

STATE OF MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION
MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
December 14, 2011

BUSINESS MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

The regular business meeting of the Montana Board of Oil and Gas Conservation was called to order by Chairman Linda Nelson at 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, December 14, 2011, at the Board's hearing room at its office at 2535 St. Johns Avenue in Billings, Montana. Board members present were Chairman Nelson, Don Bradshaw, Ronald S. Efta, Jay Gunderson, Jack King and Bret Smelser. Vice-Chairman Wayne Smith was absent. Staff present was Jim Halvorson, George Hudak, Gary Klotz, Terri Perrigo, Clyde Peterson, Tom Richmond and Steve Sasaki.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the minutes of the October 12, 2011 business meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Greg Bervy from Red Lodge was present. He has minerals in Petroleum County, has questions, and wants to know if they are Board matters or not.

His first question pertains to legal notices regarding well permits. A.R.M. 36.22.601(a) says those applying for a drilling permit must publish notice in a paper in general circulation in Helena and in the county where the well is located. He wants to know if the notice has to go in the county's official legal paper or can it go in any paper in the county. Mr. Peterson said there are conflicting definitions of general circulation. The Board will re-consider how they look at it. But for right now, if a paper is of general circulation in the county it doesn't necessarily mean the paper is in the county. For example, the Billings Gazette is published in Yellowstone County but has a large body of readers in other counties. Companies have sometimes said that smaller papers do not always publish correctly or in a timely fashion so they prefer to use the bigger papers. Mr. Peterson said if an operator publishes in the Gazette and the Gazette is a paper of general circulation in the county in which the well is being drilled, then publication in the Gazette is ok. Mr. Bervy said he thinks notice should have to be published in the official legal paper for the county.

Mr. Bervy said there is a spacing unit request on the Board's docket tomorrow that he just found about yesterday. He wanted to know if he needs to quickly get an expert or if he can ask for a continuance in order to obtain legal help. Mr. Halvorson said the docket Mr. Bervy is interested in (Docket 299-2011-Central Montana Resources LLC) has been continued to March 2012.

Mr. Bervy asked if it is a Board issue or a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) issue if an operator digs a trench and fills it with debris. He thinks it is a form of land-filling. Mr. Richmond said the Board accepts state and federal laws which say the owner or lessee has the right to dispose of their waste on their lease. The Board permits non-hazardous waste associated with the drilling operation. Mr. Bervy said it is then his understanding that this is a DEQ issue.

Mr. Bervy wanted to know if it is a Board concern when an operator reports production when no production occurs. The example he provided is that an operator reports production but the pump jack does not work and the electrical meters do not move. Mr. Peterson said that is an issue the chief field inspector Mr. Sasaki would handle. Mr. Richmond remembered a similar incident a long time ago: a well flowed even though there was no pump jack movement.

Mr. Bervy asked if there was any communication between the Board and DEQ to follow up on whether the DEQ storm water drainage permit was issued (the need for which is identified on the Board's

environmental assessment (EA) done for drilling permits). Mr. Bervy said in his experience, communication between the Board and DEQ does not happen. He questioned whether the Board makes sure staff does what they are supposed to do. Mr. Richmond said the EA form shows a number of other state and federal permits required. Storm water discharge permits are issued by DEQ and are triggered by the size of the construction project. The Board simply identifies that the operator has to get it. It does not affect the issuance of a drilling permit. The Board relies on DEQ to issue its own permits.

Mr. Bervy said an operator he is familiar with has four storage tanks and they are all rusted out. He thinks that means the structural integrity of that facility is in jeopardy, and asked if that is something Board field inspectors should be looking for. Mr. Richmond said field inspectors have authority to condemn if the location and/or facilities are not in compliance.

