To: Zito, Kelly[ZITO.KELLY@EPA.GOV]; Keener, Bill[Keener.Bill@epa.gov]; Skadowski, Suzanne[Skadowski.Suzanne@epa.gov]
Cc: Albright, David[Albright.David@epa.gov]; Rao, Kate[Rao.kate@epa.gov]; Diamond, Jane[Diamond.Jane@epa.gov]; Quast, Sylvia[Quast.Sylvia@epa.gov]; Dermer, Michele[Dermer.Michele@epa.gov]
From: Montgomery, Michael
Sent: Wed 1/28/2015 7:17:33 PM
Subject: RE: San Francisco Chronicle followup (do not forward)

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

From: Montgomery, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2015 7:52 AM
To: Zito, Kelly; Keener, Bill; Skadowski, Suzanne
Cc: Albright, David; Rao, Kate; Diamond, Jane; Quast, Sylvia; Dermer, Michele
Subject: San Francisco Chronicle followup (do not forward)

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Albright, David" <Albright.David@epa.gov>
Date: January 27, 2015 at 4:43:35 PM PST
To: "Montgomery, Michael" <Montgomery.Michael@epa.gov>
Subject: Fw: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Verizon Wireless 4G LTE network.

From: Bohlen, Steven@DOC <Steven.Bohlen@conservation.ca.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 4:03 PM

To: Drysdale, Donald@DOC

Cc: Salera, Jerry@DOC; Habel, Rob@DOC; Montgomery, Michael; Albright, David; Geroch, John@DOC

Subject: RE: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Don,

I copy our EPA colleagues on this note because we have got to get on the same page. We have wasted a day of staff time responding to various reporters questions about the number of this and that well and responding to differences between what they hear from EPA and what they hear from DOGGR. I wish they worked as hard on getting quotes in context.

To Baker and all others who ask – this is the deal. I will not allow our staff time to be consumed further on these issues.

Attached are the two spreadsheets sent to EPA some time ago as requested in their July letter.

The 532 well list we queried did include wells that injected into the 11 aquifers. In their letter of July 17, 2014 to Matt Rodriguez and John Laird, under "3. Tiered Review of Class II Wells", they requested in "a. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, the number and location of all Class II wells, by DOGGR district, permitted to inject in non-hydrocarbon-producing formations with water quality below 10,000 mg/L total dissolved solids, other than the 25 formations listed in Attachment A to this letter." In Attachment A, they listed the 25 formations that are in our MOA Attachment 2 and the additional 4 formations that had been exempted after Primacy. This was the basis for querying those wells. They did not ask that the 11 aquifers in MOA Attachment 3 were to be excluded. So, about 94 wells into these 11 aquifers are in that list. This list contains injection wells into zones with greater than 10,000 TDS.

The second list is a list of wells into hydrocarbon bearing non-exempted aquifers – 2021 in number.

These are the two lists we have sent to EPA. We have not sent updates as we are trying 1. To get our work done and 2. Trying to reduce confusion by not having multiple lists as we update our data after file checking.

Baker and others need to live with this.

Steve

From: Salera, Jerry@DOC
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 3:45 PM
To: Bohlen, Steven@DOC; Habel, Rob@DOC
Subject: FW: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Steve and Rob,

Just a heads-up in case EPA calls for clarification.

The 532 well list we queried did include wells that injected into the 11 aquifers. In their letter of July 17, 2014 to Matt Rodriguez and John Laird, under "3. Tiered Review of Class II Wells", they requested in

"a. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, the number and location of all Class II wells, by DOGGR district, permitted to inject in non-hydrocarbon-producing formations with water quality below 10,000 mg/L total dissolved solids, other than the 25 formations listed in Attachment A to this letter." In Attachment A, they listed the 25 formations that are in our MOA Attachment 2 and the additional 4 formations that had been exempted after Primacy. This was the basis for querying those wells. They did not ask that the 11 aquifers in MOA Attachment 3 were to be excluded. So, about 94 wells into these 11 aquifers are in that list.

I don't know if we want to update that list – we want that list to be the "baseline" or reference as we move forward because the database is always changing as new data are entered in the districts.

Jerry

From: Drysdale, Donald@DOC
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 3:26 PM
To: Bohlen, Steven@DOC; Salera, Jerry@DOC
Cc: Wilson, Ed@DOC
Subject: FW: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Please see the message below

From: Baker, David [mailto:DBaker@sfchronicle.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 2:25 PM
To: Drysdale, Donald@DOC
Subject: RE: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Don,

This is odd. The EPA folks told me yesterday that the 108 wells injecting into the 11 aquifers were separate from the 532 wells in the spreadsheet, with no overlap. I've just put in a call with them to clarify.

If the spreadsheet you sent me on Friday was pulled from the database in August, could you send me the most up-to-date version? When I spoke with the EPA people yesterday, they clearly were looking at a different version of the spreadsheet while we talked. Theirs had the same overall number of wells as mine — 532 — but theirs had several wells above 10,000 TDS, whereas mine showed no wells at that level. I need to be working on the same information they have.

David R. Baker

Staff Writer

Office 415.777.8400 • Cell 415.298.1764

dbaker@sfchronicle.com • @DavidBakerSF