

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 WORKGROUP FOR GLOBAL AIR PERMIT POLICY DEVELOPMENT FOR
11 TEMPORARY OIL AND GAS DRILL RIGS

12
13 MEETING
14

15
16
17 December 5, 2013

18
19 Anchorage, Alaska
20

21
22
23 Present:
24

25 Bill Barron (telephonic)
26 Isaac Bertschi (telephonic)
27 Bill Britt (telephonic)
28 Alice Edwards (telephonic)
29 Wally Evans (telephonic)
30 Eric Fiererson (telephonic)
31 Randall Kanady (telephonic)
32 Joshua Kindred (telephonic)
33 John Kuterbach (telephonic)
34 Jim Neason (telephonic)
35 James Renovatio (telephonic)
36 Sally Ryan (telephonic)
37 Alan Schuler (telephonic)
38 Jim Shine (telephonic)
39 Rebecca Smith (telephonic)
40 Erin Strang (telephonic)
41 Jeanne Swartz
42 Brad Thomas (telephonic)
43 Damien (ph) Thomas (telephonic)
44 Barbara Trost
45 Tom Turner
46
47
48
49

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (On record at 2:00 p.m.)

3 THE REPORTER: Okay. We're on the record at.....

4 MS. SWARTZ: (Indiscernible).

5 THE REPORTER: 2:00 o'clock. Yeah.

6 MR. TURNER: We're still waiting on people.

7 THE REPORTER: I know. You're speaking, so.....

8 MR. TURNER: Oh, great. So now you can hear me complain
9 about the world conditions on the record.

10 THE REPORTER: Of course, we're going to have it on the
11 record too.

12 MR. TURNER: Alice, I don't see anyone from DNR popping
13 up, so if you're -- anybody else, you're going to please
14 announce when you come on the phone, if you're there. Joshua,
15 are you on the phone I see? All these people popping up.

16 MR. BARRON: Bill Barron with DNR is on goto dot --
17 GoToMeeting.

18 MR. TURNER: Thanks, Bill.

19 MR. TURNER: Do we have Brad on the phone?

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Indiscernible) with Hilcorp and I'm
21 downloading GoToMeeting.

22 MR. KINDRED: Josh Kindred from AOGA as well.

23 THE REPORTER: Who?

24 MR. TURNER: Josh.

25 MS. SWARTZ: Josh Kindred.

1 THE REPORTER: I'm not hearing it.

2 MR. TURNER: Okay. I'll make sure they speak up.

3 MS. SWARTZ: You can probably bump up the volume.

4 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad Thomas and actually I'm at goto.

5 MR. TURNER: Okay. Brad, we see you.

6 THE REPORTER: Yeah, I'm not hearing it.

7 MR. THOMAS: (Indiscernible) we could move quick we can
8 get out of the freezing rain.

9 MR. TURNER: The Glenn Highway's shut down. It's pretty
10 bad out there. I'm going to go through the list. This is Tom
11 Turner in Anchorage. I'm going to do the quick organizing roll
12 call and I'll turn it over to Alice. In Anchorage we have
13 Jeanne Swartz, Barbara Trost, Tom Turner and we have a
14 transcriptionist. I would like everyone to please be reminded
15 when you're speaking on the phone to make sure you mention who
16 you are right away. On the phone I'm showing Alan Schuler, Bill
17 Barron, Damien (ph) Thomas. In Juneau I have John Kuterbach,
18 Alice Edwards, Barbara -- excuse me, Alice Edwards. You're here
19 in front of me, Barbara. I'm looking at you. We have Erin
20 Strang, Isaac, Joshua Kindred, Randall Kanady or Kanady.

21 MS. SWARTZ: Kanady.

22 MR. TURNER: Sally Ryan, Brad Thomas, Wally Evans. Did I
23 miss anybody?

24 MR. BRITT: This is Bill Britt and my computer is very
25 slowly downloading GoToMeeting. So I can bring that up too, but

1 I don't have it on my machine.

2 MR. TURNER: Okay. So would you make a note about Bill
3 Britt? Who just joined us please?

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Tom.

5 MR. SHINE: This is Jim Shine.

6 MR. TURNER: Okay. Jim Shine.

7 THE REPORTER: Okay. Okay.

8 MR. FIERSON: Also Eric Fierson with Caterpillar.

9 MR. TURNER: Eric. Okay.

10 THE REPORTER: Last name?

11 MR. TURNER: Fierson.

12 MS. SWARTZ: F-i-e-r-s-o-n.

13 THE REPORTER: Thank you. F-i-e-r.....

14 MR. FIERSON: Yes, F as in Frank.

15 MR. TURNER: Who just joined us?

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Indiscernible).

17 THE REPORTER: Sorry.

18 MR. TURNER: This is funny with all the beeps.

19 THE REPORTER: Exactly.

20 MR. TURNER: Who were the last two beeps? Okay. Okay. I
21 think we're ready to go. Alice, do you want to do one more roll
22 call or I can just turn it over to you?

23 MS. EDWARDS: I just wanted to let you know that in the
24 Juneau office we also have Rebecca Smith and James Renovatio.

25 MR. TURNER: Oh, James is on there too. Okay.

1 MS. EDWARDS: The last -- I guess we could probably just
2 get started. This is Alice Edwards at DEC Air Quality. Before
3 we get too far in I just want to double check and see whether
4 Gordon Brower is on the phone today.

5 MS. SWARTZ: No.

6 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. And I know that Mike Munger who's
7 also one of our workgroup members is -- was not able to be on
8 today. But it sounds like we've got Josh from AOGA and Brad for
9 the support industry and then myself and Bill and that's sort of
10 the primary workgroup members who are here. Do we have any of
11 the alternates on that I may have missed?

12 MR. THOMAS: Randy Kanady is an alternate.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Randy Kanady's on.

14 MS. EDWARDS: Oh, Randy's on. Randy, that's right. Okay.
15 So I'm hoping that this doesn't have to be an exceptionally long
16 call, but the -- at the last -- just a quick agenda check. I
17 thought we just -- I quickly kind of reviewed what we had
18 discussed before, setting up a couple of subcommittees at the
19 last meeting and then jump in, just sort of try to coordinate
20 those committees a little bit, figure out who's going to be on
21 them and maybe a little bit of logistics associated with that
22 and then as a group sort of figure out how we want to move
23 forward. I think there's a couple key things that I think we
24 should get out of today besides just sort of who's on the
25 committee. I think that we need to from the workgroup side make

1 sure that we at least have a fairly well rounded out expectation
2 of what we want from these two groups. I think we did talk
3 about that at the last meeting, but I'm hopeful that that will
4 not be too difficult. But I do think that we need to let the
5 groups have some expectation of what we're expecting them to
6 produce for us and bring back. Does anybody have any questions
7 about the agenda? I do think we may be able to move through
8 faster than two hours.

