

MINERALS REVENUE MANAGEMENT
ROYALTY POLICY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY OF MEETING
OCTOBER 28, 2004
SHERATON DENVER WEST HOTEL
LAKEWOOD, COLORADO

The Royalty Policy Committee (RPC) of the Minerals Management Service (MMS) convened its first meeting at the Sheraton Denver West Hotel, 360 Union Boulevard, Lakewood, Colorado on October 28, 2004. In accordance with Public Law 92-463, the meeting was open to the public.

Members/Alternates Present

Johnnie Burton, MMS Director, Lucy Querques Denett, AD/MRM, Jeff Hunt, BIA, William R. Brancard, New Mexico, Thomas H. Shipps, Southern Ute Tribe, Gary Paulson, Natural Gas Supply Association, Walter Cruickshank, MMS, Deputy Director, Akhtar Zaman, Navajo Nation, Harold Kemp, Wyoming, Ronald Cattany, Western Governors Association, Bill Hartzler, National Mining Association, Todd Druse, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, David Darouse, Louisiana, Michael Coney, American Petroleum Institute, Daniel Riemer, U.S. Oil and Gas Association, Thomas Lonnie, BLM, George Triebisch, AD/PMI, Orme Lewis, Public Attendee, Michael Walden-Newman, Public Attendee, William Barger, Public Attendee, Darrell Gingerich, COPAS, Carla Wilson, Independent Petroleum Association of Mountain States, Eddie Jacobs, Oklahoma Indian Mineral Owners Association, Lisa Crothers, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Other Attendees

Diana Allen, Connie Bartram, Theresa Walsh Bayani, Janice Bigelow, Bob Davidoff, Paula Diyorio, Pat Etchart, Gary Fields, Debbie Gibbs Tschudy, Cathy Hamilton, Bobby Maxwell, Brian McGee, Nancy Messer, Bob Prael, Don Sant, Perry Shirley, Tami Sluss, Greg Smith, Bob Smith, Marti Thompson, Ken Vogel, Mary Williams, Anita Gonzales-Evans.

Welcoming and Opening Remarks

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. The designated Federal official, Lucy Querques Denett, welcomed the attendees to the first meeting under the new charter and presented opening remarks. Nineteen of 20 voting members were present.

Director's Remarks

Ms. Burton provided an overview of the MMS accomplishments for the last 18 months for Offshore Minerals Management (OMM) and Minerals Revenue Management (MRM). She began with OMM stressing how important this program is for the country. The MMS is currently responsible for 30 percent of domestic oil production, and 23 percent of domestic production of natural gas. Demand and competition for Oil and Gas is increasing steadily, therefore making MMS' mission to regulate and facilitate domestic production even more important. Incentives are being offered to encourage drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, as well as Alaska. Deepwater drilling incentives are also being offered and showing positive results. Hurricane Ivan did substantial damage to the Gulf drilling operations; however, the environment was not adversely effected, meaning the standards we demand for drilling are sufficient. Loss of production has been a concern; 25 percent of wells remained shut-in after 45 days which is unprecedented.

The MRM has worked on several initiatives, one being Royalty in Kind (RIK). This program has grown significantly, using new software and technology to help track what is taken in kind. Studies were done by the General Accounting Office, the Inspector General's Office, and Luken's Energy Group to pinpoint strengths and weaknesses in the program. The results of these studies are being used to formulate a 5 year business plan for RIK starting in FY05. We have put approximately 80 million barrels in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR), and hope to continue with 100 million more by the end of CY 2005.

The MRM published several significant rules that affect the oil and gas industry. Two aspects of the Federal Oil Valuation Rule were highlighted: Non-arm's length transactions and transportation. These were published last spring and were effective in August of 2004. We are now working on the Federal Gas Rule to make it more consistent with the Oil Rule and hope to publish the final rule in the next few months. The Accounting and Auditing Relief for Marginal Properties rule was issued this year as well. The next focus is The Indian Oil Valuation rule.

Individuals from the Chippewa Cree, Hopi, and the Navajo Tribes are being trained under the Inter Governmental Personnel Act on mineral royalty valuations and audit.

As a result of a Court of Appeals decision on pipelines in the offshore, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission asked industry to verify non-discriminatory and open access to the spun-down pipelines in the Gulf. Since MMS has the authority to regulate those lines, The Policy and Management Improvement Group is reviewing this task. Rather than begin working on a rule for the formal process, an informal process of a hot line will be implemented to accept complaints for discrimination or non-open access to those lines. This will help us to identify any problems. This has been a learning exercise which will be continued this year.

