BRADFORD RANGER DISTRICT

OIL AND GAS INSPECTION REPORT

OGM Case Numbers:	243, 244 and 245	Date of Inspection:	April 13, 2007
Weather Conditions:	Cold, 30's F	Persons On-Site:	Robert Gleeson and Ken Scott – DEP – Meadville Office
Warrant/Lot Number:	Warrants 2752 & 2445 Lots 7, 8, 9, 12 & 13	Mineral Owner/Leasee:	Duhring Resource Company

Forest Service Representatives: Sheldon Winters – OGM Administrator, Paul Weese – Zone OGM Team Leader, Cara Farr – Soil Scientist, Chuck Keeports - Hydrologist
Discussed Operation With: DEP representatives on-site (Gleeson and Scott)
Equipment On-Site: None
Activity On-Site: Proposed roads and wells were flagged/marked, and existing development

INSPECTION ITEMS and RESOURCE CONCERNS

On April 3, 2007, the Allegheny National Forest sent an objection letter to Robert Gleeson of the DEP in regards to Duhring Resource Company's proposed development in Warrants 2752 and 2445. This field visit was scheduled to discuss the ANF's concerns with Duhring's proposed development. For this inspection report, a well number indicates a proposed well unless otherwise noted.

Warrant 2752 - Lot 7

- Well 7-20 is in a wetland greater than one acre, and would require a road that goes through a wetland.
- Well 7-21 is approximately 20 feet from a large spring seep which is part of the wetland greater than one acre. An access road from either the north or the south would pass through a wetland.
- Well 7-22 is approximately one foot from a wetland greater than one acre. Even if the well was moved outside the wetland, it would be difficult to locate a road that would meet Best Management Practices (BMPs) to a access this well site.
- The side slope of the hill west of Wells 7-20, 7-21 and 7-22 is greater than 35%, and several spring seeps exist along the hill side.
- The existing road (an old jeep corridor that has been worked on recently) has a grade of approximately 10-12%. Plastic cross culverts were installed at approximately 400 feet spacing. These pipes are not handling the runoff; consequently, there is significant amount of erosion and sedimentation that is occurring along this corridor. Additional culverts are needed to reduce the spacing to approximately 200 feet. Also, several of the existing pipes need to be adjusted because they were not installed correctly. This access road also needs to be seeded and mulched to minimize the erosion and sedimentation occurring in the area. Also, the roots of many standing trees adjacent to the road were buried. This material needs to be removed, or these trees need to be marked and the Forest Service compensated for this timber.
- The side slope along this corridor will make it difficult to construct and stabilize the well pads for Wells 7-13 and 7-15, and possibly Well 7-16.
- The proposed access road leading to Well 7-14 was originally flagged with a slope greater than 20%. Sheldon Winters flagged an alternative to Duhring's proposal that met BMPs. We reviewed Sheldon's alternative in the field and decided it was the more suitable alternative.
- Two proposed well locations 7-17 and 7-19 are visible from SR 948, a Concern Level 1 road in regards to scenery management as identified in the Forest Plan.

BRADFORD RANGER DISTRICT

OIL AND GAS INSPECTION REPORT

- The existing well pad proposed to be used for access to Well 7-19 is 40 feet from a vernal pool located on the eastern edge of the well pad, and is in a very wet area. Keeports recommends the following to resolve resource concerns:
    - Pull material away from vernal pond and seed and mulch the well pad.
    - Water bars should be constructed below the proposed road.
    - Install a cross culvert and construct runoff ditches on access road.
    - Crown the access road.
- The proposed road to access Well 7-18 is very close to and would be visible from the North Country Trail. The group discussed an alternative route that would move the access road away from the parking area and out of the wet area directly north of the parking area, and that would be less visible from the North Country National Scenic Trail.

Warrants 2445 – Lot 8

- Even though the side slope in this area is steep (35-40%) Winters and Hugh Lauffenberger previously flagged an alternative route to the one proposed by Duhring that they thought met BMPs.
- Well 8-43 was reviewed today. It is located in a large spring seep, and will need to be moved.

Warrant 2445 - Lots 9 and 12

- Two proposed stream crossings on Rock Run (a HQ-CWF stream) are poorly placed, and the proposed access roads do not meet standard BMPs (i.e. severe grades (25-30%), unnecessary stream crossings, steep side slopes at well sites (40-60%)). Duhring has proposed to create a loop road to access proposed well locations D-25, D-26 and D-27, which would require these two stream crossings. The terrain to the east of these crossings is too steep (30%-60+%) to be able to construct an access road with an acceptable grade, and that would not cause significant impacts to the water quality of Rock Run. The proposed well locations appear to all be within approximately 200 feet of Rock Run on very steep terrain.
- The existing development is producing a lot of sediment. The non-system road leading to the area is rutted and muddy. Silt fence has been placed within the channels of two spring seeps. Several of the culverts are undersized and filled with sediment.
- The proposed access road to Well D-13 was previously adjusted by Winters to reduce its grade.
- Wells D-28, D-29, D-31, D-32, D-33 and D-34 were not reviewed on this day.

For additional information regarding this field visit, please read a memorandum, dated April 20, 2007, written by Keeports.

COMMENTS:

Participants in the field review agreed that the concerns brought to the DEP's attention by the Forest Service in the objection letter dated April 3, 2007 were valid. Forest Service representatives said they would schedule a meeting with Duhring Resource Company to discuss the concerns the Forest has with the proposed development, and to work with Duhring, and if needed the DEP at a later date, to resolve these concerns.

Forest Service Inspector: _____

Date: 5/1/07

Reviewed: _____