State of Louisiana OILFIELD SITE RESTORATION COMMISSION MEETING JULY 27, 2022 1:00 p.m.

Oilfield Site Restoration Commission Meeting Thursday, July 27, 2022 1:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Thomas Harris, Secretary
Richard Ieyoub, Commissioner of Conservation
Steve Maley, LOGA
Barney Callahan, LWF, Sierra, and Audubon Society
Timothy Allen, Louisiana Landowners Association
David Levy, At Large

STAFF PRESENT:

Roby Fulkerson, Office of Conservation, OSR Staff Casandra Parker, Office of Conservation, OSR Staff John Adams, Assistant Commissioner of Conservation Chris Sandoz, Petroleum Engineer, OOC

1	Oilfield Site Restoration Commission Meeting
2	July 27, 2022
3	
4	
5	ROLL CALL
6	MR. HARRIS:
7	Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for being here. This is the
8	quarterly meeting of the Oilfield Site Restoration Commission.
9	I'd like to call this meeting to order.
10	Roby, would you call the roll, please?
11	MR. FULKERSON:
12	Yes, sir.
13	Tom Harris, Secretary.
14	MR. HARRIS:
15	Present.
16	MR. FULKERSON:
17	Richard Ieyoub, Commissioner of Conservation.
18	MR. IEYOUB:
19	Present.
20	MR. FULKERSON:
21	Lisa Creasman, Nature Conservancy. Lisa won't be able to make
22	it today.
23	Steve Maley, LOGA
24	MR. MALEY:
25	Here.

1	MR. FULKERSON:
2	Barney Callahan.
3	MR. CALLAHAN:
4	Here.
5	MR. FULKERSON:
6	David Levy.
7	MR. LEVY:
8	Here.
9	MR. FULKERSON:
LO	And Timothy Allen.
l1	MR. ALLEN:
L2	Here.
L3	MR. FULKERSON:
L4	We constitute a quorum.
L5	MR. HARRIS:
L6	Thank you, Roby.
L7	APPROVE MEETING TRANSCRIPT
L8	APRIL 21, 2022
L9	MR. HARRIS:
20	What is our first order of business on the agenda?
21	MR. FULKERSON:
22	The first order of business is approve the previous meeting
23	transcript from April 21, 2022. We sent it out about a week or two
24	ago, so I think everybody has had a chance to review it.
25	MR. HARRIS:

1	The next order of business would be approval of those minutes.
2	Are there any comments or questions regarding the minutes?
3	MR. LEVY:
4	I have a question, so the it appears to be just a transcript,
5	correct?
6	MR. FULKERSON:
7	That's correct, yes, sir.
8	MR. LEVY:
9	So, I mean, I I'm expected to go over every word to make sure
10	that every word in the transcript is correct? I mean, I can understand
11	approving a summary of the minutes, but I can't remember exactly
12	everything that was said in the transcript. Can I just agree that it is a
13	transcript of the meeting?
14	MR. HARRIS:
15	Well, I'm going to ask for a motion to approve those. You can
16	either when if it comes up, you can either vote to approve those or
17	not.
18	Is there a motion to approve the transcript?
19	MR. ALLEN:
20	So moved.
21	MR. HARRIS:
22	We have a motion by Mr. Allen. Is there a second?
23	MR. MALEY:
24	Second.
25	MR. HARRIS:

1	Second by Mr. Maley.
2	All in favor, signify by saying "aye."
3	(Mr. Maley, Mr. Allen, Mr. Ieyoub, Mr. Callahan voted aye. Mr.
4	Levy declined to vote.)
5	All opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	Motion carries.
8	Thank you, Roby.
9	FUND STATUS
10	MR. FULKERSON:
11	Our next order of business is a fund status update. If you guys are
12	ready, we can continue.
13	MR. HARRIS:
14	Please proceed.
15	MR. FULKERSON:
16	This update is as of the end of June. On the left, you'll see the
17	collection source. It should be the fifth slide with a total amount.
18	We've collected about 12.5 million in gas tax well, that's actually a
19	fee around 433,000 in oil fees, a little over a million in our inactive
20	well assessment fees. We get half of the inactive well assessment, I
21	believe. We've also collected around 1.1 million in SSTAs, escrows,
22	financial security. So this year, I've removed the escrow total, but the
23	total amount from fees is around 11 million.
24	We don't have any remaining expected collections this year. Our
25	last major one was in May

MR. MALEY:

I've never asked this question before, but what's -- what's the nature of the LOGA contribution?

MR. FULKERSON:

That's a good question. Cassie, do you remember what the full amount of the LOGA contribution is?

MS. PARKER:

That is something I'd have to look into. I do believe that they used to — when the program was first implemented, they used to plug more wells and to, you know, inject money, but I don't know where that 3,000 comes from right offhand.

MR. MALEY:

I was just curious. Thank you.

MR. FULKERSON:

No problem. We'll take a look at that.

We'll go on to the sixth slide, the fund statuses. We've got a large fund balance, but we've got a lot of -- quite a bit of encumbered, so we've got about 4.1 million encumbered. The balance shows about 11 million, but our balance after all costs right now is -- we've spent -- you know, we've got encumbered more than what we've spent -- or what's available, so that will all end up getting caught up because the projects take us a while to roll out through the permitting processes, but we've actually, you know -- the balance looks high, but we've spent that balance and then some.

