PTTC Workshop Summary Report
Eastern Region – Appalachian Basin

Title/Topic: A field excursion for stripper well technologies in western New York
Date: June 22, 2010
Location: Canandaigua, NY (field trip headquarters)
Co-Sponsor: Stripper Well Consortium
Speaker(s): Joel Morrison, John Holko and Doug Patchen (schedule attached)
Method Used To Advertise/Promote: E-mail distribution list among 10 local geological societies and SPE chapters; placed on national PTTC and AAPG website/calendars
Fee: Included in the SWC meeting fee
Attendees: Industry: 10 Others: 8 Total: 18

Synopsis/Overall Assessment: As part of the Stripper Well Consortium’s (SWC) 2010 Project Selection meeting, a pre-conference optional field trip was organized to visit field locations at which SWC-funded and developed technologies had been deployed. John Holko (Lenape Resources Inc) selected appropriate field sites and obtained permission to visit those sites, and Joel Morrison, Executive Director of SWC, prepared descriptions of each stop. The role of the Petroleum Technology Transfer Council (PTTC) was to prepare a brief road log and description of the surface geology in the field trip area and how it relates to subsurface geology penetrated by wells drilled in the area, and to lead a discussion of the geology on the bus between stops.

Three sites were visited, beginning with the Hydroacoustics plant, a well stimulation prototype and testing facility, south of Rochester. The second and third stops were at wells drilled by Lenape Resources: the 29 Oniel, a GOAL Tool location, and the 421 Titus Brothers #3, a brine remediation site.

The guidebook described the surface geology as the group traveled north from Canandaigua toward Rochester, during which we were going down the stratigraphic section from the Middle Devonian lower Hamilton Group (Skaneateles and Marcellus Formations) and Onondaga Limestone, through outcrop belts of Upper Silurian units ranging from the Akron Dolomite through the various members of the Bertie Dolomite, to the Salina Group (Camillus Shale and Vernon Formation). Conversely, the guidebook reflected the fact that once we left stop 1 and traveled to the south, we traversed outcrop belts of successively younger units, including the entire Hamilton Group, Genesee Formation, Sonyea Formation and finally, the West Falls Formation. Maps of surface geology were included in the guidebook, on which the trip route, stop locations and locations of measured sections described in the literature were shown. Unfortunately, the meeting organizers chose not to provide this to workshop participants.

This field trip was an excellent opportunity for SWC researchers and board members to visit field locations at which DOE-funded research results has been implemented. The trip itself also was an opportunity for participants to learn more about the geology of the area, and how it relates to the subsurface as penetrated by the drill. And, it provides an opportunity for two DOE-funded entities, the Stripper Well Consortium and the Petroleum Technology Transfer Council, to join together to produce a product of value to producers and researchers.
Participant Feedback (Implies Your Feedback Form Is Measuring Following):

Evaluation of Speaker(s):
Forty three percent of the respondents gave the speaker a 5 out of 5; 93% at least a 4 out of 5.

Did the workshop content deliver what advertising/promotional material promised?
Thirty six percent graded the workshop as 5 out of 5 based on its meeting their expectations; 86% graded it at least a 4 out of 5.

What was the most valuable part of the workshop (field trip)?
Not much can be learned on this question from examining comments on the forms. From discussions held with those on the bus, they seemed to like the idea of visiting a field site where a technology developed through the stripper well program had been implemented in the field and results could be seen. An example of this was the second stop, where grass had been grown in an area where salt water had killed all vegetation just last fall.

What was the least valuable part of the workshop (field trip)?
The only negative comment was in regard to the heavy rain that fell at stop number two while our bus driver was asleep at the wheel a half mile away. Others were disappointed that a map of the field trip route and stop locations was not provided to participants (even though one had been prepared and submitted for distribution).

Appropriateness of attendee fee (too low, about right, too high)?
Everyone said the fee was about right.

All things considered, was the workshop worth your time & money (Y/N)?
Yes.

Will you be able to use the information received and in what time frame (now, near future, at some undefined future date)?
This question was not asked, but several indicated in conversation that they could use the technology to grow grass in areas with salt water spills.