Board member Don Bradshaw reminded Mr. Bervy that Board members are basically volunteers who come together 6-7 times a year for a day and a half. He suggested if Mr. Bervy has a problem with field operations it needs to be brought up to staff. If it is not resolved at that level, it will eventually be brought to the Board. Mr. Bervy apologized. He said he keeps referring to the Board and he actually means the staff. He will follow up and be back. If staff is going to let a lot of operators continue the way they do, this is not in the best interest of the state.

TONGUE RIVER INFORMATION PROJECT (TRIP)

Mr. Richmond said the contract for TRIP is up for re-solicitation. It is going through the procurement process now. The Governor's office has to approve issuance of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the project due to amount of the potential contract (\$300,000 per year for three years), but that has not been done yet. Mr. Richmond wants to extend TRIP because it is the only real data for agricultural users in the Tongue River drainage to determine what effect coal bed methane (cbm) development has on crops, soils and water.

Mr. Tom Osborne from HydroSolutions, Inc., the project manager for TRIP, and Mr. Neil Fehringer, the agronomist for TRIP, were present to give an update on the project and the 2011 findings.

Mr. Richmond said all the 2011 TRIP reports are now available on the Board's website under the green "Coal Bed Methane" tab.

Mr. Smelser asked what bang the Board is getting for its buck. He has been on the Board for five years and does not remember last time a cbm well was permitted. The information to date is great. It puts to rest a lot of questions. He said there is not much action in cbm today and he is not sure it justifies a \$300,000 per year expenditure. Mr. Richmond said he wants to fund the program again. Right now with the price of gas they are not going to be drilling anymore wells. He agrees there is a life to it. A three year contract is what is proposed, renewable at the end of each year. It is the Board's money but Mr. Richmond thinks it is saving the state money in the long run. There is an \$11 million cbm damage mitigation account. Through TRIP there has been data accumulated that says there is no impact. The data shows there is not a disaster about to befall the state. He agrees it has to come to an end at some point. But right now he thinks it has been valuable and he would like to fund it at least another two years. Mr. Peterson said from a litigation standpoint some of the lack of cbm activity is fear of litigation. Disposal of water is expensive and there are only so many ways to do it.

Mr. Richmond said there is no untreated water going into the Tongue River today. Fidelity's untreated water discharge permit was revoked, and Mr. Richmond doesn't think there will be permits issued for untreated water again. The other thing operators can do with the water that appears to be legal is impound it in unlined pits so that the water goes into the ground.

OSTBY REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DOCKET 320-2011 AND 455-2011

Ms. Anne Ostby of Dagmar, MT was present, and said her husband Andy Ostby wanted to withdraw his request for rehearing.

Ms. Ostby thinks the Board has a procedural problem. Orders are dated the day of the hearing, but are not issued quick enough for someone to get a copy in time to request a rehearing. She does not understand why their date is the hearing date. Mr. Peterson said that issue has been discussed. There may be a statute regarding this that he has been unable to find, but he is still looking. Right now, orders are effective on the date the decision was made. But he understands Ms. Ostby's concern.

BENSUN ENERGY, LLC (Bensun) REQUEST FOR REHEARING OF DOCKET 456-2011 AND PATRICK BEGLEY LETTER DATED OCTOBER 28, 2011

Mr. Lance Bensun was present. Mr. Patrick Begley was not. Mr. Bensun requested a rehearing of the two \$5000 fines that were assessed on his company by the Board. He feels the fines were assessed because he was not able to get a workover rig which was out of his control.

Mr. Halvorson discussed the Begley letter. It was put on today's agenda today to make sure Mr. Begley also got an opportunity for rehearing. Mr. Peterson said the letter speaks to what Mr. Begley discussed at the last hearing. There is a question as to whether or not Bensun has valid interest in the wells, and Mr. Begley has filed a lawsuit. If that issue has been taken to the courts, it is out of the Board's jurisdiction. In talking with Mr. Richmond and Mr. Halvorson, it seems Mr. Begley has interpreted statute different than staff regarding the information we look for, i.e. whether the operator has a proper permit and authority to proceed. Mr. Peterson will respond to Mr. Begley. He recommends the Board stay out of this issue and recommends that what Mr. Begley says in his letter have no effect on whether the Board reconsiders its action regarding Bensun Energy fines.