If there are no questions, I can continue on to slide seven, which is

our annual collections graph.

It's kind of a high-level graph of what the collections have looked like over -- over time. As you can see, we continue to trend upwards. This year it looks a little bit higher, and that just from the -- one, we've collected more fees, and, two, the financial security we've kind of made a concerted effort to spend more money related to financial security. It takes a while to call the financial security. We have to spend the money from the fund and then essentially reimburse ourselves from it. So we'll complete the project. Once the project is completed, we'll ask the funds are moved into the OSR account and reimburse it, so it looks about -- you know, it's over a million dollars more of SSTA funding in there.

The next slide is one we added recently, just a collection graph, and that graph just kind of shows — there's four major draws during the year. The fourth one was in May. Our next one should be sometime in August, September. That's really all I have on it. It's just kind of interesting to compare it to the previous years.

So this year, as you can see, we 've kind of trended higher. The -- the kind of shaded one is the largest one, and that is 2022 -- 2021-'22 fiscal year.

If there are no questions, I can continue on with our money -- or our financial security update.

MR. HARRIS:

Please.

MR. FULKERSON:

So we've -- since we started including this, the financial security collected this year is about 1.6 million. The largest amount is a Shoreline, that's not direct financial security. I believe that's a bankruptcy settlement. We've got another \$1.2 million in this year. You'll see us try to spend that in this fiscal year. We've got a few projects earmarked. We're just trying to work our way through which ones to grab first.

So right now total in financial security, we've got about 11 million. We've spent about 1 million this year. Of the funds spent, the projects we've completed, we've completed the Humphrey's Field, and that had an SSTA with, I want to say it was 15 wells. We've completed the P&A of three wells for about \$1 million.

We've got three projects ongoing that are related to SSTAs. Two of them are Mesa Gulf Coast, a Mesa Gulf Coast package in Lake Hermitage. The Bay Batiste has a, I believe, a Mesa Gulf Coast well attached to it, as well. And the St. Mary's Parish has a Harvest Group SSTA. There's a SWD that had around 443,000. We've used — we're in the process of working those projects. Once we complete the projects, we can pull the funds back and essentially reimburse ourselves for it, so those should be coming up here in the next couple of months.

MR. MALEY:

Please clarify this. A couple of slides ago, the amount that you collected from restoration fees and shut-in wells and all that stuff --

MR. FULKERSON:

1	Yes, sir.
2	MR. MALEY:
3	that had accumulated \$12.5 million?
4	MR. FULKERSON:
5	That's correct.
6	MR. MALEY:
7	And this 11.4 is separate and distinct from that?
8	MR. FULKERSON:
9	Yes, sir, that is correct.
10	MR. MALEY:
11	And this is partly made up of Site Specific Trust Accounts and
12	partly this Shoreline money?
13	MR. FULKERSON:
14	That's correct.
15	MR. MALEY:
16	And and what else?
17	MR. FULKERSON:
18	Kind of a large group of SSTAs or financial security bond.
19	MR. MALEY:
20	And they're sort of pending and some of them are in the process of
21	being worked?
22	MR. FULKERSON:
23	So we have some this year. We're working on a few. The
24	Shoreline, we'll probably put another couple together related to it.
25	The big issue we have is they're all spread out, so then you'd end up

1	putting out one package for $\$25{,}000$ here, and one package for $\$25{,}000$
2	here. So we're trying to grab the larger amounts and work our way
3	down, and so that's why we started with St. Mary's Parish, the Mesa
4	Gulf Coast, grab the larger SSTA packages with the funding behind it,
5	spend those down, and continue on to the rest of the list.
6	MR. MALEY:
7	The total activity that you'll be able to do is 12.5 plus 11-
8	something?
9	MR. FULKERSON:
10	Kind of.
11	MR. MALEY:
12	It's just funded from different places?
13	MR. FULKERSON:
14	That's correct. We can't spend all 11 if you think about it because
15	we have to spend the money from the OSR fund then reimburse
16	ourselves.
17	MR. MALEY:
18	Oh, okay.
19	MR. FULKERSON:
20	So it's all a big juggling act to get that money spent, and then
21	recoup the funds, and then continue on with our normal projects.
22	MR. MALEY:
23	Okay. So the part of the 12.5 has to go toward these projects,
24	but you expect to be reimbursed?
25	MR. FULKERSON:

That's correct. 1 MR. MALEY: 2 Okay. 3 MR. FULKERSON: 4 5 And we have to encumber the project - well, SSTAs funds as a regular project and then reimburse ourselves at the end. 6 MR. MALEY: 7 Okay. 8 MS. PARKER: 9 I also wanted to make a point that we're also constrained by 10 11 budget, that's just not how much we collect, it's whatever budget we have approved for the year. 12 MR. FULKERSON: 13 She's right. 14 If there's no further questions, I can continue on to our money 15 recovery updates. 16 We've got a handful. I've kind of gone through what the most 17 recent update is. The Emergency 19-003, the Valentine Field, that's 18 with the Attorney General, and litigation is ongoing. I've heard 19 they're making some headway there, but I haven't had an update from 20 21 the Attorney General related to it. Emergency 20-003, South Thornwell, there's no update since the 22 last one. The court case was dismissed, and I think they're 23 reevaluating how to approach it. 24

Freshwater Bayou, 21-011, those project costs are being finalized.

