# State of Louisiana OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION COMMISSION MEETING April 15, 2021 1:00 p.m.

## Oilfield Site Restoration Commission Meeting Hearing Held on Zoom Video Conferencing Thursday, April 15, 2021 1:00 p.m.

----

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Thomas Harris, DNR, Secretary
Richard Ieyoub, Commissioner of Conservation
Steve Maley, LOGA
Donald Briggs, LOGA
Barney Callahan, LWF, Sierra, and Audubon Society
Lisa Creasman, Nature Conservancy

#### STAFF PRESENT:

John Adams, Office of Conservation Attorney
Roby Fulkerson, Office of Conservation, OSR Staff
Casandra Parker, Office of Conservation, OSR Staff
Gary Ross, Asst. Commissioner of Conservation
Gary Snellgrove, Director, Environmental Division

## OTHERS PRESENT: Pat Molbert Jim York Patrick Raley Scott Sinclair Machelle Hall Ross Donnes Clarence D. Chris McLindon William I. Cody Lillich **Greg Stutes** Richard Haik Jake Dickerson Will Coenen

1	Oilfield Site Restoration Commission Meeting
2	April 15, 2021
3	
4	ROLL CALL
5	SECRETARY HARRIS:
6	I would like to call this meeting of the Oilfield Site Restoration
7	Commission meeting to order.
8	Would you call the roll, please, Roby?
9	MR. FULKERSON:
10	Yes, sir.
11	ROLL CALL
12	MR. FULKERSON:
13	Tom Harris, Secretary.
14	SECRETARY HARRIS:
15	Present.
16	MR. FULKERSON:
17	Richard Ieyoub, Commissioner of Conservation,
18	COMMISSIONER IEYOUB:
19	Present.
20	MR. FULKERSON:
21	Donald Briggs, LOGA. I don't see him logged on.
22	(Mr. Briggs did attend the meeting later.)
23	MR. FULKERSON:
24	Okay. Lisa Creasman, Nature Conservancy.
25	MS. CREASMAN:

1	Here. Sorry.
2	MR. FULKERSON:
3	That's no problem, ma'am.
4	Steve Maley, LOGA.
5	MR. MALEY:
6	Here.
7	MR. FULKERSON:
8	Barney Callahan. LWF, Sierra, and Audubon.
9	MR. CALLAHAN:
10	Here.
11	MR. FULKERSON
12	Tyler Gray, Mid-Continent.
13	(No response.)
14	MR. FULKERSON:
15	Nathan McBride.
16	(No response.)
17	MR. FULKERSON:
18	Okay. We've got five for a quorum, Mr. Commissioner or Mr.
19	Harris. We've got five out of eight.
20	SECRETARY HARRIS:
21	Very good. Thank you, Roby.
22	APPROVE PREVOUS MEETING TRANSCRIPT
23	SECRETARY HARRIS:
24	The first order of business is approval of the transcripts of our last
25	Commission meeting. Do I hear a motion to for that approval?

1	MR. MALEY:
2	So move.
3	COMMISSIONER IEYOUB:
4	Second.
5	SECRETARY HARRIS:
6	We have a motion by Mr. Maley. Is there a second?
7	COMMISSIONER IEYOUB:
8	Second.
9	SECRETARY HARRIS:
10	Second by Commissioner Ieyoub. All in favor of approving the
11	minutes or transcript, signify by saying "aye."
12	(All aye.)
13	SECRETARY HARRIS:
14	All opposed.
15	(No response.)
16	SECRETARY HARRIS:
17	The motion carries.
18	The next order of business, Roby.
19	MR. FULKERSON:
20	Yes, sir. The next order of business we've done roll call, previous
21	transcript, and now we're at fund status.
22	I'll do a quick couple of housekeeping things just since we're on
23	Zoom again to remind everyone, because I forgot as well, Michelle is
24	recording, our court reporter, if we could say if when we talk, if we
25	could say our name before we speak, that way she knows who to

transcribe whoever is talking about -- both for the -- anyone that talks, and we'll also have questions and public comments at the end.

There'll be a couple -- one or two places where we may stop along the way to discuss different projects. As it comes up, if y'all want to stop, just let me know.

I'll share the screen, and we'll kick it off. Okay. And I distributed this a little bit earlier, so I believe everyone has got it. If you had any issues, just let me know, and I can send it again right after the meeting.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

#### **FUND STATUS**

#### MR. FULKERSON:

The next order of business is fund status. So we -- we've changed the slideshow a little bit. I'm sure you all noticed. If you have any questions about it or if you want the -- kind of the format we had previously, we've kept that. We just did this -- kind of moved to a slideshow format to make it a little bit easier to see and kind of make the slides a little less busy, but if you'd like anything else, just let me know after the meeting.

You'll see two sides of this. There's a collection source on the left and an amount, and so this is kind of the total funds for the year. So LOGA, we've got about \$3,000. In gas tax, it's about 6.2 million. Oil tax is 464,000, a little less than 2,000 in interest. Our inactive well fee is 953,000. We have none in escrow. And the total funds we've collected for the year are about 8.3 million. The last number is a

projected. We've got a large draw -- the last one would be May, and the last draw should be 1.9 million, that's kind of a -- the estimate of what we've got.

If there's no questions, I'll continue onto the next slide.

So, on this graph, you'll see the annual OSR collections, and I kind of changed it. The two big fees populate along with an inactive well assessment. In blue, you'll find the OSR fees, oil fees. In red, you'll see the OSR gas fees. And in green is the inactive well assessment. And then the line plotted above it is the total, so that kind of gives you an idea of how the oil, gas, and inactive well fees change over time and kind of where we're at. We still have the \$1.6 million to incorporate, so that -- that'll get us up closer to what we were at last year.

If there's any questions.

#### MR. MALEY:

Hey, Roby. This is Steve Maley. Last time, there was some discussion that collection of the inactive well fee was lagging. Can -- can you update us on that?

#### MR. FULKERSON:

I know they were in the process of collecting it, and I believe that's still ongoing. I can check with Brent Campbell. He had to step out this afternoon. I can follow up with Brent and kind of find out where it is, but I -- I know they are in the process or are collecting it currently.

#### MR. MALEY:

Thank you.

#### SECRETARY HARRIS:

Roby, one question is, does that invoice go out every -- every spring; is that the -- the procedure?

#### MR. FULKERSON:

I believe so, yes, sir. I believe in the first couple of quarters, they send out an inactive well assessment fee. The exact timing on it, I'm not quite sure, but I believe that's correct.

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Thank you.

#### MR. ROSS:

Mr. Secretary, this was Gary Ross. With regards to the inactive well fee that Roby showed in his exhibit that they've collected 953,000, that represents about half — well, that represents half of what was — has been collected. So the cumulative of that would be over — about 1.9 million, and I believe they've billed for about 2.3 million, but they are still working with some others to — to provide for them paying their inactive well assessment at this time. And, hopefully, that would answer Steve Maley's question, also.

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Great. Thank you.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

All right. If that's the final question on that graph, let's go on to the next one. So this is a newer graph. I think I showed it last month. There's four large draws every year, and I -- I kind of wanted to use this graph so -- I found that kind of useful, so I thought I'd throw it in

there, as well. You can see in September, November, February, and May is where the largest -- the fees come in -- or the largest collection of fees. The fiscal years are shown to the right, so you'll see the highest was actually fiscal year of 2020, and that's going to be like the turquoise or blue on top. The purple would be this fiscal year. And you don't see it in August, because it essentially mimics the fiscal year of 2020. It's slightly lower in the last couple of draws. I think, overall, if we continue on our path, we'll end up right around a million less than last year. I'm going to guess that's largely due to COVID and kind of the uncertain times, but I -- I think a pretty good a year overall.

If there's any questions related to this graph? (No response.)

#### MR. FULKERSON:

Alrighty. Onto our next one, we had a request to discuss a little bit of financial security. We've kind of — I think they'd move some of the SSTA information off of here, so we kind of put it back on here. And if we don't get exactly what everybody wants, we can definitely update it again. But our financial security update, so they collected in this fiscal year, it's about 979,000, that's OSR operator — orphan operators, and that's money collected. And the total financial security collected should be right around 6.4 million.

I also included what funds we've spent. Some of it's financial security, some of it's SSTs. We used \$500,000 in Black Elk Energy Offshore. The Northstar Offshore Financial Security, we used

185,000, that was for Emergency 21-003 in Creole Offshore Field. And then LDC Operating, the 50,000, that was financial security tied to the GA Lyons or the South Thornwell Well.

We have two packages. One is currently — it's been bid and got awarded, and I think it's in the permitting process. And the second one is a Mesa Gulf Coast. The first is a Baby Oil. It's a Humphreys SSTA. There's three wells in the package. There's 13 wells total in the SSTA. The SSTA amount I show it about 1 million, and the bid is right below it. It's just slightly over the SSTA value, so there will be some use out of the OSR funds on it.

The second package, Mesa Gulf Coast recently went to orphaned, and they've got a few leaking wells in south Louisiana. I believe there's around 500,000 in there. I may be recalling incorrectly, but we plan on hitting that package early in the next fiscal year in south Louisiana.

Are there any questions related to this financial security at this time?

(No response.)