9 MR. THOMAS: It looks good.

10 MS. EDWARDS: All right. Hearing nothing on -- to the
11 contrary we'll move into the second agenda item. So at the last
12 meeting we had decided that one of our action items was going to
13 be to set up two essentially subgroups or subcommittees to work
14 on a few specific issues. And the first group would be a group
15 that would sort of -- we called sort of monitoring and modeling,
16 maybe technical folks to take a look at the monitoring data that
17 exists as well as some of the options for modeling and some of
18 the modeling that's been done. So that was one group that we
19 thought we needed to get going, have a look at some of the
20 information in more detail so that we could continue to work
21 through the proposal that AOGA and the Support Industry Alliance
22 provided us that we went over at the last meeting.

23 The other subcommittee that we talked about forming or
24 subgroup that we talked about forming we kind of called the
25 options group which was maybe a little less clearly defined as

1 far as what they were going to do, but the idea would be to sort
2 of work through some of the options and ideas for how we would
3 pull together this -- the proposals in more of a policy format
4 and make sure that we covered the items that we would need to
5 cover as far as making them approvable by EPA and, you know, the
6 steps that we would need to go through to do all of that.

7 So those were the two groups that we -- I believe we had
8 decided to set up. And I believe we all sort of agreed that we
9 would come back in a few weeks and identify who we thought
10 should be working on those subgroups for us and so that's the --
11 that's sort of the purpose of this call as well as to make sure
12 that folks -- that we -- that the folks that are on these groups
13 have an idea of what we want and sort of when -- we know when we
14 need it and sort of what we're kind of expecting to get back
15 out, knowing that that may evolve a little bit here as the
16 groups get into the -- their work.

17 Bill or Josh or Brad or John, does anybody else have a
18 different recollection or want to add to that?

19 MR. BRITT: This is Bill. No, Alice, I think you did a
20 perfect job of summarizing that as well.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I concur.

22 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, concur.

23 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So then moving forward I guess the --
24 I had laid out in this agenda some of the questions that I
25 thought or things that I thought we should work through which --

1 that we probably should -- maybe let's just take -- is everybody
2 agreeable to just sort of take one committee at a time and we'll
3 work through one committee and then work through the next
4 committee?

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

7 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. Did I cut somebody off? Okay. So
8 the first committee I think we should look at is the -- sort of
9 this technical committee that's mon -- this group to look at the
10 monitoring and modeling. We here at DEC, we have a number of
11 people we've identified that can be used as resources or could
12 be a part of this group. I don't know if you want me to kind of
13 lay out who those folks are first or if anybody else wants to
14 sort of start off as far as who they might want to put on this
15 subgroup.

16 MR. THOMAS: But -- Alice, this is Brad. Are these people
17 that will actually serve on the subcommittee or will they just
18 be resources too?

19 MS. EDWARDS: Well, I guess we have -- we've identified a
20 number of people with different expertises that we can bring as
21 -- bring to the table to work on the -- to do this work. So I
22 -- we've identified those people. How the subcommittee's
23 organized, I guess I would venture that we should -- one idea --
24 well, one way to do this would be to identify who we think has
25 the expertise and interest to be on the subcommittee and then

1 let the subcommittees figure out how they want to organize
2 themselves and assign work out to the resources that they have.

3 MR. THOMAS: Okay. Yeah, I do find who is on the
4 subcommittee would be task one and then we can -- and then the
5 subcommittee itself can set its own agenda and processes.

6 MS. EDWARDS: That was my thought unless somebody
7 disagrees with that approach.

8 MR. BRITT: No, I like that. I think subcommittees work
9 better if they have their own control over the destiny as long
10 as we kind of lay out what the goals are.

11 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So let me -- I guess just to start
12 things off, let me tell you who DEC has identified at this point
13 from a technical perspective that can participate. Or maybe I
14 should let John do it, but we have Barbara Trost from the
15 monitoring group and -- our monitoring manager and she also has
16 identified -- are you on, Barbara?

17 MS. TROST: Yes, I am.

18 MS. EDWARDS: So she's also identified Bob Morgan and Mike
19 Gravier who's our meteorologist from the monitoring program that
20 can assist in looking at data. On the -- more of the modeling
21 side we have sort of three different modelers that we have
22 identified that can work on this. And I would say in the
23 context of DEC that because of our resources and other
24 priorities that these folks will have other priorities that
25 they're working on, but they -- during the time that they do

1 have they could spend time on it. And that's Armsure and James
2 Renovatio and then Deanna Huff.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What was the second name?

4 MS. EDWARDS: James.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: James. Okay.

6 MS. EDWARDS: And then I would also add that as far as --
7 well, and maybe this is getting a little farther along, but I
8 would also add that we have through Tom Turner's group Jeanne in
9 particular who's been helping us with these -- with our
10 workgroup and logistics and things like that and tracking
11 things, Jeanne Swartz. We could also make her available to help
12 do some of the administrative and logistical work to kind of
13 help with the subcommittees as well.

14 So that's sort of the -- I believe the focus that we've
15 come to -- come -- pulled together on the DEC side that we could
16 put towards this effort.

17 MR. THOMAS: And Alice, this is Brad. Of those six names
18 that you mentioned are you thinking that on the subcommittee
19 itself there would just be maybe two and then the other -- the
20 rest would serve as resources?

21 MS. SWARTZ: No.

22 MR. THOMAS: I mean anyone else.....

23 MS. EDWARDS: I guess it.....

24 MR. THOMAS:(indiscernible). I'm just curious.

25 MS. EDWARDS: I guess it depends on how we want the

1 subcommittee to be -- whether we see this as a group of people
2 all working on the same issue or whether we need to have one or
3 two people from each, you know, sort of sector or interested
4 stakeholder group. I don't know.

5 MR. KUTERBACH: My thought was since we do have other
6 significant projects going on by having more members actually on
7 the subcommittee we have the ability to keep the efforts of the
8 subcommittee moving even when one of the other high priority
9 projects, like the gas pipeline or some of the mines, takes away
10 one of our key resources.

11 MS. EDWARDS: And that was John Kuterbach by the way.

12 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad. That's okay by me. Josh,
13 Phil, anybody else on the phone that.....