We've got two money recovery letters ready to go. Essentially, we 1 don't send them until the total costs are run, so once the total costs are 2 run, we'll send those letters. 3 Black Elk, money recovery letters sent to the lineage. We're 4 5 working with one operator. That was actually the Timbalier Bay. We completed that project about a year ago, maybe two years ago. One of 6 7 the operators in the lineage is working with us. They've got some of 8 their own bonds for the previous wells, and we're trying to work with 9 them through the lineage how they can split that up and working with the Attorney General, as well. 10 11 The last one is Tigre Lagoon. We're currently working on that project. We sent money recovery letters out to the lineages. One had 12 a response. LLOG requested to abandon and remove a platform. We 13 removed that well from the package, and LLOG is pursuing their 14 Coastal Use Permit right now, so they should be working on that here 15

Are there any questions relating to these?

in the near future. And we started our own project Monday.

MR. MALEY:

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LLOG was in the chain of title?

MR. FULKERSON:

Yes, sir.

MR. MALEY:

They finally just stepped up?

MR. FULKERSON:

Yes, sir, they did.

1	MR. MALEY:
2	Thank you.
3	MR. HARRIS:
4	Next, Roby, please.
5	MR. FULKERSON:
6	The next one is just the orphan well count versus wells plugged.
7	It's just kind of a higher overview of what it looks like trending. As we
8	discussed the last time, we've gone to a SONRIS system where we
9	update the numbers, rather than a hand count, for really
10	reproduceability (sic). So there may be some fluctuations in the
11	numbers as we work our way through SONRIS, but, as you can see,
12	we're making headway, but they're still orphan wells popping up, so it
13	feels like we're treading water sometimes.
14	The next slide is our urgent and high-priority wells. We've got
15	about 627 wells scored. Those were P&A'd, and the remaining wells is
16	about 599. Again, that number has kind of changed, because it's based
17	off of SONRIS accounting, and we're working on our system there just
18	to make sure everything is right.
19	The next slide
20	MR. LEVY:
21	I have a question.
22	MR. FULKERSON:
23	Yes, sir.
24	MR. LEVY:
25	The prioritization checklists are supposed to be approved by the

1	Commission.
2	MR. FULKERSON:
3	Yes, sir.
4	MR. LEVY:
5	Did that ever happen?
6	MR. FULKERSON:
7	It's within the Commission's ability to approve a checklist, and
8	they certainly can. If anybody would like to put forward a motion to
9	do it or update it, they certainly can, as well.
LO	MR. LEVY:
l1	So it's not your responsibility to put to present a change in the
L2	prioritization checklist before the Commission before you change it?
L3	In other words, are you changing the prioritization checklist at your
L4	own will?
L5	MR. FULKERSON:
L6	No, no.
L7	MS. PARKER:
L8	No, sir. No, sir. The any changes that are made to that sheet
L9	are approved by the Committee.
20	MR. LEVY:
21	And that was voted on, and there's a record of that?
22	MS. PARKER:
23	Yes. It should be in our past transcripts.
24	MR. MALEY:
) 5	I voted on it

1	MR. LEVY:
2	Do you know when the last time that the prioritization list was
3	updated?
4	MS. PARKER:
5	Not offhand. I'd have to look at that.
6	MR. FULKERSON:
7	It predated me. I'm not quite sure, to be honest with you, but if
8	anyone on the Commission remembers.
9	MR. LEVY:
10	Okay. So it's been years.
11	MR. FULKERSON:
12	It sounds like it's been sometime, yes, sir.
13	MR. LEVY:
14	Okay.
15	MR. FULKERSON:
16	If the Commission is interested, they can certainly put forward a
17	motion and we can update it.
18	MR. LEVY:
19	I'm sorry. Put forward a motion to update the prioritization
20	checklist? Now, I'm curious as to what the lineage of the prioritization
21	checklist is, and I want to make sure that the prioritization checklist
22	is not just getting changed and the numbers of high-priority wells are
23	not being changed just as the list gets changed, right?.
24	MR. FULKERSON:
25	Okay

1	MR. LEVY:
2	So it says in the standard operating procedure that the
3	prioritization list is approved by the Commission. I've just been to a
4	couple of meetings now, and I have not seen that
5	MR. HARRIS:
6	Mr. Levy, are you asking about the prioritization system or the
7	actual list? Because we have wells that are taken off of our of the
8	list and added to the list almost continually.
9	MR. LEVY:
10	I'm talking about the prioritization checklist. It's a document. It's
11	a document where
12	MR. HARRIS:
13	Yes, I'm familiar with it.
14	MR. LEVY:
15	an engineer sits down with the with the the sheet that has
16	to do with the site evaluation, and they go over that prioritization
17	checklist.
18	MR. HARRIS:
19	So are you asking about the scoring system itself or the individual
20	wells?
21	MR. LEVY:
22	I'm asking about the items that are on the prioritization checklist.
23	MR. HARRIS:
24	We haven't seen need to revise that recently.
25	MR. FULKERSON:

Okay. If there's no further questions, I can move on to the well abandoned by OSR and other means — or other methods. We've had — mostly OSR P&A's the last year. The EPA was out for a good bit during COVID. They've begun work again. We'll have an update later on, but they've P&A'd one well in south Louisiana. They did the second project in Tigre Lagoon, that should start up soon. And I believe they've got some wells in Shreveport in Amera (phonetic) Field they're looking at, as well. No major Coast Guard updates. I don't believe they've P&A'd anything recently. Those would be the big ones, but most of the previous year will all be OSR P&A'd wells.