#### PROGRAM STATISTICS

#### MR. FULKERSON:

Alrighty. I'll continue on to the next page, the orphan well count versus wells plugged. Again, the well count is on the right, and on bottom is the year. As you can see in the fiscal year, blue is the amount of orphan wells we have, and red is the amount of wells we have plugged and abandoned. So, currently, we're at 4,525, and we've

plugged and abandoned 3,477.

Are there any questions related to this slide?
(No response.)

#### MR. FULKERSON:

Our next one is orphaned wells plugged. So we've got four different counts there. We've got the orphan well count, that's in blue. We've got plugged by -- by other means in red. Wells plugged by OSR funds in green, and total plugged by OSR funds and other means in purple. So, essentially, the wells we've got plugged -- we've had plugged the last couple of months since the last quarterly meeting, we've had one well plugged by the Coast Guard, which I'll highlight later, and the remaining wells have been plugged by OSR this time.

There are any questions about the orphan wells plugged graph? (No response.)

## OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION PROGRAM PROJECTS MR. FULKERSON:

Alrighty. So, previously, we'd thrown all the projects -- current projects, upcoming projects, and future projects and the north Louisiana mandate on that one operational slide, and it -- there was kind of quite a bit going on there. We've got that available if you'd like it. I kind of divided these up into different packages, fields, wells, and a cost to kind of give an overview of what we're looking at.

So the first slideshow we have is completed projects in fiscal year 2020 to 2021. We've had quite a few packages, so we've got 20-003 in Caddo-Pine Island. It was 11 wells and about 278,000. We've also got

1	20-004 in Monroe Field with four wells for 184,000; 20-005 in Monroe
2	Field from 19 wells and 280,000. Package 20-006 in Caddo-Pine
3	Island, that was two wells and 75,000. PA 20-007, South Timbalier
4	Block 8, four wells, and that's right around 3.4 million. That's the
5	Black Elk project we discussed on the previous slide with the \$500,000
6	in financial security. The next package is 20-009, that's Rousseau
7	Field. There was two wells, that was about 597,000. And we've got
8	two more in Caddo-Pine Island, one for 21 wells and the other for 36,
9	and that's 104,000 and 159,000 each. And one of the last projects
10	we've completed just recently is the Welsh project, 20-005, that was 14
11	wells and \$446,000.
12	Any questions on our completed projects?
13	MR. MALEY:
14	Yes. Roby, could you repeat the number at South Timbalier Block
15	8?
16	MR. FULKERSON:
17	Yes, sir. It is 3.4 million actually, it's \$3,441,640.
18	MR. MALEY:
19	No. That it was covered by a security of a half a million dollars?
20	MR. FULKERSON:
21	Yes, sir. It was covered by half a million.
22	MR. MALEY:
23	Okay. So 2.9 million, roughly, hits the OSR fund for that?
24	MR. FULKERSON:
25	That's correct

#### 1 MR. MALEY:

Okay. I guess it's a matter of looking online, but is there any discussion about -- I'm sure Black Oak -- Black Elk didn't develop that property. Is there any discussion about looking at the chain of title on it?

#### MR. FULKERSON:

We have looked up the chain of title, and I believe that goes to Blake, and I'm not quite sure where they are in the process, but we -- we have looked up that chain of title, and I'm not sure where we are in the process of recovering it.

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Steve, this is Tom Harris. Yes, we are required, not only given — the Office of the Secretary, the Secretary is mandated to seek to recover reimbursement for any well that exceeds the \$250,000 trigger, and we are required to go in inverse chronological order to seek recovery, and we do so on a regular basis.

#### MR. MALEY:

And is that -- so that's in progress?

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

That -- I'm not sure where it is in -- in progress, but, yes, within the next certainly this year, we'll begin that -- that process of -- of attempting recovery. You have to document having gone up the chain of -- of operators in inverse chronologic -- chronological order. Some you have to document that there was no response and there was no viable responsible party up the chain, have to dot all the I's and cross

the T's, but we do that on a regular basis, just as a matter of -- a matter of policy and procedure.

#### MR. MALEY:

Right. That's just such a big number, right. It would be important to follow up on it and keep track of it.

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

I -- I agree completely.

#### MR. MALEY:

Thank you.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

I'll keep going. The next one we have is completed emergency projects. So we've done three larger emergencies this year. The first package is 21-001 in Kaplan Field. If you'll remember, I want to say just before Hurricane Laura and some of the other hurricanes, we came across a tank battery that breached the secondary containment and was going to natural drainage. It was a saltwater disposal well, but it had quite a bit of oil and saltwater behind the containment. Essentially, the levees were overflowing. We went on and pumped that out, cleaned up the site, and we didn't plug and abandon the well on that package. We plugged and abandoned it on the Welsh package later. The first package was to clean the site up, essentially, before it was the middle of hurricane season, so we wanted to, essentially, create a safe environment rather than leave that something like a bigger environmental issue.

The next project we've got is 21-002, Boston Bayou, that was one

well for about a million dollars. If you'll remember correctly, after — I can't remember which hurricane, we had quite a few through there, but the — we had a well leaking in Boston Bayou after a hurricane. The well that actually frozen over the master valve, and both master and secondary master valve were leaking. We were able to P&A that well.

And then the last one is Creole Offshore Field in 21-003, 185,000. Post-hurricane, we found the production equipment hanging off the side of the platform offshore. We didn't P&A the well, but we hired a contractor to go out there to essentially remove any of the equipment that may fall off the side of the platform. And there was an ongoing leak that the BSEE found during their flyover. So we stopped the leak and removed all the equipment that could -- was in danger of coming off the side of the platform.

Are there any questions related to our emergency projects?

#### MS. PARKER:

Roby, this is Cassie. I just want to point out that that Boston Bayou, it was one wellbore, but it was two serial numbers.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

That's right. You're correct. I'm sorry. It was one wellbore, two serial numbers, that -- technically, I guess, you would put it as two wells. Thank you for that update.

And we'll go on to our next slide. So I -- I put this together because it -- I thought a pie chart might be useful. It's an actual OSR funds spent fiscal year 2020 to 2021. It kind of just shows you where the

largest block of money is going and kind of the different projects. So every different piece of the pie is one of our projects, and as you can see that, you know, there's quite a few more projects in north Louisiana, but the largest piece of the pie ended up going to Kaplan Field, Boston Bayou, Rousseau, and the South Timbalier Block 8 Field with Black Elk.

Are there any questions related to the first pie chart? (No response.)

#### MR. FULKERSON:

All right. Our next slide is current projects, so we've got five packages currently out. 18-005 in Monroe Field, that's four wells for 89,000. I believe those wells are just being carried over due to weather constraint. Since 2018, they haven't been able to get to the wells, and we just keep carrying them forward hoping that at some point we'll be able to get to them.

21-001 in Monroe is four wells and 63,000, that was built around a leaking well. It was the first package we got out this year. I believe the well -- we were able to button the well up, and it's no longer leaking, but, essentially, the weather has just not permitted us to get over there and complete that project.

And the bottom three, so, currently, Womack Brothers is on 21-003 in Caldwell. It's 21 wells and 222,000. They've had quite a bit of weather delay in north Louisiana, and that's pushed back the 003, 006, and 007. We've got operators — or I'm sorry — contractors on 003 in Caldwell and 007 in Caddo-Pine Island. Ideally, we'll complete all

1	three of these prior to year end.
2	Are there any questions related to our current projects?
3	MR. MALEY:
4	Roby, this is Steve Maley, again. Could you name the contractors
5	associated with, especially, those last three?
6	MR. FULKERSON:
7	Yes. So 007, I believe, is Elm Springs and 006 and 003, I believe,
8	are both Womack Brothers.
9	MR. MALEY:
10	Okay. And how about the other two, just for completeness?
11	MR. FULKERSON:
12	I believe 001 is Elm Springs, and I think 005 Cassie, correct me
13	if I'm wrong, is is that Elm Springs, as well?
14	MS. PARKER:
15	No, that's Womack Brothers.
16	MR. FULKERSON:
17	Okay. So, yeah, 005 is Womack Brothers.
18	MR. MALEY:
19	Thank you.
20	MR. FULKERSON:
21	No problem.
22	Okay. If there's no further, I'll go onto our upcoming projects.
23	We've got a handful. So for the first one is the 21-008, that's
24	Humphreys, and there's three wells for 1,090,000, that is the Baby Oil
25	package. We have SSTA funds for, I believe 1,027,000, so it will take

some funding out of -- of the project -- or the orphan fund. 1 We have 21-009 in Monroe, that's 26 wells for 303,000. 2 And we have one package, the bids are currently under review. 3 It's 21-010 in various fields in north Louisiana. There's 29 wells. 4 5 We've got the bids. Essentially, we're in the process of signing off on it. I believe the bid -- bidding was closed last Thursday, I believe. 6 We've got PA 21-011, that's Wildcat Lafayette. That's actually 7 Vermilion Parish. I believe I shared photos with it last -- I want to say 8 9 last quarterly meeting or our emergency meeting we had in December. The - after hurricane Laura, I believe, there was a freshwater SWD in 10 11 Vermilion Parish, and they had a 25,000-barrel tank that has been blown about three-quarters of a mile off a location, and two or three 12 other tanks were blown a mile to a mile-and-three-quarters away. 13 Essentially, we just want to get out there and get there before the next 14 hurricane season, because quite a bit of that equipment has been 15 blown guite a bit of ways away from the location. 16 We're also in the process of working on PA 21-012 in Golden 17 Meadow, that's 13 wells in Lafourche Parish. They're shallower wells. 18 We've got a few leakers over there, so, essentially, it's us addressing 19 20 some older wells, but the biggest issue is that one we're discussing with the CES would be wells that are mismarked, but that -- that one 21 has not been bid. And Vermilion Parish, I believe, may either be 22 currently out on the website or going to be out there shortly. 23 If there's any questions about these projects? 24 MR. MALEY: 25

Hey, Roby. The Golden Meadow package, is that -- are those marsh locations or land wells?