Mr. King asked what additional work needs done to make the well productive. Mr. Bensun said the well is actually producing into a tank right now. They still have to tie in all the lines and cover them all up. There is currently about 13 feet in the tank. The well is producing about 80-100 barrels per day with an 80 percent water cut.

Mr. Richmond said if the Board feels like the situation has changed since it assessed penalties, it should grant the rehearing request. The well is on production and that is marvelous, but it was later than expected.

MOTION: Mr. King moved to have a rehearing on both fines. Mr. Smelser seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Ms. Perrigo presented the financial report attached as Exhibit 1. She also presented the schedule for 2012, which includes a meeting in Butte in April.

Mr. Smelser asked if the Board wanted to go to Sidney again this summer for a hearing. He said there should be a new motel (or two or three) by that time. He said Sidney welcomes the Board and having meetings there has been very beneficial to those counties. It was the consensus of the Board to return to Sidney for its June hearing. Mr. Smelser will reserve 20 rooms at a new motel and will reserve the fairgrounds commercial building.

Mr. Efta wondered if the Board needed to meet seven times in 2012 instead of six. Mr. Halvorson has no strong feelings one way or the other, and suggested the Board look more to industry to see if it would benefit them. Attorney John Lee thinks if special statewide spacing is approved at tomorrow's hearing it will take some of the pressure off.

BOND SUMMARY

Mr. Halvorson presented the bond summary attached as Exhibit 2.

DOCKET SUMMARY

Mr. Halvorson presented the docket summary attached as Exhibit 3. He also handed out a copy of the default docket list (Exhibit 4) and a list showing applications grouped together according to issue(s) (Exhibit 5). Included on Exhibit 5 are applications consistent with the proposed statewide rule. There are also applications for additional wells in a proposed temporary spacing unit. He said additional wells in a new spacing unit are a really good argument for smaller spacing units. At some point the question becomes not "can we do it" but "should we do it," in regard to additional wells in undrilled spacing units. If an operator already knows how many wells should be in a spacing unit, then maybe the Board is going the wrong way. The Board has previously agreed to accept additional wells after a well is drilled. On the final page of Exhibit 5 the issue is requests for modified setbacks of 500/200 in developed area of Elm Coulee where the Board has consistently ordered 660' setbacks, and some encroach on fully developed spacing units.

Chairman Nelson asked about orphaned tracks. Mr. Halvorson said there is one pending application that clearly creates an orphaned tract. One application from Continental Resources is a three-section spacing unit which avoids creating an orphaned tract. The Board has accommodated orphaned tracts in proposed special statewide spacing. Staff will not administratively approve any application that would create an orphaned tract.

He wanted to go back to the "are we sure this is the route we want to go down" question. He is worried the Board may approve multiple wells in area where the first well is non-commercial. The Board made a policy decision that it wanted to see the first well 1320' off boundary. If the Board grants the requests for multiple wells, it would be approving the first well to be drilled somewhere other than 1320' off. Mr. Halvorson said the way some of the applications are worded for multiple wells, they could put the initial well somewhere other than 1320' from the boundary. In the case of Elm Coulee, regardless of the Board's decision about 200' setbacks having no impact, the question is did everyone have the same opportunity to drill that close. In fully developed units do we have equal opportunity?

Mr. Halvorson said at the last hearing he felt like a lot of people were "lost" He thinks it serves everyone including Board members better if we have a list of applications grouped by issues. Chairman Nelson also thinks a lot of people were confused last time.

STAFF REPORTS.

Mr. Richmond introduced Leo Heath of the Petroleum Engineering Department of MT Tech who was present to talk about two proposals for funding from the Board's 1.5 million per year education appropriation.

