

PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP (PAWG)

Pinedale Fire House, Pinedale, WY

November 4, 2004

9:00 AM- 5:00 PM

PAWG Decisions, Recommendations and Action Items

Decisions

- Leave all decisions regarding composition of TG's to each TG.
- TG monitoring plans are to be completed by February 18, 2005; monitoring to start by summer 2005.
- PAWG agreed that an overview of sagebrush ecology should be put together for Wildlife TG and delivered to them for use sometime after the 1st of the year.
- Wildlife TG will explore adding individuals from special interest groups.
- Meeting for TG Presentations: March 2&3 –all day, each day.
- Next PAWG meeting Jan. 5th with TG's as an interim meeting to address any questions TG's may have about their charge.
- Hard copies of TG's final reports should be submitted to PAWG by February 18th and sent to either Bob Reese or Linda Baker.
- Socio-economic TG added three new members: Ward Wise, Tom Burns, and Robert Jones.
- PAWG will attempt to find support help for specific portions of TG projects after a need is identified work is available.
- Cultural/Historical/Visual TG will drop “visual” from its title.
- Cultural/Historical TG will add a representative from SHPO.
- The PAWG will not form a Range TG as reflected in item #3 of decisions of the August 11th meeting.
- Recreation, hunting and tourism issues will be taken into consideration in the existing TG's where appropriate.

Recommendations

- Bob Reese to look into how TG's will handle the funding they secure for their projects and report back to PAWG at next meeting.
- PAWG will operate under consensus and TG's should adopt this same framework..
- TG's should think “outside of the box” about issues that will improve the all over picture in each of their areas.
- TG's and PAWG will share minutes of meetings to increase communication.
- All TG's should look at the “visual” aspects of their areas where appropriate.
- Use internal facilitation for next PAWG meeting, as it went well this time.

Action Items

- Bob Reese to report back to PAWG at next meeting on procedure for handling money.
- Dave Vlcek will contact SHPO about adding a representative to the Cultural/Historical TG.
- Bob Reese will follow up with Carol Kruse about sound system for next meeting.

PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP (PAWG)

Pinedale Fire House, Pinedale , WY

November 4, 2004

9:00 AM- 5:00 PM

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

PAWG Members: Mary Flanderka, State of Wyoming; Robert Barrett, Member-at-Large; Nylla Kunard, Town of Pinedale; Susan Kramer, Landowner bordering PAPA; Robin Smith, PAPA Oil & Gas Operators; Linda Baker, Environmental Community; Kirby Hedrick, Member-at-Large, Robert Reese, Sublette County Government; Paul Hagenstein, Livestock Operators Bordering/Within PAPA

Presenters: Joel Berger, Senior Scientist-Wildlife Conservation Society
Rusty Kaiser, University of Wyoming

Meeting Facilitated by: Linda Baker/Robert Reese

Meeting Recorded by: Susan Webster

CALL TO ORDER

Facilitated by Linda Baker

Approval of July 12 & August 11, 2004 Minutes

Minutes for both meetings were approved. Minutes will be posted and available on the web at www.fido.gov/ after approval at each PAWG meeting.

FIRST PRESENTATION

Joel Berger, Wildlife Conservation Society

“Pronghorn and Energy Development in the Upper Green –Preliminary Findings”

By: Joel Berger, Jon Beckmann, Kim Berger

- Pronghorn of the Upper Green River Basin (UGRB) move up to 650 kilometers between winter and summer range.
- Pronghorn of the UGRB have the second longest migration of all terrestrial mammals in the Western Hemisphere. The movements of these pronghorn exceed those of woodland caribou, African wildebeest, zebras, and elephants, and Asiatic chiru.
- The pronghorn migration route moves through three geographical bottlenecks on federal public lands (BLM and USFS), and these vary in size from 200 to 500 meters.
- Pronghorn of the UGRB are reliant on wintering range situated between the Pinedale and Jonah project areas, sites that are being increasingly fragmented by roads, gas field development, and habitat loss.
- Pronghorn use of large fragmented habitats continues.

- Habitat size and pronghorn group size are linked. Smaller groups occupy smaller habitat fragments. The biological consequences, if any, of this diminution in sociality are not known.
- Overall habitat use is reduced in smaller fragments. The biological consequences, if any, of this pattern are also not known. Current research is aimed at developing and testing models to determine the extent to which habitat abandonment has population-level effects.
- Dense roads alter pronghorn use, and fragmentation leads to abandonment.

Q.: Where are we with our threshold in this area?