#### MR. FULKERSON:

They're land wells, yes, sir. I believe they're all — they are all land wells. I guess it's kind — some of — they don't look necessarily like a swamp, but it's definitely a more wetland area.

#### MR. MALEY:

Thank you.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

No problem.

I'll go on to -- and this is the estimated OSR fund expended during this fiscal year. So this was just for the projects that we have currently kind of out to bid or we know the prices on. So you'll see Humphreys is thrown in there. Any of the other projects, the 21-009, 010 is thrown in, as well. So you'll see that, when you add Humphreys, it also kind of splits everything up, as well. So the largest projects cost-wise still remain in south Louisiana, but you'll kind of see what our final year -- this is an estimated final year spending will be on the projects.

#### MR. MALEY:

Steve Maley, again. One suggestion I would make since -especially the legislature is always interested in the balance between
north and south Louisiana is to try to group them together and
associate them with well counts.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

Okay. Yeah. I -- I was --1 MR. MALEY: 2 -- that are getting plugged. 3 MR. FULKERSON: 4 5 I thought about doing that this time and I just hadn't come across a good way to do it yet, but I'll - since more than one person thinks 6 that way, I'll definitely work in that direction. 7 MR. MALEY: 8 9 Right. It -- it might be kind of busy and you might have to lose some of the detail on the -- on the labels, but I would think that would 10 11 be an obvious question somebody would want to ask. MR. FULKERSON: 12 Yes, sir. No -- good point. I'll -- I'll definitely -- I -- I'll try to 13 incorporate it for sure in our next slideshow. 14 MR. MALEY: 15 Thank you. 16 MR. FULKERSON: 17 Are there any further questions on funding, because we kind of 18 step away from funding, I believe, from here? 19 (No response.) 20 21 MR. FULKERSON: 22 The last thing on our project update -- or project summary is always the north Louisiana mandate. So we put out 12 total packages 23 in north Louisiana. There's 235 wells total in those packages. We 24

haven't P&A all those wells, of course, but we've spent about 923,000

25

to date, and we've budgeted about 2.4 million in north Louisiana. We've got another slide coming up later showing the weather, but the weather significantly delayed getting to quite a few of those wells up there. As you can see the rain we've had down here, they're also having up there, and they've got a bit more complex problems.

Any questions related to our north Louisiana mandate? (No response.)

#### MR. FULKERSON:

All right. And as I mentioned the north Louisiana weather, I believe the Shreveport and maybe the Monroe Office, as well, they usually provide pretty good photos of what they're facing out there. So, when you think north Louisiana, you think piney woods, but the piney woods actually have quite a bit of water out there. So you can see the locations and the location roads are flooded pretty well. A lot of the operators have gotten used to having to essentially pull the trucks or the rigs through the mud to get to some of the wells. So I know we've been doing that on some of the Shreveport packages recently, and possibly Monroe, as well, but if they can't access the site and it's mudded over, a lot of times, they'll try to use equipment to just drag the equipment onsite and go on about the plugging operations, but just depending on the flooding of it, that may not permit it.

All right. One thing I brought up this time and it's something that -- it's kind of -- there's quite a few of them, and we've had quite a few this year, so we've had about 50 leaking wells, and so we'll -- we'll intervene on them and we call it just -- the best name I could think of

it was a surface intervention. So, if we find a well leaking in — in the state that's an orphan well, whether it's gas or oil, we'll go to the site, try to clean it up, and repair the leak.

If you guys remember from South Thornwell, we had a leaking well out there and that one kind of -- if you let it leak and it continues to have -- be an issue, you may have a bigger problem later on. So we've spent about \$76,000 so far this year, and that's just repairing leaking sites, and then the cleanup, if at all possible, and that's 50 sites, north Louisiana, south Louisiana. We don't get much on water. But this is mostly all land wells.

If there was any questions related to this?

#### MR. MALEY:

Steve Maley, again. Are these -- is this an unusual level of activity, or is this just business that's always going on and we usually don't talk about it?

#### MR. FULKERSON:

I'm going to guess it's probably more routine. I just thought it was a -- when you got up to about a hundred thousand dollars, that's almost like one of our projects, so I just thought it would be something good to bring up to everybody that kind of goes around in the periphery so everyone kind of knows what, you know, it -- there's not a lot of ongoing leaks, and if there is, we try to get them repaired.

#### MR. MALEY:

Okay, good. Thank you.

#### **NAV AID PROJECT**

#### MR. FULKERSON:

The next one is kind of one we've all discussed previously. I -- I wasn't here at the time, but it's kind of come up again recently. I believe there was a well struck recently -- and, actually, I don't believe it was a well. It was a platform that may have been related to an orphaned well, so I -- I think that kind of initiated the nav aid discussion, again.

So a few years ago, we looked at putting nav aids, and I believe they did put nav aids on there. There's no Office of Conservation regulations related to nav aids. It comes from the Coast Guard. We put in here that, you know, the United States Coast Guard regulates private aides to navigational areas through an application process. Compliance is mandated in Title 33, Code of Regulations. U.S. Corps of Engineers requires it. Again, the current Conservation regulations do not address it.

So -- and it was something we wanted to discuss. The pricing is the pricing you guys saw a few years ago. I didn't really have -- I'm quite sure if we wanted to go out to a full scale and get another price estimate on it. We pulled how many orphaned wells we have on water, and you're looking at about 300 wells. If you'll look at this -- the chart to the right, that gives you the different priorities of the wells, 1A, 1, 2, 3, 4, the number of wells and the cost to install the nav aids. It's about 738,000, and that's about 200 nav aids. We're at 300 wells now, so I -- you know, just a safe estimate, I would think we're looking at somewhere between \$800 and \$1 million to install the

nav aids.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The previous nav aids weren't maintained. I believe that the maintenance program is around \$400,000 to \$500,000 on them. We haven't gone out to a full bid or a full quote process on it. It's just something, I -- I think both the Office of Conservation and then some of the Board members have brought up as a good discussion point.

So I'll kind of open the floor if anybody would like to talk about nav aids or have any suggestions for us.

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Has -- Roby, this is Tom Harris. Has anyone explored the potential for federal money to be used to get these wells into compliance with Coast Guard and Corps of Engineers requirements?

#### MR. FULKERSON:

I have not. I don't know that they have previously. It's something we can definitely try to take a look at.

#### MS. PARKER:

I think that was discussed when we first approached this subject in 2010, I think, but I'll have to go back and read past transcripts to see. I'm not 100 percent sure.

#### MR. MALEY:

It was a topic of discussion when I joined the board in 2012, but I don't remember federal money being discussed.

I had a question about your table, Roby, that priority doesn't have anything to do with the priority assigned to orphan wells, does it? I mean, this is — is this a separate evaluation?

#### 1 MR. FULKERSON:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe --

#### MS. PARKER:

That's the Coast Guard priority -- the priority the -- that the Coast Guard uses to determine whether or not a light needs to be installed on a well.

#### MR. MALEY:

Based on its -- you know, whether it sits in a -- a navigable, you know, heavily-trafficked, waterway or things like that, I would assume.

#### MS. PARKER:

Right, the -- the depth of the water, the navigable -- navigable waterway. There's quite a few different criteria it has to meet.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

And I believe not all 300 wells would meet that criteria. You know, some of the wells wouldn't require nav aids. Just a thought in my mind, I'm thinking Boston Bayou, that was a -- kind of a back-channel bayou that really you couldn't hardly get in and out of, so, you know, I imagine that one wouldn't require it, but some of the ones -- like Black Elk and a few others, I would imagine, would require it.

#### MR. ROSS:

Steve, this was Gary Ross. Back in 2010, when the issue came up after a well was struck in Terrebonne Parish, we did approach the Coast Guard, and, basically, their response was that they regulated it, but they didn't step in to maintain them. They did lend assistance in

reviewing the well sites that we sent them serial numbers and information. They're the ones that -- that basically classified the well locations and established the priority and told us what type of nav aid to attach or whether it required more than one nav aid. But, yeah, we had exercised, you know, the -- the potential for them to -- to fund it back in 2010.

#### MR. MALEY:

Right. And I -- I guess I understand why they answered the way they did. Now, in particular, since infrastructure and all those things are getting such a high level of attention, I would think -- I mean, the federal government spills this much money on an hourly basis, and it's certainly, in the interest of anyone using the waterways of the state to keep these things marked and lit.

I would think, you know, perhaps, you know, rather than just going to the Coast Guard, perhaps approach the congressional delegation or somebody that's on an appropriate committee and say, hey, what about this? You know, it's on -- on one hand, our option is to divert funds from plugging wells, which everybody wants to do, but on the other hand, we need to be able to keep people from running into them on accident, so...

