

Conversation Contents

FW: anwr obligation

Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>

From: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Sent: Mon Jun 26 2017 07:49:11 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: "Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Subject: FW: anwr obligation

FYI per your request

From: Walter Guidroz [<mailto:wguidroz@usgs.gov>]
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 9:37 AM
To: Scott Cameron <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>
Cc: Murray Hitzman <mhitzman@usgs.gov>
Subject: FW: anwr obligation

Scott,

With respect to what we could obligate for FY2017, we already are past the deadline for submitting requests to procure items >\$25K, and none of the essential items for either NPRA or ANWR are less than \$25K. However, there are two possible exceptions which, taken together, total about **\$825K**:

- State Coop route: There may be a mechanism in the State Coops agreements that would allow larger "procurements" with a special sign-off on the request by the Acting Director. If we could go this route, we could send funds to the state of Alaska to get started with at least sampling the wells around the perimeter of ANWR, and perhaps even get samples from one or two wells to send to Weatherford to start analysis. Dave Houseknecht talked to Joe East (ERP State Coop Project Chief) about this mechanism 2-3 weeks ago and it sounded like it was doable; I'm still trying to get confirmation from Joe but haven't heard back yet.

Depending on the number of wells analyzed (potentially up to 16 wells), the cost would total about **\$750K**. Of this, Alaska retains about \$50K for sampling, \$590K goes to Weatherford for analytical work, \$60K would be for state overhead and \$50K would cover the cost of sampling two wells on the Canadian side of the border. This work is necessary to constrain the charge potential for all of the Section 1002 area. Even analyzing only half the wells would represent a significant improvement in geochemical characterization; this would bring the cost down to about \$350K.

- Field work: We could add a second helicopter to the field season and invite staff from the state of Alaska to go along – our helicopter contract was just confirmed a few days ago (**\$75K** for 8 days).

If you have any further questions then please let us know; we'd be happy to help.

Walter

From: Hitzman, Murray [<mailto:mhitzman@usgs.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 6:04 PM
To: Cameron, Scott <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>; Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: anwr obligation

Scott

Walter will get you numbers for what we might be able to obligate for FY2017 tomorrow. we were flat out today on several other things including getting the data from BOEM into the resource plan document (just sent). let me know if you have questions.
best

--

Murray W. Hitzman
U. S. Geological Survey
Associate Director - Energy and Minerals
12201 Sunrise Valley Dr., MS 102
Reston, VA. 20192
703-648-4576

"Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>

From: "Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Sent: Mon Jun 26 2017 07:54:48 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: anwr obligation

OK

Back to Scott's question - If we respond that we have a mechanism for spending more FY17 funds, where are those funds going to come from? Isn't that the bigger issue?

On Mon, Jun 26, 2017 at 9:49 AM, Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov> wrote:

FYI per your request

From: Walter Guidroz [mailto:wguidroz@usgs.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 9:37 AM
To: Scott Cameron <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>
Cc: Murray Hitzman <mhitzman@usgs.gov>
Subject: FW: anwr obligation

Scott,

With respect to what we could obligate for FY2017, we already are past the deadline for submitting requests to procure items >\$25K, and none of the essential items for either NPRA or ANWR are less than \$25K. However, there are two possible exceptions which, taken together, total about **\$825K**:

- State Coop route: There may be a mechanism in the State Coops agreements that would allow larger "procurements" with a special sign-off on the request by the Acting Director. If we could go this route, we could send funds to the state of Alaska to get started with at least sampling the wells around the perimeter of ANWR, and perhaps even get samples from one or two wells to send to Weatherford to start analysis. Dave Houseknecht talked to Joe East (ERP State Coop Project Chief) about this mechanism 2-3 weeks ago and it sounded like it was doable; I'm still trying to get confirmation from Joe but haven't heard back yet.

Depending on the number of wells analyzed (potentially up to 16 wells), the cost would total about **\$750K**. Of this, Alaska retains about \$50K for sampling, \$590K goes to Weatherford for analytical work, \$60K would be for state overhead and \$50K would cover the cost of sampling two wells on the Canadian side of the border. This work is necessary to constrain the charge potential for all of the Section 1002 area. Even analyzing only half the wells would represent a significant improvement in geochemical characterization; this would bring the cost down to about \$350K.

- Field work: We could add a second helicopter to the field season and invite staff from the state of

Alaska to go along – our helicopter contract was just confirmed a few days ago (**\$75K** for 8 days).

If you have any further questions then please let us know; we'd be happy to help.

Walter

From: Hitzman, Murray [<mailto:mhitzman@usgs.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 6:04 PM
To: Cameron, Scott <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>; Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: anwr obligation

Scott

Walter will get you numbers for what we might be able to obligate for FY2017 tomorrow. we were flat out today on several other things including getting the data from BOEM into the resource plan document (just sent). let me know if you have questions.

best

--

Murray W. Hitzman
U. S. Geological Survey
Associate Director - Energy and Minerals
12201 Sunrise Valley Dr., MS 102
Reston, VA. 20192
703-648-4576

--

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>

From: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Sent: Mon Jun 26 2017 07:58:19 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: David Houseknecht <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Subject: RE: FW: anwr obligation

Yes it's an issue (!!) and we've already discussed that. I'll reinforce that again...

From: Houseknecht, David [<mailto:dhouse@usgs.gov>]
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2017 9:55 AM
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: anwr obligation

OK

Back to Scott's question - If we respond that we have a mechanism for spending more FY17 funds, where are those funds going to come from? Isn't that the bigger issue?