Individual Written Comments of Note:
Schedule

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

12:00  Field trip departs by bus from the front lobby of the Inn on the Lake
12:45  Arrive at Stop #1 – Hydroacoustics, Inc
1:30   Depart Stop #1
2:15   Arrive at Stop #2 – Lenape’s well #421 Titus Brothers 3
3:00   Depart Stop #2
3:15   Arrive at Stop #3 – Lenape’s well #29 Onieel well
4:00   Depart Stop #3
5:00   Arrive at The Inn on the Lake
List of Attendees

Burns, Lyle, Clean Tech Innovations, LLC, Bartlesville, OK; lyledburns@aol.com

Covatch, Gary, DOE-NETL, Morgantown, WV; gary.covatch@netl.doe.gov

Fesenmyer, Frederick, Minard Oil Co, Bradford, PA; ffesenmyer@minardrunoil.com

Holko, John, Lenape Resources, Inc, Alexander, NY; jholko@lenaperesources.com

Jensen, Kirt, Team Technologies/Veritran, Inc, Albuquerque, NM; kirt.jensen@team-technologies.com

Lavan, Sue, Penn State University, University Park, PA; sal5@ems.psu.edu

Levine, Alan, RJ Lee Group, Inc, Monroeville, PA;

Lewis, David, Cyclone Production Tools, LLC, Chickasha, OK; David. Lewis@cycloneproductiontools.com

Martin, John, NYSERDA, Albany, NY; jpm@nyserda.org

Morrison, Joel, Penn State University, University Park, PA; jlm9@psu.edu

Noynaert, Sam, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; sam.noynaert@pe.tamu.edu

O’Hanley, Harry, OsComp Systems, Inc, Cambridge, MA;

Robuck, Barbara, Penn State University, University Park, PA; bjr10@psu.edu

Santos, Pedro, OsComp Systems Inc, Cambridge, MA; psantos@oscomp-systems.com

Silsbee, Mike, RJ Lee Group, Inc, Monroeville, PA; msilsbee@rjlg.com

Walton, John, OsComp Systems Inc, Cambridge, MA; jwalton@oscomp-systems.com

Wang, John Yilin, Penn State University, University Park, PA; john.wang@psu.edu

Wood, Liz, Penn State University, University Park, PA; ery2@psu.edu
EVALUATION (return to coordinator at conclusion of workshop)

Petroleum Technology Transfer Council Appalachian Region Workshop

A Field Excursion for Stripper Well Technologies in Western New York

June 22, Canandaigua, NY

1. How did you hear about the workshop?
   - 0 Direct mailing
   - 7 E-mail
   - 0 Periodical
   - 1 Internet/www
   - 3 Phone
   - 3 Other

2. What additional topics would you like to see in future Focused Technology Workshops? See other page

Scientific analysis of results
How to take new technology to commercial status
Down-hole technology (oil recovery)

3. Are you a(n):
   - 3 Operator (field supervisor, geologist, engineer)
   - 2 Service Company employee
   - 3 Consultant
   - 3 Educational Institution employee
   - 3 State/Federal Government employee
   - 0 Student

4. Please circle the response that best indicates your agreement, with 5 being the strongest:
   A) The program met my expectations
      5 (5) 4 (7) 3 93) 2 1
   B) The speakers/facilities were acceptable
      5 (6) 4 (7) 3 (1) 2 1
   C) The program was well organized
      5 (7) 4 (3) 3 2 1

5. The workshop fee was:
   - 0 too low
   - 12 OK
   - 3 too high

6. Additional comments: (Please use back of page if needed).

   No rain!

7. Please indicate which tech transfer method is most helpful to you. Rank from 1 to 5, with 5 being the most helpful:
   - Workshop
     5 (5) 4 (3) 3 (0) 2 (0) 1 (0)
   - Individual assistance
     5 (3) 4 (2) 3 (3) 2 (1) 1 (0)
   - Reports/Case studies
     5 (2) 4 (2) 3 (2) 2 (2) 1 (0)
   - Internet
     5 (1) 4 (1) 3 (2) 2 (2) 1 (2)
   - Newsletters
     5 (1) 4 (0) 3 (0) 2 (4) 1 (3)

8. Have you attended other PTTC events? 31 Yes (how many?) 0 No
   - 0 (10)
   - 3 (2)
5  (2)

Have you used any new technologies based on knowledge gained through PTTC events?  3 Yes  10 No
If yes, please describe (in general) the application/results. (PTTC will only use your response with your permission.)

GOAL tool - good results
Airlift system – good results
Brine remediation – excellent results

9. Would you be willing to share with others any technology innovations or best practices?
   11 Yes  2 No  If yes, briefly list topics/information you are willing to share.