**Gas Exploration Advisory Group**

**November 2, 2012**

**12:00-1:30**

**Bentley Conference Room**

* Distribution of a document providing a summary of the steps and meetings to date
* What is the purpose of the group?
	+ fact finding
	+ educating the community on the results of fact finding
		- compiling notes, documents into public GoogleDocs
		- Facebook page for updates to students
	+ Organizing community forums, informational sessions, etc.
	+ Educating the community about Bousson and the role it plays for our community
	+ formulating a plan for how to most effectively listen and synthesizecommunity opinions, responses, concerns:
		- survey?
		- compilations of email responses?
		- recording of community conversations?
	+ laying out a clear plan for how the advisory group will reach out to additional student groups, faculty council, ASG throughout the process for the opinions of these groups, but also to establish how these groups can help facilitate the work of the advisory group
	+ should we visit other sites, (we’ve been invited to Bethany College by their CFO)?
	+ establishing a plan for regular, consistent and clear communication to the entire campus community
	+ recommendations made to the AEC
* How will the college handle the question of seismic testing since this decision needs to be made relatively soon? If we decide to do seismic testing, advisory group should determine what protective stipulations and limitations need to be written into the contract
* Next steps for community conversation
	+ schedule a community forum in November?
	+ Should we share notes and documents in public GoogleDocs?
* What campus commitments, values and principles need to be considered within this conversation?
	+ Environmental Guiding Principles (copies to be distributed)
	+ climate neutrality goal
	+ Strategic Plan (copies to be distributed)
	+ Bousson management plan
	+ relationship with immediate neighbors and greater Crawford County community

**Documents distributed: Allegheny College Strategic Plan Combinations 2020, Allegheny’s approved environmental guiding principles as approved September 20, 2002 by the Board of Trustees and updated in January of 2005, summary of steps taken to date, notes from previous meetings, an example of an oil and gas lease, information form Seitel regarding Seismic Testing.**

**Future agenda items**

Should we create a list of questions that we would like to answer? For example, one key question is "how do we evaluate the environmental impact of deep-drilling fracking?"

Should we sign with a leasing company?

Should we not sign with a leasing company?

Should we continue the discussion?

If we decide to move forward with a leasing company, how do we choose which is the best?

If we decide to move forward with a particular leasing company, the advisory group should review and finalize a "perfect lease" for Allegheny.

Establish some sense of the implications of drilling:

* + financial
	+ environmental
	+ community
	+ reputation/marketing

**Please e-mail me any topics you would like considered for future meetings.**

11.02.12 Bousson Advisory Group

Present: Larry Lee, Brian Anderson, Milt Ostrofsky, Emilie Hickox, Scott Wissinger, Ron Cole, Dave Anderson, Steve Onyiewu, Kelly Boulton

Representation: Larry reported that both he and President Mullen had received a number of emails indicating there was concern among the campus community that the advisory group might be lacking in representation from certain perspectives (for example, additional student(s), female faculty member(s), staff member(s)). How do we balance fair and equal representation with a small, nimble committee? Brian reinforced that many students felt there should be additional representation and that it might be wise to add an underclassman (Brian is a comping senior) from ASG. Kelly also received many statements of concern from students suggesting greater student representation and thought any additional students should be unaffiliated with any particular position at this time. Dave suggested we also ask someone to be present whose sole role will be to take notes. Larry noted that he and Kelly had previously discussed this so the minutes could be made available publicly.

Timeline of conversation so far: Larry presented a document summarizing the steps of the conversation thus far along with dates. AEC (Allegheny *or is it Administrative?* Executive Committee) and the board charged us with gathering information to be able to make an informed decision.

Purpose of the group: The group’s role is to not only gather information, pass it on to the campus community, host community forums, and gather feedback, but also to educate the trustees and make recommendations. There was question about how the group operates in terms of communication, decision-making, and process. It was suggested that the group should discuss issues and present the opinions and concerns of others on campus in an attempt to reach consensus, but with the understanding that if consensus is not reached that recommendations are made to AEC and the trustees as a qualified mix of opinions. The first discussion for the group is regarding seismic testing since we need to give the company an indication of whether we might be willing to allow the testing with our own stipulations to minimize impact at Bousson within the next two weeks. We can tentatively agree but write into the contract that we reserve the right to change our mind in the early months of 2013 before the testing is scheduled to commence in March.

The group discussed the current drilling activity in the area, including the well currently being flared near Cochranton and visible from Route 79 and the well at Pettis Corners. Scott Wissinger stated a student is testing water upstream and down of the first 5 drill sites in the area to record TDS, etc. Dave stated information about any well site can be obtained from DEP.