A.: They have seen abandonment in both areas; Jonah snow is less and the mesa snow is higher.

Q.: Is reclamation in Jonah coming along fast enough? Do we need to look at whether reclamation is adequate?

A.: The more we look at issues the better off we all are.

Q.: Where are your studies focused?

A.: Our goal is to get a 1st class handle on population that rely on the upper green and getting a better handle on the entire dynamic. Where are the Upper Green winter ranges – working out to the Mesa.

Q.: What is the study area?

A.: It comprises about 1500 sq. mi.; we ask for permission to enter private lands, where appropriate, but access is limited.

Q.: Do we know what lead to the losses in migration why and when it occurs and has occurred?

A.: Most routes disappeared as a result of development, agricultural growth, and highways over the course of the last 30-50 years.

Q.: What happened to the animals? Where did they go?

A.: We don't really know. Lots of things play into to this it is not just one thing or another. We are probably not dealing with a huge population; we are talking about 300 animals.

Q.: Do the animals abandon the area completely?

A.: Roads well pads, fragmentation, parcel size etc. are causing abandonment. So is lack of original vegetation because it was not re-vegetated properly. Many things are affecting the animals.

Q.: If you had unlimited resources what could you do?

A.: In an ideal world we would use lots of documentation, replication, and have large sample sizes so that we can address the ultimate questions with controls in all areas. Determine what habitat types foster the healthiest populations.

Q.: Do you have a control area?

A.: We have a quasi-control in area of about 50 miles.

Q.: We have a reclamation task force that could use your thoughts about the right way to revegetate.

A.: I can't really address that for you, but will direct you to someone who can help. We also need to consider other things beside vegetation like snow depth, size of area, etc.

Q.: Was the problem at Fontenelle due to lack of sage brush?

A.: Yes.

Q.: What is the impact between different populations?

A.: Revegetation should be planned for multiple species not just for one—mosaics are good.

Q.: Were you able to identify different stagings of migration? A.: There is some interaction between staging, hunting and migration.

Q.: Could you distinguish staging areas?

A.: No, we weren't focused on that.

Q.: Are new technologies such as directional drilling valuable regarding population size?

A.: Directional drilling is great because it is reducing the footprint on wildlife.

Paul

Historically between 1920 and 1960 no antelope were seen. That corridor in southern Wyoming was basically defunct. Later on there was a large transplant of animals.

Q.: What effect have subdivisions had on the animals?

A.: This is a big issue. A lot of disturbance, such as dogs and fences, causes the animals to move.

Q.: When the 30,000 animal populations came back did they just rediscover the corridor?

A.: Eighty percent of animals seem to naturally return to their summer areas.

Q.: How has the population changed in the last 20 years?

A.: Unfortunately, the data is not there at the resolution we need to answer that question. We just don't have good ground data to be able to know at this time.

Dan

Twenty years is a short period of time when considering this. My thought is that what we are experiencing in population decline is linked to overall disturbances.

Q.: Is the selection of migration route and winter range invariant?

A.: Last winter we had 300-400 animals; last year we had 12,000. They look for low snow and suitable forage life. We are probably not growing more habitat for wildlife, we are losing it. What this probably does is drive the animals out. What we want to know is what are the consequences of this scenario.

Morning Break

SECOND PRESENTATION

Rusty Kaiser, University of Wyoming

“Potential Impact of Natural Gas Development on Sage Grouse: Phase III”

This area (Pinedale) has the largest sage grouse population in all of North America

HENS AND ROOSTERS

- . Substantial sexual dimorphism.
- . Males are much larger than the females

SAGEBRUSH OBLIGATES

- . Without it they die

SPRING: TIME TO STRUT!

- . Leks are clear areas where the birds strut
- . Roosters--Arrive late February on leks and strut until early June
- . Hens--Arrive mid March and usually gone by end of April
- . Weather is a factor

NESTING

- . Usually within 2 kilometers of lek
- . Hens lay 5-9 eggs on average
- . Most hatch from mid May to end of June with approx. 25 day incubation
- . Main predators are badgers (take little chunks of the eggs and are dainty with them)and ravens
- . (tend to scatter the eggs). In 2004, ravens had higher impact on nest than in the previous year.

SUMMER

- . In summer successful hens head off to areas with high vegetation.
- . Barren hens group up and take off.
- . In late summer they flock to green agricultural areas.
- . Early brood rearing--near nest sites
- . Barren hens and roosters take off
- . Late brood rearing

FALL

- . In general the population is declining everywhere.
- . Hunting however does not seem to have much of an impact lately and hunting had been on a decline in this area in recent years.