If there are no questions, we can continue on to the next slide,

If there are no questions, we can continue on to the next slide, which is our current orphan numbers. This is just broken down of the different priority scores by district. You also see wells that have not been inspected yet, that ranges for different reasons, that may be within the first 90 days when the inspectors have to get out there or the locations. Wells that have not been prioritized and then a total count of wells.

If there's no questions there, I can continue on into our next -- you know, our current projects that we're working now and our upcoming projects.

OSR PROJECTS

MR. FULKERSON:

Currently, we've got a handful of projects we're finishing up. The 21-009 has one or two wells left. The contractor should finish that one pretty quickly. Carlisle Field has 29 wells, that was cancelled. That

1	well has been about almost two years ago now, and we don't want to
2	keep continuing on carrying those packages forward without the work
3	going on. Tigre Lagoon has just started.
4	Yes, sir.
5	MR. MALEY:
6	So that's a case of a a bid that was accepted, and the contractor
7	just didn't follow through and have any activity on it?
8	MR. FULKERSON:
9	It hasn't had activity in about two years, and so we just felt like it
10	was time to pull it off there and rebid it eventually.
11	MR. MALEY:
12	Okay. So it was partially completed or
13	MR. FULKERSON:
14	No work was done.
15	MR. MALEY:
16	no work was done?
17	MR. FULKERSON:
18	Yes, sir.
19	MR. MALEY:
20	Thank you.
21	MR. FULKERSON:
22	We've got 22-003, Caddo-Pine Island, that project is currently
23	ongoing. 22-004, which is Lake Hermitage, that project is ongoing.
24	22-005, Red River and DeSoto, that project is currently ongoing.
25	We've got two more, 22-007, I believe they just finished site clearance.

They may have a little bit there to finish up the paperwork, that's complete. And Lake Washington is ongoing, as well.

And so you can see we've got quite a bit of funding here wrapped up between Lake Hermitage, Tigre Lagoon, and Lake Washington.

Those should all be wrapping up here probably in the next -- next month or two.

If there's no further questions, we can continue on into our upcoming projects.

We've kind of got a few earmarked for coming up. There's a Masters Creek. We had that emergency last year. There's a few more we want to remove and a large facility that was related to that emergency well, so those are all Yuma wells, I believe. Unfortunately, most of them are not left in good shape, so we're going to try to grab those.

There's one, 23-004, Shuteston Field, that is a well -- an old Briton (phonetic), if I remember right. That well has lost quite a bit of integrity at surface. It's got a -- I think the last thing we left in it was a plug at surface, but, essentially, every valve on the well had leaked, so we're going to try to get that one taken care of, as well.

There's one well in Masters Creek, 23-005. We're kind of trying to determine how to approach that well. It's a little unique, and we're working our way through the -- how to handle it.

As we discussed, there's a Shoreline package. We're kind of -we've got a handful of wells we've looked at, and we're just trying to determine which ones to grab because we've got that financial security tied to it.

They've got some larger groups, Rabbit Island, it's just hard to grab Rabbit Island because there's like 60 wells offshore, and \$1.2 million doesn't get us very far.

The last, we're looking at a handful of wells in Lockport. The inspector made it out. It looked like there was — in the marsh there was a handful of wells with some oil around it, so we'd like to take a look at those. I know there's at least two we're going to remove, possibly a few more. We're going to look at the inspections and talk with the inspectors and kind of get feedback.

And that's kind of what we're looking at for this year as far as we've gotten.

If there's any questions, or we can continue on.

I know we usually update this every year at the end of the year, just orphan well transfers. So this year, we had 23 transfers. That is a company taking the well out of the orphan program and putting it in their name. I kind of put the three big ones on there. This was in Cote Blanche, Caldwell, and then we had a handful by the Well Done Foundation. I want to say that's less than five, but I believe they're slowly taking over more, so that kind of pilot project they're working on kind of -- I guess they're continuing to pursue it, so it's going well for them.

MR. ALLEN:

Can you elaborate on that? I've never heard of the Well Done Foundation.

MR. FULKERSON:

It's a group out of Montana or Wyoming, and they go out to the sites, measure the methane. If the methane is high enough — well, first, they'll put in a co-op. The co-op allows them to work on the well, enter the premises. They'll go out on a well — go to the wellsite, measure the methane. If it checks a certain amount of methane, they'll put the well into their name, and then I believe they get carbon credits from the P&A. And then, I believe, through those carbon credits, they — I don't know if they seek reimbursement or those have some value. But that's kind of the way I understand that system.

MR. MALEY:

It's 501-C-3; is that correct?

MR. FULKERSON:

I believe so, yes, sir.

MR. MALEY:

-- that he's targeting wells that have emissions, so they sell them as carbon offsets to -- you know, that's kind of the business plan in a nutshell.

MR. FULKERSON:

But, in total, we've got 23 for the year.