On Mon, Jun 26, 2017 at 9:49 AM, Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov> wrote:

FYI per your request

From: Walter Guidroz [mailto:wguidroz@usgs.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 9:37 AM
To: Scott Cameron <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>
Cc: Murray Hitzman <mhitzman@usgs.gov>
Subject: FW: anwr obligation

Scott,

With respect to what we could obligate for FY2017, we already are past the deadline for submitting requests to procure items >\$25K, and none of the essential items for either NPRA or ANWR are less than \$25K. However, there are two possible exceptions which, taken together, total about **\$825K**:

- State Coop route: There may be a mechanism in the State Coops agreements that would allow larger "procurements" with a special sign-off on the request by the Acting Director. If we could go this route, we could send funds to the state of Alaska to get started with at least sampling the wells around the perimeter of ANWR, and perhaps even get samples from one or two wells to send to Weatherford to start analysis. Dave Houseknecht talked to Joe East (ERP State Coop Project Chief) about this mechanism 2-3 weeks ago and it sounded like it was doable; I'm still trying to get confirmation from Joe but haven't heard back yet.

Depending on the number of wells analyzed (potentially up to 16 wells), the cost would total about **\$750K**. Of this, Alaska retains about \$50K for sampling, \$590K goes to Weatherford for analytical work, \$60K would be for state overhead and \$50K would cover the cost of sampling two wells on the Canadian side of the border. This work is necessary to constrain the charge potential for all of the Section 1002 area. Even analyzing only half the wells would represent a significant improvement in geochemical characterization; this would bring the cost down to about \$350K.

- Field work: We could add a second helicopter to the field season and invite staff from the state of Alaska to go along – our helicopter contract was just confirmed a few days ago (**\$75K** for 8 days).

If you have any further questions then please let us know; we'd be happy to help.

Walter

From: Hitzman, Murray [mailto:mhitzman@usgs.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 6:04 PM
To: Cameron, Scott <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>; Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: anwr obligation

Scott

Walter will get you numbers for what we might be able to obligate for FY2017 tomorrow. we were flat out today on several other things including getting the data from BOEM into the resource plan document (just sent). let me know if you have questions.

best

--

Murray W. Hitzman
U. S. Geological Survey
Associate Director - Energy and Minerals
12201 Sunrise Valley Dr., MS 102
Reston, VA. 20192
703-648-4576

--

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

"Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>

From: "Houseknecht, David" <dhouse@usgs.gov>
Sent: Mon Jun 26 2017 08:18:19 GMT-0600 (MDT)
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: anwr obligation

Answers from Admin and Joe East:

We can do procurement of seismic reprocessing in October-November timeframe. If we get the paperwork ready, it can be submitted ~mid October.

We can do procurement of ANWR-periphery well analyses through COOP program to DGGS immediately. Grant over \$400K would require Bill W signature plus Deputy or Assistant Secretary signature. Plus, grant over \$20K must be advertised for 14 days prior to award. From experience, I can tell you the COOP route can be slow, so we may need some pushing to make this happen in short timeframe.

On Mon, Jun 26, 2017 at 9:58 AM, Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov> wrote:

Yes it's an issue (!!) and we've already discussed that. I'll reinforce that again...

From: Houseknecht, David [mailto:dhouse@usgs.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2017 9:55 AM
To: Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: anwr obligation

OK

Back to Scott's question - If we respond that we have a mechanism for spending more FY17 funds, where are those funds going to come from? Isn't that the bigger issue?

On Mon, Jun 26, 2017 at 9:49 AM, Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov> wrote:

FYI per your request

From: Walter Guidroz [mailto:wguidroz@usgs.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 9:37 AM
To: Scott Cameron <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>
Cc: Murray Hitzman <mhitzman@usgs.gov>
Subject: FW: anwr obligation

Scott,

With respect to what we could obligate for FY2017, we already are past the deadline for submitting requests to procure items >\$25K, and none of the essential items for either NPRA or ANWR are less than \$25K. However, there are two possible exceptions which, taken together, total about

\$825K:

· State Coop route: There may be a mechanism in the State Coops agreements that would allow larger "procurements" with a special sign-off on the request by the Acting Director. If we could go this route, we could send funds to the state of Alaska to get started with at least sampling the wells around the perimeter of ANWR, and perhaps even get samples from one or two wells to send to Weatherford to start analysis. Dave Houseknecht talked to Joe East (ERP State Coop Project Chief) about this mechanism 2-3 weeks ago and it sounded like it was doable; I'm still trying to get confirmation from Joe but haven't heard back yet.

Depending on the number of wells analyzed (potentially up to 16 wells), the cost would total about **\$750K**. Of this, Alaska retains about \$50K for sampling, \$590K goes to Weatherford for analytical work, \$60K would be for state overhead and \$50K would cover the cost of sampling two wells on the Canadian side of the border. This work is necessary to constrain the charge potential for all of the Section 1002 area. Even analyzing only half the wells would represent a significant improvement in geochemical characterization; this would bring the cost down to about \$350K.

· Field work: We could add a second helicopter to the field season and invite staff from the state of Alaska to go along – our helicopter contract was just confirmed a few days ago (**\$75K** for 8 days).

If you have any further questions then please let us know; we'd be happy to help.

Walter

From: Hitzman, Murray [<mailto:mhitzman@usgs.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 6:04 PM

To: Cameron, Scott <scott_cameron@ios.doi.gov>; Walter Guidroz <wguidroz@usgs.gov>

Subject: anwr obligation

Scott

Walter will get you numbers for what we might be able to obligate for FY2017 tomorrow. we were flat out today on several other things including getting the data from BOEM into the resource plan document (just sent). let me know if you have questions.

best

--

Murray W. Hitzman
U. S. Geological Survey
Associate Director - Energy and Minerals
12201 Sunrise Valley Dr., MS 102
Reston, VA. 20192
703-648-4576

--

Dave Houseknecht
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466

--

Dave Houseknecht

U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
MS 956
Reston, VA 20192
(703) 648-6466