Ms. Burton explained that the changes made to the charter are intended to make it operate more efficiently. The Minerals Management Advisory Board has been eliminated and MMS's three advisory committees now operate under their own charters. The charters are very similar and include term limits, more flexibility in appointments, and an ethics statement. She explained the membership categories of the advisory committee, and stressed the importance of reducing the operating cost of these advisory committees due to budget constraints.

Associate Director's Remarks

Ms. Denett announced recent MRM personnel changes. Milt Dial, Deputy Associate Director, retired and Debbie Gibbs Tschudy is now the Deputy Associate Director. Mary Lou Miller, Associate Director Staff Assistant, retired and Tami Sluss is now in the position. Lonnie Kimball was selected as the Houston Business Center Manager. Two Senior Executive Level positions were announced, one for the Compliance Program Director and one for the Royalty In Kind Program Director. Selections for these positions will be made in the next few months. The Assistant Program Directors for both Onshore and Offshore Compliance and Asset Management are being combined into one position.

Ms. Denett discussed the meeting agenda items and outlined the projects for the upcoming year. She discussed the 5-year RIK Business Implementation Plan and explained that the SPR fill may be delayed due to Hurricane Ivan. The Federal Gas Rule will be finalized in the next few months. The Indian Oil Valuation Rule will be the program's next high priority. The MRM will work on publishing the proposed rule for prepayment of royalty relief on marginal properties. The Takes versus Entitlement Rule will also be a high priority as well as the Late Payment and Over Payment Interest Rule. The MMS continues to work on the Records Management Improvement Project, started earlier

this year due to the Cobell litigation. She also informed the RPC that Alaska had joined the State and Tribal Royalty Audit Committee (STRAC) this year, giving us 11 states and 8 tribes that are in 202/205 Cooperative and Delegated Agreement programs.

Ms. Denett explained her role as the RPC's Executive Secretary. She introduced the new ex-officio members to the Committee: Tom Lonnie representing the BLM, and Dennis Bodenchuk representing the BIA. Jeff Hunt represented BIA as the alternate.

During this meeting the RPC will elect a Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Parliamentarian and vote on the draft By-Laws included in your packets. A summary of the minutes will be distributed to all members approximately 8 weeks after this meeting.

A 15 minute caucus was observed to facilitate committee nominations. The nomination process followed.

Election of Officers

Ms. Denett opened nominations for Chairperson.

Ron Cattany was nominated for Chairperson and was elected by unanimous vote.

Vote: 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 0 abstaining. Motion Carried

Dan Riemer was nominated for Vice Chairperson and was elected by unanimous vote.

Vote: 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 0 abstaining. Motion Carried

Carla Wilson was nominated for parliamentarian and was elected by unanimous vote.

Vote: 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 0 abstaining. Motion Carried

Chairperson Ron Cattany thanked everyone for their participation and mentioned to the new officers the great working relationship the RPC has with the MMS, both in Washington D.C. and Denver. He expressed his appreciation for MMS's open door communication policy as it relates to the activities of the RPC.

Adoption of By-Laws

Chairperson: Ms. Denett and Ms. Burton were asked if any changes had been made to the bylaws.

Mr. Fields: Reported changes to the bylaws to support the new RPC charter.

Mr. Hartzler: Reported a change to the time frame to submit reports from subcommittees from 30 days to 20 days.

Mr. Walden Newman: moved that the first sentence in section 4-B read "Supporting materials, reports and other documents required to reach an informed decision will be transmitted to RPC members at least 20 days in advance of the meeting during which they will be considered."

Mr. Barger seconded the motion and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Vote: 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 0 abstaining. Motion Carried

Mr. Lonnie: Moved to adopt the operating procedures and bylaws as amended.

Mr. Barger: Seconded the motion and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Vote: 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 0 abstaining. Motion Carried.

Financial Management Update

Bob Prael provided an overview of Financial Management (FM).

Within the FM organization functions are managed by four groups. Accounting Services are managed by Kathy Martinez, Financial Services are managed by Bob Prael, Reporting Services are managed by Lorraine Corona, and Systems Support issues are managed by Dave Menard.

Mr. Prael discussed charts illustrating Federal Mineral Reporting and Revenue Flow, and Indian Mineral Reporting and Revenue Flow. Procedural questions were asked pertaining to matching funds with reports, accuracy of royalty rates, and status of the report verification backlog. Mr. Prael and Ms. Denett explained that the Internet shutdown, as well as a new system implementation, contributed to the problems. These issues have been addressed and the backlog of work was eliminated as quickly as possible. An RPC update will be issued to clarify questions raised by Committee members.