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Steve, that's a very good point, well taken. We'll try to figure out -we'll reach out to our Louisiana's congressional delegation and see if we can get any assistance, and we'll report back to this Commission.

#### MR. MALEY:

1	That's great. That seems like it'd be low-hanging fruit, but I don't
2	know. What do I know?
3	SECRETARY HARRIS:
4	I I agree.
5	MR. MALEY:
6	Thank you.
7	MR. FULKERSON:
8	And we'll pursue it and try to bring it up in the fourth quarter
9	meeting, as well, to see if we have any progress at that time.
10	Does anyone else have anything related to nav aids they'd like to
11	discuss before moving on?
12	MR. BRIGGS:
13	This is Don Briggs. I just want to say that, I just feel like y'all
14	doing good work. I mean, there's still still a lot got a lot of work to
15	do and you're still making progress, that's good.
16	MR. FULKERSON:
17	Yes, sir. It feels like it though. The Districts are actually doing a
18	really good job trying to get a lot of this done. So I appreciate you guys
19	taking notice.
20	FEDERAL AND THIRD-PARTY ACTIVITY
21	MR. FULKERSON:
22	So kind of our next one I threw in there is sort of our federal and
23	third-party activity. We haven't seen much under the EPA post-
24	COVID.
25	We did have the Coast Guard P&A a leaking wells offshore. It

was a Yuma well. I think Yuma, the operator itself, has—did not go to work on it quite yet, but, essentially, they were in the orphan process. We orphaned two or three wells from Yuma in this area because we weren't sure which wells they were going to be exactly.

Once we orphaned them, when we found what was leaking, and it was actually a hole in the surface casing, the conductor, and I'm not sure if it went all the way to production or the tubing, but the Coast Guard intervened and P&A'd the well. So that — that was the one project this — this quarter completed by third party or the federal government.

And I believe the remaining Yuma wells will be going orphan here either this month or next month.

### INTRODUCE FOR APPROVAL NEW OSR CONTRACTORS MR. FULKERSON:

Kind of some of our business, we've got two new contractors, so we will have to do the formal vote to approve new OSR contractors. We've got two that applied this month. One is Fran Oil. I believe they may have been on there previously. The contact is William Andries, and they applied to work on land wells of all depths.

And I don't remember, John, do we need to have a majority or just someone a second?

#### MR. ADAMS:

We need to go through the -- the standard formal vote process, which means someone needs to make a motion to approve them.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

APRIL 15, 2021

1	Okay.
2	MR. ADAMS:
3	And then we need to have a a vote with the majority voting to
4	SECRETARY HARRIS:
5	Thank you, John.
6	But, before we do that, are there any representatives of either
7	Fran Oil or Total Well Services on the call that might like to introduce
8	themselves?
9	(No response.)
10	SECRETARY HARRIS:
11	Apparently not.
12	Is it the staff's recommendation to approve these new OSR
13	contractors?
14	MR. FULKERSON:
15	Yes, sir. One second, I'm sorry, I didn't get, it was Joshua
16	Rosamond, for land and water.
17	SECRETARY HARRIS:
18	Very good. This would be the appropriate time to entertain a $^{-}$ a
19	motion to approve these two new OSR contractors.
20	MR. BRIGGS:
21	Don Briggs, I so move.
22	SECRETARY HARRIS:
23	Moved by Mr. Briggs. Is there a second?
24	MR. MALEY:
25	Second.

1	SECRETARY HARRIS:
2	Before we vote, any any discussion or comments?
3	MR. STUTES:
4	This is Greg Stutes. I got your question earlier. Steve Maley had
5	invited me in, and Roby connected me. I'm on the advisory
6	Commission for Louisiana's Energy Environment and Restoration, and
7	which is called CLEER, so certainly just trying to fold in what
8	what y'all are doing with our mission that THAT we're developing as
9	we speak, so excellent presentation by everybody involved and
10	appreciate it.
11	Thanks, Steve, for getting me connected.
12	SECRETARY HARRIS:
13	Well, thank you for participating. It it's appreciated. We look
14	forward to working with you.
15	MR. STUTES:
16	Same here.
17	SECRETARY HARRIS:
18	So we have a a motion and a second to approve Fran Oil and
19	Total Well Services as new OSR contractors. All in favor, please,
20	signify by saying "aye."
21	(All aye.)
22	SECRETARY HARRIS:
23	All opposed?
24	(No response.)
25	SECRETARY HARRIS:

COILLI

That motion carries, and we welcome them as -- as new OSR contractors. That is, I believe, a good thing.

Our next order of business, Roby.

## UNDERWATER OBSTRUCTIONS PROGRAM 2020-2021 MR. FULKERSON:

Yes, sir. I was going to provide an update on our Underwater Obstructions Program for this fiscal year. If y'all remember, previously, we — we were asked to remove some anchors related to the BP netting in south Louisiana, specifically Mendicant and Beauregard Island. We bid the first one, and the bid came in quite high for the survey. It would have used up almost, you know, 75 percent of the funding just to survey rather than remove anchors. We're not quite sure where the anchors are in relation. They — they just have a general outline or how many anchors there are. So we — we — we pulled the project and just rebid one of the two islands hoping to reduce the amount of costs, so we can survey at and remove the anchors.

I think that the -- the Mendicant Island was, it seems like, completely surrounded by oyster reefs, and that was going to, I guess, pose quite a bit of operational issues. This one we rebid with just Beauregard Island, it does have some oyster leases around it, as well. I think at the point of our second project, anything in the oyster leases, we'll probably just leave in place, and everything -- any objects we find, whether anchor or any other object, we will remove it outside of the oyster leases. So that -- that project, I think, has just hit the

website again, so we should have that site visit and bid it here in the next month or so.

Any questions related to underwater obstructions?

#### MR. MALEY:

Yeah. Roby, this is Steve, again. I was reading through the minutes, and I -- I probably should've asked this question last time, but what's -- what's the logic for OSR being asked to pay this money? I mean, if the -- these obstructions were created as a result of the BP, you know -- reaction to BP spill, correct?

#### MR. ADAMS:

Mr. Maley, this is John Adams. OSR money is not being spent on this project. It's money from the — the Underwater Obstruction Fund, which is a separate fund. But OSR is providing the — the — the resources or the — actually, the — we're using the same OSR staff to provide the resources to the Department of Natural Resources who oversees the underwater obstruction management and — and — and — and funds and that sort of thing. So we're utilizing the — the resources that we have in place to provide bid packages for OSR, but all of the — the money and that sort of thing is — is coming from a separate fund and is not related to the OSR fund.

#### MR. MALEY:

Thanks. You -- you probably told us that last time, and thanks for refreshing my memory. That -- that's sounds fine.

#### MR. ADAMS:

Sure, not a problem.

able to address.

MR. ROSS:

24

25

#### **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 1 And, John, Tom Harris here. Just for clarification, the -- that 2 separate fund is funded by a fee paid by the pipeline companies; is 3 that correct? 4 5 MR. ADAMS: Yes, sir. 6 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 7 And, basically, it's -- it -- the way the statute for the Underwater 8 9 Obstruction Fund reads, if it -- when the fund balance dips below a certain amount, the fee is reinstituted to kind of top up that 10 11 obstruction removal fund. MR. ADAMS: 12 Well, for -- for underwater obstructions, essentially, \$250,000 is 13 placed into the fund annually, so whatever is spent out of it is simply 14 replaced the following year. 15 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 16 Thank you, John. I appreciate that clarification. Thanks. 17 MR. MALEY: 18 But it -- it still kind of seems like if the obstruction resulted from 19 the BP spill -- I mean, BP is \$65 billion into recovering from that 20 21 mistake. Is this money being spent on their behalf? MR. ADAMS: 22 That's an excellent question, and that's above my pay grade to be 23

This - this is Gary Ross. We were approached last year by Jerome Zeringue who requested that we utilize the funding of underwater obstruction to help remove that. I think Blake Canfield probably has more detail with regards to it, but we worked with - with the group because anchors had previously been removed, utilizing what source of funding, I'm not aware of, but we dealt with the same contractor who had done it before. And at the time, Representative Zeringue estimated it to be about \$200,000 to remove those. Well, as Roby indicated earlier, that the bid just to assess -- to identify the actual location of the anchors was -- what was it, Roby, 170,000 or something like that? MR. FULKERSON:

Yes, sir, that's correct, about 170,000.

#### MR. ROSS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, therefore, we -- we -- secondly, as -- as we noted, the large number of oyster leases in the area. So it could stand to reason that -that, previously, when this was bid out, the work was being done, it didn't go into these areas where the oyster leases were, and so that's why they were left over. But it - it appears that the price is going to be way more than just -- way more than the 200,000, if assessment was going to be simply \$170,000.