14 MR. KINDRED: No, that's fine. This is Josh Kindred from
15 AOGA. That's fine by me.

16 MR. THOMAS: Well, Alice, this is Brad again. I can -- we
17 met and identified who would serve on each of the subcommittees,
18 so when you're ready I can -- you've got that information.

19 MS. EDWARDS: Go ahead, Brad.

20 MR. THOMAS: On the modeling and monitoring subcommittee
21 the individuals we thought would be best suited to serve would
22 be Wally Evans, Tom Damiana, Randy Kanady, Ben Wedin. He's with
23 Nordic. Wally by the way, I'll just tell you, Wally's with
24 Hilcorp. Tom's with AECOM. He's a modeling and monitoring
25 expert. Randy, of course, is with ConocoPhillips. He's the

1 alternate in the Support Industry Alliance. Ben Wedin with
2 Nordic. Alejandra Castano with BP. And I would like to be
3 there as well, but I've got my name on both of the
4 subcommittees. So if you don't object to that I would like that
5 function. Alejandra's doing the same thing.

6 MR. TURNER: Alice, this is Tom. Mike Munger, did you
7 check in?

8 MR. BRITT: No, Mike -- this is Bill. This is Bill.
9 Mike's not going to be able to check in. I'm his proxy, so he's
10 in trouble.

11 MR. TURNER: Oh, okay. Because he came in on the
12 GoToMeeting. We were just checking in.

13 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

14 MR. TURNER: All right. Brad, can you do us a favor for
15 the transcriptionist and read those names again and do it just a
16 little bit slower.

17 MR. THOMAS: Yeah. Yeah. On the modeling and monitoring
18 subcommittee we have Wally Evans with Hilcorp, Tom Damiana with
19 AECOM, Randy Kanady who's the -- he's with ConocoPhillips, Ben
20 Wedin who's with Nordic, Nordic Calista, Alejandra Castano with
21 BP and Brad Thomas, committee member for the Alaska Support
22 Industry Alliance.

23 MS. EDWARDS: Thanks, Brad. Josh, did you have anybody
24 else in mind on.....

25 MR. KINDRED: No. And this is Josh Kindred from AOGA.

1 No, and that's -- we have been meeting. These are lists that
2 Brad and I and everyone else worked out.

3 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. And Bill, from DNR's side do you have
4 anybody you'd like to have participate?

5 MR. BARRON: No, I think DNR will stand down on this
6 subcommittee and let DEC take the lead.

7 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. And I would say -- one of the
8 thoughts I had, and I know I'm digressing a little bit here, is
9 that I'm hoping that as the subcommittees work that they'll --
10 that through Jeanne or whatever mechanism we have for kind of
11 letting people know about meetings or calls or things like that
12 that maybe happen that they kind of keep the full workgroup --
13 the workgroup members themselves sort of looped in just so if
14 folks want to -- that are on the workgroup want to participate,
15 like Gordon or Mike or you, Bill. But, you know, that you can
16 do that if you choose to.

17 So it sounds like we have a pretty good group there. It's
18 -- I mean it's a pretty big group, but they've got quite a bit
19 of information to go through it sounds like. So are there any
20 others -- other folks that -- do you think -- do you all feel
21 like that's a pretty good group or is there some other interests
22 or expertise that we think should be on that group?

23 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad Thomas speaking. Bill, is it a
24 resource constraint that we keep a DNR individual off the
25 subcommittees? Because I think it would be helpful if DNR was

1 represented there.

2 MR. BARRON: No, Brad, it's not a resource thing. It's we
3 really don't have any air experts in terms of, you know, the --
4 if you're looking at, you know, the results of modeling versus
5 monitoring. If you think it would be advantageous I would be
6 more than happy to volunteer myself on that.

7 MR. THOMAS: I do. That's my opinion.

8 MR. BARRON: That's fine. I'll be happy to jump in on
9 that team.

10 MR. THOMAS: Good.

11 MS. EDWARDS: I would -- one request, Mike Munger left me
12 a message saying he couldn't be here earlier this week he did
13 say he was willing to participate on the subcommittee -- on a
14 subcommittee as well and we can chat with him about which one he
15 feels like he would be most comfortable serving on.

16 MR. KUTERBACH: This is John Kuterbach. One thing that
17 we're going to have to be sure we recognize, even though they're
18 not going to be officially on the subcommittee, but an integral
19 resource is going to be our resources at EPA.....

20 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

21 MR. KUTERBACH:that are experts in monitoring and
22 modeling.

23 MS. EDWARDS: And I will admit I haven't called EPA before
24 this call and I did not get that accomplished. I am going to
25 Region 10 next week and I will raise this issue down there and

1 see what kind of resources they have available to assist as a --
2 you know, from a resource perspective.

3 So any other thoughts on the makeup of this committee? Or
4 subcommittee. So the next question I had was sort of who will
5 organize and lead the subcommittee meetings. And that -- I kind
6 of laid out an idea here earlier which was I think that we
7 should let the subcommittee sort of org -- get together and
8 organize itself as far as how it wants to operate or how it
9 wants to assign out the work to look at the different pieces and
10 the different issues that are raised through the proposal that
11 we've been looking at. That's my opinion. But I do think, you
12 know, we can provide someone like Jeanne to help make sure that
13 those meetings get organized and that the logistics get worked
14 out and things like that. So I don't know if you guys are
15 comfortable with that approach or if the workgroup members want
16 to have a little more input into how the subcommittee is
17 organized and led.

18 MR. THOMAS: Alice, this is Brad. Just a thought. You
19 know, consistent with the larger committee perhaps the
20 expectations should just be communicated to the subcommittees
21 that they be led by, you know, one person from DEC, one from
22 DNR, one from the industry side. Just so there's three folks
23 that can really direct it. That way one person just won't
24 dominate. That's just a thought, just occurred to me.

25 MR. KUTERBACH: This is John. That's a good point. I

1 think it's good that we don't have one person dominate. I just
2 want to caution everybody to recognize that when you split the
3 responsibility among three people that can also lead to a little
4 less efficiency in accomplishing the objectives.

5 MR. THOMAS: I -- yeah, and I acknowledge that.

6 MS. EDWARDS: So any other thoughts on that. I mean I
7 think that could be workable, to share that role and then it
8 gives some backup so if somebody's not able to lead a particular
9 call or meeting you can -- you could do that.