Questions and answers followed:

Mr. Shipp: On the chart, what is the formal communication line between MMS and BLM?

Ms. Denett: That was intentionally left off of the chart. The MMS has extensive communication with BLM. MMS also shares production data with BIA, BLM and OMM every month.

Mr. Jacobs: When the monies don't match the reports what happens?

Mr. Prael: We contact the company to get the correct information to match the check or wire to the 2014. If the check does not come in, our accountants work it manually or they contact the company for clarification.

Mr. Riemer: When do revenue dollars go directly to the individual Indians/allottees?

Mr. Prael: When the lease terms say that the lessee will pay directly to the allottees. They are called Direct Payments.

Mr. Zaman: Many times there are months missing from the production reports – where are they? What is the possibility that MRM can provide the missing production data to us?

Ms. Williams: Reports are missing due to the backlog. However, we provide all accepted and rejected production data to BLM and OMM on a weekly basis. BIA is provided the production data monthly. We will work with you to get you the data you need. Raw data is not available to you as we use to capture the data prior to any edits and since we have front-end edits performed through a service provider, before we receive the data, obtaining the unedited data is probably not possible.

Mr. Cattany: What reclamation fund is receiving the mineral lease revenue?

Mr. Prael: The Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Lewis: What is the reconciliation process and third party aspect?

Mr. Prael: Royalty reports come in from payors identified by payor codes. Money received should have the same matching payor code. When the payor code isn't identified or the amount is different or if the report doesn't come in with the money, we have an open receivable. Our accountants then work it manually payor code by payor code until it is identified by dollar amount or they contact the company for clarification.

Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Compliance and Asset Management (Onshore CAM) Update

Mary Williams, Onshore CAM Manager, outlined the CAM compliance strategies, current compliance activities and accomplishments, and introduced the CAM Management Group.

The goal of the Onshore CAM compliance strategy was to shorten the compliance cycle from the typical 6 years to 3 years. To accomplish this goal working with our State and Tribal partners, in FY 2004 we performed a combination of audits and compliance reviews on those onshore properties that constitute the top 50 percent of the royalty-producing properties for CY 2001. In FY 2005 we will audit or review the top 60 percent of producing properties for CY 2002 and for FY 2006, we will audit or review the top 70 percent of producing properties for 2003.

The compliance review process was described as a series of tests to the volume, royalty rate, value, and allowances which determine whether the royalty payment is reasonable on a property basis.

Traditional audits are still being performed. These audits are augmented by an Audit Quality Improvement plan containing 39 improvement actions. Twenty-six of these actions and a new compliance tracking system have been implemented. Audits are performed in accordance with the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards.

Questions and Answers followed:

Mr. Walden-Newman: What is your definition of property?

Ms. Williams: Property can be a stand alone individual lease or a unit agreement with allocated production.

Mr. Darouse: Do you have any controls in place that would give you a high degree of assurance that compliance reviews are appropriate and that the royalty has been accurately paid?

Ms. Williams: Random audits are the tool we use to check properties that have had a compliance review.

Mr. Darouse: If your compliance reviews were found to have a high rate of inaccuracy, would you consider not using that procedure in the future?

Ms. Williams: Yes, where we can we will.

Mr. Darouse: Is there any kind, other than collection of interest, of punitive measure that MMS has the authority to exercise?

Ms. Williams: The civil penalty process.

Offshore Compliance and Asset Management (Offshore CAM) Update

Bobby Maxwell, Offshore CAM Manager, reported that compliance work for 2001 included approximately 850 properties, representing \$4 billion in royalty collections for that year.

The RIK oil and gas volumes are being reconciled. The Offshore Minerals Management liquid verification system reconciles all the volumes from the Gulf.

Pricing thresholds for deepwater royalty relief are being monitored and the thresholds are being surpassed this year. A full-time person works on the production allocation schedule reports as submitted by the operators in the Gulf.

Other work includes random and targeted audits, and audit referrals. Background and system reviews are being done at all the major residencies and payors. Offshore CAM is participating in the takes verses entitlements rule-making and heavily involved in settlement negotiations. Questions and answers followed:

Mr. Reimer: Does E-room data include pricing information that some lessees would consider proprietary?

Mr. Maxwell: Data in the E-room is only available to authorized personnel. It is not available to the public.