Dr. Susan Schrader of the Petroleum Engineering Department was present to give a proposal for a study of in-situ combustion. There is a lot of heavy oil in Montana, and a big problem is how to get it to flow. The proposal, attached as Exhibit 6, would build a combustion tube to do testing. This combustion tube would also be available to producers. The study would cost \$499,983 and take place over 2 years. Plans would be to start in March 2012 and finish in February 2014.

Mr. Richmond said it was easy to prioritize projects when only one was before the Board (the Elm Coulee EOR study that the Board approved at its last meeting). He thinks the Board may want to look at a couple more before it makes a decision on funding any other projects. Mr. Gunderson thinks the Board needs a procedure/protocol about how to prioritize. Mr. Richmond agreed. He also suggested the Board not make a decision on the in-situ project today.

Chairman Nelson asked if the \$1.5 million education appropriation per year is only intended for MT Tech, or can other institutions request funds. Mr. Richmond said the legislation strongly suggested the university system and the sponsor strongly recommended MT Tech.

Mr. Richmond does recommend funding another study today though: development of a procedures manual and a field inspection system. The Legislative Auditor brought the lack of same up as an issue in the Division's recent performance audit. Mr. John Getty of MT Tech was present to discuss the two-phase project which is attached as Exhibit 7. Mr. Getty said they are excited to write a program that would allow real-time field work to be integrated into RBDMS. Mr. King asked if other states have something similar. Mr. Richmond is only aware of states the auditor's talked to (Arizona and Texas) who said they have similar procedures in place. He thinks a good, solid procedure manual would be something other states would be interested in. But he would not want to go with a model of Arizona and Texas. He would look at Idaho, Utah, Wyoming and Colorado. He thinks the two-phase approach is the way to go.

MOTION: Fund the development of a procedures manual and a field inspection system. Right now approve \$6250 to fund Phase I—development of scope of work. Motion made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and passed unanimously.

Mr. Heath will continue working with Mr. Richmond about when to report back, etc. Mr. Bradshaw had a request regarding Dr. Schrader's proposal. He would like all the companies dealing with heavy oil to know what the Board is considering funding for the state.

Mr. Sasaki presented a letter from Joni Stewart of Mountain Pacific General, attached as Exhibit 8. Mountain Pacific plans to attend the March 2012 business meeting to give an update.

Fraudulent Affidavit of Publication

Mr. Sasaki brought up an issue regarding a drilling permit issued to Evolution Oil Group LLC (EOGL). He said it appears a fraudulent affidavit of publication was submitted. EOGL is a Canadian company, new to Montana, that owns minerals in Sheridan County. They hired Mr. Steve Harmon to do their permitting. On Friday November 18, 2011 Mr. Sasaki got the Sheridan County News affidavit by fax from Mr. Harmon. He also got a call from Mr. Harmon saying they needed the permit issued as soon as possible. Mr. Sasaki began the environmental assessment and talked to inspector Schmidt about some surface issues. Mr. Schmidt said he saw the drilling permit advertised in the Sheridan County News on Nov 17, although Mr. Sasaki's fax affidavit had a November 3 publication date. Mr. Schmidt checked. The legal notice was not published on November 3rd. After talking to the Sheridan County news notary, Mr. Sasaki said the fax affidavit had been altered. The notary's records said it was notarized and published on the 17th. Mr. Sasaki contacted Mr. Harmon and EOGL and told them the permit was being held until this issue was brought before the Board at its December 14 business meeting.

Mr. Steve Harmon was present to explain the situation. He said their company has done lots of land work in recent years and that they were overwhelmed by the Canadian business. He had a temporary worker who altered the affidavit because she did not publish the ad in time in the Plentywood paper. This employee is no longer working for him.