10 MR. BARRON: Yeah. This is Bill. I think a shared role
11 is fine. I've got no qualms with that.

12 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So we'll let the folks on the group
13 figure out who those folks should be, although it sounds like
14 Bill's going to do it for DNR since he's volunteered himself up.

15 The other questions then are sort of more about when can
16 the subcommittee start work and what do they need to start their
17 work. And I know, Brad, at the last meeting you were going to
18 try and pull together some of those datasets and I don't know
19 sort of where you're at status wise on that aspect of it which
20 is probably a little bit of what they would -- I mean they could
21 do some organizing, but it would be hard to do much more without
22 the data in front of them.

23 MR. THOMAS: We are very far along in pulling those
24 together. So I think at the first subcommittee meeting it will
25 be ready. I -- and I'll ask Mr. Damiana to weigh in on that,

1 but I said something -- if I were to check (indiscernible).

2 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

3 MR. THOMAS: Tom, are you there?

4 MS. EDWARDS: So as far as we -- is Tom -- Tom, are you
5 on?

6 MR. THOMAS: He's there. I saw his name on the
7 GoToMeeting.

8 MR. TURNER: Tom Damiana. Correct?

9 MS. SWARTZ: Yeah.

10 MS. EDWARDS: Yeah, it's like -- that -- it sounds to me,
11 Brad, like you feel like you'll have the materials ready. So as
12 long as we feel like they have something to work with, you know,
13 I don't have any issue on my side. I just wanted to make sure
14 that if we're going to send them off to do something that they
15 -- we've given them the -- you know, what they need to do the
16 work.

17 MR. THOMAS: Okay. Yeah, it'll be ready.

18 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So then I guess the last question for
19 this subcommittee then is sort of do we want to kind of hone in
20 and -- hone in a little bit more on what our expectation is. I
21 don't know that I really want to force a schedule onto the
22 subcommittee until -- you know, force a schedule on the
23 subcommittee or a deadline on the subcommittee until we kind of
24 know -- they have a chance to look things and get a sense of
25 that. But maybe we need to set a little bit of a structure of

1 what we're looking for and then also perhaps a timeframe for
2 them to come back and give us an idea of what they can
3 accomplish -- you know, after they've had a chance to organize
4 and look at some things maybe come back with a little plan of
5 what -- or a timeframe of when they can get back to us with the
6 deliverable.

7 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad. It would seem the timeframe
8 might be defined by the subcommittee itself. You know, we could
9 push them to be as aggressive as possible, but once they see
10 their workload perhaps they could, you know, propose to the
11 larger committee that timeframe after they see it.

12 MS. EDWARDS: I think that's -- yeah, that's what I was
13 thinking, but maybe we give them a -- and I don't know because I
14 don't know when because of the holidays when exactly the
15 subcommittee could first get together and really talk either by
16 phone or in person. And I guess the question I would have is do
17 we want to maybe set a -- not a deadline for them to necessarily
18 deliver a product, but maybe a timeframe for them to give us a
19 status update on what their plan is.

20 MS. TROST: This is Barbara with DEC Air Monitoring. I'm
21 trying to figure out. We haven't seen any of the data. I don't
22 know what format it's going to come in. So that'll be a little
23 bit of a challenge to come up with sort of a -- with a better
24 idea of what we're looking at. But what we could potentially as
25 one of the first action items for this workgroup, get together

1 and even agree on what level of review and what kind of a type
2 of a review we want to see with the dataset that Brad is sending
3 out or will be sending out. I mean I think there's a couple of
4 things that we're trying to see. First we need to look at the
5 quality of the data and then we need to define the -- this --
6 representativeness of the data, what can we interpret or how
7 large of a scope can we use the data for. I think that's what
8 we need to define before we even go down -- sit down and go
9 through the data in more detail. So that might be the first,
10 you know, action item is once we get the data within sort of a
11 shorter timeframe to get around it and agreeing on sort of the
12 steps and the goals.

13 MR. TURNER: Alice, this.....

14 MS. EDWARDS: So Barbara, do you.....

15 MR. BARRON: That makes a lot of sense.

16 MS. EDWARDS: Go ahead. I cut somebody off.

17 MR. BARRON: Yeah, this is Bill. You know, trying to
18 understand what you've got first and then try and set your
19 timelines makes a lot of sense rather than setting an unofficial
20 deadline.

21 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. Did somebody else want to say
22 something? I think there -- I think I heard another voice in
23 there.

24 MR. TURNER: This is Tom. One suggestion would be just to
25 maybe set a date for this organizing meeting based on what

1 Barbara and Bill said maybe the first two weeks or the middle of
2 January because of the holidays. And then that -- after that
3 organizing meeting they could come back and we could distribute
4 the information through Jeanne to the group about what the next
5 steps are, what the timetable is. Give everyone a chance to get
6 together. You have a pretty large group in the technical group
7 and there'll probably be some discussion about how to sort out
8 the work, who's going to be looking at what and then they can
9 come back and tell us what their project plan is.

10 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad. That sounds good.

11 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So we'll plan that the -- this
12 monitoring, modeling subcommittee will have sort of an initial
13 -- some initial work the first -- sometime in the first half of
14 January to look at the initial data, scope out what they want to
15 do and agree on the level and type of review and sort of their
16 steps and their goals and get back to us with sort of a plan and
17 a timeframe that they think that that could be accomplished in.

18 MR. KUTERBACH: Are we clear on what -- this is John. Are
19 we clear on what the mission of this group is? I understand
20 they need to define exactly what review they need to do and how
21 in depth they need to go, but I want to make sure that the
22 members of the subcommittee are clear on what the -- what their
23 charge is from the workgroup.

24 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad and, John, I think you're spot
25 on with that because it's worth bringing up in this meeting.

1 And when we talked, we being the AOGA members and the Support
2 Industry Alliance, when we talked about this a couple weeks ago
3 we thought that a very central question that this workgroup
4 ought to be charged with answering is this one, is there a
5 reason to believe that drill rigs are a threat to the ambient
6 air quality standard. I mean does the data show they are a
7 threat to the ambient air quality standard, a simple yes or no
8 answer. And if so, then they propose a way forward and if not
9 then they propose, you know, something else.

10 MR. KUTERBACH: Well, this is John. I guess I was looking
11 at it from a different perspective, was does the data support a
12 change to our current SIP.

13 MR. THOMAS: I guess -- yeah, that -- Brad again. That's
14 a second question they could be charged with answering. So they
15 could answer both.