WINTER

- . Don't have winter location data
- . Sagebrush is essential and comprises 100% of their diet.
- . Where the birds find sage exposed they eat the leaves which are high in fat.

SAGE GROUSE IN WYOMING

- . Wyoming was historically home to great numbers of sage grouse (Patterson 1952).
- . Wyoming has more sage grouse than any other state (Braun 1998).
- . Lek counts indicate declining population.
- . Male lek count from 1958-2000 has been on a 7 year cycle

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT (THE STUDIES)

- Phase I—Alison Lyon – Declining population but productivity was the same
- Phase II—Matt Holloran-Dramatic declines on impacted leks while control area remained the same
- Phase III—Rusty Kaiser- If production remains the same are yearling sage grouse disturbed by gas development or using the leks, or moving to other leks?
This phase will look at the potential impacts on yearling populations.

PHASE I

- Nest site locations
- Habitat use
- Nest success
- Brood rearing success
- Site fidelity
- Some Juvenile work....mostly adults

PHASE II

- Continuation of vegetation/habitat analysis
- Look at impact of roads and pads
- Adult lek fidelity
- Noticed dramatic declines on impacted leks while controls remained relatively stable

PHASE III

Are yearling sage grouse that would normally be using a lek disturbed by gas development using the lek, moving to another lek, or not breeding at all?

YEARLINGS

Hens

- Usually breed in first year of life
- May visit multiple leks before breeding
- Show nest site fidelity

Roosters

- Physically capable of breeding...but usually don't
- Arrive later than adult males on leks
- Establishment themselves on a lek or a territory within a lek

STUDY AREA

The northern end of the Jonah Field. We look at the distance from well pads and distance from active rigs. There are three control leks in place – Big John, Speedway, and Desert Wells.

OBJECTIVES

Yearling males

- Establishment on a lek(yes or no)
- Number of and location of leks visited prior to establishment
- Spring survival
- Movement from original strutting ground (do yearlings tend to establish on non-impacted leks?)
- Distance from original strutting ground (where parent bred) to selected strutting ground

- Timing of establishment (do impacted yearlings establish later in the breeding season?)

OBJECTIVES

Yearling females

- Breed(yes or no; investigated both in terms of lek visitation and nest initiation rates:
- Selected breeding lek(do impacted yearlings breed on leks that differ from adults?)
- Number and location of leks visited prior to breeding
- Nest area selection(do impacted yearlings select nesting habitat farther from parent than non-impacted yearlings?)
- Spring survival
- Nest success and chick productivity
- Timing of nest establishment

METHODS

- Spring trapping occurs at the end of March.
- This years 60 birds were collared and collaring is good for about 3 years

LEK COUNTS

Fourteen leks were counted and were all checked before the sun rises and counted 3-4 times to assure consistent reliable data.

NEST SEARCH AND EVALUTATION

Main goal to see which females were successful and follow them until summer trapping. Barren hens are turned over to G&F for West Nile Virus research. They are tracked by GPS signal in collar for nest identification.

CATCHING AND WEIGHING

A successful nest will have eggs that are cut into two pieces and are laying in the nest bowl. The egg membrane sticks to the successful egg interior. Chicks are left undisturbed for the first ten days and checked only from a distance. Birds are followed 2 times per week for most of the summer. Once they reach ten weeks they are trapped. They are caught in a net, and quickly weighed to identify whether they are a rooster or a hen.

DNA SAMPLING

DNA is sampled from the toe nail and used to match hens with chicks through this blood sampling

COLLARING

In 2004 90 chicks were collared. In 2005 we expect 150 birds and 15 leks and they will be followed through data logging, telemetry, trapping and lek counts on foot and from the air. Another field season is planned for 2006

MONITORING = TIME AND \$\$\$

- Daily lek counts
- Night trapping
- Telemetry
- Nest Searches
- Data entry and analysis

- Writing and presenting data

COST BREAKDOWN FOR 3 FIELD SEASONS

Technicians (3) —\$21,000

Collars—\$28,000

Data loggers—\$11,000

Trucks and trailers—\$15,000

Miscellaneous—\$5000

Total Funds Used —\$80,000/year

Q.: What about winter flight money, is there some for this year?

A.: I'll fly twice this winter once at the end of December and again at the end of January.

Q.: Is the population in this area still declining?

