

Montana Board of Oil and Gas Conservation
Environmental Assessment

Operator: EOG Resources, Inc.

Well Name/Number: Anna 1-3H

Location: SW SE 3 T25N R53E

County: Richland, MT; Field (or Wildcat) w/c

Air Quality

(possible concerns)

Long drilling time no

Unusually deep drilling (high horsepower rig) no

Possible H2S gas production No

In/near Class I air quality area no

Air quality permit for flaring/venting (if productive) no

Mitigation:

 Air quality permit (AQB review)

 Gas plants/pipelines available for sour gas

 Special equipment/procedures requirements

 Other: _____

Comments: No special concerns

Water Quality

(possible concerns)

Salt/oil based mud no

High water table no

Surface drainage leads to live water no

Water well contamination no

Porous/permeable soils no

Class I stream drainage no

Mitigation:

xx Lined reserve pit

xx Adequate surface casing

 Berms/dykes, re-routed drainage

 Closed mud system

 Off-site disposal of solids/liquids (in approved facility)

 Other: _____

Comments: will use fresh water mud/oil base in build section and produced water in laterals

Soils/Vegetation/Land Use

(possible concerns)

Stream crossings no

High erosion potential no

Loss of soil productivity no

Unusually large wellsite no

Damage to improvements no

Conflict with existing land use/values no

Mitigation

 Avoid improvements (topographic tolerance)

 Exception location requested

xx Stockpile topsoil

 Stream Crossing Permit (other agency review)

xx Reclaim unused part of wellsite if productive

 Special construction methods to enhance reclamation

 Other: _____

Comments: Location requires about 2' fill on low corner and 11' cut on high corner

Health Hazards/Noise

(possible concerns)

Proximity to public facilities/residences over ¼ mile

Possibility of H2S No

Size of rig/length of drilling time

Mitigation:

xx Proper BOP equipment

 Topographic sound barriers

 H2S contingency and/or evacuation plan

___ Special equipment/procedures requirements
___ Other: _____
Comments: no special concerns

Wildlife/recreation

(possible concerns)
Proximity to sensitive wildlife areas (DFWP identified) no
Proximity to recreation sites none in immediate area
Creation of new access to wildlife habitat no
Conflict with game range/refuge management no
Threatened or endangered Species no
Mitigation:
___ Avoidance (topographic tolerance/exception)
xx Other agency review (DFWP, federal agencies, DSL)
___ Screening/fencing of pits, drillsite
___ Other: _____
Comments: No special concerns.

Historical/Cultural/Paleontological

(possible concerns)
Proximity to known sites none identified
Mitigation
___ avoidance (topographic tolerance, location exception)
___ other agency review (SHPO, DSL, federal agencies)
___ Other: _____
Comments: no concerns -on private

Social/Economic

(possible concerns)
___ Substantial effect on tax base
___ Create demand for new governmental services
___ Population increase or relocation
Comments: no special concerns

Remarks or Special Concerns for this site

Well is a 14,185' (MD) dual lateral Bakken horizontal test TSU is 1280 acres approved as Docket 220-03

Summary: Evaluation of Impacts and Cumulative effects

Only minor, short term impacts associated with this project.

I conclude that the approval of the subject Notice of Intent to Drill (does/does not) constitute a major action of state government significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and (does/does not) require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

Prepared by (BOGC): [Signature]
(title:) Administrator
Date: December 9, 2003

Other Persons Contacted:

(Name and Agency)

(subject discussed)

(date)

If location was inspected before permit approval:
Inspection date: _____
Inspector: _____
Others present during inspection: _____