16 MR. BARRON: This is Bill. I think we ought to try and
17 blend the two of them together. Because, you know, if the
18 answer is no then by definition almost the existing SIP is --
19 needs to be looked at hard. If it's yes then maybe the existing
20 SIP is okay or still needs to be looked at hard, but I think
21 it's in a combination kind of review. Kind of an if then kind
22 of statement.

23 MS. SWARTZ: Is there not data? Is the data of not good
24 quality? I mean (indiscernible) questions.

25 MS. EDWARDS: There's some thinking -- brain thinking

1 going on here I think. So.....

2 MS. SWARTZ: That's -- yes no is not (indiscernible).

3 MS. EDWARDS: What if we had a -- what if it was more like
4 -- I'm trying to.....

5 MR. KUTERBACH: This is John. I guess I'm just coming
6 from the perspective of we have a current situation that we want
7 to change. Does this data support that change?

8 MR. TROST: This is Barbara. Jeanne brought up a good
9 point. I mean the one question that was -- the one bullet in
10 the alliance of your proposal was also saying we need to review
11 whether there are sufficient data available to make a
12 determination and that -- neither one of these questions
13 necessarily speaks to that.

14 MR. TURNER: And this is Tom just also jumping in. Based
15 on kind of what was presented about what process we need to go
16 through to change the current SIP and I'd like to kind of
17 reiterate what John's saying. The goal here is we have a
18 current status quo, for lack of better re -- you know, of words.
19 It's in the SIP and we have to have demonstrated data and
20 evidence in order to change that SIP for EPA's approval. And so
21 it's not a question of a yes or no. It's a question of do we
22 have the data enough to change EPA's mind and how does that data
23 have to look in order to pass EPA scrutiny. Because what we're
24 changing here is the SIP.

25 MS. EDWARDS: So is it -- what we're really asking this

1 group to do is to -- we're asking this group to evaluate
2 existing monitoring and modeling data to determine whether air
3 quality -- to determine its representativeness in looking at air
4 quality impacts from drill rig operation and the need to make
5 changes to our -- I mean I'm trying. I'm not quite there.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

7 MS. EDWARDS: It seems like it's -- what we want this
8 group to do is to evaluate the adequacy of the existing
9 monitoring data in both quality representativeness to determine
10 whether or not air quality impact -- you know, to determine its
11 representativeness in looking at air quality impacts from drill
12 rigs and the need to revise our approach to manage those
13 emissions or impacts. I don't know. I'm trying to find a way
14 to bring the two together.

15 MR. THOMAS: Well, how about -- this is Brad, Alice. How
16 about -- going back to the question I posed originally. Doesn't
17 the data show that there is -- the drill rigs are any threat to
18 ambient air quality and if not -- let me restate that. Does the
19 data show to a reasonable person whether or not drill rigs are a
20 threat to ambient air quality and, if not, what will it take, if
21 anything, to make it persuasively representative to EPA
22 (indiscernible). I just didn't think that through very well,
23 but it seems like that's where you're trying to go.

24 MR. SCHULER: Alice, this is Alan. You know, we're trying
25 to word craft, you know, a goal here which really needs to be

1 stated. Would it be worthwhile just to think about this and
2 then pass around a proposal around, an email to wordsmith it a
3 little bit more rather than try and do it on the phone?

4 MS. EDWARDS: That's probably not a bad idea actually.

5 MR. KUTERBACH: I think that's a very good idea.

6 MS. EDWARDS: Yeah. We can certainly do that. I think we
7 have a -- I think the folks on the phone have a sense of what
8 we're trying to get at. Maybe we can bounce a couple ideas
9 around amongst the group and try and hone it in a little bit
10 better for you guys in advance of any meetings.

11 MS. SCHULER: And one other thought too. It seems like,
12 you know, we're -- granted, you know, John's ideas are really
13 coming at the issue from an opposite, you know, direction.
14 Because, you know, reasonably, you know, it's almost -- well, if
15 there's no data there's no reasonably, there's a threat. You
16 know, and so I mean that could lead to one conclusion versus,
17 you know, the opposite side of is there data to support we need
18 to make a change where it shows that there needs to be something
19 there at least so that there's a change. So I think we need to
20 be very careful too which way we come at this question.

21 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad. Yeah, I agree, that is
22 important. The important parcel of that is when the workgroup
23 identifies its mission, you know, lands on its mission and its
24 tasks that they set standards on the data they're going to
25 review. There's -- I've heard a tendency to set a very high bar

1 to the data that's been collected which may or may not be
2 achievable. So, you know, the word reasonable has to come into
3 play in my opinion at the beginning of the subcommittee's work.

4 MR. TURNER: Should I say something about reasonable, it
5 has to pass EPA?

6 MS. SWARTZ: Yeah.

7 MR. TURNER: Brad, this is Tom. I understand the term
8 reasonable and what would be considered from various viewpoints
9 reasonable. The standard is EPA's. They're the ones that set
10 the standard. They're the ones that have it in the SIP. That's
11 the standard we have to look at. Or we have to have sufficient
12 evidence to change their mind. So I think it's very important
13 to recognize where that standard is. That's -- you know, it's
14 the process to demonstrate enough data in order to change the
15 existing SIP and EPA is the judge on that.

16 MS. EDWARDS: Well, and I guess -- this is Alice. I guess
17 the question is -- I mean it's -- I understand, Brad, your --
18 the concept of reasonable as well and I think it's sort of what
19 is sufficient to make the case, to make the argument that there
20 is -- either is or isn't any impact from these types of
21 activities that we need to worry about. And I guess you're
22 pointing because you could monitor something to death and the
23 way we're monitoring then would be needed to make that point or
24 you could do way too little. And the question is, is sort of
25 where is that middle ground that's both reasonable and

1 sufficient to make the case. And I suspect that that will be an
2 interesting discussion, but I think it's something the group
3 could work on. But I understand your point.

4 So if we bounce around a little bit maybe amongst the
5 workgroup members a little bit more, we try to maybe flush this
6 out a little bit more, and it doesn't necessarily have to come
7 down into once sentence, but I think we kind of know how we need
8 to bring it together a little bit more for them. But I think we
9 have an -- I mean I think most folks probably working on this
10 committee at least have an idea of where this is headed and
11 we'll work to try and be a little more precise in our
12 expectation. But we can -- I think Alan's right. It's probably
13 easier to wordsmith that by working through some email drafts
14 and come up with something that we feel more comfortable with or
15 all feel comfortable with.

16 MR. THOMAS: And just one administrative note. Tom
17 Damiana is on the phone. He sent me an email. He's having
18 technical difficulties communicating. I don't know if that's
19 something on your end there, Alice or Tom.

