

Prairie LE Pad  
Alternative Site Analysis

Great Western is planning on drilling and developing minerals in Sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 30 and 31 of T1S R66W, with surface holes located in Section 20

The range of locations evaluated to develop these units includes parts of Sections 19, 20, 29, and 30 T1S R66W. Other sections weren't considered because they aren't able to develop the entirety of the proposed units / minerals.

Location analysis

Alternative A: 19

While looking at the south half of Section 19 for a possible surface location, there are limitations due to a neighborhood that cuts across the northeast quarter. There is a neighborhood in the NE & NW quarters of Section 30 that could possibly put the pad in a buffer zone. Almost the entire section is in a Public Water System Protection (PWS). The north half of Section 19 was not proposed due to technical constraints which include long reaches on the vertical portions of the proposed wellbores. Although Section 19 is not within a SWH or RSO, it isn't an ideal choice because of the above reasons.

Alternative B: Section 20

Looking at Section 20, the only area not in a PWS is the SW quarter. Looking to the East of SW quarter, there is an approved Petroshare Pad (Brighton Lakes). GWOC has worked with the developer, who is also the surface owner, and have agreed to an SUA, and his future development plans were taken into consideration. In the SE quarter, there is a pond / reservoir and houses. The other parts of Section 20 were not proposed due to technical constraints which include long reaches on the vertical portions of the proposed wellbores. Section 20 is not within a SWH or RSO. Additionally, there is an oil pipeline in proximity that would help alleviate traffic. This location was processed by the City of Brighton and approved under their CUG process.

Alternative C: Section 29

Looking at Section 29, the only portion not in a PWS is the NW quarter. There is a neighborhood in the NE quarter of Section 30 that could possibly put the pad in a buffer zone. The south half and NE quarter of Section 29 was not proposed due to technical constraints which include long reaches on the vertical portions of the proposed wellbores. There is a planned pad from another operator in the NW quarter of Section 29 and plans for future development. Although Section 29 is not within a SWH or RSO, it isn't an ideal choice because of the above reasons.

#### Alternative D: Section 30

While looking at Section 30, there is a floodplain that cuts from the NW quarter through the SE. The north half is also densely populated with houses. The South half of Section 30 was not proposed due to technical constraints which include long reaches on the vertical portions of the proposed wellbores. Putting a pad here would not develop the entirety of the Section 19 & 30 units that are proposed. Almost the entire section is in a Public Water System Protection (PWS). Although Section 30 is not within a SWH or RSO, it isn't an ideal choice because of the above reasons.