If there's no further questions, we can continue on.

I've been putting in the pie charts, but I think they were kind of a little busy, so I just tried this instead, the funds spent per district and the sites per district. It kind of just tells the story I think you all probably already know from the previous numbers. But Lafayette is

where most of the funds are spent, but you can see Shreveport and Monroe is where most of the P&As occur, shallower wells quicker, more packages.

The next page is our north Louisiana mandate. We're just mandated to spend over \$1 million a year. With our performance indicator, which is wells P&A'd and the emergencies, we've easily met that this past year. I don't -- \$1 million is pretty easy to meet, so we've met it and exceeded it.

The next slide I have is surface interventions. And I apologize we -- since going to the printouts, we're back to black and white. It looks a little bit better when you have the Zoom meetings, but -- we've got 49 total this year for about \$100,000, and that's just -- we're allowed to spend up to \$5,000 to intervene in the site without going to bid law and taking a few months to bid. So if we can repair a valve, do any work like that, stop a leak, we'll go out and do it for less than \$5,000.

The next page I have is our federal update, which is the Big Lake project. They've completed that, that was the EPA. Tigre Lagoon is another larger project. They're going to have to build a road to get in and out of there, and it's actually one of the larger wells, if you think about it, wellhead section-wise in the state. It's got a good bit of pressure on it. It's lost some integrity. Interesting project. They'll start that in the next couple of months. I think they've rebid it recently, and they should be moving along here shortly just depending on contractor award and what the road situation looks like.

If there's no questions with our federal work, I can continue on to

the federal funding update. I know this has kind of come up.

FEDERAL FUNDING UPDATE

MR. FULKERSON:

So we've applied for the initial grant. We're slowly setting up a website, which should be available here in the next couple of months related to the federal funding.

The initial grant is for \$25 million. Initially, we thought we would receive it sometime over the summer, but we're hearing that the earliest we'll receive it is going to be October 1st. So sometime after October 1st, we should have that funding. We 're just not really sure on timing.

There is a Phase I Formula Grant. So the initial grant, all states were eligible for 25. There's one Formula Grant they used after that. They haven't given us a timeline on it, but Louisiana's number was 22 million.

And then we've been working with the Wildlife and Fisheries Department. Essentially, the Department of Interior got a source of money, the same source of money, to P&A wells. So they earmarked around 151 sites they want to P&A, and they've been working with us and we've been working with them to get the sites selected. I think they're going to end up working with us to bid the projects and P&A the wells, so that way we can reduce the costs, the mobilization, from the 25 million and the 12 million.

MR. MALEY:

These are Wildlife Management Areas?

1	MR. FULKERSON:
2	That's correct, yes, sir. Most in the Monroe area, and some in
3	Lacassine.
4	MR. ALLEN:
5	Federal or State Wildlife Management Areas?
6	MR. FULKERSON:
7	Federal, yes, sir.
8	MR. ALLEN:
9	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services?
LO	MR. FULKERSON:
l1	That's correct, yes, sir.
L2	MR. ALLEN:
L3	Not the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries?
L4	MR. FULKERSON:
L5	No, sir. I probably should have been more clear. That is the
L6	federal Department of Interior fisheries and wildlife department.
L7	That's all the federal funding update I have. Are we ready to
L8	continue?
L9	MR. HARRIS:
20	Yes. Thank you, Roby.
21	APPROVE NEW OSR CONTRACTORS
22	MR. HARRIS:
23	I see we have five, six new OSR contractors, that's the largest
24	number I've seen.
25	MR. FULKERSON:

That's the largest I remember. I imagine a lot of it is related to the federal funding. You don't technically have to be on this list for federal funding, but we recommend they get on it, that way they -- you know, they're definitely going to hear about it.

I can read through all of them. Would y'all prefer to approve all at one time or do them individually? Six seems like a lot.

MR. HARRIS:

Do we have representatives here from any of the contractors on this list that would like to speak?

(No response.)

Apparently not.

Would you read them out, and we can approve them or at least discuss and see if there are any comments and entertain a motion at the proper time.

MR. FULKERSON:

Sure. Okay. The first is MADCON Corporation out of Pearl River, Louisiana. They are a marine contractor for all depths and areas, and they are interested in being a decommissioning/general contractor. The next one is Southern Underground of Louisiana, LLC, and they are out of Zachary, Louisiana. And they are a general contractor, and they are interested in wells between zero and 5,000' and land only. The next is ETECH Environmental and Safety Solutions out of Odessa, Texas. They are an environmental cleaning company, and they're interested in land wells between zero and 10,000', remediation work only. Justiss Oil Company out of Jena, Louisiana. They are a

1	general contractor, zero to 10,000', land only, and P&A work.
2	Weatherford based in Houston, all types, all depths, well completions,
3	P&A, and decommissioning. Delta Seaboard, LLC, out of Houston,
4	Texas, all types, all depths, P&A, and decommissioning.
5	MR. HARRIS:
6	Is it the recommendation of the staff that all six of these
7	contractors meet the meet the requirements, and is it your
8	recommendation that the board approve these?
9	MR. FULKERSON:
10	Yes, sir. They have completed all requirements, gone through the
11	checklist, and I believe we're good with all of them. They all meet the
12	standards.
13	MR. CALLAHAN:
14	If we accept this number, how many would it be total?
15	MS. PARKER:
16	I want to say that this will put us about 52, 53. I'd have to check
17	and get back to you for sure, but in the 50s somewhere.
18	MR. CALLAHAN:
19	When we made the sweep a couple of years ago to get rid of some
20	of the dead ends
21	MR. FULKERSON:
22	Yep.
23	MR. CALLAHAN:
24	how many how many did we have actually back then?
25	MS PARKER:

It was closer to 70-something.