20 MR. DAMIANA: Can you all hear me now?

21 MS. SWARTZ: Yes.

22 MR. THOMAS: Oh, it's -- yeah, I can hear you.

23 MS. TROST: Yes.

24 MR. TURNER: Yes.

25 MR. DAMIANA: Okay. I think I figured it out.

1 MR. TURNER: Did you try and go through the audio or
2 through the call in line, Tom?

3 MR. DAMIANA: I'm on the call in line right now.

4 MR. TURNER: Yeah, that's the best way is to use the call
5 in line.

6 MR. THOMAS: So Tom, what I mentioned earlier regarding
7 the availability of the -- all the technical information, we'll
8 be good to go early in January. Correct?

9 MR. DAMIANA: Yeah, that's correct.

10 MR. THOMAS: Okay.

11 MS. EDWARDS: Great. So I think then if we all work a
12 little bit on the -- sort of the expectation or mission
13 statement or whatever for the subcommittee, what we want from
14 the subcommittee as the workgroup a little bit more, polish --
15 try and polish something up where it maybe runs through a few
16 drafts amongst the committee we can work on that over the next
17 few weeks and make sure that we have that in advance of whenever
18 the first meeting is for this group. And then I think then
19 maybe we've got what we need to get this subcommittee moving.
20 Is there anything else that folks think we need to talk about
21 with relation to this particular subcommittee before we move on
22 to the other one?

23 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad, Alice. I think that's -- that
24 was very, very productive.

25 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

1 MR. TURNER: Alice.

2 MS. EDWARDS: So the.....

3 MR. TURNER: Excuse me, Alice. This is Tom. If -- since
4 Jeanne's in logistical support we can send out proposed meeting
5 dates with a possible statement to the workgroup.

6 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

7 MR. TURNER: Okay. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

8 MS. EDWARDS: Thanks, Tom. Thanks, Jeanne. So then the
9 other group that we talked about and I probably have a harder
10 time articulating what the objective of this -- clearly even the
11 contents we've just had trying to objectively kind of lay out
12 the -- what the last group was lined out to do. This one I
13 think for me is a little -- maybe a little harder to articulate.
14 But this would be what we call the options group to look at
15 different options for how to sort of look at what kind of
16 regulatory changes or how you might bring this together in more
17 of a -- more of the process and policy side of it. You know,
18 what's going to need to be done on that side of things to make
19 something work or what other options might there -- you know,
20 what kinds of options do we have. So who -- Brad, have you
21 identified some folks for that kind of a group?

22 MR. THOMAS: Yes, we have, Alice.

23 MS. EDWARDS: So who do you have? Who are you -- who
24 would you propose to have on that group?

25 MR. THOMAS: Well, first of all, Josh Kindred will serve

1 on it.

2 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

3 MR. THOMAS: Then we got Bill Britt. Josh is there. Of
4 course Bill Britt's with Hilcorp. John Neason with Nabors
5 Drilling. Mike Peters with Doyon Drilling. John Hellen with --
6 what's the name of that company? They just bought Pioneer.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Caelus.

8 MR. THOMAS: Caelus. And of course Alejandra and me
9 again.

10 MS. EDWARDS: I apologize, Brad. I missed the third
11 person. It was Josh Kindred, Bill Britt and what -- who was the
12 third person you named?

13 MR. THOMAS: John Neason, N-e-a-s-o-n. He's with Nabors
14 Drilling.

15 MS. EDWARDS: Oh, Nabors. Okay. Thanks. Great. So on
16 the DEC side I think we -- I would probably participate to some
17 extent. We have John and Tom for sure from the DEC side.

18 MR. KUTERBACH: Maybe Jim as a backup for me.

19 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

20 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, that's fine.

21 MS. EDWARDS: And then Bill, did you want to -- did you
22 want anybody from DNR to participate on that, did you want to
23 participate on this one as well?

24 MR. BARRON: Yeah, I'll -- go ahead and put my name down.
25 I may find somebody else in the meantime, but go ahead and put a

1 placeholder for me and then I get to throw Munger under the bus.
2 Put him on too.

3 MS. EDWARDS: Yeah, I would say that this is probably
4 where we -- Mike would probably want to participate as well.

5 MR. BARRON: Yeah, I think it'd be a good one for Mike.

6 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

7 MR. BARRON: I can tell him that you volunteered him.

8 MS. EDWARDS: Well, we'll check with him and make sure he
9 wants to participate. I also will check back with Gordon and
10 see if he wants to participate or have anybody participate on
11 any of these subcommittees. Certainly not required for that,
12 but we'll double check with him as well since he's not on the
13 line.

14 MR. TURNER: Alice, do we need to.....

15 MS. EDWARDS: Anybody else?

16 MR. TURNER: Do we need to check with EPA on that one?

17 MS. EDWARDS: I will check in with EPA on that one as
18 well. My -- I believe that we will be able to get access
19 probably to Dave Bray to help us and the resource on that group.
20 So -- but I will double check with EPA again next week to make
21 sure that that -- that's -- that that will work for them. Dave
22 Bray is the EPA staff person that we've been sort of keeping
23 informed on this particular project and I think he would be a
24 good resource for that particular committee, subcommittee. So
25 does anybody have any other suggestions for that committee or do

1 we think we've got that -- a pretty good rounded group on that
2 one?

3 MR. THOMAS: Sounds good.

4 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sounds good to me.

6 MS. EDWARDS: So again, the same thing, I think we can use
7 Tom or his staff to help organize as we are for these calls. I
8 -- and we can get this group together as well and sort of sort
9 through who wants to lead. But we can -- I think we can set up
10 the same kind of colleague shared leadership on this group as
11 well if we want to. Does that make sense to everybody?

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, it does.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

15 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. And then what about timing to get
16 this started, this particular group started? Do we want to
17 start them in the same sort of timeframe as the other group?
18 This one doesn't -- it doesn't rely so much on -- I mean at some
19 point we need -- there needs to be an error section between
20 what's coming out of the other group and this group, but I think
21 there's probably some things that this group could start looking
22 at in advance of having an answer out of the monitoring and
23 modeling sort of review. So do we want to try and target early
24 January as well for trying to bring this group together?

25 MR. BARRON: Yeah, I -- this is Bill. I think we need to

1 start moving ahead on both of them kind of in a parallel path
2 and kind of just exchange information as we see necessary back
3 at the workgroup. But yeah, we need to get -- you need to get
4 moving on this.