Now, also, Steve, with regards to one of your questions on the difference in the funds, OSR has utilized some of the Underwater Obstruction Removal Fund, in association with some of the OSR projects that are out on the water when they have to do site clearance

1	verification-type activity.
2	MR. MALEY:
3	And Mr. Zeringue is a legislator?
4	SECRETARY HARRIS:
5	Yes, he is.
6	MR. ROSS:
7	Yes.
8	MR. MALEY:
9	That dealt with that kind of stuff.
10	Yeah, I just as a citizen, I find it odd that public money that's
11	is being spent for something where there's a an obvious cause, but
12	we don't need to belabor this meeting with with that point.
13	MR. ADAMS:
14	Mr. Maley, just to add a little bit to that again, this is John
15	Adams while that that fund, it's it's money that is collected from
16	pipeline operators, so that I I don't know that it's completely
17	accurate to to classify it as public money. But my appreciation is
18	that the that fund also has the authority to seek reimbursement
19	from viable entities for work that $\cdots$ that is done. But, again, I $\cdots$ I
20	believe the cost has to be expended first.
21	MR. MALEY:
22	Okay. Well, I would think that would be a wise thing to do.
23	Sounds like if the statutory limit is a quarter of a million, it will be
24	exceeded.
25	SECRETARY HARRIS:

And -- and this is just semantics, but I -- I consider monies collected on fees to be public funds, but that's probably moot for this discussion, just my opinion.

#### MR. MALEY:

The legislature has the power to make them public when they want to.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

That is correct.

Thank you, John.

### MR. MALEY:

Thank you, guys.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### MR. FULKERSON:

All right. If there's no further questions, I'll slide onto the next bit of business. Our performance indicators, as we discussed, we used to have, I think, high priority, how many wells we P&A'd, they've kind of changed it this year to simplify it, so it's just how many wells we've abandoned. Our goal is 225 for this year. The last quarter, we have abandoned 32, so we're getting -- sitting at 115. I want to say we have like 150 additional wells out there for being -- for plug and abandonment. We're, essentially, just waiting on weather, mostly in north Louisiana. We have a couple of projects in south Louisiana. Golden Meadow isn't bid yet, and the Freshwater is only one well, so the bulk of the wells would come from north Louisiana remaining. It's just kind of depending on whether we get the weather window to

# OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION COMMISSION MEETING APRIL 15, 2021

1	accomplish that goal or not. We believe we still will hit the goal, but
2	that's a question, but but that I guess we'll find out next time we
3	all get together.
4	Any questions related to performance indicators?
5	(No response.)
6	PROJECT UPDATES
7	MR. FULKERSON:
8	All right. I'll slide on to the next part. We had a request come in
9	for an update on the DeSoto Parish project from I believe it's
LO	Emergency 18-003. We asked Gary Snellgrove with the Office of
l1	Conservation, our environmental team, to kind of give an update, and
12	I'll hand the floor over to Mr. Snellgrove, and he's got a few slides and
L3	I guess some brief updates.
L4	So, Mr. Snellgrove, whenever you're ready, sir.
L5	MR. ADAMS:
L6	We're not hearing you, Gary.
L7	(Off-the-record discussion.)
L8	SECRETARY HARRIS:
L9	Gary, while we're waiting, would you introduce yourself for the
20	record, please?
21	MR. SNELLGROVE:
22	Yes. I had done that earlier, but I'll do it again.
23	SECRETARY HARRIS:
24	Oh, thank you.
25	MR. SNELLGROVE:

I couldn't -- my conversation. Anyway, yeah, Gary Snellgrove, Environmental Division Director. The role that I play in this EMER 18-003 emergency has been as a project coordinator, and my primary focus -- focus has always been on public safety and environmental -- on the environmental side of things. So, with that being said, what I'm going to present is -- gives you an update. Back in -- now I'm going off memory. I had all my notes on my desktop, and I don't have them with me, so I apologize for that.

But back in August of 2008, I was asked to give an update at that point in time, which I did. I came before the Commission, and I gave a package out that included where we were at that time and the response, which began — the first evidence that we had of a — of a problem out there was with this water well that, was — was venting into the atmosphere. And I think it was in July of 2017.

So, again, in June — in August of 2018, I was asked to give an update to wherever we were, and I did, and I gave you a package. And in that package was this — was this map that you see. So this map, along with the information that was provided, we had a — a site investigation plan that was implemented at that time. This map identifies what we had identified — what we had established at that point in time to be the area of investigation out there after the gas was discovered. And the extent of what we found gas to be in the area is depicted by the little green cross marks.

And so the idea there was to get into an -- to have an area established with boundaries that -- that would encompass all of what

we knew to exist at that time, and -- so that we could have that area established so that anything -- any activity inside of the -- that nine-square-mile area would, you know -- any penetrations would need to come before our agency so that we would know what was going on or penetrations into the -- you know, below the aquifer or through the aquifer into the subsurface to make sure that we had proper safety measures in effect and what have you.

So that's -- that's how we had established, at that time, these nine sections, based on the -- again, the -- the location of where we knew we had gas in the aquifer. And what you see with the red dots are the water -- the oil and gas wells in the area that we had established at that time to be of interest or investigation to determine a source or -- and/or migration pathway.

This package that I had provided to you back then was about eight pages or so. It also included some financial information that was provided by the OSR Program staff. So you had some tables in there that showed finance — money spent to date up to that point in time, or, again, August of 2018. And it also included an outline of the topics — or the — or the information that I presented, and so we moved through that and explained where we were at this time.

And in summary -- and reading the minute notes that were provided for the public record back then freshen up on that and -- in summary. And, basically, at that point in time, we weren't able to have that, and, at that time -- we had not at that time determined the source of the gas, and although it was still under investigation and

that we hadn't concluded and found a definitive source. And we had the -- by -- by that point in time, we'd already established several vent wells in the area that -- that had -- that were apparently providing some relief from the -- from the gas pressure in the aquifer, in addition to some efforts that were made to -- on some wells and wellbores in the area where we found some mechanical integrity issues, and those wells were isolate -- the situations were isolated and plugged and repaired. And after that activity, we started to see the -- the gas, beginning to retreat, if you will, and the pressures going down, conditions improving. So, as we -- that's where we ended in August of 2018.

So, to date -- Roby, to the next slide -- so to date -- this one here. Yeah. Okay. So sometime thereafter, I think it was towards the end of 2018 -- again, I don't have the supplements with me, but there -- the supplement, I believe is the third, and, at that point in time, we'd had enough data to actually shrink the area of investigation from the nine-mile -- square-mile original AOI, area of investigation, to what you see here on this map, which is, you know, a reduced -- so what we have is a portion of Section 22, all of the Section 27, and a portion of Section 28, where we had identified definitively that we still had gas issues. We still had pressure in the aquifer, and we -- we could eliminate any of the areas outside of this box based on what we had established and, you know -- and determined that we did not -- we no longer had gas issues. So that was in the latter part of -- after your meeting and your update and prior to the end of that year, we had already gotten to this

# OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION COMMISSION MEETING APRIL 15, 2021

point in the -- in the emergency response effort with the -- again, the repair and isolation of issues with a few wells -- or the gas wells in the area, and the -- the vent wells that were out there, you know, providing relief.

So let's go to the next slide. Then in 2020, I think it was April of 2020, there was a fifth supplement to the emergency order, and that provided for an additional reduction of the size of the area of investigation and -- and mainly -- well, only what was reduced at that time was the -- the rectangle -- rectangular portion outside of Section 27, which was the part of Section 28, which included the Hanson and the Billingsley wells. And, at that point in time, we had -- we were able to establish that there were -- there was no more gas pressure in that area at those properties. The -- the water wells had calmed down, and the pressures had abated.

The OSR Program entered into — with — into the wells at these locations — or the gas wells in these locations and found that they weren't contributing. So we had concluded the investigation, and, thankfully, the gas abated to where that area was no longer of concern, so it was removed accordingly.

And so this is where we're at. We still have pressure in Section 27. We have an OSR well that was entered. The Artis Martin recovery well was established from a reentry at -- at the Artis Martin property in -- almost in the central portion of Section 27, and that well is still venting at a -- at a significant rate to date. It's -- it's -- it was a reentry and perforated a wellbore from an -- again, an existing oil and gas

producing well at one time, and we just happened to perforate and, thankfully, in a -- in an area where it would sustain production -- gas production and it has ever since.

Other wells have produced in that same section, but they, for whatever reason, have either bridged over, sanded up, and they're no longer serving to vent gas in Section 27. So we — we do — we know that we still have gas, at least in the central portion of Section 27, and so, therefore, that's why we have included that, as well as the Indigo relief well.

If you look in Section 22 -- right, thanks, Roby, for pulling it back up -- so we still have some pressure issues in what appears to be either with the gas or some issues still in the lower portion of Section 22. So that's why we -- we remain to date with emergency conditions, and that is our status.

If you can go to the next slide below the maps.

#### MR. FULKERSON

I'll stop the share and switch screens on you guys if you'll give me a second.

### MR. SNELLGROVE:

Right. Okay. So, in February, this — this table is dated February of 2020, at the — at our request, we asked Elm Springs to give us an update on the — the sites that the OSR Program had a footprint at — as far as this response. So this table represents what remains to close out the sites that Elm Springs, under the OSR Program, did some — did some type of investigative or — activity during the EMER 18

1 response.

So -- so these are the ones -- this 176,777 is what remains, estimated costs for closing out all of them, the OSR-related project sites inside of the original nine AOI. And that was the end of it.

So this -- this is just a summary of what remains, so I felt that it was -- since you guys are interested in -- in costs that this would be important to show where we are with that response.

