

SCOMM

133:19

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Interim:

East Railroad Avenue
Juneau, Alaska 99654
(907) 373-1842
Fax (907) 373-4729



Session:

State Capitol Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182
(907) 465-2186
Fax (907) 465-3818

REPRESENTATIVE VIC KOHRING
DISTRICT 14

SPONSOR STATEMENT

HJR 17

"LEASES IN NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE"

In 1923, by Executive Order, President Harding set aside public land within the present boundaries of the National Petroleum Reserve for the purpose of oil and gas production. The area north of the Brooks Range in the 23 million-acre area was originally known as the Naval Petroleum Reserve. When this Reserve was set aside, the oil was designated for use in case of a national energy emergency. This area, now known as National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPRO) is the largest block of federally owned land in Alaska.

In 1976, Congress transferred management of the area to the Department of the Interior, with a provision that oil development in the area was prohibited except by act of Congress. However, in 1980, the Reserve was opened and a further provision stated that 50% of the royalties from any oil extracted from the reserve would go only to the State of Alaska (despite the fact that the Reserve is federal land).

House Joint Resolution 17 urges the Secretary of Interior to continue competitive lease sales in this area. Recent discoveries in May 2001, were the first Petroleum Reserve discoveries made on acreage purchased during the May 1999 BLM competitive lease sale—the first lease sale in this area since 1984. These discoveries confirm the potential strategic importance of this area, which is to bring us closer to energy self-sufficiency by reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

With oil production on the North Slope in decline, opening NPRO to oil and gas exploration and development could mean between \$500 million-\$2.2 billion for U.S. bank account with half of that going to the State of Alaska. It is also estimated that 40% of all coal remaining in the U.S. is in Alaska. Over 50% of that may lie in the Reserve. Significant gas reserves are also projected for this area.

HJR 17 recognizes the advances made in technology in Arctic exploration and production in the past 30 years and urges further development continue in a way that limits the effect on the environment and that develops Alaska's resources in a responsible manner.

[Prev](#)[Home](#)[Next](#)

1. Authority

Congress authorized "an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas" in the NPR-A in 1980 (P.L. 96-514, Dec. 12, 1980). Leases the agency sold in 1982 and 1983 have now expired. Federal land in the Northwest NPR-A is currently unavailable for leasing because existing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation is dated and no longer adequate; however, none of the public land in the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area is closed, i.e., withdrawn from oil and gas leasing. If BLM decides to undertake renewed leasing in the Planning Area, the final IAP/EIS will be the basic NEPA analysis for that authorization. The Record of Decision (ROD) will identify those areas that will be made available and unavailable for leasing.

The BLM is undertaking this IAP/EIS to fulfill the mandates of the President's energy policy and BLM's responsibilities to manage these lands under authority of two laws passed in 1976 - the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act (NPRPA) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). The President's energy policy directs the Secretary of the Interior (the Secretary) to "consider additional environmentally responsible oil and gas development, based on sound science and the best available technology, through further lease sales in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska."

The Northwest NPR-A IAP/EIS addresses BLM responsibilities under the NPRPA and FLPMA through a NEPA required process. The document provides the public and government officials an opportunity to take a comprehensive look at future management of the area, including the potential for oil and gas leasing and possible Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act designations. The BLM expects the plan to have a life of 10 to 15 years, though it may prove suitable for either a shorter or longer period.

The authority for the management options in the IAP/EIS comes from several statutes, including NEPA, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and particularly FLPMA and the NPRPA. Under FLPMA, the Secretary has broad authority to regulate the use, occupancy, and development of the public lands and to take whatever action is required to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands (43 U.S.C. § 1732).

Under the NPRPA, the Secretary has the authority to conduct oil and gas leasing and development in the NPR-A (42 U.S.C. § 6508). The NPRPA also provides that the Secretary "shall assume all responsibilities" for "any activities related to the protection of environmental, fish and wildlife, and historical or scenic values" (42 U.S.C. § 6503(b)). In addition, the NPRPA authorizes the Secretary to "promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate for the protection of such values within the reserve" (42 U.S.C. § 6503(b)). The NPRPA, as amended, contains special provisions that apply to any exploration or development activities within areas "designated by the Secretary of the Interior containing any significant subsistence, recreational, fish and wildlife, or historical or scenic value" (42 U.S.C. §§ 6504(b), 6508). Portions of the Teshekpuk Lake and the Colville River Special Areas are within the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area. These provisions require that any oil and gas exploration or development within a special area "shall be conducted in a manner which will assure the maximum protection of such surface resources to the extent consistent with the requirements of [the] Act for the exploration of the reserve" (42 U.S.C. §§ 6504(b), 6508). Oil and gas activities must include or provide for "conditions, restrictions, and prohibitions as the Secretary deems necessary or appropriate to mitigate reasonably foreseeable and significantly adverse effects on the surface resources of the NPR-A" (42 U.S.C. § 6508(1)). In conducting this IAP/EIS, BLM is fulfilling these statutory mandates.

This IAP/EIS is consistent with the major goal of the NPRPA, namely helping meet the total energy needs of the Nation, by assessing opportunities for oil and gas production on Federal lands in the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area while protecting other resource values. Because it takes years to find, delineate, and develop a producing oil or gas field in the remote arctic environment, oil and gas leasing is not conducted to meet today's need but to meet future needs.

The U.S. currently imports more than half of its petroleum supply, and the Federal Government projects that the proportion of the Nation's oil coming from overseas will continue to climb, approaching two-thirds by 2020. Oil production in the U.S. overall and on Alaska's North Slope declined through 2001 (Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, *Annual Energy Outlook 2002*, December 2001, p. 89; "Crude Oil Supply and Disposition, 1973-Present," www.eia.doe.gov/pub/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/petroleum_supply_monthly/current/txt/table accessed Sept. 16, 2002; Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, "Pipeline Facts, Throughput" www.alyeska-pipeline.com/PipelineFacts/Throughput.html.) According to the DOE, importation of foreign oil significantly increases this country's trade deficit. Domestic oil production, especially on Federal lands, contributes directly to the health of the Nation's economy and to Federal revenues. The oil industry provides jobs, many of them high-skill and high-pay jobs. Lease sales, rentals, bonuses, and royalties from Federal oil and gas leases contribute to the Federal treasury, as do taxes paid by oil companies and their workers. Oil produced from the NPR-A would be transported using excess capacity of the existing Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS), which would be available in the timeframe projected for development of new NPR-A fields.

In addition to management actions in this IAP/EIS that contribute to ensuring a healthy and productive ecosystem, the BLM is engaged in some inventory and monitoring to meet that goal. (Appendix A describes ongoing and anticipated inventory and monitoring efforts.) For example, BLM has worked with Ducks Unlimited since 1994 to define the vegetative land cover of the NPR-A and the agency is now linking this habitat information with wildlife data compiled by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Alaska's Department of Fish and Game. The BLM has also worked with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) since 2001 on two projects. One is providing digital infrared imagery of the northeastern part of the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area to inventory vegetation health; the other is providing elevation measurements at 5-m increments to a precision of no more than 2 m. The BLM is also conveying lands within the Planning Area to Native Alaskans on the North Slope through conveyance of Native Allotments to individuals and conveyance of lands to corporations as authorized under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). The latter include conveyances to Atkasuk Corporation, Olgoonik Corporation, and Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation (the ANCSA village corporations for Atkasuk, Wainwright, and Barrow) and to the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC) (the ANCSA corporation for North Slope Native Alaskans). These inventories and conveyances will continue under all alternatives considered in this IAP/EIS.

The Northwest IAP/EIS also fulfills BLM's mandate under Section 1320 of ANILCA, 43 U.S.C. §1784, authorizing the Secretary to "identify areas in Alaska which he determines are suitable as wilderness." This same provision of ANILCA, however, states that public lands in Alaska, including NPR-A, are not subject to Section 603 of FLPMA, 43 U.S.C. §1782 that requires the completion of Wilderness review and describes the procedures for management of any lands recommended for Wilderness designation to Congress, pending Congressional action. Consequently, this plan identifies specific areas for consideration as Wilderness under the discretionary authority of ANILCA Section 1320. Under Alternative C, BLM would manage lands it identifies for possible recommendation by the Secretary for Wilderness designation as Wilderness Study Areas (WSA's), pending Congressional action on the Wilderness recommendation.

Section 1320 of ANILCA exempted the NPR-A from Section 202 of FLPMA, 43 U.S.C. §1712 that

requires the preparation of land use plans (called Resource Management Plans, or RMP's in regulations adopted by BLM). Because of this exemption, the current IAP/EIS is not an RMP (as most BLM planning efforts are called). The statute (FLPMA § 202) and regulations governing the preparation of RMP's (43 C.F.R. Subpart 1610) do not apply to this planning effort.

This plan does not address legislative proposals that would authorize hardrock mining or wildlife refuge designations or identification of lands for exchange to Native corporations. For further discussion of these and other management actions not addressed in this IAP/EIS, see [Section II.G](#).

[Prev](#)[Home](#)[Next](#)

[Cover](#)[Next](#)

Executive Summary

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) initiated the Northwest National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A) Integrated Activity Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (IAP/EIS) to determine the appropriate multiple-use management of 8.8 million acres of the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area (Maps 01 and 02), consistent with existing statutory direction for its management. To carry out its management responsibilities, BLM is addressing three major questions: (1) What lands should BLM offer for oil and gas leasing? (2) What measures should be developed to protect important surface resources from oil and gas activities? (3) Consistent with the existing statutory direction for the area, what non-oil and gas land allocations should be considered for this portion of the NPR-A?

In addressing these questions, BLM has focused on the relationships of the current and potential uses of the Planning Area and the impact of those uses on the natural and human resources of the area. In this analysis, specific resources, uses, and portions of the Planning Area have stood out as especially significant.

The potential use of the area for oil development is a major focus of the IAP/EIS. In examining this potential, BLM fulfills a mandate of the President's energy policy directing the Secretary of the Interior to "consider additional environmentally responsible oil and gas development, based on sound science and the best available technology, through further lease sales in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska." Congress, in a 1981 amendment to the National Petroleum Reserves Production Act (NPRPA), 42 U.S.C. § 6508, also has directed that BLM undertake oil and gas leasing in NPR-A. North Slope oil production, centered at the massive Prudhoe Bay field, is key to the Nation's domestic oil supply. The North Slope contributes about 16 percent of America's current domestic production. The oil industry has discovered and developed other fields both to the east and west of Prudhoe. However, production is in decline from these older fields, and there are indications that the Planning Area contains oil and natural resources that could help to stem the decline.

Subsistence activities, particularly hunting and fishing, in the Planning Area are exceedingly important to local residents, including the Inupiat, the Native people of Alaska's North Slope. Subsistence hunting and fishing are central to the Inupiat's ages-old cultural system. Moreover, subsistence activities provide critical sustenance for people who live off Alaska's road network at an extreme distance from the Nation's food-distribution system.

Several portions of the Planning Area have particularly important surface values. A small portion in the extreme northeast part of the Planning Area falls into the Teshekpuk Lake Special Area designed to protect waterbird habitat; while the northern banks of the Colville River in the southernmost part of the Planning Area are in the Colville River Special Area, designated to protect raptors (Map 34). The Kasegaluk Lagoon at the far northwestern corner of the Planning Area offers primitive recreation experience, including kayak and small boat paddling along the coast (Map 12). It also is rich in wildlife, including migratory birds and marine mammals, and features marine tidal flats that are rare on the North Slope. The hills and mountains in the southern part of the Planning Area have special values (Map 12). They are particularly remote, being far from any of the region's communities, and relatively rarely visited even by subsistence hunters. They also feature good hiking and scenic vistas in high terrain.

The IAP/EIS analyzes a No Action Alternative and three alternative future management plans for making part or all of the Planning Area available for oil and gas leasing in a manner consistent with

responsible protection of other important surface resources. These alternatives present a range of actions that BLM could take to manage the surface and subsurface resources of the Planning Area consistent with statutory direction for management of the NPR-A.

Each alternative includes management actions and mitigation measures that broadly apply to the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area. For example, there are stipulations and required operating procedures addressing waste prevention, handling and disposal; spill prevention and response; potential impacts of oil and gas exploration and development; protection of subsistence activities; and protection of vegetation, raptors, and cultural and paleontological resources. This IAP/EIS also includes land allocation decisions, stipulations, and required operating procedures specific to portions of the Planning Area. These address in part, some of the issues raised by the public during scoping as well as decisions BLM is directed to address in land management plans.

The alternatives presented in the IAP/EIS are consistent with the purposes of the NPR-A's governing statutes. Each alternative offers a different balance between serving the "total energy needs of the nation," a goal of the NPRPA, and protecting surface resources from "unnecessary and undue degradation," as required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. See Table II-01 for a comparison of these alternatives. The alternatives are:

Alternative A  : Alternative A would make all BLM-administered lands in the Planning Area available to oil and gas leasing. Under this alternative, no Special Areas, WSA's, or WSR's would be proposed. The entire Planning Area would be open to OHV use. Protective measures include applying stipulations and required operating procedures, and identifying VRM areas. Additional protection may be introduced following future additional NEPA analysis on specific activities.

Alternative B  : Alternative B would make 96 percent of the BLM-administered lands in the Planning Area (100 percent of the area of high oil and gas potential) available for oil and gas leasing. The proposed Kasegaluk Lagoon Special Area would not be available for leasing and no permanent oil and gas facilities would be allowed either in the Special Areas or, excepting two right-of-way sites to be designated at Peard Bay and near Wainwright, in and along the shores of the coastal bays and lagoons (including islands in those bays and lagoons). Stipulations and required operating procedures would place further restrictions on the placement of permanent oil and gas facilities around lakes, rivers, and important habitat. Offshore exploratory drilling would only be allowed in winter in the coastal bays and lagoons from bottom-fast ice pads, natural islands, and human-made gravel islands. Protective measures include applying the relevant stipulations and required operating procedures, recommending the Kasegaluk Lagoon area be designated a Special Area, limiting OHV and airboat use, and identifying VRM areas. Additional protection may be introduced following future additional NEPA analysis on specific activities.

Alternative C  : Alternative C would make 47 percent of the BLM-administered lands in the Planning Area available for oil and gas leasing while emphasizing protection of specific surface resources through barring lease sales, excluding permanent oil and gas facilities, or both in potentially sensitive areas. The areas withheld from leasing include all those identified as being of concern for estuarine, deep-water lakes, and river and riparian habitat; caribou movement and migration areas; raptors, loons, brant, and eiders; cultural and paleontological resources; subsistence cabins and camps; three proposed WSA's; and one proposed wild river and 21 proposed scenic river corridors. In addition, under this alternative Federal subsurface oil and gas below surface lands owned or selected by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act village corporations for Atkasuk, Barrow, and Wainwright would not be available for leasing.

Under Alternative C, less than 2 percent of the area considered as being high in oil and gas resource potential would be made available for leasing. Except for two right-of-way sites to be designated on previously disturbed ground at Peard Bay and near Wainwright, permanent oil and gas facilities would be prohibited in and along the shore of major bays and lagoons (including islands in those bays and lagoons). Other protective measures include applying relevant stipulations and required operating procedures, limiting OHV and airboat use, and identifying VRM areas. If Congress adopts recommendations in this alternative to create three Wilderness areas, then all oil- and gas-related structures, as well as ice roads, ice pads, and seismic studies would be prohibited in those areas. Prior to such Congressional designation, however, ice roads, ice pads, and seismic studies could be allowed in the proposed WSA's, if they can be shown to not impact permanent wilderness values. Additional protection may be introduced following future site-specific NEPA analysis.