A.: There are long periods where data was either unavailable or insufficient. For instance, in 1958 monitoring was very good. From 1962 through 1990 it was poor and now in last 4-5 years we have done a good job with monitoring. We still see some cycles tied to an assortment of things. We use peak number of males as an indicator. We see fluctuations but overall there is 40-50% decline in population.

Q.: What information do we have regarding climatology and decline?

A.: I don't really have data on that. I am looking at the relationship between gas drilling and population.

Q.: Do you have suggestions for this group?

A.: Winter data gathering needs to be looked at, as far as flights are concerned, and the physical gathering of data, looking at predators, West Nile Virus, and noise.

Q.: Regarding the Leavitt Draw Lek, we have physical and seasonal restrictions and we went beyond this. Did it have an impact on the leks in that area?

A.: Each year the Leavitt Lek won't be impacted as much as it was in prior years.

Q.: What is overall hypothesis of decline in lek count?

A.: Habitat fragmentation, land grazing, fire projects...it's really a bit of a mystery.

Q.: What would reclamation for habitat improvement processes be?

A.: It's a problem. Even though we have great expanses, the quality may not be there. The revegetation reclamation grass isn't doing much good for grouse. The cows should probably be kept off it for a while. Statewide Plan is on the Fish and Game website and I encourage people to read.

Q.: Are there any plans or studies in place for looking at impacts post drilling?

A.: No, we don't have anything in place at this time.

Q.: Have you seen any information related to habitat in large corridors vs. smaller corridors?

A.: Most of my information is focused on yearlings.

General Discussion

Composition of the TG's seems to have changed. Leave all decisions regarding composition to the task groups themselves. TG's can look to the ROD for guidance, but are not limited to its suggested group composition. Membership can be handled by an identified individual in each group. The monitoring plans to be completed by 1st of March and start monitoring by summer.

Should an overview of sagebrush ecology be put together? PAWG Group agreed that it should yes they will get it to the Wildlife TG. They will include additional information relative to manipulations that are pertinent from other studies. Get together with all the TG's together to review. Part of it focuses on the anticline and the habitat on the whole region. Tentative date of completion for this overview is the 1st of the year.

*** Lunch Break ***

TASK GROUP REPORTS

Facilitated by Bob Reese

WILDLIFE

Reported by: Rollie Sparrowe, Chair

- Eight members of group attended the 1st meeting
- Discussed basic working issues and how to get information
- The focus of this group will be to develop coherent monitoring strategies
- Group will work by committee with sub-groups
- Will meet again 1st week in January-all day
- Talked about current issues
- Next meeting is scheduled for the 9th of November
- What do we need and how do we get it?

Q.: We need some clarifications. What is the role of the PAWG and the role of this TG? How do we handle access to information, duplication of work and coordination? How do we identify immediate and logical needs for information? What do we do about the fact that interest groups are absent from this TG—there are no environmental groups? How do we handle the 5 years worth of existing data?

A.: We as a whole aren't restricted from looking at existing data. TG's are charged with setting up monitoring program and figuring out how it is going to be paid for. There are no set parameters dictated in ROD. PAWG's job is to evaluate plan and work hand in hand to make recommend to the BLM. Funding will probably come from a variety of sources such as industry, the private sector, etc. TG's should prioritize needs and look at funding for monitoring and mitigation.

This task TG will look at additional representation to round out their group and let the PAWG know what or who they identify.

WATER QUALITY

Reported by Jocelyn Moore in for Chair, Gene George of Yates Petroleum

- First meeting was held on October 22nd with 50 % of members in attendance
- Discussed objectives of the TG, Charter, Appendix C, Adaptive planning, and the

- federal register notification
- Viewed PowerPoint (PP) presentation about ongoing water monitoring programs that was paid for by or Sublette County and learned that all water wells within a certain range of wells have to be sampled
- Next meeting is scheduled for November 10th

Q.: What other water quality data is available? Does the BLM place advertisement about meetings? How do we review soil conservation reports? Regarding our TG membership list, does each member have a vote, can state agency people vote, does every body vote equally?

A.: Each agency, by virtue of the business they conduct, has a different mission. Our charter does not say one way or another if or how voting should be handled. We suggest that each TG come to a conclusion that all members are “able to live” with a consensus on matters, but not necessarily 100% agreement. TG should report to the PAWG all matters for additional consideration and of importance. All meetings are to be advertised in the federal register and in local papers.

Q.: Was our first meeting legitimate, as it was not advertised?