MR. CALLAHAN:

Okay. So it's a third of the number. I was just thinking, I mean, we had to go in there and clean house, and then we come back and put more -- more --

MS. PARKER:

Right. I don't think any of these were on that list that we went and swept, but I can check and make sure.

MR. HARRIS:

This federal funding that we're going to be getting, it's going to be a steady stream over the next four to five years. We're going to be anywhere between tripling and quadrupling the amount of dollars being spent on -- on well plugging over that period of time, and I anticipate we're going to need more contractors to -- to get that work done.

MR. MALEY:

And they changed the rules too to -- no longer is it required that somebody be an approved State contractor to be on the orphan well list. So there's people that probably worked as subcontractors before for somebody else, like Weatherford, for example, which is a large diversified services company, that now because of the large funds available and so forth, they're interested in being on the list, and they don't have to qualify as a Louisiana contractor.

MR. CALLAHAN:

Right.

MR. MALEY:

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

So I think it's appropriate --

MR. ALLEN:

Well, that answered my next question. It was, part of the application, these folks do not have to generate or prove that they are a licensed Louisiana contractor? I don't understand that.

MR. MALEY:

Well, they used to.

MR. FULKERSON:

They used to. I think they changed that in August of 2020 or '19.

MS. PARKER:

They removed that requirement now so it removed the bonding requirement for our projects. And, again, I could tell you the bill, but it would be incorrect. I'd have to look it up and get back to you for the exact Act.

MR. HARRIS:

We had a few legislators on our oversight committees that suggested we tried to streamline the — the contracting process to allow more out-of-work oil and gas contractors to do plugging work, but that was — those bills, at least one or two, of those passed and some of the requirements were eliminated, those that were deemed not — unnecessary by the legislature.

MR. ALLEN:

Thank you.

MR. HARRIS:

1	Are there any questions regarding these contractors? Any
2	questions, comments?
3	(No response.)
4	Hearing none, is there a motion to approve these six contractors?
5	MR. IEYOUB:
6	So moved.
7	MR. HARRIS:
8	We have a motion by Commissioner Ieyoub.
9	MR. CALLAHAN:
10	Second.
11	MR. HARRIS:
12	Second by Mr. Callahan.
13	All in favor, signify by saying "aye."
14	(Aye by Mr. Ieyoub, Mr. Maley, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Allen.)
15	All opposed?
16	MR. LEVY:
17	I oppose.
18	MR. HARRIS:
19	So noted. The motion carries, and these six contractors are now
20	approved by the Commission.
21	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
22	MR. HARRIS:
23	Project updates.
24	MR. FULKERSON:
25	Okay. So for our performance indicators, these are just every

year, we have a certain amount of wells we have to P&A. This year, we earmarked about 225, I want to say our number wells. We had about 172. Essentially, they're just wrapping up the projects in north Louisiana, Shreveport and Monroe area, and the one project we pulled off, the Carlisle Field for 29 wells. We've P&A'd a calendar -- fiscal calendar year 172 wells.

Any questions?

MR. ALLEN:

The goal was 225, and we got 172. What is the goal for next fiscal year, this coming — this fiscal year, I should say.

MR. FULKERSON:

I don't remember off the top of my head. I'll have to talk with the Office of Conservation team to see. I think we reduced it 200 or left it at 225. It's one of the two numbers, and I don't remember off the top of my head.

MR. ALLEN:

It looks like it would increase exponentially with the infusion of new money coming through.

MR. HARRIS:

Well -- and I'll be glad to address that. We're going to be doing the same thing with our orphan well program based on the regular sources, the funding. That's going to continue doing what they're doing. The contracting for utilizing the federal money is going to be a separate but parallel process. Of course, it's still going to require closure in accordance with 29-B. Office of Conservation field staff will

be involved in that. We decided that if we tried to quadruple the number of wells and dollars spent using the existing process, we were going to fall short. You know, we are looking to utilize this federal money to plug a lot -- large number of wells, but we need to use a more streamline process, and, hopefully, larger contractors who can, not only plug the wells properly and safely, but also address all of the federal reporting requirements that will come with this money. Those of you who were involved with the ARA (phonetic) probably remember a lot of the strings that came with that as far as reporting jobs, in this case, jobs -- reduction in methane emissions, impact to disadvantaged communities, and we're going to make that part of the contracting scope of services.

NEW BUSINESS/OLD BUSINESS

MR. FULKERSON:

Our last order of business is new business/old business.

We have one update. The — we promised Mr. Levy an Office of Conservation update in response in the last meeting. They're still working on that written document. I would imagine it's ready sometime between now and the next meeting or at the next meeting. They haven't given me a timeline on it.

That's all I have for the day.

MR. HARRIS:

Thank you, Roby.

Our next order of business on the agenda is old business.