Mr. Barger: Do compliance audits track the amount of money gained from the energy and effort put into it? At some point you are going to get diminishing returns. How do we know where that point is?

Ms. Denett: Yes we do track it. So far we have not had any diminishing returns.

Indian Oil and Gas Compliance and Asset Management (Indian CAM)

Theresa Walsh Bayani, Indian CAM Manager, addressed ongoing Indian CAM work of the past year. Indian CAM performed numerous audits throughout the year and compliance reviews on 18 properties, representing \$49 million. The Indian Gas Valuation Rule, effective in January 2000, has assisted in complying with index pricing and major portion pricing for 100 percent of Indian Gas for CY 01 and 02, representing \$293 million.

Additional Indian CAM work was done to ensure compliance with alternative dual accounting, an election that payors can make under the new Indian Gas Valuation Rule.

Extensive evaluation of price indices was emphasized. Also, the success of the Indian outreach sessions as well as the number of Indian inquiries serviced was discussed.

Ms. Walsh Bayani also explained the difference between compliance reviews (a percentage of royalties reviewed within the 3-year goal) and assurance of major portion/index pricing compliance at 100 percent (annually).

Questions and answers followed:

Mr. Hartzler: What is the difference between compliance reviews for 18 properties in CY01 versus compliance with the Indian gas rule for 100 percent of Indian gas leases?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: We did a complete compliance review of the royalty rate, the volume, the value, and allowances for 18 properties as part of the three-year cycle. The other goal requires us to cover and assure compliance for 100 percent of Indian gas leases for index pricing and major portion pricing only.

Mr. Cattany: How many leases would be represented in the 18 properties?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: It depends on the make-up of the properties and the number of units involved but definitely more than 18 leases.

Mr. Jacobs: What sets the tolerance for auditing old leases where production is marginal?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: A multi-tiered strategy. We array leases from highest to lowest and divide them into three tiers and select leases from all tiers.

Mr. Zaman: Do these 18 properties cover the 202 tribal agreements?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: Yes and a couple of tribes assisted us with the compliance reviews.

Mr. Shipps: What has been done to review the reliability of index reporting? What, if any, problems have you encountered in being able to comply with the IBLA's decision in the Burlington Southern Ute major portion component to make sure that the major portion analysis you do in those areas meets the regulatory requirements for a valid major portion analysis?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: In response to your second question, we have not incurred any problems because the new Indian Gas Valuation Regulations require MMS to array all the prices including arm's-length and non-arm's-length prices in the major portion array. In response to your first question, feedback indicates index pricing is working. With index pricing we are able to get compliance quickly with minimal litigation and appeals.

Mr. Zaman: Lucy, how much reliance do you have on El Paso's indexing?

Ms. Denett: We don't know anything specific on El Paso but we will be happy to work with you further.

Mr. Walden-Newman: How do you decide index or major portion?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: For those areas where published indexes were available, MMS evaluated the publications and used those indexes. When indexes are not available we use the non-index pricing method which is the major portion calculation. However, if indexes are available, leases can opt out of index zone valuation.

Mr. Walden-Newman: The right to opt out of an index zone valuation, does it rest with the lease owners?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: MMS determines whether the leases are opted out of the index zone valuation for the allotted leases, and tribes decide whether to opt out of index zone valuation for tribal leases.

Mr. Kemp: Is there a formula with index pricing in reference to transportation costs?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: The index based formula for Indian leases is based on the index pricing for a particular index less 10 percent for transportation. It is a very simple calculation.

Mr. Walden Newman: Of the total Indian lands, how much are held jointly by tribes versus individual Indian owners?

Ms. Walsh Bayani: The majority of royalties are located on tribal lands. We will research your question and report the findings to you through our RPC update process.

Solids and Geothermal Compliance and Asset Management (Solids Geothermal CAM) Update

Bob Davidoff, Solids Geothermal CAM Manager, presented an overview of Solids Geothermal CAM initiatives. He pointed out that Solids Geothermal CAM's differ from the Oil and Gas CAM's because all financial and compliance work for Federal and Indian solids is done within the group, or "one-stop shop". This represents about 135 producing operations with nearly \$400 million in CY 2000 royalties.

Based on an earlier recommendation by the RPC coal subcommittee, the solids producing and royalty reporting has been combined into one web-based form called the P&R report.

He emphasized working together with BLM, in particular on the topic of royalty-rate reductions, and discussed that new valuation regulations were forthcoming for sodium and potassium.

Questions and answers followed:

Mr. Zaman: If P&R works in solids, why doesn't it work for oil and gas?

Ms. Denett: For solid minerals, the lessee and operator are usually the same, so it makes sense to combine the royalty and production report. That is not the case for oil and gas. Also, the huge universe of oil and gas leases would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to pre-populate all of the data associated with those leases.

Mr. Lewis: What is the trend with prospect for geothermal leases increasing or diminishing?

Mr. Davidoff: I think it is growing but I think Mr. Lonnie from BLM should respond.

Mr. Lonnie: We have a significant numbers of lease applications pending (50 or 60), so it is an upward trend.

Royalty in Kind (RIK) Update

Greg Smith, RIK Denver Manager, provided the Committee with an update on RIK initiatives. The MMS RIK reflects a conservative energy wholesaler selling into the entry point of the market, not downstream; achieving fair market value. The approach to sales focuses on Gulf of Mexico (GOM) royalty volumes, since MMS owns 1/6 to 1/8 of the royalty from GOM production.

After 6 years in a pilot status, the various programs are now considered operational.

The MMS is pleased at the amount of competition for their gas. At a recent gas sale almost all gas sales had multiple bidders. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) oil is dominated by the SPR initiative at the present time with a little more than 100,000 bbl/day.

Numerous studies have been done on RIK by GAO, the Inspector General, and internal to MMS. They are generally favorable to RIK; all had remarks on RIK revenue performance.

The RIK is instituting performance measures recommended by the Lukens Energy Group on an initial basis.

He reported that, with the further implementation of RIK, MRM is realizing goals in offshore compliance personnel reductions and a decrease in the number of RIK appeals. The 5-Year Business Plan demonstrates RIK's commercial objectives. Principle number one is to maximize net revenues.

Some discussion occurred about whether there will be an impact when SPR is filled and the 100,000+bbl/day returns to the marketplace. The general consensus was no due to the relatively low volumes when compared with overall national production figures.

Questions and answers followed:

Mr. Paulson: Do any of these studies take into account conflict reduction or is that just an add on?

Mr. Smith: It is an add on.

Mr. Cattany: When the SPR is filled and when those barrels come back into the marketplace, is that enough of a volume to affect prices to consumers?

Mr. Smith: No.

Mr. Reimer: Have you talked with the tribes about doing RIK on Indian oil?

Mr. Smith: We have had some discussion but only one tribe has come forward to inquire about the feasibility.

Mr. Brancard: You didn't mention factors that you learned that are not favorable to RIK. What are those?

Mr. Smith: Some involve deepwater. Onshore where there is a large concentration of de minimis producing leases.

Mr. Hunt: Do you have any future plans for the San Juan basin?

Mr. Smith: No specific plans with regard to the San Juan basin.

Inter-Association Royalty Strategy Task Force Update

Dan Riemer, Chairperson, Royalty Strategy Task Force (RSTF), introduced the RSTF as an advisory group for various trade associations that represent diverse producer interests. The API, DPC, IPAA, and USOGA have utilized RSTF in the past for issues that have an impact on oil and gas production from Federal and Indian lands. It is not a trade association.

He emphasized that the work on issues is multi-disciplinary. Also, their work is that of a facilitator, pulling together groups to solve a problem. Cited events such as the pipeline allocation problem, in which RSTF worked with transporters, operators to resolve the platform production imbalances.

The RSTF will be convened to work on the Indian oil rule as they did for the Federal Oil Valuation Rule, in 2000 and 2004, and the Gas Valuation Rule in 2004.

Mr. Zaman stated that he would like the RSTF to work on future Indian oil rules.

Western Governors' Association Update

Ron Cattany, representing the Western Governors' Association (WGA), updated the RPC.

He explained that the WGA is an association comprised of 18 States and three Territories. The WGA has an internal group called the Western Interstate Energy Board, succeeding the Western Governors' Policy Office. This group pulled together the energy policy position data presented by this speaker.

Current priorities under Chairperson Governor Owens of Colorado are: protecting threatened and endangered species, strengthening State and Federal energy policy systems, improving drought preparedness and ensuring western water supply and quality, and restoring and maintaining healthy forests and rangelands in the west.

He introduced and described five key areas of mining-related policies that the WGA selected:

- Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act
- The National Minerals Policy
- The community right-to-know/toxic release inventory
- The Abandoned Mine Land Program; cleaning up abandoned mines
- Mining Reclamation Financial Assurance

The financial matters of the five key areas were discussed, and questions dealt primarily with the timing of the funding in those areas.