Now, I'd say, with respect to costs, Indigo has voluntarily contributed to the — through escrow agreements with our agency. I think there are now two. We just received notice that we're going to have a \$100,000 escrow entry for work in Section 28, i.e. the Hanson and Billingsley locations. So it's a little more than what we anticipated costs to be, but as these projects go, sometimes they are over in — you know, items that exceed, so there was a little bit of extra put into that agreement to cover any additional costs in Section 27 for addressing the Hanson and Billingsley closures.

Yeah. So the conclusion of these projects will be to go back to any wells that were entered and -- and risers put on and gauges and stat -- (unintelligible) that -- to serve as any type of -- to serve as means to determine if there's any gas pressure that would have either bailed the well or may have occurred over time. So the goal there would be to go back and get on those well locations and remove the risers and -- and, you know, plug the well back to its -- stay five feet below the surface or whatever the requirement is under the program, and then to eventually, you know, dress out the surface of the property, grade it,

seed it, and allow it to return back to natural conditions. So that's -- that's what these estimates represent of what's remaining out there.

I don't have any other information to present. That's where we are today with the response, and I'll entertain any questions to the extent that I'm able.

## **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Gary, this is Tom Harris. Where are we -- and I know we've had this discussion in the past, but I'd like to know if anything has changed as far as being able to identify a single responsible party?

### MR. SNELLGROVE:

So the — the investigation that was conducted concluded, and the conclusion was that we found no source. We did not — we were not able to establish a definitive source of natural gas for — that was the goal of the reentry and the things that were done to address all of the wells that were out there, but there was also a study that was done of gas — natural gas in the area, both of what — which was producing, which was being emitted to the, you know — out of the Hanson well. And Weatherford performed a geochemistry isotopic evaluation of all the gas, and the conclusion of that was that they — they were — they were not able to establish a comparative match definitively from any other gas in the area to the gas that was coming out of the Hanson — out of the oil well. So they — they — they were not — they were not able to establish, you know, a particular formation where the gas could've — could've come from or originated from.

What they found was, interestingly enough, found Smackover,

some signature of Smackover gas in this — in this gas that was coming out in the Hanson, and it appeared that — based on the report that it was a — it was a mixture. There was — you know, as I recall reading the report — and it's available on our — on our web page, it's this Weatherford report that came out, I think it was in September of 2018, about a month after I presented the package to — to this Commission. The report is out there again on — on our webpage. We have a DeSoto Parish icon where you can point and click on it and get you all the data and all of those supplements and orders, directives, and maps, and information that I presented to you at this — on these tables is all there. It's all out there.

But that -- that was the bottom line, that the -- the geochemistry report, third-party report, came in and did not give us a definitive source of gas, and nor have we found to date that.

Now, we did -- we did identify some wells that contributed to migration. One of them was an OSR well that was entered the Mason 1. We found that there was an issue with cement downhole a depth. Once we plugged it, within -- within an hour or so, the bubbling at that surface stop. So we know it was contributing just by empirical evidence. There was a well offsite from that area nearby, the Mason 27, and it was found that that well had some integrity issues, that well was repaired and now is an inactive status, and we saw, eventually, the pressure at the Mason completely go away. Because at one point we used the Mason -- our Mason well as a vent wet, and it didn't last very long, but that's because the problem was addressed -- the

on, Machelle.

25

pathway was addressed nearby. So - so that situation calmed down. 1 And then of course we had -- there was integrity issues with 2 another well at -- I think it's a Thomas (phonetic) well, where we had 3 gas bubbling at the surface too. That well was opened and reentered 4 5 and then addressed, and we found that the bubbling in that area went away after that well was -- was plugged back. 6 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 7 Thank you, Gary. I appreciate the information. That was - that 8 9 was very helpful. MR. SNELLGROVE: 10 11 Yes, sir. MR. FULKERSON: 12 Do you have any additional questions or follow up on 18-003 before 13 we proceed with the next topic? 14 (No response.) 15 MR. FULKERSON: 16 All right. 17 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 18 Hearing none, please, proceed. 19 MR. FULKERSON: 20 21 The next update, we've got two previous emergencies from a year, maybe two years ago. We've got a South Thornwell and a Valentine 22 update. I'll hand it over to Machelle Hall, with the Attorney General's 23 Office. I think she'll provide the Valentine update, I believe, if you're 24

## MS. HALL:

Yes. I'm providing the Valentine update, and another update, as well, for Lytel (phonetic).

## MR. FULKERSON:

Perfect.

## MS. HALL:

Okay. So for Lytel (unintelligible) — let me see here — the — the law — there's already an ongoing lawsuit which we intervened in. The trial in that lawsuit — that is a landowner suit. That law — that trial is set for July 26th through August 16th, but we have hired outside counsel, Patrick McIntire from Oats and Marino, to manage this case — or actually the DNR has. And they have filed a Motion to Sever the DNR's claims from the landowner's claims. That motion is set for May 11th. Right now the attorneys are checking to see if anyone objects. There was some discussions that needed to happen with two of the lawyers to see if they had any objections, and they had not yet heard back from them the last time that I talked to them. And so, if it is not severed, then this is currently scheduled to go to trial at the end of July. If we are severed, we will be reset for some time later than that.

Does anyone have any questions about that, the Lytel update?

### MR. FULKERSON:

And Lytel, just so everybody knows, that is South Thornwell or the GA Lyons.

## MS. HALL:

And then on the Valentine suit, which is also Harangue Well No.

1	3, the Attorney General's Office is representing Conservation in that
2	litigation, and we filed the suit in 2019, in October, and we've been a
3	bit delayed with that, both because of COVID and other things, and
4	working out some of the defendants and getting an answer and dealing
5	with exceptions. But now we are beginning discovery in that matter.
6	I hope that we may be able to resolve that suit within about a year,
7	but I can't promise that, that suit may last a couple of years to resolve
8	it, and so right now we are suing the entity that we believe hit the well
9	with their equipment, as well as their insurance company. And so we
10	still have quite a bit of work to do on those suits or in that suit.
11	Are there any questions about that; is that enough information for
12	everyone?
13	MR. FULKERSON:
14	No. I think that was perfect, Machelle. Thank you very much.
15	Does anybody have any questions for her? That was a great
16	update.
17	MR. MALEY:
18	No. That's what we were looking for. Thank you.
19	MS. HALL:
20	All right. Thank you, everyone.
21	SECRETARY HARRIS:
22	Thanks, Michelle.
23	OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS
24	MR. FULKERSON:
25	Okay. Sliding on, I'll move on to our last couple of slides here

actually, last slide, new business, old business.

We've got a few things. I believe John Adams may give us an update on a few things, and we've got a few -- a request from the Commission members, so we'll start with John and go from there.

## MR. ADAMS:

This is John Adams. Yes. One of the Commission members had asked for a — an update an update on the — the Louisiana Oilfield Restoration Association Program. Some of you may recall that the Commissioner entered into a cooperative endeavor agreement with LORA in November of 2019. At that time, we estimated that it would take three-and-a-half to four years for the program's reserve account to reach the \$5 million mark, at which time LORA will begin using a portion of its proceeds to plug orphan wells. As of now, their reserve account is at \$1.7 million, which is slightly ahead of the three-and-a-half-year prediction. They're — they're currently doing business with about 110 operators, which, again, is about where we predicted they should be at this stage. So, at this point, they're proceeding almost exactly as predicted, and they are on schedule to begin plugging orphan wells in about two years from now.

Does anyone have any questions about that?

#### MR. MALEY:

That's -- no. I had asked the question, and that satisfies me. Thank you.

### MR. ADAMS:

Thank you.

# MR. FULKERSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Perfect. You'll see first on there is recoupment of funds update. I think we kind of went over that, that was mostly geared around South Thornwell and Valentine, so we can kind of check that box.

And Mr. Maley had actually put together a monument proposal, and I'm not sure if I saw the gentlemen on here or not, but if it -- if he's available, this would be a good time to present it, and I can pull up the slides.

### MR. MALEY:

Yeah, I -- this is putting a trial balloon for the OSR. I've known Chris McLindon who's an independent geologist in the New Orleans area, an independent geologic consultant, for a number of years. And on two or three occasions, I've seen his presentation to industry groups relating to coastal erosion, land loss, subsidence, all those things in south Louisiana. And he is working with a group of renowned scientists from -- and he'll fill you in -- LSU, Tulane, and LUMCON, different places like that, and they have a -- they have found it difficult to monitor subsidence and -- in the coastal zone. Their costs to establish new monuments from the grassroots is quite high, and Chris came up with the idea, how about orphan wells to the extent that there are problematic wells that OSR has not been able to address or are not in immediate plans for removal, perhaps some of those can be converted into geospatial monuments, and that's about the limit of what I know about it. I've -- Chris has a -- a formal proposal that I -- I think -- not really looking for any kind of up-or-down approval in this

# OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION COMMISSION MEETING APRIL 15, 2021

meeting, but perhaps a formation of a working group to study the proposal, see if there's any common interests. I think it makes a lot of sense for orphan wells to be thought of as part of a global coastal restoration — the coastal restoration people should be thinking about orphan wells when they do their business and vice versa. So I'll shut up and introduce Chris, and, you know, whatever he has to say. It's — it's kind of a — a new idea, you know. Maybe we can take lemons and make lemonade out of them. So, anyway, here's Chris.