A.: Yes, if no decisions were made. Carol Kruse and Rey Adame, public info officer for BLM-Pinedale office, take care of media announcements. Meeting notices must be published in Federal Register and distributed to media outlets.

AIR QUALITY

Reported by Terry Svalberg, USDA-FS

- Conducted its first meeting on November 3rd
- Discussed rules and regulations.
- Reviewed PP from state about monitoring flaring events
- Discussed need to pull together baseline air quality info for group to broaden understanding all issues related to this charge
- Next meeting is scheduled on November 30th
- Donna Nye from BLM will be the scribe for this group

Q.: From the PAWG to Air Quality TG...Does your group have a feel for what they will look at?

A.: We plan to look at the strengths and weakness of existing monitoring systems for back ground data as well as other available information. We currently have a good mix of people in this group and do not see a need for additional folks to join the group at this time.

RECLAMATION

Reported by Dan Stroud, Wyoming Game and Fish

- Lani Matthews has been appointed scribe for the group
- Our first meeting was October 27th
- Review of Charter
- 5 members missing
- Requested a list of operators in the Anticline field for reference

Q.: What is the lifetime of the monitoring plan, the flexibility, and who does the monitoring? We need to start visiting with oil and gas folks to get a better understanding of what has been done—perhaps go out on field trips.

A.: Monitoring is generally done by contractors and university people.

Q.: We understand the primary role of this committee...are there other roles or needs that we should be to providing recommendations for?

A.: Adaptive management ...learning by doing. Are there other things outside the ROD that would improve the monitoring? For instance, look at multiple species and any other “out of the box” things that will improve the all over picture.

Look at the monitoring to make sure things are accomplished—is it effective, does it help mitigation the effects on wildlife? Do you see need for additional mitigation not included in the ROD. As part of reclamation you can look at grazing practices and climatic conditions. Monitor impacts and outcomes and add additional info. Look at existing data to see if existing reclamation is working. Reclamation standards have changed in some areas. You have to look at the old and new. Sage brush reseeding is difficult to evaluate.

Vegetative management is what is needed as part of the reclamation TG. How to encourage the forces of some plants over others on disturbed sites. Group was encouraged to use the existing work done on public and private lands. Need for securing funds for certain periods of time will unfold as each group better understands what their group will need to do. In addition, look at visuals like fences, top soil piles, landscaping, and erosion. Consider adding a landscape architect to this TG. Recontouring should be part of the reclaiming. Look at the whole picture.

Q.: What lands should we focus on?

A.: Develop one for federal land—within Pinedale Anticline and one for state land.

Q.: What about split estate? What does your group think about how to management this?

A.: Monitoring split estate is not included in the ROD. Maybe TG could develop some educational info in this area for the public to use going forward.

Q.: What is the deadline for completion of this project?

A.: Late February 2005. TG presentations will be held on March 2-3 rd 2005 Hard copies of monitoring reports should be submitted by February 18th to Bob Reese or Linda. Reports should include the following elements: an outline of project, possible funding sources, and possible contractors. The next PAWG meeting is Jan. 5th and will be an interim meeting to evaluate TG's progress and address any questions.

Q.: How much information needs to be included in the report? When funding is found, who holds the money?

A.: You need a payment schedule and some oversight for this. Maybe we should divvy up those tasks between PAWG members. All deliberations, money and otherwise, come down to what the BLM decides. The charter does not address handling money or developing contracts. Maybe we can write MOU's? How to handle money has been tabled and Bob will explore this and report back to PAWG at the January meeting. Kathy Gunderman offered to help with guidance regarding grants. It was noted that grants can be problematic because they are time consuming to write and obtain.

TRANSPORTATION

Reported by; Charles Price, Chair and Bill Wadsworth, BLM Liaison

We have many questions and would like to look at several items regarding this area.

Q.: Are pipelines considered transportation? Are utilities? What about pipeline and disturbed areas? Bridges in the New Fork—are they adequate? Roads—should we monitor them? Should we do traffic counts? Should we look at wildlife interaction, infrared monitoring, traffic on Tyler, and the routing of traffic? Will we have to work with wildlife task group? Are meetings published in local papers?

A.: BLM submits 30 days prior to meeting to media. Local people should be informed. We are looking at the effective area which may be outside the boundaries of the anticline. We have to look at both ends of the road. Defined area for cumulative impacts already established.

Q.: Are we looking at the area the anticline is impacting-it is probably mutijurisdictional. We are volunteering for tough task. The questions are going to become the outline for the project. We will monitor the effectiveness of mitigation.