MR. LEVY:

Well, I mean, I have some questions about Freshwater City and the plugging of the well.

MR. HARRIS:

m. mann.

I'm shocked. It appears to be a recurring thing every meeting.

MR. LEVY:

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

Yes, it does. So I'd like to go back to the -- to the bid that was -the request for quote. The request for quote that is on the website that
is a public document lists for the minimum equipment requirements,
it requests a rig, it requests a workover rig, and it requests a rig that
is able to pull doubles. So is that what was on location and used to
plug that well?

MR. FULKERSON:

Honestly, I don't know. I wasn't onsite, sir.

MR. LEVY:

All right. So, in 1985, there was a hole in the 7-5/8" casing at 2186, so they went and squeezed that casing.

Is there anybody here that knows about this well, that knows the downhole --

MR. HARRIS:

Excuse me, Mr. Levy. You're -- are you addressing activities that occurred before this well became orphaned?

MR. LEVY:

No. I'm talking about the plugging operation that occurred this time. It -- it -- the minimum equipment requirements required a workover rig. There was no workover rig that plugged this well. All

they did was go in with the 2-7/8" tubing and pump cement. That didn't have anything to do with the 7-5/8" casing. The 7-5/8" has no cement on the back side from 970 to the 10-3/4" casing. That does not conform with 29-B, Statewide Order 29-B.

MR. HARRIS:

Mr. Levy, I -- I believe the Office of Conservation disagrees with you and certified that as being closed.

MR. IEYOUB:

Mr. Chairman, if you -- if you will, I would like to -- one of our engineers to address Mr. Levy's questions and give answers, if possible, to some of his questions. So I call on Chris Sandoz to maybe try to answer Mr. Levy's questions about the plugging of the well and whether or not it was done in conformity with 29-B.

MR. SANDOZ:

Thank you, Commissioner.

Mr. Levy, so everything that I've reviewed related to the well shows a USDW around 1,030', and there is -- when this well was plugged, there was mass cement across all annular spaces and across the base of the USDW, up to 60' above the USDW in that string -- or outside of that string --

MR. LEVY:

In what --

MR. SANDOZ:

The 7-5/8ths. So the base of the USDW is covered a cement plug outside of that casing up to 60' above the base.

1	MR. LEVY:
2	Correct.
3	MR. SANDOZ:
4	Right. So there is yeah, I agree, there's a gap of no cement above
5	that, but 29-B does not require cement to be in that
6	MR. LEVY:
7	Well, on the P&A review, it it says USDW plug, and it says,
8	cemented across all annular spaces.
9	MR. SANDOZ:
10	It is. It is cemented across the USDW plug, isolation of the base
11	of a USDW.
12	MR. LEVY:
13	What about the 5-1/2 by 7 7-5/8ths?
14	MR. SANDOZ:
15	The 5-1/2 was cemented, I believe, much higher than that.
16	MR. LEVY:
17	Wasn't there a pressure test done on the 5-1/2 by 7-5/8" casing?
18	MR. SANDOZ:
19	Was a pressure test done on the I'm not following.
20	MR. LEVY:
21	In the plugging operation, there was a pressure test that was
22	performed on the $5-1/2$ by $7-1/2$ " casing annulus.
23	MR. SANDOZ:
24	I'm I'm not aware of that.
25	MR. LEVY:

1	I believe it's in the public documents that are on the that are on
2	SONRIS.
3	MR. SANDOZ:
4	And and so if that pressure
5	MR. LEVY:
6	That bled down.
7	MR. SANDOZ:
8	If that was done from surface, I would expect you couldn't do a
9	pressure test, right? There is a gap there in the outside of the 7-
10	5/8ths. Are you talking about a pressure test in the
11	MR. LEVY:
12	No. So the statement on the P&A review that says it's cemented
13	across all annular spaces, do you consider the outside of the 7-5/8ths
14	and the earth an annular space?
15	MR. SANDOZ:
16	Yes.
17	MR. LEVY:
18	Okay. So is it cemented across the entirety USDW?
19	MR. SANDOZ:
20	That does not it does not
21	MR. LEVY:
22	So you're saying it does not happen.
23	MR. SANDOZ:
24	No. I'm saying under 29-B
25	MR. LEVY:

1	So it's okay to commingle 1,000' of USDW zones?
2	MR. SANDOZ:
3	To commingle it? It's all it's it's
4	MR. LEVY:
5	You just let it all open.
6	MR. SANDOZ:
7	The regulations don't require us to isolate that at the time of P&A.
8	The only time the regulations would require it is if we pull that casing,
9	right, and even then it doesn't require full isolation of the USDW. It
LO	only requires isolation of the base of the USDW.
l1	MR. LEVY:
L2	Okay.
L3	MR. SANDOZ:
L4	I mean, I have the regulations here, you know. We can go through
L5	them.
L6	MR. LEVY:
L7	So you're contest you say that that that it is not required
18	that there be cement on the on the outside of the 7-5/8ths, it is not
L9	required for a salt for a fresh water aquifer, it is not required in that
20	zone?
21	MR. SANDOZ:
22	To be fully isolated at the time of P&A, no. It's only required if
23	you pull the casing.
24	MR. LEVY:
25	Okay. Okay. I I I disagree that that does not conform to 29-B.