### MR. MCLINDON:

Steve, thank you very much.

I've worked as a -- a geologist primarily in the oil and gas industry for the last 40 years, and about ten years ago, I began working with the local universities helping to provide them access to oil and gas industry seismic data to study the relative contribution of faults and subsidence.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

### MR. MCLINDON:

So, anyway — and — and Mr. Briggs was instrumental in the very early stages of — of helping to kick off this program. We have now had eight university research projects completed using industry seismic data, three more in the works. And I believe, as a result of that university research, the Water Institute of the Gulf last year put together an expert panel on neotectonics, which was intended to study the relationship between geology and subsidence.

And it was in one of those meetings that there was a discussion

that it's actually very difficult to determine the relative contribution of the various sources of -- or processes that cause subsidence. And there are two major groups which you'd consider to be deep, tectonic movement that -- associated with a fault, and then shallow compaction. And the reason was, even though several of the monuments that are used with GPS to measure the -- the motion of the earth's surface, even though those are driven to refusal, that's not deeply enough anchored, that there's a phenomenon called down-drag, in which compaction does pull those down. And so you're -- you're -- they're still measuring the combined effect of both shallow compaction and deep tectonic forces.

And so that discussion on -- you know, to speculate on what -- what -- where we could possibly find a -- a deeply -- or how could we get a deeply-anchored monument which would record only the deep component of subsidence and, therefore, allow -- begin the process of allowing to differentiate the two.

This is important because it points — if you could — if you could make that determination, it points your efforts in how to manage the coastal restoration program and — and how to monitor potential impacts on infrastructure. If — if compaction is more important, than you really want to focus on mapping the highly organic soils, which are the most compactible, but if it turns out that faulting is a component that is important, then — then — then it — it leads you to — to want to put more effort into mapping those faults.

So that discussion evolved into putting a group together. There --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there are 12 of us now. Dr. Frank Tsai with LSU Department of Civil Engineering just contacted me and requested to join the group a short while ago. We put this proposal together that Steve has, and we actually put it out almost exactly a year ago, and so right into the COVID mess, and -- and nothing really happened with it. I was still willing to let it sit there for a while until things sorted out, but then I heard that there was consideration on a national level of making -addressing orphan wells a component of the big infrastructure package. And so I thought, well, maybe there's an opportunity here to put together a proposal to try to get in front of the federal government and see if we could bring in some federal funding to convert -- and -and - and - and, really, it's just a question of abandoning the wells, securing them, and then LSU with the Center for Geoinformatics would take care of putting the equipment on, and they would -- they would maintain the equipment. As Steve has alluded to, there's a lot of other questions in - in exactly how you get that done.

But the map that's up there now, the "the CORS is "is Continuously Operating Reference System, those are the main reference GPS stations. Your cell phone and every other GPS device looks to those for coordinates constantly operating. The "the red circles are tide gauges, which are also used to measure subsidence."

And then our group selected the six wells, which have the API numbers associated with them. The selection process was both geological, this would be a good -- we -- we tried to choose areas that probably had higher subsidence rates based on their geological setting

and then their surface conditions. And you could see the — the — the well down in Plaquemines Parish, that's in Bastian Bay that has a nice, steel deck there. Steve and I have discussed this actually briefly. I believe that well has been abandoned, but the surface equipment was left in place because of concerns over the oysters in the area. So that — that's in a high subsidence area. It's got a — it's got surface equipment that would make it accessible as a GPS station.

And by comparison, up in the south part of Lake Borne, that SBCH, that's the Shell Beach Corps Station, that's out in the water, that cost them \$600,000 to -- to install. So the -- the -- the challenge in measuring subsidence in south Louisiana right now is that it's very expensive to go out and put a facility in areas where you think you have the highest subsidence rate, because most of them are in the -- out in the marsh or in the water.

So I appreciate your time. Steve mentioned it's just a trial balloon, but I and -- and the rest of the team are available for any further discussions, and -- and, certainly, if it comes to putting a proposal together to try to attract some federal money, I'll be available to work on that.

#### MR. FULKERSON:

APRIL 15, 2021

Okay. Well, thank you so much, Chris and Steve, for bringing that up. I think it seems like a — kind of a worthy repurposing of some of these wells and something we can definitely try to set up a meeting and get together and see if we can talk about what wells you guys are interested in and what we can do and kind of how this all would fit

together. And maybe the next meeting we'll have some type of a proposal to put together.

## MR. MCLINDON:

Great. Thank you very much.

#### SECRETARY HARRIS:

Chris, I do have one question. This is Tom Harris. I noticed -- I can see some of these are pretty clearly on State water bottoms. Are any of these sites on privately-held lands?

### MR. MCLINDON:

I -- I would have to venture a guess that they are, yes. And I don't -- that's not a criteria I really look at. I -- I just assume that, you know, if -- if -- if the wells were in the program to be abandoned, then, you know, if we could -- it -- it -- one that was in a really good location could just be moved up the priority list. That's my initial thought was we could just move one or two of them up to the priority list and then put the GPS equipment on them. It -- it shouldn't be much different than normal procedure to abandon a well, other than leaving the surface equipment in place.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

I think this is a very worthy effort, and I would -- I would be supportive, personally. My question is, if -- and this, I guess, would be to John Adams, and I don't know, John, if you're able to answer this on the -- on the fly, but do we -- can we authorize this activity on privately-held lands that are -- you know, are -- have an orphaned well on them?

## MR. ADAMS:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, that's an excellent question, Mr. -- Mr. Secretary. The answer is, I don't know. We would certainly have to perform some research to find out. The Commissioner -- the Commissioner certainly has authority over accessing for purposes of removal all of the -- the -- the well equipment and -- and -- and structures and those sorts of things, but I think it's an entirely different question to utilize it for -- for purposes of -- of turning it into some -- a monitoring station or adding equipment to it.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

I suspected as much. Thank you. And I -- I assumed you wouldn't have the answer at the ready yet because I've never heard this question posed before. Thank you.

### MR. ADAMS:

Yes, sir. Thank you.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

We definitely -- we definitely need to look into it.

## MR. FULKERSON:

We'll work that way. I appreciate it.

I guess, Mr. Secretary, the last thing we have is open the floor for any questions. I'll kind of turn it over to you or any questions, sir.

## **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Thank you, Roby. Excellent job, by the way. Thanks for -- for all you and your staff do.

Are there any questions or comments, first, from -- let's start with

1	the Commission members?
2	MR. MALEY:
3	I've been pretty active asking questions, so and I'm not shy, so
4	most of them have been answered throughout the meeting. Thank you
5	very much. It was very informative.
6	SECRETARY HARRIS:
7	And I I personally appreciate all your questions, Steve. Thank
8	you.
9	PUBLIC COMMENTS
10	SECRETARY HARRIS:
11	Are there any questions? We'll open it - open to the public, any
12	public comments or questions?
13	MR. COENEN:
14	Yes. This is Will Coenen. Can y'all hear me?
15	MR. FULKERSON:
16	Yes, sir.
17	MR. COENEN:
18	Good afternoon, everybody. I had a couple of questions about the
19	Bethany-Longstreet issue. And I know Mr. Snellgrove handled that,
20	and I'm not sure if he's still there, but maybe I can just pose these
21	questions to the Commission.
22	Mr. Snellgrove identified at least three wells in the Section 27 and
23	28 area that I think he described as contributing to the migration or
24	otherwise having integrity issues. There was the Mason No. 1 which I

think is Serial No. 158546, there was the Mason 27 No. 1 which is

25

# OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION COMMISSION MEETING APRIL 15, 2021

Serial No. 123766, Thomas 28-2 which is 229067. Two of those three are Indigo wells. The other one is a Halwig (phonetic) well, which is now -- that company was acquired by Chevron. The total expenditures I think I saw on the last report, total expenditures associated with dealing with the Bethany-Longstreet problem was about \$4.2 million, and I think Mr. Snellgrove identified another at least \$176,000 that'll have to be spent going forward.

My question is, has any effort been made to recover any of that \$4.2 million and the forthcoming \$176,000 from Chevron and Indigo? MR. ADAMS:

Mr. Coenen, that's — we appreciate you asking those questions. This is John Adams. As this is a — the — the portion of the meeting here is — is — is — is particularly for comments, we were not prepared to answer those questions. Mr. Snellgrove is not in the room with us anymore, but we will gladly look into that, and if you would like to schedule a meeting or conversations with us later to follow up on that, we'll be glad to do that.

## MR. COENEN:

Okay. And -- and one other question, if I may, the -- the Chevron Mason No. 1, and I think a couple of these other wells, were put into the orphan well program. What was the particular reason for putting the Mason No. 1 Well into that program when it's, obviously, the responsibility of somebody that has money? I mean, Chevron has plenty of money to pay for its own P&A operations.

