

# **PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP (PAWG)**

Lovatt Library, Sublette County, Pinedale, Wyoming

May 19, 2005

9:00AM - 5:00 PM

---

## **Action Items**

1. Talk to each TG about looking at travel funding. (All)
2. Add discussion about Matrix and TG reports to the August agenda.
3. Work with Rey, in Public Affairs in Rock Springs on a draft of the PAWG funding report press release. It will include recommendations made, funding committed, potential partners, voids, and volunteer hours, and next steps. (Carol)
4. Send e-mail to Robin regarding Kirby's vice chair position. (Linda)
5. Follow up with DEQ to see if they are going to do a separate water analysis. (Mary)
6. Write a letter to SCCD requesting them to send annual and trend analysis data each year, starting with 2005 and including all past annual data. (Prill)
7. Copy the board of Agriculture on the SCCD letter from the BLM (Prill/Linda).
8. Invite a DEQ representative to come and give us an overview of what is going on and how they view the trends so we can be informed. (Linda)
9. Research ISO 1400 EMS and report back to PAWG. (Mike)
10. Create Power Point presentation, regarding the strawman discussion, for PAWG review and comment. (Kirby)
11. Add "BLM" to the title of the funding matrix. (Mike)
12. Prepare a draft of the funding press release for the PAWG's review by June 17<sup>th</sup> and the PAWG will review and comment within 7 days and send a final draft back to the BLM by June 24<sup>th</sup>. (Carol)
13. Work with Carol to draft letter to the state of Wyoming to help with getting more money for BLM. (Carol, Linda, Bob, Susan) Check on how much money the regional forester has requested for '06 (Terry/Mary)
14. Prepare a PDF version of the PAWG Monitoring Proposal document with "BLM" added to the title and send to all TG chairs for distribution to members. (Mike)
15. Bring a phone and a nice map of the PAPA to August meeting (Mike/Prill)
16. Move action items to the top of the cover page in all future minutes. (Susan)
17. Send final versions of April minutes to Carol for signing as well as the March 15<sup>th</sup> minutes. (Susan)

## **Decisions**

1. Table strawman discussion until Robin is present.
2. Apply the new matrix to the TG reports.
3. Kirby volunteered to run meetings as a vice chair in Linda's absence and has agreed to help with meetings in general.
4. Use the information flow process described on page 24 of these minutes.

## **Recommendations**

1. Apply the new matrix to the TG reports.
2. Mary recommended the TGs use her interns for Matrix/TG Report evaluations. BLM draft Press release for the PAWG's review.
3. Invite a DEQ representative to come and give us an overview of what is going on and how they view the trends so we can be informed.
4. Include a discussion on mitigation spreadsheet, funding matrix, and reviews of monitoring from TGs on August agenda.

# **PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP (PAWG)**

Lovatt Library, Sublette County, Pinedale, Wyoming

May 19, 2005

9:00AM - 5:00 PM

---

## **In Attendance:**

### **PAWG Members:**

Bob Barrett, Public-At-Large; Mary Flanderka, State of Wyoming Susan Kramer, Landowners Bordering/Within PAPA (by phone); Linda Baker, Environmental Community and Co-Chair; Kirby Hendrick, Public-at-Large; Nylla Kunard, Town of Pinedale; Paul Hagenstien, Livestock Operators Bordering/Within PAPA.

**PAWG Member Excused:** Robin Smith, PAPA Oil and Gas Operators

### **Task Group (TG) Members:**

Socioeconomic - Carmel Kail, Steve Reynolds (Oil and Gas Operators)

Air Quality – Terry Svalberg (USDA-FS)

Cultural/Historic –Clint Gilchrist (Sublette Co.)

Wildlife – Ron Hogan (Questar), Aimee Davison (Shell)

Questar: Chuck Greenhawt

Shell: Deena McMullen

Pinedale BLM: Prill Mecham, Carol Kruse, Mike Stiewig

Meeting Facilitated By: Linda Baker, co-chair

Meeting Recorded By: Susan Webster

---

Call to Order at 9:00 AM, Linda Baker, Co-Chair

Approval of April 21 & 21 meeting minutes.