No Action Alternative (Map 14):  The No Action Alternative reflects current BLM management of the Planning Area and BLM's decision that the 1983 EIS for leasing in NPR-A is inadequate for renewed leasing program in the Northwest NPR-A. Under this alternative, no new oil and gas leasing would occur; no new designations such as Special Areas, Wilderness Study Areas (WSA's), or Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR's) would be proposed; no Visual Resource Management (VRM) classifications or off-highway vehicle (OHV) designations would be made; and no right-of-ways would be designated. Existing Special Area designations for the Colville River and Teshekpuk Lake areas and stipulations BLM applies when permitting activities would continue to provide protection of surface resources. Stipulations listed in the 1983 oil and gas leasing EIS for the NPR-A apply under this No Action Alternative. However, because oil and gas leasing does not occur under this alternative, the stipulations from that EIS have no practical effect. Under this alternative, two options exist with regard to seismic activity. Winter seismic activity could occur throughout the Planning Area (the existing management situation), or seismic activity could be prohibited.

No Preferred Alternative is identified in the Draft IAP/EIS. The Preferred Alternative may be one of the four alternatives described above or it may combine elements of two or more of the alternatives above. The public is encouraged to comment on elements of each alternative that they would like to see incorporated in the Preferred Alternative. The BLM wants the public's input on all the options offered in the draft document before it selects a specific plan. Comments received during the public comment period will be considered in development of the Preferred Alternative.

The analyses of the potential impacts of the alternatives (Sections IV.B. through IV.E. of the Draft IAP/EIS) are based on the scenarios presented in Section IV.A. of the Draft EIS. The analyses assume that the stipulations and required operating procedures are adopted under each alternative. The analyses also assume compliance with existing laws and regulations. The impacts of the first sale and multiple sales under each alternative are summarized below.

Summary of Impacts: Impacts are of several general types. Except for overland moves, non-oil and gas activities generally occur during the summer. They commonly are of short duration (e.g., aircraft flight or landing) and very localized (e.g., a research or recreational camp). These are unlikely to have more than a short-term and localized impact.

Seismic activities, overland moves, and exploratory drilling, all occur during the winter when the ground is frozen and snow-covered and many species have migrated out of the area. These activities can briefly impact the species that remain through the winter. Their impacts can linger into the following summer and longer in the form of vegetation that appears greener than surrounding areas and shallow water tracks and ponding.

The greatest impacts are associated with oil and gas development. Placement of gravel drilling pads, roads, airstrips, staging areas, and docks and the activities that take place on them, as well as construction of oil and gas pipelines will permanently disturb or destroy soil and vegetation; impound and disturb water; disturb, displace, or kill fish and wildlife; risk disturbing or destroying paleontological and cultural (archaeological and historic) resources; and potentially adversely affect subsistence (by affecting species or impeding user access) and recreation. The impacts from developing and using these facilities vary among resources. Because the land likely to be disturbed is a very small percentage of the 8.8 million surface acres BLM manages in the Planning Area, impacts to soil, vegetation, water, and paleontological and cultural resources will almost certainly be very minor. Impacts to fish and wildlife and subsistence and recreation extend beyond the immediate vicinity of the disturbed ground and, depending on location and protective measures, can be out of proportion with a development's small footprint. If a development leads to a crude oil or refined fuel spill, particularly one that extends beyond a pad, impacts could be more severe.