Mr. Efta asked where the alteration took place. Mr. Harmon said it took place in his office in Fergus County. Mr. Efta thinks criminal charges would be appropriate. But it is a misdemeanor so we couldn't extradite. This is pretty serious – altering public documents.

Mr. Peterson had a conference call about this with Mr. Richmond, Mr. Sasaki, and EOGL. The decision was for Mr. Sasaki to investigate. Mr. Sasaki thought it was appropriate to allow the firm to go ahead with re-publication but wanted to bring it to the Board's attention so it could decide if it wanted to do anything else.

Mr. Gunderson asked how the person who did the altering became employed by Mr. Harmon. Mr. Harmon said she started October 31 and worked a couple weeks. He said he bought the old Farmers Bank building in Lewistown and they need to have a presence there. He said they get maybe 4-5 people walk in daily to ask about work. This lady walks in who said she was a land man. He put her to work right away.

Mr. Peterson recommended the Board lean on Mr. Efta, who has more experience in these matters. Mr. Efta said with Mr. Harmon's employee gone, the only recourse is Mr. Harmon's firm – which has a responsibility for the action of its employees. Mr. Harmon said he realizes the seriousness of this matter. Mr. Peterson said in lieu of criminal action, the Board has the ability to do a civil penalty and could ask the Fergus county attorney to file criminal action. If this lady ever gets stopped in Montana, they would arrest her. Mr. Efta doesn't think it would be appropriate to charge anyone in Colorado.

MOTION: Mr. Efta made a motion to impose a civil penalty of \$500 on Solena Energy Group (Mr. Harmon's company), and that the Fergus County Attorney's office be made aware of the situation. Mr. Bradshaw seconded the motion and it passed. Mr. Smelser voted no.

Walker 44-2 well

Mr. Sasaki presented a letter from Eva Preston, President of E&E Walker, Inc. requesting that the Board declare the Walker 44-2 well in Section 2, T19N-R53E, Dawson County, Montana, an abandoned well and require the operator, Energy Equity Company, to properly plug and abandon it.

MOTION: Mr. Gunderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to schedule Energy Equity Co. for a show cause hearing for March 2012 as to why it should not be ordered to plug and abandon the Walker 44-2 well which has not produced since 2007.

Rosetta Resources Inc. Flaring Request

Mr. Richmond presented a request from Rosetta Resources Inc. to flare gas at the Simonson Farms 3608-34-01H –B well in Glacier County, Montana, beyond the 60-day test period as required by ARM 36.22.1220. The letter is attached as Exhibit 10. Mr. Richmond said this is sweet gas. It is a Bakken well and makes approx 45 barrels of oil and 281 mcf of gas per day. It currently has approximately 6000 cubic feet of gas per barrel. If it gets to 10,000 cubic feet per barrel, it becomes a gas well. It is not economic to market gas at this point. Mr. Gunderson asked what they are trying to do with a longer time frame. Mr. Richmond thinks they need more time to determine if they want to drill another well. He recommends their flaring request be approved for six months.

MOTION: Mr. Smelser made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and passed, to approve the Rosetta Resources, Inc. flaring request for six months. Mr. King voted no.

Data Management and Audit

Mr. Richmond said the Legislative Audit Committee made 3-4 recommendations after the Board's performance audit. One was to adopt the state computer system policy. DNRC made a comment to the audit report that the BOGC computer system should be on the state system. Mr. Richmond said the BOGC system IS a state system. He recommends he and Chairman Nelson meet with Director Sexton to relay the message that the Board is satisfied with the way the Board's computer system is currently being handled.

MOTION: Mr. Gunderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to tell the DNRC Director that the BOGC is happy with the way the computer system is currently handled.

Mr. Peterson said it is helpful that the Board is administratively attached, but statute is unclear. It is positive that the Board wants to say it is happy with the way things are. But that may not be enough. The Board may need a significant reason to "buck" the system. Mr. Richmond said he will suggest the Board improve the security of system, as that is the goal; and will work with the department to improve the security of system. He thinks it is important to make the system work for us without having to hire an IT person to do it. There is very little state money invested in the system. It has been developed through the

Ground Water Protection Council with money from EPA to run this 22-state database. The Board has gotten this 3-4 million database for about \$75,000.