Linda- Corrections: Question regarding the word “timble” on page 20 of the April 21<sup>st</sup> minutes should read “trimble” which is a type of GPS unit.

Linda- should we be following Robert’s Rules at these meetings?

Carol- We are working on consensus not voting so, we don’t need to use Robert’s Rules.

## **Meeting with BLM Director**

---

Discuss PAWG chair’s meeting with BLM area director Prill Mecham; Combine federal register notices/subjects; funding decisions for 2005 field season.

Linda-We are not required to publish TG meetings in federal register but we do have to publish PAWG meetings and we can't combine subjects. We can submit notification at the same time to the federal register. The charges for publication are by the column. The BLM website is still down because of the lawsuit; all notifications are available on the fido.gov website. All PAWG related info is there as well.

Clint- TGs only need media notification but not notification in the federal register.

Linda- Where are we with our budget?

Carol- We are in the hole again.

Linda- This will probably put a damper on people participating. Can we get other funding sources?

Prill- Not according to the feds. We are pretty broke. We looked at how we could maybe get some volunteers to do this. There is no funding for TG expenses. We have submitted for PAWG money, though. The fiscal year begins Oct 1.

Carol- She clarified how reimbursement works.

Prill- BLM will not be funding TG members.

Mary- How much money are we looking for to fund this?

Linda-About \$5-7000. Mary do you have ideas?

Mary- So we need about \$7000?

Linda- Approximately.

Mary- Who would hold the money if we are able find money?

Prill- The BLM wouldn't.

Linda- Recommended we talk to each TG to look at travel funding.

## **2005 Funding Discussion**

---

Prill- Reviewed the priorities for funding in 2005. Prill thanked everyone for being there. When you signed up you knew the feds had a process to approve you. You represent the public interest group you are here for. You should know what your constituents want. Meetings are important. The feds have a lot invested in you. This is my pep talk. This group is unique in the federal government. There are no other groups like you. Other states have resource area councils that would do this. PAWG is the only FACA chartered

group in the state. You don't have to necessarily represent the state of Wyoming, but the interest groups interested in the Pinedale anticline. The feds want the BLM to succeed. We get questions from the DOI all the time about the PAWG process and how it is going. I believe the process is working. We have heard complaints about the process not working. It is up to all of you to make it work.

One affirmation that it works is the list of priorities I am going to share with you today. (Prill distributed the BLM Monitoring Proposal Spreadsheet). The items on this list of recommendations came from TGs and were sent to the BLM. We looked at duplicate submissions; we saw duplications like item #3--4 TGs wanted to do the same thing. We gave that a high priority as it would benefit several TGs #1 & #2 we considered of high importance. You can see estimated costs on this list. We gave the Wildlife TG the third priority. For the 4<sup>th</sup> priority 2 TGs wanted this. The 5<sup>th</sup> priority we gave to #6. Seed trials were important to continue- these were given high priority. Item #7 was recommended by 2 TGs. Number #8 minor amount of money, but important to continue. Item #9 will benefit several TGs. The total cost is \$257, 000 and we still have a small amount of additional money in the pot. Our deadline has passed for requesting additional funding for this year. All items on pages 1-3 are all the recommendation from the sub-committees. After funding the ones BLM thought were important to fund; the rest was passed on to the state. We identified additional funding partners—the state and other potential partners.

Kirby- Did you recommendations go to the state or to Washington DC?

Prill- Just to the state and they decide whether to approve these projects for funding. Money for the 2005 projects needs to be obligated by the 1<sup>st</sup> of July and that has been done. The money is secure.

Mary- Regarding #7, there is willingness to write a grant proposal. I found out from DOT regarding #29, there is money allocated for planning for the county, but it has to go through the county commissioners for a planning effort-it needs to be initiated by the county. We need the grant proposal.

Nylla- Who should be in charge of getting that going?

Mary- The TGs should. It goes from the state to the local government.

Carmel- We are waiting on a response.