Alternative A will have the greatest impact primarily because it would likely lead to the most seismic surveys, exploratory drilling, and development. Impacts in most instances would be minor. The footprint would be unlikely to destroy more than 1,500 acres of soil or vegetation. Individual fish, mammals, and birds would probably die or be displaced, but it is unlikely that populations would be measurably impacted. And impacts to subsistence and recreation generally are classified as no more than minor. Three potential occurrences could increase the level of impact to some resources under Alternative A. One is oil field development in the caribou insect-relief area. Development in this area could interfere with caribou movements and have adverse reproductive consequences. This in turn could adversely impact subsistence hunters and those dependent on them. Secondly, an oil spill could also increase impacts above minor if it occurred in or entered a river delta or nearshore area occupied by waterbirds. If development activities were to have effects on a rare or vulnerable species, moderate or severe impacts could result. Certain vulnerable bird species — those with declining or with small or sensitive populations, including the threatened spectacled eider — could be moderately impacted if development occurred where the species was concentrated. Rare plants could be impacted severely if development overlapped the area in which such plants exist.

Alternative B would have slightly less impact than Alternative A. Alternative C would have a significantly reduced impact primarily because development is considered unlikely under this alternative. If development did occur, however, impacts for some species would still be significantly reduced from that anticipated under Alternatives A and B. Areas that would not be available for oil and gas leasing include important bird habitat and much of the caribou insect-relief area. Impacts from the No Action Alternative would generally be negligible or very small, temporary, and localized.

The cumulative analysis (Section IV.F. of the Draft IAP/EIS) discusses the effects that past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions might have on important resources in the Planning area and the surrounding area. In addition to the potential effects of actions in the Northwest NPR-A Planning Area, the cumulative analysis includes the potential effects of activities elsewhere that may affect the important resources of the Northwest NPR-A and surrounding areas. The conclusions of the cumulative analyses are summarized below.

Cumulative impacts to soils, paleontological resources, water resources, water quality, air quality, freshwater and marine fish, wild and scenic river values, and visual resources are expected to be minimal, short-term, and or localized. Long causeways with inadequate breeches could have measurable, long-term impacts on hydrologic conditions; no such causeways are projected for any of the alternatives. Global climate change could alter the composition vegetation species, increasing deciduous shrubs and decreasing sedges and grasses. Activities in the Northwest NPR-A are not expected to contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions. Opportunities for primitive recreation will

continue to be reduced by oil and gas activities on the North Slope. Oil and gas activities will continue to impact visual resources of the North Slope with long-term impacts related to the long-term presence of production pads, support facilities, roads, and pipelines. Over the next 20 to 30 years, the onshore and offshore oil industry in and near Prudhoe Bay is expected to decline with a parallel decline in the economic indicators within the North Slope region.

Cumulative effects of North Slope oil-industry activities (primarily mortality in the unlikely event a large oil spill) could be substantial to loon species and king eider, and significant to long-tailed duck, king eiders, and common eiders. Normal oil and gas activities are expected cause the loss of small numbers of eiders, particularly spectacled eiders, through disturbance effects on survival and productivity, and collisions with structures. Any substantial loss of eiders could be an obstacle to full population recovery.

North Slope oil and gas development could result in a long-term displacement and/or functional loss of habitat for Central Arctic Herd (CAH), Teshekpuk Lake Herd (TLH), and Western Arctic Herd (WAH) caribou. Oil development in the Prudhoe Bay-Kuparuk area has caused a shift in CAH calving distribution away calving range near the oil fields. Calving by TLH caribou may be reduced near the pipeline corridors — a potential long-term (several-generation) effect on the distribution of the TLH caribou. The No Action Alternative and Alternative C would not allow development in the TLH insect-relief habitat. The alteration of tundra habitat in the Prudhoe Bay area has not had any apparent effect on the distribution and abundance of other terrestrial mammals, with the possible exception of arctic foxes, which have apparently increased in numbers near the oil fields.