5 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

6 MR. THOMAS: Alice, this is Brad. I agree with Bill. One
7 of the things that we -- when we met in the group we ended with
8 the option -- we really had to work, you know, two things. The
9 second thing to work out is the -- is to take the
10 recommendations from the modeling and monitoring subcommittee
11 and act on that, you know, to develop it if that's the direction
12 chosen, you know, (indiscernible). But the first thing is just
13 to make sure that, you know, certain issues are adequately
14 worked and understood, things like what was the effect of the
15 existing permitting program, what did it accomplish, what -- did
16 it have an effect on the NOx, did it effect how drill rigs
17 operate. The second thing is rig activity. There's a lot of
18 concern expressed about if the permitting program is lifted will
19 rig activity mushroom. You know, what -- to talk about things
20 like what drives rig activity and make sure it's understood,
21 how, when, where, how many rigs are deployed and why. A third
22 thing that they could work on is, you know, we proposed this
23 concept of a leadership team to adapt to and respond to
24 monitoring data as it came in. So they could talk about what
25 the leadership team -- what it would consist of, what it does,

1 what it -- how often it's going to meet and, you know, what its
2 function is.

3 MS. EDWARDS: Okay.

4 MR. KUTERBACH: And this is John. A couple other things
5 that I think this is going to have to address is how do we
6 address Title 5 requirements for Title 5 sources to include all
7 applicable requirements with respect to drill rigs.

8 MR. THOMAS: Yeah. Yeah.

9 MS. EDWARDS: And I think originally, and Tom Turner may
10 have brought this up at the last meeting, there was also this
11 concept of trying to look at how -- ultimately how to bring
12 things into whatever kind of regulatory changes we would need to
13 get approvals for, sort of looking at the -- maybe the approval
14 framework with EPA. I don't know if that's the right term to
15 use, but.....

16 MR. TURNER: Alice, this is Tom. Yeah, there needs to be
17 some recognition in the regs about how this is going to be
18 affected. If like you have some type of ongoing program or
19 whatever we'll have to put that into the regs. And then the
20 other.....

21 MS. EDWARDS: So I mean we would need -- there would need
22 to be some sort of -- regardless of what happens, if we change
23 the regulatory program we got to change the regs. So maybe
24 there's some process related pieces that this group could work
25 through as far as how that would come together and what would be

1 needed to do that and what would be needed to make it approvable
2 by EPA knowing that we've got the technical people on the other
3 side. Sort of one of those key elements that we need to make
4 sure we have in place to do something like that.

5 MR. TURNER: One other thing that's going to be quasi
6 related to the regs is, you know, the permitting program is
7 self-funded. So they would need some type of recognition of
8 whatever program or existing path forward, there has to be some
9 ability of being able to pay for it.

10 MS. EDWARDS: So it sounds like there's a number of things
11 that this group could work through, a number of issues that it
12 could work through. Looking towards options depending on what
13 the outcome is from -- that they work through the monitoring and
14 modeling piece and what that's looking like and where we might
15 go from -- based on the outcome of that review. Also there's --
16 it sounds like there's several things we could work on while
17 that other work is being done.

18 Are there other ideas on this one? I'm still not hearing
19 any kind of clear expectation, but I -- we're sort of lumping in
20 a lot of things that ultimately would end up at the workgroup
21 for discussion, full workgroup for discussion anyway. But some
22 of these I think you're right, we need to probably go into in a
23 little more detail. We may need to think through and sort out
24 which ones -- while this subcommittee may need to work on, we
25 should also figure out which of those topics Brad might be --

1 think that we need to go back through with the full workgroup to
2 make sure that everybody has understanding of those issues.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

4 MS. EDWARDS: How to bring those back to the larger
5 workgroup if we need to. Other ideas, other thoughts on this
6 group?

7 MR. KINDRED: This is John Kindred from AOGA. I know when
8 we had our working group meeting trying to figure out what the
9 two committees, what their tasks would be, I think there was a
10 consensus that we all thought in its infancy the options group
11 could talk about I guess concepts in broad terms, but that
12 ultimately the catalyst for whatever precise ideas we were going
13 to have was going to be determined by the monitoring and
14 modeling group. Or in other words once we get more information
15 we'll have a better idea of what direction to go or what
16 concepts to fine tune. So while I agree with Bill that we
17 should start them at the same time, I think a lot of the second
18 group or the options group, a lot of their efforts are going to
19 be dependent on the information coming out of the monitoring and
20 modeling group.

21 MS. EDWARDS: I agree with that statement as well. Okay.
22 So other thoughts, Bill or Brad or Tom, others?

23 MR. THOMAS: No. So this is Alice -- or this is Brad,
24 Alice. So what'll happen next is somebody from ADEC will try to
25 capture all these thoughts in a single one page document and

1 send them out to both for comment so we can get some sense of
2 what the charge is going to be to the subcommittees.

3 MS. EDWARDS: Yeah, I think we can do that. We should be
4 able to do that. We'll make sure that we got a list of the
5 subcommittee, our best take at trying to come up with a charge
6 or the ideas that we've got on the table. We may do -- we may
7 want to do a little bit of emailing around, Brad and Bill and
8 Josh, to make sure -- you know, if we want to try and hone in
9 that -- those statements a little bit more before we send them
10 out to a broader group we can do that if you'd like or we can
11 just shoot something across and let people respond to it.

12 MR. THOMAS: I like the honing idea better, Alice.

13 MR. KINDRED: Yeah, I do too.

14 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So we will pull stuff together, but
15 we'll try -- maybe try a couple -- sending out a couple drafts
16 to the workgroup members on sort of the expectations and what we
17 want out of the committees just to make sure we're kind of all
18 together on the same page and then we'll send it out more
19 broadly. And let's plan to do that -- I know it's the holidays.
20 I'm pretty much gone for the next two weeks. So -- but can we
21 still try to target the end of -- at least having that
22 accomplished by the end of the month? And in the meantime we'll
23 -- we will proceed with the logistics of setting up the calls or
24 the meetings of the subcommittees in early January. So we'll
25 find -- start working on finding the times and days.

1 MR. KUTERBACH: Yeah, I'm good with that.

2 MR. TURNER: Yeah. And Alice, we could probably do
3 another seven day turnaround on the transcripts which will help
4 us with this. It's always nice to go back and read those. Is
5 that correct, Teresa?