Steve- We have not submitted it yet and are waiting for comment from the rest of the TG. That request is only for a portion of the money needed.

Prill- Socioeconomic TG was not funded by the feds. It really should have been in the purview of the state county and the oil and gas operators.

Mary- The state would like to see other money put toward this.

Carmel- So is this not approved by BLM?

Steve- Are you saying TGs need to fund this?

Mary-No.

Prill- It was approved by BLM as a recommendation but not for funding.

Linda- Later in the meeting, we will discuss, the funding sources in a matrix that will help us get a bigger picture of where we can go for funding.

Kirby- Is BLM willing to provide resources to help us lobby groups to get funding?

Prill-We need to look at the ROD to see if that fits within that structure.

Kirby-How do we really go out and get funding for this, though. It would seem to me to be helpful, with some of these, to get the counties attention for this.

Prill- Definitely, in terms of writing a letter for strong recommendation. But we can not force them into anything. I am willing to indicate in a letter the importance of this project.

Linda- is the PAWG empowered to present that to potential funding sources?

Prill- It would keep it clean if the BLM does it.

Kirby- What about a letter and an offer for PAWG to present to these folks.

Prill- That's the right approach-to do it the under the umbrella of the BLM.

Mary- Carmel, Nylla, and Steve- lets meet during the break to lock in the money the state has.

Paul- It looks like we are treating the socioeconomic group like a stepchild. We need to understand why BLM does not want to fund this group. We are missing something here. It's a big problem and it's all intermeshed.

Kirby-I respect your opinion Paul. It's very important the county step forward and look at where the money is going. The county needs to step up to the plate. We may have to agree to disagree about this. I'd like to find out why the county won't work on this.

Carmel-I think the county will. I think they don't know anything about this.

Nylla- The county is doing budgeting right now. I would like to see Prill go in and make that recommendation.

Prill- I am willing and supportive, but it is the county who needs to take the lead. BLM's job is to protect and manage land and disclose the impacts-- not to fix the problem.

Linda- I hear agreement here. No one should be exempt.

Mary- It would be appropriate for the BLM to give a small amount of money to this group for disclosure.

Prill- We have a philosophical difference of opinion here and I cannot address that question right now.

Paul- There are other places getting money from gas development.

Nylla- The town is doing some planning on this. The town gets \$107,000 of the money and no more of it.

\*\*\*\*\*Break\*\*\*\*\*

Linda-PAWG alternates. We cannot have alternate representative. Our constituency can get minutes online.

Prill- PAWG is responsible to make sure the public gets information.

### **Strawman Discussion**

---

Kirby- Robin, Rollie and I are having a hard time finding a framework for this strawman, but we are committed to try and come back to the PAWG with something that has a little structure. As far as self monitoring, there is probably some type of NPD we can put together. I don't have a whole lot of information at this point, though.

Linda – I have some ideas.

Carol – The DOI has done a lot of Adaptive Management work that I have in my office. You will not find a lot out there that relates to this group.

Linda- In Robin's recent e-mail he had concerns with at what point in the monitoring indicates that mitigation is necessary? What do we consider adequate monitoring? This 2005 monitoring proposal indicates there may be need for additional monitoring. I'm not sure where his discomforts lie.

Carol- Should we table this until Robin is present?

Linda- Yes, we probably should. Is it within our capability to determine this? We have 2 indications from wildlife regarding needs for monitoring. In an excerpt from the deer study- the monitoring done for 5 years indicates impacts. She referred to the document.

Mary- In any process the question should be, “did we accomplish what we set out to do “ and “what are we monitoring”. We are monitoring for the PAPA ROD assumptions. To make sure there are no unanticipated outcomes, we monitor adequate activities that were disclosed. Then we ask, do we need to monitor them or are they in compliance?

Bob – The next step is that we take on mitigation when a TG indicates that the time has arrived and the mitigation is warranted for the impacts. My question is how long does the process go on and when do you mitigate?

Linda- Wildlife asked for mitigation analysis. We are on the cusp of a decision about what to do with the data.

Bob B.- Mary has a good point.

