

## **-Info-Public Service Commission**

---

**From:** Schock, Victor F.  
**Sent:** Friday, July 01, 2016 8:18 AM  
**To:** -Info-Public Service Commission  
**Subject:** FW: One-Call Complaints Against Denbury Onshore, LLC

Please docket in the below captioned cases.

Thanks,  
Victor Schock

---

**From:** Michael James [mailto:michael.james@denbury.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:55 PM  
**To:** Schock, Victor F.  
**Subject:** One-Call Complaints Against Denbury Onshore, LLC

Mr. Schock:

Please consider this email the response of Denbury Onshore, LLC ("Denbury") to those certain ND One-Call Complaints filed with the North Dakota Public Service Commission by Ernst Trenching, Inc. ("Ernst"), and identified by case number below.

**Case Numbers PU-16-243, PU-16-244 (Ticket #16047871)**

The Complaint associated with PU-16-243 alleges that Denbury's line "was 11' off marks." The directions provided in Ticket #16047871 did not make sense and Denbury called for further clarification. The One-Call request should have been redone, but was not. The starting and stopping points were apparently the same point and very confusing.

The Complaint associated with PU-16-244 claims that "Denbury flagged both sides of Road, but they didn't know what side it was on so they marked both sides of the road." On the issues of flagging both sides of the road, Denbury talked to both Jeff and Keith with ERNST and another hydro-vac company to help identify where the line was.

**Case Numbers PU-16-245, PU-16-246 (Ticket #16023593)**

The Complaint associated with PU-16-245 claims that "Denbury mismarked by 500' or so." The directions and streets were misidentified in Ticket #16023593 and the One-Call request should have been redone, but was not. Denbury personnel did their best to interpret the faulty directions and misidentified street names and contacted Jeff with Ernst to get clarification.

The Complaint associated with PU-16-246 alleges that "Denbury lines...They thought two lines. There was 3 lines. We just missed one of them." Denbury was unaware of the third line as it did not appear on any Denbury maps or in any records, and was either fiberglass or poly as it was not detected by a line finder.

**Case Number PU-16-251 (Ticket #16037531)**

The Complaint associated with PU-16-251 alleges that "Denbury had 3 lines. 15' off one line." All three lines were marked by Denbury personnel who also met with Jeff from Ernst. Ernst may have missed some red flags as there were multiple other lines marked within the requested area.

**Case Numbers PU-16-252, PU-16-253, PU-16-254 (Ticket #16037533)**

The Complaint associated with PU-16-252 simply states "Denbury 9 lines. They had no idea." Denbury marked both sides of the 15' right of way and indicated to Ernst that there were multiple live and abandoned lines

therein. Furthermore, Denbury personnel rode the right of way with Jeff and Keith from Ernst to go over the route. It was identified that cows had pulled some of the flags before Ernst was able to commence its line installation, but said pulled flags were replaced by Denbury prior to Ernst starting its work.

The Complaint associated with PU-16-253 alleges that "Denbury had two or three lines in here. They had no idea where they were at." Denbury was unaware of these lines as they did not appear on any Denbury maps or in any records, and were either fiberglass or poly as they was not detected by a line finder.


The Complaint associated with PU-16-254 simply states "Denbury – Two lines, no idea." Again, the lines were not known to Denbury as they did not appear on any Denbury maps or in any records, and were either fiberglass or poly as they was not detected by a line finder.

### **Summary**

Denbury personnel contacted Consolidated Telephone, the owner of the fiber optic line being installed by Ernst, to discuss the installation of its line under Denbury's existing pipelines. Although I message was left, Consolidated Telephone never responded. Denbury personnel assured me that in response to these various One-Call requests, the proper attention was given to identifying our lines through the use of GPS, maps, records, etc. However, even using best efforts, it is not always easy to identify underground lines as some are fiberglass and poly lines, and others are very old. The area of these One-Call requests consists of an old oil field with hundreds of buried flowlines, shipping lines, etc., and almost all were identified and marked as requested. Denbury personnel further informed me that they were very cooperative with Ernst, making themselves constantly available, and answering any questions Ernst might have had. There was no indication during any meetings between Denbury and Ernst personnel that Ernst was confused, displeased, or concerned about Denbury's efforts to comply with the One-Call requests. In fact, during the subject project, Ernst crossed or paralleled approximately 40 to 50 Denbury lines over approximately 10 to 12 miles without a single line strike. The Denbury lines must have been sufficiently marked as that is an exceptional achievement.

I am available anytime to answer any questions you may have or to discuss these issues further. Thanks.

Michael S. James  
Chief Counsel - North Region  
Denbury Resources Inc.  
Denbury Onshore, LLC  
2310 Oil Drive  
Casper, Wyoming 82604  
Main: (307) 439-1850 Ext. 4522  
Cell: (307) 752-3968



This confidential e-mail is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Unless expressly stated otherwise in a written communication other than in electronic form, no e-mail communication shall satisfy the requirements for a writing or constitute a contract or electronic signature.

---

This transmission, email and any files transmitted with it, may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) strictly confidential under federal or state law. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not use, disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender (only) and delete the message. This message may also be subject to disclosure under the North Dakota Open Records Laws.