

TECHNICAL REVIEWERS' RATING SUMMARY

G015-F

Town Hall Meetings – A Conversation on Oil and Gas

Submitted by North Dakota Association of Oil and Gas Producing Counties

Principal Investigator: Vicky Steiner

Request for \$10,000; Total Project Costs \$20,000

Rating Category	Weighting Factor	Technical Reviewer		Average Weighted Score
		15E-01 Rating	15E-02 Rating	
Objective	9	3	3	27.0
Availability	9	4	2	27.0
Methodology	7	3	2	17.5
Contribution	7	3	3	21.0
Awareness	5	2	3	12.5
Background	5	4	4	20.0
Project Management	2	3	2	5.0
Equipment Purchase	2	5	5	10.0
Facilities	2	3	3	6.0
Budget	2	3	3	6.0
Average Weighted Score		163	141	152
Maximum Weighted Score				250

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

FUND	X
FUNDING TO BE CONSIDERED	X
DO NOT FUND	

G015-F

Town Hall Meetings – A Conversation on Oil and Gas
Submitted by: North Dakota Association of Oil and Gas Producing Counties
Principal Investigator: Vicky Steiner
Request for \$10,000; Total Project Costs \$20,000

1. The objectives or goals of the proposed project with respect to clarity and consistency with North Dakota Industrial Commission/Oil and Gas Research Council goals are: 1 – very unclear; 2 – unclear; 3 – clear; 4 – very clear; or 5 – exceptionally clear.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 3)

The educational and informational purpose of these Town Hall meetings will assist leaders at the state and county levels in dealing with the fast growth of oil exploration in their neighborhoods and help them plan ahead to avoid problems for both the industry and the local surface owners and businesses.

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating:3)

The overview refers to several issues: surface owner rights; mineral owner rights; oil company procedures on split estates; how to find information. However, the proposal only discusses a surface owner rights brochure that is already available on the Department of Mineral Resources website. The budget refers to the re-printing of that public information but doesn't say who will rewrite the brochure to make it more user friendly. The proposal does not elaborate on what information would be provided by the industry on their procedures.

2. With the approach suggested and time and budget available, the objectives are: 1 – not achievable; 2 – possibly achievable; 3 – likely achievable; 4 – most likely achievable; or 5 – certainly achievable.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 4)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating:2)

The hosting of Town Hall meetings appears to be achievable. This reviewer questions who will be drafting the information to be distributed and the information is the key to achieving the objectives of this proposal—that is educating the public. That work is not identified in the proposal or in the budget.

3. The quality of the methodology displayed in the proposal is: 1 – well below average; 2 – below average; 3 – average; 4 – above average; or 5 – well above average.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 3)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating:2)

See number 2

4. The scientific and/or technical contribution of the proposed work to specifically address North Dakota Industrial Commission/Oil and Gas Research Council goals will likely be: 1 – extremely small; 2 – small; 3 – significant; 4 – very significant; or 5 – extremely significant.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 3)

A significant improvement in the understanding of the benefits of exploration in local communities can be realized, establishing contacts that local people can use to gather additional

information and realizing the future improvements possible in their community, without unnecessarily hindering future exploration.

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating:3)

There is no scientific contribution in this proposal. As an education opportunity there is significant value to this type of effort if the information developed is user friendly and well written.

5. The principal investigator's awareness of current research activity and published literature as evidenced by literature referenced and its interpretation and by the reference to unpublished research related to the proposal is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 2)

No comment

Reviewer 015D-02 (Rating: 3)

No reference is made to current literature that is available other than the reference to the Department of Mineral Resources brochure. It would be helpful to know what is available and will be provided from the industry on matters that affect mineral and surface owners.

6. The background of the investigator(s) as related to the proposed work is: 1 – very limited; 2 – limited; 3 – adequate; 4 – better than average; or 5 – exceptional.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 4)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating: 4)

Although the proposal does not provide any background information on the principal investigator, this reviewer is aware that Vicky Steiner has the skills to coordinate these type of meetings, prepare news releases and coordinate schedules. What is lacking in this proposal is who will be preparing the information for distribution.

7. The project management plan, including a well-defined milestone chart, schedule, financial plan, and plan for communications among the investigators and subcontractors, if any, is: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – very good; or 5 – exceptionally good.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 3)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating: 2)

No plan is provided in the proposal other than to say there will be four meetings in western North Dakota before the end of 2008. No specific locations are identified, no time frame is provided, no plan is outlined on preparation of materials, etc.

8. The proposed purchase of equipment is: 1 – extremely poorly justified; 2 – poorly justified; 3 – justified; 4 – well justified; or 5 – extremely well justified. (Circle 5 if no equipment is to be purchased.)

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 5)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating: 5)

No equipment is being purchased.

9. The facilities and equipment available and to be purchased for the proposed research are: 1 – very inadequate; 2 – inadequate; 3 – adequate; 4 – notably good; or 5 – exceptionally good.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 3)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating: 3)

Without any details on where meetings will be held it is difficult to comment on facilities and equipment available. The reviewer is certain that adequate facilities can be leased in western North Dakota.

10. The proposed budget “value”¹ relative to the outlined work and the financial commitment from other sources is of: 1 – very low value; 2 – low value; 3 – average value; 4 – high value; or 5 – very high value. (See below)

Reviewer 015F-01 (Rating: 3)

No comment

Reviewer 015F-02 (Rating: 3)

Since the match is 50% the value is average. The proposal is lacking in sufficient detail to evaluate what other value may be contributed by the writers of the information that will be distributed.

Section C. Overall Comments and Recommendations:

Please comment in a general way about the merits and flaws of the proposed project and make a recommendation whether or not to fund.

Reviewer 015F-01 (Fund)

The educational value to the local communities and the feedback from those communities will benefit all parties. This is a simple, but effective concept that is long overdue.

Reviewer 015F-02 (Funding May Be Considered)

This is a noteworthy project. It is timely that information is updated and made available to interested surface and mineral interest owners. The proposal is silent on where the information will be available following the town hall meetings. Will it be available to state and local agencies to distribute?

This proposal would have received a higher rating if more detail had been provided. If the information is developed from both the industry and the state then this will be beneficial and worthy of funding from the Oil and Gas Research Council.

¹ “Value” – The value of the projected work and technical outcome for the budgeted amount of the project, based on your estimate of what the work might cost in research settings with which you are familiar.

Financial commitment from other sources – A minimum of 50% of the total project must come from other sources to meet the program guidelines. Support less than 50% from Industrial Commission sources should be evaluated as favorable to the application.