Linda- I’m not sure we had reasonable assumptions in 2000.

Bob B.- The EIS and the ROD didn’t do a good job of describing this--where is the bar ditch?

Linda- Maybe it’s our task to identify what is acceptable.

Kirby- Regarding Rollie’s waterfowl situation, to make decisions easier they created bar ditches which then became the trigger for action. Having guidelines puts pressure on decision making. We ought to set thresholds.

Carol- The EIS did disclose significant NEPA criteria clearly. Acceptable impacts is a whole other issue and is certainly a discussion you should have—the needs to come from the TGs .The significance varies from one topic to another.

Bob- But, the EIS missed the socioeconomic impacts.

Carol- We reported what we thought would be impacted.

Bob-Is our job different, related to the EIS information?

Kirby- A place to start is to pursue mitigation if we have a matrix that identifies the impacts for comparison and has a legal framework. We could go back and tabulate what was previously defined and figure out and develop a matrix to compare the EIS and the TG reports. What about 5 headings on the matrix?

Mary- We need to know if mitigations are applied and acceptable. We will be able to see this. This is like a self check—a barrow ditch.

Bob- Robin has a point, what are we doing?

Linda- Mike, I hear you are good at this sort of thing. Maybe we could create a framework for this on the flip chart.

Sketch of the Matrix:

- Significance Criteria in EIS
- Significant Criteria of TGs
- TG Opportunities for Mitigation
- Effectiveness of Current Mitigation

Mary- In the BMP process you have action mitigation, result, was mitigation applied, was it applied correctly and effectively, and what is the mitigation or mid course correction.

Mike- The strawman working group can work on putting this together this.

Carol- I think Robin is saying you should go through the PAWG charter with these criteria.

Kirby- This becomes a self check. I think these should be organized by the TGs.

The group reviewed the elements of the proposed matrix and establish the following categories for it.

1. Impact Issue
2. EIS/ROD significant impact vs. Current Status
3. TG impact concern Threshold vs. Current Status
4. EIS project vs. Current Status
5. Mitigation Applied
  - a. Applied effectively
  - b. Effectiveness
6. Mid-course recommendation

Linda- Suggested that the PAWG now needs to go through and apply this matrix to the TG reports.

Linda-Reminded everyone to work on this and asked that this item be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mary- Offered her interns to work on this project with the TGs.

All- The PAWG agreed.

Kirby- The interns can do numbers 1,2, 4,and part of 5. The other sections would be out of their scope.

Carmel- Regarding #5, it would be nice to have a whole list of these.

Kirby- Yes, the interns can list the information but not determine what would apply. The PAWG could handle the judgmental experienced-based issues.

Carol- The interns could also begin the list of suggested mitigation that exists in the ROD.

\*\*\*Susan joined by phone\*\*\*

Linda- PAWG will need to help with this as well. We have to consider this job along with the funding matrix information. We will parcel tasks later in our meeting today.

Linda- Susan said part of our problem is that some of our TG people have dropped out and how does the public perceive what we do and all the constituencies. We could take each TG report and disseminate the information to the media. We have responsibility to report to the public--report regularly and welcome their involvement.

Carmel- This is a good idea. Noah wrote a full newspaper spread in the Round Up on reporting of the TGs, but it was too much information all at once.

Linda- It could be packaged in small bits.

Steve- We had a great public showing of 75 the night before we presented our report to you. The public is interested.

Kirby- Maybe we should report on the funding. Maybe once per week.

Linda- You are right Steve, this is a PAWG responsibility. A report could include information about funding and potential partners. The audience is the public in general.

Prill- We have a Public Affairs guy in Rock Springs. We could get the information to him i.e., press releases regarding results and the actions items. He would send them to all state media outlets. There are two parts to the story--what the PAWG is doing and what the BLM is doing. One RMEF could possibly be a funding source.

Carmel- We need to tailor the information for the local reader in Pinedale and for the state-- have two versions.

Carol- It would be most effective to give the public affairs office the information, they can send it and the papers will choose what they want to print.

Linda- The information may wind up being too general this way, though.