A.: The job of the TG's is not necessarily to solve problems, but to identify issues and make recommendations. The process is supposed to come up with monitoring for the mitigation. Focus on development of monitoring and management recommendations.

Q.: Is there any thing else you want this TG to do?

A.: The PAWG will make decisions based on consensus and we recommend you and all other TG's adopt this method too. Come to agreement on issues so that each member can "live with" the recommendation you make to the PAWG and the BLM.

Q.: Does the PAWG group vote?

A.: No. We will use consensus.

Comments

We identified corridors for traffic. Tyler was chosen because it was there and it services so many. Everyone is going to be impacted and the best we can do it minimize that impact. TG will weigh rerouting. Highway patrol might be interested in helping understand and mitigate. There are problems on and with the entrances to the anticline. The county monitors this and has data. In fact, the county has come up with some road counts in the last several weeks. County Road and Bridge would have that information . Sublett County has traffic data going back for 35 years.

Q.: What are we measuring impact of ?

A.: We are not measuring a single impact, it will be multiple...population, wrecks, wear and tear, bridges, speed, wildlife interaction and not just on the anticline, also with the highways. Pipelines are vague on this—workers can run vehicles up and down right of way. The work of this TG may not be as definitive as with some of the other TG'S. All considerations are important including things like road maintenance. PAWG Charter will guide both the TG's and the PAWG.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC

Reported by: Carmel Kail

This TG would like to add the following three members: Ward Wise, Tom Burns, and Robert Jones. The EIS is flawed as far as pace in development. We need to bring it current and identify the new issues such as housing, emergencies, social service, public services, public safety, public issue, school issues, demographics, economic diversification, and quality of life indicators.

We will try to gather existing data to establish trends that are focused on last 5 years. Conduct a survey of operators in forming projections, needs, plans, desires, and options. Address issues that are important regardless of BLM's interest or ability to act on them. Look at state and federal funding. Get Summary of current effected environment. The forces may come quickly and wind up staying for a long time. Conduct an Impact assessment.

Q.: What resources do we have as far as looking for information and analyzing it? Can we get some help in this area?

A.: That is possible with appropriate requests, after you identify a need and have work for an individual to do. BLM needs to stay out of the groups, though. If you need a statistician we can probably help get that kind of help for you. Go directly to the PAWG to ask .

Q.: How are we going to communicate back and forth ? Can the PAWG send minutes to the TG's and the TG's share minutes among one another ? What should we do with TG minutes?

A.: They need to be signed, dated, approved and then posted to the FIDO website. Members of PAWG are listed on site but not the TG members. It is a good idea to have member's names and contact information listed on the site. The FIDO website will hopefully be moved to the BLM website at some point in the future. TG groups can identify overlap with other groups and come up with some way to discuss and resolve issues. Each group should jot down a list of how they may overlap. Make it part of you monitoring program. Start with nuts and bolts and then branch out. There is nothing in the ROD that specifically addresses this for the TG's.

CULTURAL/HISTORIC/VISUAL

Dave Vlcek, Chair

We spent some time on self identification and recapped assets in depth in order to understand what we have already.

Q.: What does "visual" mean in the title of this TG? Is it referring to the wells? "Historical" is the primary interest of the group. We don't see a fit for visual in this group. Should we be looking at visual components of historical assets?

A.: A suggestion was made to remove "visual" from the name of this TG and incorporate that characteristic in the overall scheme for all TG's. Each TG will now address visual aspects of their charges as appropriate and where applicable.

Q.: Most people on this TG aren't from here. If they go on a tour of the area is that considered an actual meeting that needs a formal announcement?

A.: No, unless decisions are going to be made.

Q.: Do we need to include a representative from SHPO?

A.: It is not a requirement under the ROD, but it would be a good idea. Dave will follow-up with a request that SHPO appoint someone to join this TG.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None at this time

FINAL GROUP COMMENTS

It was noted that a Range TG (which was to include recreation, hunting, and tourism) had not been formed to date, as reflected in item #3 under decisions, recommendations and actions in the August 11, 2004 meeting minutes.

It was decided not to go forward with item #3 and to look at recreation, hunting and tourism for consideration in the existing TG's as needed and where appropriate.

The Group agreed that the facilitation of this meeting was well done and would work well for the next meeting in January of 2005.

Bob Reese will follow up with Carol Kruse about a sound system for January meeting

**** Meeting Adjourned ****

.....

Certified as accurate:

Linda F. Baker, co-chair

Date

Robert L. Reese, co-chair

Date