Chairman Nelson suggested Mr. Richmond write a letter to the Legislative Audit Committee chairman and maybe there will be no need to meet.

Mr. Halvorson said the Legislative IT Auditor recognized the Board's administratively attached status. He said if the Board followed the state password policy and had a security document detailing policy that should be ok

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6pm.

PUBLIC HEARING.

The Board reconvened at the Board's hearing room at its office at the 2535 St. Johns Avenue in Billings Montana, at 8:00 a.m. on Thursday, December 15, 2011, to hear the matters docketed for public hearing. As a result of the discussion, testimony and technical data placed before the Board, the following action was taken in each matter.

Docket No. 462-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Montana Board of Oil and Gas Conservation as set forth in Board Order 380-2011. Ms. Nelson and Mr. Efta voted no.

Docket No. 463-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Fidelity Exploration & Production Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 381-2011.

Docket No. 464-2011 – The application of Fidelity Exploration & Production Company was withdrawn.

Docket No. 465-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Fidelity Exploration & Production Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 382-2011.

Docket No. 466-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Fidelity Exploration & Production Company as set forth in Board Order 383-2011.

Docket No. 467-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Fidelity Exploration & Production Company as set forth in Board Order 384-2011.

Docket No. 468-2011 – The request for re-hearing of the applications of Whiting Oil & Gas Corporation and G3 Operating was withdrawn so this docket was dismissed.

Docket No. 469-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Efta and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Primary Petroleum Company USA, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 385-2011.

Docket No. 470-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of XTO Energy Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 386-2011.

Docket No. 471-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of XTO Energy Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 387-2011.

Docket No. 472-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of XTO Energy Inc. as set forth in Board Order 388-2011.

Docket No. 473-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of XTO Energy Inc. as set forth in Board Order 389-2011.

Docket No. 474-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Marathon Oil Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 390-2011.

Docket No. 475-2011 & 6-2012 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Marathon Oil Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 391-2011.

Docket No. 476-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Marathon Oil Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 392-2011.

Docket No. 477-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Marathon Oil Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 393-2011.

Docket No. 478-2011 & 5-2011 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Marathon Oil Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 394-2011.

Docket No. 479-2011 & 7-2012– The application of Triangle Petroleum Corporation was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 480-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Bensun Energy, LLC was approved as set forth in Board Order 395-2011.

Docket No. 481-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Energy Corporation of America was approved as set forth in Board Order 396-2011.

Docket No. 482-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of TAQA North USA, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 397-2011.

Docket No. 483-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to approve the application of TAQA North USA, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 398-2011.

Docket No. 484-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of TAQA North USA, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 399-2011.

Docket No. 485-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of TAQA North USA, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 400-2011.

Docket No. 486-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of TAQA North USA, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 401-2011.

Docket No. 487-2011 – The application of Central Montana Resources LLC was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 488-2011 & 8-2012 FED – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. King and unanimously passed, to approve the application of G3 Operating, LLC as set forth in Board Order 402-2011.

Docket No. 489-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Efta and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Topaz Oil and Gas, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 403-2011.

Docket No. 490-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of NFR Bear Paw Basin LLC as set forth in Board Order 404-2011.

Docket No. 491-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 405-2011.

Docket No. 492-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 406-2011. Mr. King recused himself.

Docket No. 493-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 407-2011. Mr. King recused himself.

Docket No. 494-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 408-2011. Mr. King recused himself.

Docket No. 495-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 409-2011.

Docket No. 496-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 410-2011.

Docket No. 497-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 411-2011.

Docket No. 498-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 412-2011.

Docket No. 499-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 413-2011.

Docket No. 500-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 414-2011.