Carol- We could write it for the local media and the others will take out what they don't need.

Linda- It could potentially be a broader audience.

Mary- It is more relational that way.

Clint- What I hear from the community is that the PAWG is just another advisory board that is not doing anything. Publish the funding information and that will change the perception of the group. The money will get the attention.

Mary- The matrix will get attention too. Right now we have only have the funding info to present. I would rather be rock solid as a group with a matrix, before we start talking about the money.

Susan- We need to bring out the funding info so people know what is happening.

Linda- Let's work on releases, one at a time together.

Mary- We could provide the information to the BLM, let them craft the release and then we review the draft for the media. The release can give recognition to those who have worked on this project so far, the recommendation that the BLM has made, and the funding and funding voids.

Carol- The media won't be interested in all that information, they will with the funding though. And they will print what they want.

Kirby- Lets make it no more than 2 pages.

Linda- The press release can include recommendations made, funding committed, potential partners, voids, and volunteer time.

Mary- We should estimate the number of volunteer hours; I would imagine it's a big number.

Prill-We should add next steps, too.

Carol- I will work with Ray on the draft.

Nylla- Do we need another meeting to discuss this?

Linda- No, we will do it by e-mail.

Carmel- Regarding the BLM funding, is this all cash or is this man hours of staff as well.

Prill- No man hours of our staff are included here but it shows project dollars to hire seasonal employees.

Carol- This \$ 300,000 represents 25% of the federal BLM monitoring budget.

Prill- This is very significant.

Mary- The new energy bill completely ignored monitoring.

### **Public Comment**

---

None at this time

Linda-The county is planning on finding a replacement for Bob Reese. I'm not sure if the county will appointment someone to the PAWG or if one of the commissioners will.

Paul- Bob's position was advertised in the paper.

Carol- The PAWG appointment is going to be a lengthy process. It took over a year to get you guys appointed.

Kirby- What about the vice chair issue?

Linda- I could use some help and would appreciate any volunteers.

Mary- I just want to point out that it is hard to run a meeting and abdicate for your interest group.

Carol- The PAWG did agree, initially, to have 2 co-chairs. If you are going to change it should be recorded in the minutes.

Kirby-I don't want to overcommit myself.

Linda- I don't mind making assignments.

Nylla- Why don't we try it as is and see if it works and then decide differently if it doesn't work.

Kirby-Robin believes we need a co-chair.

Paul- You should have a co-chair if something happens to you.

Susan-Linda, you are doing a good job-one person seems to work fine.

Carol- BLM could provide a facilitator if needed.

Bob- We tried that already.

Kirby- With great enthusiasm, Kirby volunteered to run meetings as a vice chair in Linda's absence and has agreed to help with meetings in general.

Linda- I will send an e-mail to Robin to this effect.

Mary- This is a tough position.

Kirby- Linda, I will crack the whip when you put on your "green outfit".

Carol- The person who handles this position needs to have management skills to enable the group discussion. We cannot take a vote on this. The PAWG passes items by consensus; consensus means everyone saying they can live with it.

Kirby- Robin needs to say if he can live with this.

\*\*\*Break for Lunch\*\*\*

### **Water Quality TG Report Discussion**

---

Linda- Regarding this TG's report, what we were hoping to see was a timeline of the analysis of the data they have seen. They say here that produced water is beyond the scope of their work. The TG representatives could not attend this meeting, but provided a report. I do not see the timeline for when we get to see the analysis. It is a surprise that produced water is out of the scope of their charge; regarding trend analysis, the operators are not paying for this. We do not have an analysis here in hand to tell us what they are doing. I recommend we get an analysis ASAP, including trend data and annual analysis.

Carol- We should take it to Robin to find out where this is going. BLM will follow-up and see if we can sort this out.

Linda- I'm not clear on who their funding sources are.

Prill -The New Fork data is being collected and paid for by the operators.

Susan- Yes, that is right?

Linda-Does the group have any opinions about the recommendation?

Paul- I'd like to know during what period will they do this work?

Linda-That's a good question.