Public Remarks

Mr. Shirley: Has MMS done a study that would take into account using RIK oil that would be sold in the market today at a higher price than perhaps when the SPR oil was released during the past year?

Ms. Burton: Department of Energy is monitoring this.

Mr. Shirley: In the past years has any oil been released from the SPR?

Ms Burton: Nothing in the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. Cruickshank: In the mid nineties there were some releases from the SPR solely for the purpose of balancing the budget. In 1999 or 2000 there were some releases to try to support the heating oil market in the Northeast.

Committee Roundtable

The RPC established 5 sub-committees to work on important issues. The membership including contact information follows:

Coal Subcommittee

Membership

Chairperson:	Bill Hartzler	303-749-8445	whartzler@foundationcoal.com
Vice Chairperson:	William Brancard	505-476-3405	bill.brancard@state.nm.us
	Akhtar Zaman	928-871-6587	akhtarz@yahoo.com
	Bill Barger	801-240-3842	bargerwe@ldschurch.org
	Ron Cattany	303-866-3971	ron.cattany@state.co.us
	Jeff Hunt	303-594-6942	jeffreyhunt@mindspring.com
	Bob Davidoff	303-231-3306	robert.davidoff@mms.gov
	John Hovanec	303-231-3312	john.hovanec@mms.gov

Geothermal Production Subcommittee

Membership

Chairperson:	Bill Barger	801-240-3842	bargerwe@ldschurch.org
Vice Chairperson	Orme Lewis	602-952-8800	adviser_az@mms.com
	Theresa Walsh Bayani	303-231-3701	theresa.bayani@mms.gov
	Herb Black	303-231-3769	herb.black@mms.gov
	Rich Estabrook	707-468-4052	restabro@ca.blm.gov

Oil and Gas Valuation Subcommittee

Membership

Chairperson	Dan Riemer	713-296-3722	dfriemer@marathonoil.com
Vice Chairperson	Harold Kemp	307-777-7331	hkemp@state.wy.us
	Tom Shipps	970-247-1755	shipps@mbsslip.com
	Lisa Crothers	713-624-9187	lcrothers@br-inc.com
	Dave Darouse	214-6-5-9704	david.darouse@la.gov
	Gary Paulson	281-3662686	paulsogl@bp.com
	Carla Wilson	303-623-0987	cwilson@ipams.org
	Mike Coney	504-728-4643	michael.coney@shell.com
	Fred Watson	713-680-6796	freddie.w.watson@exxonmobil.com
	Mary Williams	303-231-3403	mary.williams@mms.gov
	Richard Adamski	202-208-4001	richard.adamski@mms.gov

Oil and Gas Royalty Reporting Subcommittee

Membership

Chairperson	Darrel Gingerich	918-661-7905	darrel.e.gingerich@conocophillips.com
Vice Chairperson	Todd Druse	970-564-5453	tdruse@utemountain.org
	Gary Paulson	281-366-2686	paulsog@bp.com
	Lisa Crothers	713-624-9187	lcrothers@br-inc.com
	Harold Kemp	307-777-7331	hkemp@state.wy.us
	Pam Williams	281-544-3149	pam.williams@shell.com
	Phil Sykora	303-231-3413	phillip.sykora@mms.gov
	Lorraine Corona	303-231-3671	lorraine.corona@mms.gov
	Jim Morris	303-231-3770	james.morris@mms.gov
	Jan Bigelow	202-208-4453	janice.bigelow@mms.gov

Indian Valuation Subcommittee

Membership

Chairperson	Perry Shirley	928-871-6340	perryinwr@yahoo.com
Vice Chairperson	Lisa Crothers	713-624-9187	lcrothers@br-inc.com
	Akhtar Zaman	928-871-6587	akhtarz@yahoo.com
	Carla Wilson	303-623-0987	cwilson@ipams.org
	Dan Riemer	713-296-3722	dfriemer@marathonoil.com
	Jeff Hunt	303-594-6942	jefferyhunt@mindspring.com
	Theresa Walsh Bayani	303-231-3701	theresa.bayani@mms.gov
	John Barder	303-231-3702	john.barder@mms.gov

Scheduling Next Meeting/Adjournment

A vote was taken to decide on the location of the next Royalty Policy Committee meeting in May of 2005. The choices were New Orleans, Louisiana; Santa Fe, New Mexico; and Albuquerque, New Mexico. New Orleans was selected by unanimous vote.

Vote: 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 0 abstaining. Motion Carried

Meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.