6 THE REPORTER: Yes, sir.

7 MR. TURNER: She said yes.

8 MS. SWARTZ: Okay.

9 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. So workgroup folks, we'll try to hone
10 those ideas in for the -- sort of the goals for these groups
11 that -- what we want out of them by the end of the month. And
12 we'll try to send out something here within the next couple --
13 you know, within the next couple weeks for sure on that. In the
14 meantime Jeanne and Tom can get working on trying to get the
15 meeting dates polled out to everybody for the meeting dates.

16 MR. TURNER: (Indiscernible).

17 MS. SWARTZ: I think somebody should.

18 MR. THOMAS: This is Brad.

19 MS. EDWARDS: And hopefully we can come together in the
20 first part of January then.

21 MR. THOMAS: Alice, this is Brad. So did I just hear that
22 Tom and Jeanne are going to go ahead and propose the first
23 meeting dates for the subcommittees?

24 MS. SWARTZ: Yeah.

25 MS. EDWARDS: Yes. I think while we work this issue we

1 should go ahead and start -- because there's so many people and
2 we want to try and get as many of them to participate as we can,
3 especially in organizing things, I think what we need to do is
4 start polling them all for the best timeframes in that first
5 part of January for days of -- for days for meeting -- days and
6 times for meeting. And we can start working that now and then
7 in the mean -- and while they're doing that we the workgroup can
8 keep working a little bit on these goal statements for the --
9 for better -- lack of a better word, for the subcommittee and
10 try and get those polished up by the end of the month. And then
11 that way we can bring everything together and have stuff noted
12 and hand some things out to folks in early January.

13 MR. THOMAS: Okay. I think that's very good.

14 MR. TURNER: Logistics.....

15 MS. SMITH: Hey, Brad. This is -- Brad, this is Rebecca.
16 If there are some of those people you guys are proposing to be
17 on the subcommittees for who we don't have email contact
18 information yet could you be sure to send that to Jeanne?
19 Because some of those names.....

20 MR. THOMAS: I will.

21 MS. SMITH: Yeah, some of those names don't look familiar
22 to me, people who are on them.

23 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, I'll do that, Rebecca.

24 MS. SMITH: Thanks.

25 MR. TURNER: This is Tom. I have a logistical question

1 for the first subgroup meetings. Are we going to do those in
2 person, which might be useful since it's a large group, and do
3 you want those all transcribed? We can make both of those
4 arrangements. I can work with Jim to find space and get the
5 transcriptionist in.

6 MS. EDWARDS: I don't know what the rest of the group
7 feels like. I don't know that we would need to transcribe them
8 to be honest. I do think that finding a meeting location would
9 be fine, but I think we should provide the option for
10 teleconferencing in.

11 MR. TURNER: Okay. Great, no problem. We can do that.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I agree.

13 MS. EDWARDS: That's my feeling. You know, these kinds of
14 meetings I don't know that we need the transcription for them.

15 MR. KUTERBACH: Agreed.

16 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, this is Brad. I don't object.
17 (Indiscernible).

18 MS. EDWARDS: But I guess maybe coming from the workgroup
19 side, you know, from my perspective it would be nice if some --
20 you know, maybe this is something that Jeanne and Tom can take
21 care of as well. It would be nice to at least get a summary of
22 the meeting so that, you know, there is some record of what was
23 discussed, even if -- you know, not verbatim.

24 MR. TURNER: That's.....

25 MR. THOMAS: I agree, Alice. (Indiscernible) notes that

1 summarize would be good because on the modeling and monitoring
2 subcommittee, for example, it's going to be mind numbing
3 technically. It's going to be boring.

4 MS. EDWARDS: Well, I mean everybody wants to be able to
5 have a candid discussion and talk about this stuff and then -- I
6 think, but it'd be nice to capture the high points and what's --
7 sort of where things are at, what's agreed to and what are --
8 who's working on what and things like that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep.

10 MS. EDWARDS: All right. So we'll get surveys out for
11 meeting dates. I think we will get -- we will have meeting
12 rooms set up, but, you know, we'll make sure that there's the
13 ability to participate telephonically. And other things that we
14 need to take care of today.

15 MR. TURNER: Alice, according to the agenda do we need to
16 worry about the next workgroup meeting or do you want to see
17 what happens with the subcommittees?

18 MS. EDWARDS: I guess what I would suggest we do is that
19 we tentatively pencil in a workgroup meeting towards the end of
20 January to get -- at least to get a status report out from the
21 first subcommittee meetings and sort of what the plan is and
22 keep everybody on the workgroup up to speed. And I guess.....

23 MR. BARRON: Yeah. This is Bill. I agree with that.

24 MS. EDWARDS: And I don't know if we -- and I think we
25 could probably do it -- we can make a decision at a later point,

1 but I think we could probably do it by teleconference like
2 today.

3 MS. SWARTZ: Okay.

4 MR. THOMAS: Yeah, this is Brad. I think that's an
5 excellent idea.

6 MS. SWARTZ: Then that's less of a problem logistically.

7 MS. EDWARDS: And I would suggest then that we try and
8 find a time in the second half of January for that, Tom.
9 Turner. I should say Tom Turner.

10 MR. TURNER: No, we got it. I'm making notes quick.

11 MS. EDWARDS: And I would say the primary agenda item
12 would just be the status reports from the subcommittees.

13 Okay. Well, we did really well on time. So is there
14 anything else for the good of the group or other things that we
15 need to talk about today? I'm trying to be cognizant of the
16 folks in Anchorage who have really bad weather to deal with this
17 afternoon going home.

18 MR. THOMAS: We appreciate that.

19 MR. KUTERBACH: Yeah, that was going to be -- that was the
20 only comment that I was going to make. For those that are in
21 Anchorage, please drive safely. It's not worth getting in a
22 wreck over.

23 MS. EDWARDS: Okay. Well, it sounds to me like we've
24 probably covered everything. So I hope you all have a good
25 holiday and we will follow up on the action items we've

1 discussed and look forward to getting these subcommittees
2 rolling in early January.

3 MR. THOMAS: All right. Thanks, Alice. Good job.

4 MR. KUTERBACH: Thank you, Alice.

5 MS. EDWARDS: Thanks, everybody.

6 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

7 MR. TURNER: Off record.

8 THE REPORTER: Okay. We are off the record at 3:03.

9 (Off record at 3:03 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Nicolette Hernandez, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 42 are a true, accurate and complete transcript of proceedings of the Workgroup for Global Air Permit Policy Development for Temporary Oil and Gas Drill Rigs, held December 5, 2013, in Anchorage, Alaska, transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Date

Nicolette Hernandez