Paul- By July 31<sup>st</sup> , according to the document.

Linda- We need to know when we get analysis of current data.

Carol- Explain why that is not appropriate that we don't have the information.

Linda- We asked the Water TG for this in last meeting. I am losing patience with why we don't have it.

Carol- I read this as an annual cycle reporting. I thought this was just a general schedule.

Linda- Why does it take 6 months to do this?

Carol- Did the conservation district have a hold up?

Mary- Yes, it has to do with whether or not the operators are paying.

Prill- It's also the BLMs data. We just got the raw data for the first 4 years.

Linda- We have a timeline for an annual summary, but I would like an analysis of the 5 years of data.

Paul- The sooner the better. The chemical analysis should take no more than a week.

Mary- Is Robin in charge of getting SCCD to do this?

Linda- We could ask him to do this.

Paul- I use to turn around my reports in month, when I was doing it.

Mary- I will follow up with DEQ to see if they are going to do a separate analysis. They don't regulate this though.

Linda- I'm not clear on the process.

Terry- Analysis can be very time consuming. You may want to hire someone to do this.

Linda- It is my understanding the SCCD is doing this at this time.

Prill- We have had similar frustrations. The record should show that raw data will not do any good- we need the analysis.

Mary- The operators are trying to comply with the ROD. If they pay for the analysis, they own the data.

Carol- Maybe Robin and the BLM should sort this out.

Prill- BLM will write a letter to SCCD requesting them send annual and trend analysis data each year, starting with 2005 and including all past annual data.

Mary- Concerns and complaints about this should go to the Board of Agriculture.

Linda- We will copy them on this.

Kirby- Regarding pipeline monitoring, that practice should be on the surface, contrary to my thoughts. But before we endorse that, we should have further discussion.

Ron- We plan to bury the pipeline and want to bury them. We think we can because we provide protection from rust, and see pressure records regularly.

Paul – How do you pinpoint location of pressure drops?

Ron- It will be between pumping stations and often times you will see this on the surface. They run "smart pigs" through the pipe to see what is going on. There are isolation valves in the event a leak occurs.

Linda- I agree with Ron about the buried pipeline.

Mary- There are a lot of issues with pipe on the surface.

Paul- It's hard to reclaim the land if pipeline is not buried.

Kirby- This looks more like a consideration not a recommendation. I think we need more discussion on this though.

Linda- We can make recommendations.

Carol- Are there temperature issues with condensate?

Ron- No not when they are buried below frost level; when buried, up top there might be.

Bob- What is this mitigating?

Linda- It is easy to recognize leaks and deal with spills. I suggest we recommend they be buried.

Mary- Related to habitat, there are lots of reasons to bury them.

Susan- I think we talked about this at another meeting

Linda- Regarding produced water, has the BLM done any more research on that?

Prill- The companies are doing this research all the time and there is a lot of discussion regarding the topic.

Linda- The PAWG should talk about this.

Carol- I don't know that this is in the scope of what you should do; you should be looking at impacts.

Linda- There is a landowner who has produced water being pumped across his property.

Carol- BLM does not allow surface discharge of produced water on BLM land. There is discussion in legal circles regarding this on state and private lands.

Prill- I've told operators there will be zero discharge from produced facilities on public lands. The issue is where they put it? Water can be reinjected, but operators are finding tight sands that limit their ability to do this.

Carol- Some companies are hauling it away. There are permits to treat the water enough to be put back into permanent streams. This is a DEQ thing.

Mary- DEQ controls the quality but not the quantity of water.

Carol- Discharging above normal volume water is a big issue in some streams and can cause huge erosion problems. The amount of salt that enters ephemeral and intermittent streams is a problem too.

Linda- Is this under our purview? Why shouldn't we be involved?

Carol- PAWG should address the impacts of this not the process of taking care of it. Right now all produced water is either being stored or hauled. DEQ hasn't made a decision to permit this.

Prill- Once that action is decided, then the PAWG should look at it. It hasn't been formally looked at yet, though.

Carol- The PAWG could say if there should ever be surface discharge then we would look at the impacts.