Docket No. 501-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 415-2011.

Docket No. 502-2011 – The application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation was withdrawn.

Docket No. 503-2011 – The application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 504-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Bradshaw, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation as set forth in Board Order 416-2011.

Docket No. 505-2011 – The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 506-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 417-2011.

Docket No. 507-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 418-2011.

Docket No. 508-2011 – The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 509-2011 – The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 510-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 419-2011.

Docket No. 511-2011 – The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 512-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 420-2011.

Docket No. 513-2011 & 11-2012 FED – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 421-2011.

Docket No. 514-2011 & 12-2012 FED – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 422-2011.

Docket No. 515-2011 & 13-2012 FED – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 423-2011.

Docket No. 516-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 424-2011.

Docket No. 517-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 425-2011.

Docket No. 518-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 519-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 426-2011. Mr. King voted no.

Docket No. 520-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 427-2011.

Docket No. 521-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 428-2011. Mr. Efta and Mr. King voted no.

Docket No. 522-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 523-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 429-2011. Mr. King voted no.

Docket No. 524-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and failed on a tie vote, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 430-2011. Mr. Efta, Mr. King, and Ms. Nelson voted no.

Docket No. 525-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 526-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 527-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 528-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 529-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 530-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 531-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 532-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 533-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 534-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 431-2011.

Docket No. 535-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 536-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 432-2011.

Docket No. 537-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 538-2011 & 14-2012 FED– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 539-2011 & 15-2012 FED– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 540-2011 & 1-2006 FED Amendment #1– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No's. 541-2011 & 11-2005 FED Amendment #1 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 433-2011.

Docket No. 542-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 434-2011.

Docket No. 543-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 544-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 435-2011.

Docket No. 545-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Efta, seconded by Mr. King and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 436-2011.

Docket No. 546-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 547-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Continental Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 437-2011.

Docket No. 548-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 549-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 550-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 551-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 552-2011 & 16-2012 FED– The application of Decker Operating Company was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 553-2011 and 17-2012 FED – The application of Blue Water Petroleum, LLC involves land under the jurisdiction of the BLM. The order will be issued by the BLM.

Docket No. 554-2011 & 18-2012 FED – The application of Blue Water Petroleum, LLC was withdrawn.

Docket No. 555-2011 & 19-2012 FED – The application of Blue Water Petroleum, LLC was withdrawn.

Docket No. 556-2011 – The application of TAQA North USA, Inc. was withdrawn.

Docket No. 557-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Tomahawk Oil Co. Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 438-2011.

Docket No. 558-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 439-2011.

Docket No. 559-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 440-2011.

Docket No. 560-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Smelser and passed, to approve the application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 441-2011. Mr. King voted no.

Docket No. 561-2011– The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 562-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 442-2011.

Docket No. 563-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 443-2011.

Docket No. 564-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 444-2011.

Docket No. 565-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 445-2011.

Docket No. 566-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 446-2011.

Docket No. 567-2011– The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 568-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 447-2011.

Docket No. 569-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Oasis Petroleum, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 448-2011.

Docket No. 570-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and passed, that the \$5000 fine assessed on Bensun Energy, LLC in Board Order 177-2011 be refunded. Mr. Efta and Mr. Gunderson voted no.

Docket No. 314-2010– The application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 5-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Efta and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 450-2011.

Docket No. 6-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Efta and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 451-2011.

Docket No. 11-2011 & 4-2011 FED – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Efta and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 452-2011.

Docket No. 63-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 64-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 65-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 69-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 72-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 73-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 74-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 77-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 78-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 79-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 80-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 81-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 82-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 83-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 155-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Abraxas Petroleum Corporation as set forth in Board Order 453-2011.

Docket No. 156-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Abraxas Petroleum Corporation as set forth in Board Order 454-2011.

Docket No. 157-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Abraxas Petroleum Corporation as set forth in Board Order 455-2011.