The group discussed the scope of the considerations surrounding the question of how to proceed at Bousson. Scott noted that one consideration includes the actual users of Bousson and the need to consider Allegheny’s ability to attract subsequent researchers to the faculty depending upon how Bousson is managed. Another consideration is the concern of sustainability champions and supporters on campus. Steve noted another consideration is the financial opportunity presented if this can be realized without compromising the values of the college. Ron summed up the multiple considerations as practicality versus philosophy. Scott and Kelly noted that the campus conversation must address both sides and the ultimate decision must be a complex consolidation of all these considerations.

Scott noted that in the past the college has managed Bousson more like a national park than a national forest and there have been written statements (sometimes emails) from past presidents regarding managing Bousson in this manner. Ron asked for clarification about whether the college is considering drilling *on* or drilling *under* Bousson. Larry replied that there has been no official decision but all conversations so far have assumed that we would not allow drilling *on* Bousson. Other surface activities such as roads, pipelines, transfer stations would also likely be unacceptable at Bousson.

The group discussed the issue of seismic testing, for which Seitel is hoping to hear our intentions in the next two weeks. Larry distributed information from the testing company as well as notes from a meeting in which we asked detailed questions about the process. Ron has experience with seismic testing and stated that if testing happened all around Bousson but not on it (or in a very limited capacity on Bousson), the company could still extrapolate the surrounding geological data to understand the potential resource underneath Bousson. If we assumed we would want to allow no additional surface impact to Bousson (no new trails, no trimming of trees, no soil compaction or erosion) we could consider allowing seismic testing on our property only along the existing driveway, the electrical line right of way and possibly along existing trails if the drilling rig could fit. Scott suggested we be clear that we don’t want to allow road enhancement.

Steve asked what the financial income potential of drilling was. Larry reported that Bethany College has done Marcellus drilling under their property and said it was “lucrative” although they’ve not been specific on this. They have offered to give Larry a value range that might give us a better idea. The estimates we’ve heard from the leasing companies have ranged anywhere from $2-10 million dollars over 10 years if they drill.

If the college moves forward with the drafting of a leasing contract, we can include many stipulations and protections. Dave noted that the lease should stipulate that the contract applies only to Utica shale. If the drilling company were to identify another gas resource in a different geological formation, they would have to go through a separate leasing process with us in order to obtain access. Larry indicated that he had provided copies of a “perfect lease” for all members of the advisory group to review. In theory, a drilling company would never accept a “perfect lease” but it will be a useful tool for us to consider the different options and concerns.

The group discussed the need to educate the campus community on the existence, history and current uses of Bousson. Rich Bowden could not attend the meeting but suggested a compilation of Bousson photos, history, GIS maps, descriptions of current research activities, related publications and student presentations and grants. Dave suggested we also craft a GIS map of our county with Bousson highlighted and past and current oil and gas development recorded. He has access to this data but would have to turn it into a “layer” for GIS. Scott indicated we have a pre-GIS map of how different spaces in Bousson are used for research or otherwise. This also could be turned into a GIS layer.

Brian stated that ASG is willing and expecting to survey students regarding this issue so the advisory group might suggest questions that could be included that would help the process.

Larry asked if the advisory group thought it would be okay to say “yes, maybe” to seismic testing if we include many stipulations about where they can and cannot drill test holes and also reserve the right at this time to make a final decision in early 2013 before testing is scheduled to commence. Kelly expressed that in practice there was probably little harm in saying “yes, maybe”, but also expressed concern about the perception of this action in the campus community before educating and consulting them about the decision. Brian expressed his belief that the perception will be that we’re moving forward without asking the community. Brian asked if we say yes (even “yes, maybe”) to seismic testing and this is made public what does this say about Allegheny. Steve asked if the board of trustees will make the decision about seismic testing or just drilling. Larry stated the board will be involved in the entire conversation, but his sense is that the board wants an “informed decision” and sees that tentatively committing to seismic is what we should do to make that “informed decision”. Brian asked why we’re even discussing it if we think the board wants it; do we have a voice? Kelly asked if instead of telling the seismic testing company ”no” or “yes, maybe” at this time, we instead tell them we’re involved in a community process and will be able to provide them with a definite answer early in 2013.

Since the meeting had already run overtime, the conversation was curtailed and will be resumed at ***the next meeting on Thursday 15 November at 12:15 in the Bentley Conference Room.***