Linda- There is going to come a point when we have to address it.

Susan- Regarding recharge rate, table water formations are being cased so there is no loss to the formation. Produced water is coming from a deeper formation and separate from this. There is no potential of migration into the deeper formation.

Linda- We don't see an additional monitoring need with this right now, but we should keep it in mind for the future.

Kirby- Yes, Mark Thiesse has lots of ideas about this. Maybe we should ask someone from DEQ to come and give us an overview of what is going on and how they view the trends so we can be informed.

Linda- OK

Linda- Regarding sedimentation, I thought SCCD was monitoring this.

Kirby- I recall that the invertebrate tests were best indicators and the best testing for looking at this issue.

Linda- They also monitor for other things. Linda read from a document describing the reasons behind why they test for different elements in water analysis TSS.

Paul- Our reservoirs are only half full because of sedimentation issues. It's an extreme problem.

Kirby- Let's invite these people to come talk with us.

Kirby- We need to place what we are doing in context and then put some meat on this. DOI requires ISO 1400 environment management system.

Mike- The BLM will research this and get back to Kirby.

Kirby- I will put together a Power Point presentation for the PAWG for review and comment.

Linda- Referred the research Kirby had done on this already. It doesn't exactly describe what we do, but it helpful. Mary, Rollie, Carmel, Mike and Kirby will continue to work on this work.

Linda- Do we want to establish a level of concern (thresholds) and is our data reliable?

Kirby- Most AEM literature says don't be too small and agree on levels of concern that exist so that up front, before you get any activity, you know how you are going to agree on things.

### **Funding Matrix Discussion**

---

Linda- In looking at establishing a matrix, the idea was to look at the existing Air Quality TG matrix on funding that was very good. I talked with Prill and Carol about this. The objective is to fill funding gaps and to follow the direction of the ROD (which seems contradictory). The ROD points out that everyone involved in this process should play a part in the funding role.

Bob- That is not what the ROD says.

Linda- Read the funding information on page 15 of the ROD and it says”...”; and on page A33 “...” Those to me are contradictory statements. I think this should be a cooperative effort. The first thing is to figure out what we have and what we need.

Kirby-Out of all the groups, the BLM is the only one that has leverage with the operators.

Prill- There are benefits to all of these monitoring efforts.

Mike- Aren't we trying to look at funding all of these?

Linda- What should go in the funding matrix?

Mary- The matrix is really already here, in the funding chart that was distributed by the BLM, showing the current status of funding related to the Proposed projects.

The group listed the following items to be included in the “Funding Gaps Matrix” for 2006 and are as follows:

1. Impact
2. Partners
3. Existing
4. Needs/Gaps
5. Timeline By Year

Linda- Rollie Sparrowe is seeking funding from a national federation; we can think about that as an option.

Prill- Do you as the PAWG want to fill out this matrix or go to TGs for this work to be done?

Carol- The list of potential partners maybe should be an attachment to the table not in it.

Kirby – What is the next step after we get this matrix filled in?

Linda-Take it to our interested public and ask for participation in funding.

Terry- Our Air Quality table had years in it which was helpful. Maybe you want to add this to your list?

Ron- Is this a complete list of funding needs?

Prill- This table is just for FY 05 and relates to the BLM.

Linda-This will be a tremendous tool to help us going forward and help us with the adaptive management process.

Terry-There is a lot of administrative paperwork involved in doing this.

Kirby- We need to give credit to those who have helped to date.

Carol- You want to know who is funding all monitoring and research that is done through the filed office.

Prill- Our specialists can get the information on our projects. Where it gets tough is the projects where the BLM is not included. We don't feel we have a handle on what is being done out there and there may be lots of redundancy. That would be the ideal source for the answer to your questions. Gaps are something we want to identify. Once we get that report, the PAWG should look at it.

Mary- We need to at least identify what we currently know for 2005 and the information we don't have will come to us as participants see they may not have been included.

Linda- Does everyone agree with this concept?

Nylla- I think we need the information.