Docket No. 178-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 179-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 180-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 240-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 456-2011.

Docket No. 242-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 457-2011.

Docket No. 296-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Efta and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Mountain View Energy, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 458-2011.

Docket No. 299-2011– The application of Central Montana Resources LLC was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 302-2011– The application of G3 Operating, LLC was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 322-2011 – The application of Whiting Oil and Gas Corporation was withdrawn.

Docket No. 334-2011 & 20-2012 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Samson Resources Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 459-2011.

Docket No. 335-2011– The application of Samson Resources Company was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 336-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Samson Resources Company was approved as set forth in Board Order 460-2011.

Docket No. 342-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Fidelity Exploration & Production Company as set forth in Board Order 461-2011. Mr. King recused himself. Mr. Bradshaw voted no.

Docket No. 355-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 356-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 357-2011– The application of Continental Resources, Inc. was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 387-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of EOG Resources, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 462-2011.

Docket No. 392-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 463-2011.

Docket No. 393-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 464-2011.

Docket No. 394-2011– The application of TOI Operating was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 403-2011– The application of Sands Oil Company was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 404-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 405-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 409-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 410-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 411-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 416-2011 & 11-2011 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 465-2011.

Docket No. 418-2011 & 14-2011 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 466-2011.

Docket No. 420-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 421-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 467-2011.

Docket No. 422-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 424-2011 – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 468-2011.

Docket No. 426-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 427-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 429-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 430-2011 & 10-2012 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was approved as set forth in Board Order 469-2011.

Docket No. 432-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 434-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 470-2011.

Docket No. 435-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 471-2011.

Docket No. 436-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 472-2011.

Docket No. 437-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 473-2011.

Docket No. 438-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Smelser and passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 474-2011. Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Efta voted no.

Docket No. 439-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Gunderson, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 475-2011.

Docket No. 441-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Bradshaw and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 476-2011.

Docket No. 444-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 445-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. King and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP as set forth in Board Order 477-2011.

Docket No. 446-2011– The application of Brigham Oil & Gas, LP was continued to the March 2012 hearing.

Docket No. 450-2011 & 5-2012 FED – Board staff placed this application on the Default Docket for approval without hearing if no protests or requests for hearing were received by 10:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. None were received. The application of Mountain View Energy, Inc. was approved as set forth in Board Order 478-2011.

Docket No. 452-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Efta, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 479-2011.

Docket No. 453-2011 – A motion was made by Mr. Efta, seconded by Mr. Smelser and unanimously passed, to approve the application of Slawson Exploration Company, Inc. as set forth in Board Order 480-2011.

Docket No. 571-2011– A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. Gunderson and unanimously passed, to require that the \$1000 fine ordered in Board Order 257-2011 against Brent Zimmerman must be paid and all compliance and clean-up issues at the Heringer 11-21 well must be addressed by the Board's June 14, 2012 public hearing. This is set forth in Board Order 481-2011.

Docket No. 572-2011– A motion was made by Mr. Smelser, seconded by Mr. King and unanimously passed, to schedule for a Show-Cause Hearing for bond forfeiture for Athena Energy LLC for the Board's March 2012 hearing for failure to plug and abandon its wells in Liberty, Hill and Valley Counties, Montana. This is set forth in Board Order 482-2011.

NEXT MEETING


The next business meeting of the Board will be Wednesday, March 7, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. at 2535 St. Johns Avenue in Billings, Montana. The next regular public hearing will be Thursday, March 8, 2012, beginning at 8:00 a.m. at 2535 St. Johns Avenue in Billings, Montana. The filing deadline for the March 8, 2012, public hearing is February 9, 2012.

BOARD OF OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION OF THE STATE OF MONTANA



Linda Nelson, Chairman
Don Bradshaw
Ronald S. Efta
Jay Gunderson
Jack King
Bret Smelser

ATTEST:



Terri H. Perrigo, Executive Secretary