1	that is certainly not in the spirit of 29-B, and it seems to me that
2	that there is a conduit between the 5-1/2 and the 7-1/2 7-5/8" casing
3	that would allow saltwater to flow from a lower zone to an upper zone
4	into the freshwater
5	MR. SANDOZ:
6	The 5-1/2 excuse me the 5-1/2 and 7-5/8ths annulus has
7	cement higher than the and outside of the 7-5/8ths. So there
8	there's the annular space is reduced in that area, right. The 5-1/2
9	has cement to where is it?
10	MR. LEVY:
11	I understand the 5-1/2. I'm talking about the 5-1/2 by 7-5/8"
12	MR. SANDOZ:
13	Yeah. The 5 the space between the 5-1/2" casing and the 7-5/8"
14	casing, that annular space has cement up to 229
15	MR. LEVY:
16	When was that cement placed?
17	MR. SANDOZ:
18	That was that was primary cementing, I assume. I mean, I
19	didn't review those records relating
20	MR. LEVY:
21	So you're saying that was placed when the 5-1/2" liner was run?
22	MR. SANDOZ:
23	Probably so. That would be my guess. We didn't do any remedial
24	cementing to that well. I didn't admittedly, I didn't review the

entire record, but I am looking at it point forward. When we got the

25

4

well, that's what I looked at, here's what the well -- here's how the well is and how we're going to plug it point forward, that's what I looked at.

3

MR. HARRIS:

5 6 7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

Mr. Levy, I'd also like to remind you that this Commission has no oversight of the Office of Conservation, that's not within our -- our powers, duties, and responsibilities as a Commission. We oversee the Oilfield Site Restoration Program itself. Obviously, you disagree with the Office of Conservation on their own rules that they wrote, but that is not really Commission business.

MR. SANDOZ:

The only thing I could add is, I have to disagree that - with your statement that it wasn't plugged to 29-B standards. In addition to our own review, we act almost just like an operator would. We submitted -- because this is a disposal well, we drafted what we believed to be the proper procedure, and we submitted that to another independent office in Conservation for their review and compliance. So, not only does it meet 29-B, but it would meet the injection and mining requirements and then the EPA requirements beyond that.

MR. LEVY:

Well, I think if this was -- if this whole project was reviewed by an independent, a completely independent engineering firm, that they would agree that that fresh water aguifer is at risk.

MR. HARRIS:

That -- that's your opinion, Mr. Levy. Again, I remind you that this is not Commission business, that we do not have any oversight

1	over the Office of Conservation and enforcement of 29-B.
2	MR. LEVY:
3	I understand, Mr. Harris. I understand what you're saying, but
4	but, me, as a citizen, and I am representing the citizens here, I cannot
5	stand here I cannot sit here and allow this 1,000' aquifer to be
6	ruined
7	MR. IEYOUB:
8	That's purely speculative. You are speculating this is not a court
9	of law, but if it were, you would be totally speculating.
10	MR. HARRIS:
11	Are there is there any other old business or new business before
12	this body?
13	(No response.)
14	Are there any public comments?
15	(No response.)
16	Hearing none, it's time to entertain a motion to adjourn.
17	MR. ALLEN:
18	So move.
19	MR. LEVY:
20	Oh, wait. I'm not done. Okay. So in 29-B, the the the original
21	well design did not have surface casing that covered the the fresh
22	water it should
23	MR. HARRIS:
24	Mr. Levy, you're out of order.
25	MR. LEVY:

1	All right. Okay. Can I reference 29-B, ask a question?
2	MR. HARRIS:
3	Certainly.
4	MR. LEVY:
5	29-B says that fresh water horizons are exposed when production
6	casing is removed from the well or as a result of production casing not
7	being run. A cement plug shall be placed from at least 100' below the
8	base of the deepest fresh water sand to at least 150' above the base of
9	the sand.
LO	MR. SANDOZ:
L1	That that's correct.
L2	MR. LEVY:
L3	You contend that that
L4	MR. SANDOZ:
L5	I contend that's correct, but that applies when it when the casing
L6	is removed from the well, so it's an open-hole plug, right. So this is not
L7	an open-hole plug.
L8	MR. LEVY:
L9	Right.
20	MR. SANDOZ:
21	So it does not apply. If it did apply, it requires 150' of cement
22	above the base of the USDW, the base which is at 1,030', so really to
23	only 900'. That's what it would require, although it does not apply.
24	MR. LEVY:
25	The assumption there is that the 10-3/4 would have went through

1	the fresh water aquifer, and it did not in the original well design,
2	that's the problem.
3	MR. SANDOZ:
4	It doesn't it doesn't matter.
5	MR. HARRIS:
6	Mr. Levy, you're welcome to your opinion, but I think at this point
7	it's just argumentative.
8	ADJOURN
9	MR. HARRIS:
10	We do have a motion before the Commission, a motion to adjourn.
11	MR. MALEY:
12	Second.
13	MR. HARRIS:
14	We have a second by Mr. Maley.
15	All in favor, signify by saying "aye."
16	(Mr. Maley, Mr. Allen, Mr. Ieyoub, Mr. Callahan voted aye. Mr.
17	Levy declined to vote.)
18	All opposed?
19	(No response.)
20	This meeting is adjourned. Thank you all for your participation.
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 on July 27, 2022, 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 42, 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