

# Oil Field Environmental Incident Summary

**Incident:** 20130701142551      **Date/Time of Notice:** 07/01/2013 14:04

**Responsible Party:** Enseco energy services

**Well Operator:** NEWFIELD PRODUCTION COMPANY

**Well Name:** JOHNSON 150-99-33-28-2H

**Field Name:** SOUTH TOBACCO GARDEN

**Well File #:** 24293

**Date Incident:** 5/19/2013      **Time Incident:** 0130

**Facility ID Number:**

**County:** MCKENZIE

**Twp:** 150

**Rng:** 99

**Sec:** 33

**Qtr:** SW SE

**Location Description:** ran off of location down a hill with rain water across the road and into the field it also ran off onto a Whiting oil location right below it.

**Submitted By:** ron christopherson

**Received By:**

**Contact Person:** ron christopherson  
363 N. SAM HOUSTON, PKWY E  
SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77377

**General Land Use:** Cultivated

**Affected Medium:** Topsoil

**Distance Nearest Occupied Building:** 1 Miles

**Distance Nearest Water Well:**

**Type of Incident:** Tank Overflow

**Release Contained in Dike:** No

**Reported to NRC:** Unknown

	<b>Spilled</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Recovered</b>	<b>Units</b>
<b>Oil</b>	4	barrels	0	barrels
<b>Brine</b>	0	barrels	0	barrels
<b>Other</b>	0	barrels	0	barrels

**Followup**      **Units**

**Description of Other Released Contaminant:**

crude oil and flowback water

**Inspected:**

**Written Report Received:**

**Clean Up Concluded:**

**Risk Evaluation:**

none

**Areal Extent:**

Absorbent & Safety Solutions contained the spill on the farmers field.

**Potential Environmental Impacts:**

hydrocarbon and chloride contamination to top soil.

**Action Taken or Planned:**

Absorbent & safety solutions responded to the spill and contained it with boom absorption pads. Standing water was sucked up using a water truck. Right now we are working with absorbent solutions about possible scrapping of the top soil and replacing it with new soil. We are waiting on the land owners decision.

**Wastes Disposal Location:** unknown

**Agencies Involved:**

**Updates**

---

**Date:** 7/7/2013    **Status:** Reviewed - Follow-up Required

**Author:** Roberts, Kris

**Updated Oil Volume:**

**Updated Salt Water Volume:**

**Updated Other Volume:**

**Updated Other Contaminant**

**Notes:**

Release ran off location, across a field, and onto another company's E&P location. Follow-up is required for 2 reasons. 1) determine the off location impact and remediation outcome/plans; and 2) and more important, find out if this release was reported verbally to anyone within 24 hours of the incident, and who specifically it was reported to.

---

**Date:** 7/17/2013    **Status:** Inspection

**Author:** Miller, Adam

**Updated Oil Volume:**

**Updated Salt Water Volume:**

**Updated Other Volume:**

**Updated Other Contaminant**

**Notes:**

This incident was initially not reported because of confusion with the three companies involved over who was responsible for the reporting. The standing oil and water was collected via vac truck and either disposed of or put back into production. Soil samples were collected in the ditch and out into the landowners wheat field. A map of the sample locations and the analysis is in the report folder. Upon visiting the site, I walked in the field where the oil had run off location. I was unable to detect a presence of visible oil.

**Updated Oil Volume:**

**Updated Salt Water Volume:**

**Updated Other Volume:**

**Updated Other Contaminant**

**Notes:**

I have spoken with the landowner and for the time being he wants the remediation to be done in place rather than removing the contaminated soil. Richard stated he was concerned that his crop was doing well and that when the land is disturbed like that it is nearly impossible to repair it back to its original form. He stated that he is ok with the plan to apply S200 or MicroBlaze to the affected area and remediate insitu. I advised him that he could be held liable if the contaminants were to escape his property because he refused the removal treatment but that movement of the contaminants was unlikely.

I have spoken with Kris Roberts and we agreed that pursuing an enforcement action for the lapse in reporting time was not the best course of action.