Access to subsistence-hunting areas and subsistence resources, and the use of subsistence resources could change if oil development reduces the availability of subsistence resources or alters their distribution patterns. The communities of Point Lay, Wainwright, Barrow, Atkasuk, and Nuiqsut would be most affected. Caribou could become unavailable, undesirable for use, or experience long-term population and productivity effects for a period longer than 5 years, it could chronically disrupt sociocultural systems in the community that are reliant on caribou for subsistence, which would be a significant adverse effect. Effects would be expected to disrupt community activities and traditional practices for harvesting, sharing, and processing subsistence resources, but not displace sociocultural institutions, social organization, or sociocultural systems. Disproportionate, high adverse effects to the subsistence communities of the North Slope are expected as a result of cumulative impacts from oil and gas activities.

Cover

Next

[Prev](#)

[Home](#)

[Next](#)

A. PURPOSE AND NEED

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) initiated the Northwest National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A, also referred to as the Reserve) Integrated Activity Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (IAP/EIS) to determine the appropriate multiple-use management of this 8.8-million-acre area consistent with existing statutory direction for its management (Map 01 , Map 02 ). Specifically, the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (NPRPA), as amended, encourages oil and gas leasing in NPR-A while requiring protection of important surface resources and uses. To carry out its management responsibilities, BLM is addressing three major questions in this IAP/EIS.

1. What lands should BLM offer for oil and gas leasing?
2. What measures should be developed to protect important surface resources from the impacts of oil and gas activities?
3. Consistent with the existing statutory direction for the area, what non-oil and gas land allocations should be considered for this portion of the NPR-A?

[Prev](#)

[Home](#)

[Next](#)



National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska

Central Energy Team >> Other Topics >> NPRA

[Links](#) [Feedback](#) [Contact](#) [Search](#)[NPRA Home](#)[Staff](#)[Products](#)[Links](#)

The National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska (NPRA) - Legacy Data Archive

In 1923, President Harding established the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 4. This area, approximately 37,000 square miles at the northern-most portion of Alaska, has been explored and mapped by the USGS since 1901. The U.S. Navy undertook the first modern oil-exploration program between 1944 - 1958, establishing the feasibility of using modern petroleum exploration and production methods under arctic conditions.



For further
information please
contact:
Nick Zihlman

U.S. Geological Survey
Box 25046, MS 939,
Denver Federal
Center, Denver, CO
80225
(303) 236-5741
zihlman@usgs.gov

With the discovery of the largest oil field in North America, Prudhoe Bay in 1968, and the Arab oil embargo in 1974, the U.S. Navy established the next exploration program in the reserve. In 1975 the U.S. Navy signed a 5-year contract with the Husky Oil NPR Operations, Inc., to manage and supervise all aspects of the exploration program. In 1976, the petroleum reserve was renamed the National Petroleum Reserve, Alaska, (NPRA) with the USGS given the lead responsibility for further research and exploration.

The NPRA exploration program continued under USGS leadership until ended in 1982. Over one billion dollars has been invested in the acquisition and processing of geological and geophysical data from the NPRA. The data collection presented here, resulting from those exploration efforts, has over 12,000 line miles of seismic data, collected between 1972 and 1981, digital and analog data from 43 wells, and associated reports and documentation.

This page can be found at
<http://energy.cr.usgs.gov/other/npra/npraindex.htm>
Maintained by: Central Energy Data Management
Last modified: 08:32:20 Tue 23 Oct 2001
[USGS Privacy Policy and Disclaimers](#)



FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2003 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HJR 17
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Natural Resources
 Title Leases in Natl Petroleum Reserve BRU Resource Development
 Component Oil and Gas Development
 Sponsor Kohring
 Requester House Oil and Gas Component No. 439

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2003) cost: 0.0

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2004 budget proposal: ☐

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

NPRA leasing and development will have a positive fiscal impact for the State. Alaska will receive 50 percent of royalties, bonuses, and rentals from oil and gas leasing and production in NPRA.

Prepared by: Mark D. Myers Phone 269-8800
 Division Oil and Gas Date/Time 3/26/2003
 Approved by: Tom Irwin, Commissioner Date 3/26/2003
 Agency Natural Resources