### MR. ADAMS:

1	Again, we've received your comment, and and and we
2	appreciate that.
3	MR. COENEN:
4	Okay. There's other wells that I can send to your attention maybe
5	by an email, but like Southern Natural Gas had a well, I think, that
6	was put into the orphan program called the Bess McMichael Well,
7	Serial No. 109699, and a Southern Natural Gas is, obviously, currently
8	a going concern, as well. So I would ask the same question with
9	respect to Southern Natural Gas.
10	MR. ADAMS:
11	Your comments are received.
12	COURT REPORTER:
13	Mr. Coenen, this is the court reporter. Are you representing any
14	particular interest?
15	MR. COENEN:
16	I'm calling today on my own behalf, ma'am, as a member of the
17	public, interested party.
18	COURT REPORTER:
19	Okay. That's fine, that's fine.
20	MR. COENEN:
21	If I can and I probably need to clear up that serial number on
22	the Mason 27 No. 1. It's 237166. Thank you.
23	SECRETARY HARRIS:
24	At this time, are there any other public comments or questions?
25	MR. HAIK:

Yeah. This is Richard Haik. I mean, I will make a comment. I'm definitely not going to ask a question.

When -- when we look at the graphs and you look at (unintelligible), it may be a good idea to look at the taxes as the -- or the collection, even if they are a tax, the collections as a percentage of the total value that's produced in that area, whether it's value of gas or the value of -- of oil. As -- as the price moves up and down, it would give the Commission -- it would give this Commission an idea of the value -- the collect -- the value that's being extracted from the state versus value that's being left over to clean up whatever becomes orphaned. That's the first comment.

The second comment is -- so -- so, when you're looking at that, we -- we then look at it, in this second comment, the value of oil and gas produced in Louisiana versus the -- versus the rest of the country. And we look at the Resource (phonetic) Conservation Recovery Act, that's federal funds, and what percentage of those funds are coming back to Louisiana. We should look at that every -- on a (unintelligible) case. And the reason for that is that certain states are getting a lot larger share of those funds than Louisiana. We -- we may not have an idea of what we're getting back as -- from that federal program, but we should.

The other note I was -- and I'm always -- I'm like an insurance guru on this, because it always bothers me somewhat. Anytime -- anytime we're do-- and we talked about navigational aids. Anytime we're working on water, to get a Coastal Use Permit and you're on

water, you have to comply with Coast Guard navigational aids, that's part of the -- part of the permit. If you don't comply, you're not going to get the permit. Consequently, they don't check it, but if you don't have both forms of insurance, it could get very expensive to everybody.

So we -- I guess what I'm really getting at is, when -- when somebody says they want to do work on water, they want to do work on water, if they're not covering -- carrying USL&H and MEL, which is both very expensive coverages, it's hard to just say they'll do work on water, I'll do work on water, but are they properly insured?

So those are my comments, and I appreciate your time.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Thank you, Mr. Haik.

I don't know if anyone wants to follow up on that or if there are any other additional questions.

### MR. FULKERSON:

I'll follow up and come up with a couple of questions for the committee -- for the Commission. Richard, I'll get with you afterwards to make sure we kind of go over the graphs and see -- look at it. I think I understand, but it'd probably be a longer conversation you and I can have offline about it.

And then, second, I -- I just wanted to ask the Commissioner or -- would you guys still like to continue to meet via Zoom or in person? I know we talked about it last time, but I thought I'd check this time just to make sure everybody is still happy with the way we're going or would like to go back to our in-person meetings.

25

## MR. CALLAHAN: 1 Well, I'm kind of enjoying not making the long ride up to Baton 2 Rouge, I'll tell you that. 3 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 4 5 I do miss seeing all your smiling faces on a quarterly basis. MR. BRIGGS: 6 This is Don Briggs. I -- I agree. I feel the same way about yours. 7 MR. FULKERSON: 8 9 It sounds like everybody kind of likes the system, so we'll continue to do it, and I think we've found a meeting room on our floor, so if 10 somebody wants to come in, we've got it -- we'll have it set up here. 11 And then the second one, on my part, is just a -- so the slideshow, 12 did it kind of help meet everybody's needs or if there's something else 13 that y'all want, please, let me know after the meeting, and we'll make 14 sure we incorporate it going forward or just on the next meeting. So, 15 please, let us know. 16 MR. DONNES: 17 Secretary Harris, Mr. Fulkerson, this is Ross Donnes. Can you 18 hear me? 19 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 20 21 I hear you. I can hear you fine. MR. DONNES: 22 Okay. I'm sorry. I - I just wanted to - to put something into the 23 record, as well. I understand from -- from Mr. Adams I should

probably phrase it as -- as a comment. So, again, my name is Ross

Donnes. I represent the owners of a piece of property that's subject to, I think, OSR bid 431 PA 21-008, that's in the Humphreys Field.

So my first comment is that, it's -- it's come to our attention that representatives of BP Oil have sent two emails to OSR staff agreeing to plug and abandon the wells that are subject to this bid package. So my concern is that we're spending public money to bail out BP Oil, which is, obviously, one of the largest oil companies in the world.

My second comment concern with regard to this bid package is that it's also come to our attention that there's been no consideration of the environmental sampling that is in DNR's possession and whether or not this work will mobilize that contamination that's on the property in the vicinity of these well sites. We would ask that, you know, it — it be reviewed by the appropriate personnel at the Office of Conservation to determine whether or not this will have an impact on the contamination onsite.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Well, thank you, Mr. Donnes. We appreciate the comment. I have not -- I'm not aware of the BP email that you're -- you're referring to. Certainly, we'll commit to absolutely finding out more about that regarding the closure standards for wells that clearly falls under the Office of Conservation and their 29-B closure standards, and I'll defer to someone from Conservation to address that issue.

### MR. DONNES:

Thank you, Secretary Harris.

# MR. FULKERSON:

I think for our -- just some of our closure standards there, but we 1 can probably talk about it offline, as well, but, you know, we can 2 involve Mr. Snellgrove again, who stepped out of the room, and discuss 3 it, but I think we -- I don't know if this is the best place for it, but, you 4 5 know, we can certainly discuss what -- what's been discussed and what's included the permit for Coastal Use. 6 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 7 Great. Thank you. 8 Do we have any other -- final call for -- for question or comment. 9 (No response.) 10 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 11 Hearing none, Roby --12 MR. ROSS: 13 Secretary, Tom Harris? 14 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 15 Yes. 16 MR. ROSS: 17 Gary Ross here. I -- I would like to make a statement at this point 18 in time. I've been associated with OSR Program for 23-and-a-half 19 years. This will be the last meeting that I'm attending in an official 20 capacity, because I'm retiring on June 3rd. 21 MS. CREASMAN: 22 Congratulations. 23 **SECRETARY HARRIS:** 24 And you certainly will be missed, there's no question about that, 25

1	Gary. It's been an honor and a privilege to work with you.
2	MR. BRIGGS:
3	Where's he going?
4	SECRETARY HARRIS:
5	I think they're called grandkids. Correct me if I'm wrong, Gary.
6	MR. ROSS:
7	Yes, that is correct, grandkids, fishing, camping.
8	MS. CREASMAN:
9	Great.
10	MR. ROSS:
11	And and if if Roby forwards me the email of the attendance in
12	the future, I'll probably dial in to listen and to, you know, share any
13	experience I I know of that may assist in helping with problems
14	that they currently have today.
15	SECRETARY HARRIS:
16	Well, Gary, thank you. Thank you very much for your for your
17	years of service. You've really been a a credit to the Office of
18	Conservation and the Department.
19	MR. ROSS:
20	Well, thank you, sir.
21	MR. BRIGGS:
22	Yes. And, Gary, I'd like to say, I'd like to ditto that. You've
23	you've been a tremendous help to to the Department over the years
24	and to our state. You know, you can bring the kids up and put them
25	on Zoom.

# COMMISSIONER IEYOUB:

Mr. Chairman?

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Please go -- go ahead, Commissioner.

### **COMMISSIONER IEYOUB:**

I tried to talk Gary out of retiring, but he wouldn't listen to me. But you're absolutely correct that Gary has been invaluable. He's — he's just tremendously competent. He's very, very important to the staff and the operation of what we do in Conservation. I wish you would reconsider, but I think he's made up to leave, and we're certainly going to miss him. I hope that he will continue to have input and attend and listen into the Commission meetings, because he's — he's got a — just a vast knowledge of what goes on and what needs to be done. So I congratulate him on his years of service to the state, and I certainly appreciate all of his service, and I wish him well. Thank you.

#### MR. ROSS:

Thank you.

### **SECRETARY HARRIS:**

Well said. Commissioner.

If there's no further business, I want to thank you all, first, the Commission members, and members of the public for participating in this process, and -- and thank you all and we'll see you in three months.

This - oh, we do have to do this formally. Do I have a - a motion

1	to adjourn?
2	MR. CALLAHAN:
3	Motion here from Barney.
4	SECRETARY HARRIS:
5	Mr. Callahan moves that we adjourn. Do I have a second?
6	COMMISSIONER IEYOUB:
7	Second.
8	SECRETARY HARRIS:
9	Second by Commissioner Ieyoub.
10	Not hearing any objection, this meeting is adjourned. Thank you
11	all.
12	THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

### CERTIFICATE

I, MICHELLE S. ABADIE, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, as the officer before whom this meeting was taken, do hereby certify that the Oilfield Site Restoration Commission Meeting, held by the Zoom Video method, on April 15, 2021, by the Department of Conservation, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, was reported by me, was prepared and transcribed by me; that the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 68, inclusive, is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding; that I am not related to any parties herein, nor am I otherwise interested in the outcome of this proceeding.

MICHELLE S. ABADIE, CCR #24032 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER