the Sterling formation. Surface estate is owned by the Salamatof Native Association, Inc. and managed by the Cook Inlet Regional, Inc. (CIRI). Mineral estate is owned by CIRI and managed by the BLM.

The sidetrack operation is proposed to begin in late June 2001 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. The cuttings and excess drilling fluid will be trucked to a Kenai Field Class II disposal well (KU 24-7). Completion fluids will be trucked to Well WD #1, an approved disposal well.

Gas from the well will be produced and processed through existing facilities on the 34-31 pad.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

We have no record that an environmental assessment was written for the original well when it was drilled in 1965 and BLM has not developed a land use plan for oil and gas development in the Kenai Peninsula area. The subject Proposed Action, however, is very similar to the Proposed Action described in EA No. AK-040-99-022 (Kenai Gas Field Development Wells 33-6 and 42-7, August 1999). The impacts will be less than those addressed in EA-040-99-022 since the well already exists and the duration of the work will be two weeks shorter but the EA provides a basis for a decision on the proposal in accordance with Federal regulations (43 CFR 1610.8(b)(1)).

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

EA No. AK-040-99-022; Kenai Gas Field Development Wells 33-6 and 42-7, August 1999.

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 nearly identical to that described in the Kenai Gas Field Development EA (KGF EA). The Proposed Action is located on an existing pad, on the same road, in the same Gas Field less than one mile from the one described in the KGF EA. The KGF EA analyzed the impacts from drilling a well on the 41-7 pad. The current Proposed Action is for the same type of operation on the 34-31 pad, northwest of the 41-7 pad.

- 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 KGF EA were allow the drilling and deny the drilling. The environmental issues and concerns have not changed since the signing of the EA

- 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.

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 KGF EA are slightly greater as would be anticipated for the Proposed Action. While the KGF EA analyzed impacts of a drilling operation located on the 41-7 well pad and did not analyze the *specific* impacts for drilling activity on the 34-31 well pad, the setting, affected resources, and location are so similar, that the KGF 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 proposal for which the KGF EA was written was posted for 30 days and received no comments. The current proposal will also be posted for 30 days.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

See attached NEPA routing sheet and specialists' worksheets.

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 (43 CFR 1610.8(b)(1)) and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA

Peter J. Ditton, Acting
Anchorage Field Manager

06-25-01
Date