Kirby- I think we stick with what is on the list the BLM has put together for the first pass.

Mike-I want to make sure that what is going on out there is included on that list for the media information.

Mary- Our priority is to continue the studies.

Linda- We should use the funding matrix for 2006 and Mike will put together a bear bones for this year. What do you think about this Paul?

Paul- You have to do something for this year and look ahead for next year.

Mary- The title of the matrix should have BLM in it.

Carol- The 2006 matrix will go beyond the monitoring proposals, right?

Linda- Yes.

Prill- National Labs is already doing this for us. You guys may not need to do this.

Linda- We have potential partners. Should we mention operators in the matrix?

Prill- The Argon guy can include your information into the matrix.

Carol- There may be money that hasn't been obligated yet.

Kirby- The media release should have ballpark numbers of what all participants are doing at this point and recognition of their efforts.

Prill- The specialists can say who the cooperators are on this.

Ron- I didn't want other things to fall through the cracks when you create the new matrix.

Paul- Everyone should get the credit they deserve in the media release.

Mary- We need to add estimated costs for Air Quality for state and legislative reasons.

Linda- What is the timeline for putting out a press release?

Mary- It should be done in June.

Carol- A couple of weeks.

Linda- How about on the BLM gets a draft of the press release to the PAWG by June 17<sup>th</sup>; the PAWG will then turn it around in 7 days and send a final draft back to the BLM by June 24<sup>th</sup>.

All- Agreed

## **2006 Planning**

---

Linda- Planning by year column should look long-term; an impact is a project; existing funding

Water Quality and other TGs should have their TG annual summaries so that we have time to meet, discuss, and recommend, so that the TGs can get back to PAWG by end of February.

Prill- Projects for following fiscal year must be submitted in March so they can get into the budget cycle, with recommendations in by the first part of March.

Linda- What do we anticipate for the 2006 field season?

Mary- All the Air Quality monitoring is at risk.

Terry- Cooperative agreements for funding take about 2 months to put into place. We need to come up with funding for the projects in August.

Linda- So, those should be on our list for funding?

Mary- How much money is left?

Prill- The money they gave us ( \$300,000 ) is a one time pot that will not carry over and doesn't apply to 2006.

Linda- That \$300, 000 represents 25% of the Federal BLM monitoring budget. So, we need to figure out how to get more money- national funding for monitoring. The House passed version of the energy bill reduces royalties for deep wells at 25,000 ft. and marginal wells. It's an incentive.

Carol- You may be surprised at the leverage you have with the state of Wyoming and the legislators.

Linda- I think it's worth a try to craft a letter to this effect.

Prill- They will not look at it unless you name your partners and cooperators and the percentages put in by BLM, Forest Service, DEQ, State of Wyoming, NGO's, and Game and Fish.

Linda- Should we identify the amounts?

Prill – Look at contributions now with percentages and others by percent.

Carol- Do you think actual numbers would be helpful? It's close to \$1,000,000 with all parties included.

Linda- We should send the letter to congressional group to get it into the energy bill that is now being marked up in the Senate.

Kirby- Your best bet is to get in at the Senate level.

Linda- I will work with Carol to draft letter to help with getting more money for BLM.

Kirby- It would be worth getting on a plane and going to have a conversation with someone about this.

Linda- I can find out who the best person is to run with this. It would help dramatically. We need to reassess where we are.

Prill- Keep in mind that 2007 requests must be submitted in March of 2006. We may be too late to submit budget requests for 2007.

Kirby- So, in early January the TGs should identify needs to be submitted to BLM in March? This would be the TGs deliverable?

Linda- We need to think about the number of meetings we want for the rest of this year (2005) and what we want the TGs to do. We don't have a limitation on how often we meet.

Prill-Only monetarily.

Linda- What about August for the next meeting?

Carol- When are you going to fit in getting back to TGs about monitoring?

Linda- We need to meet to talk about that.

Prill- Described how the fiscal year project/budget planning process works:

For FY07 projects, the TGs need to deliver requests by Feb 1 for FY 07 (Oct 06-Oct07) By March of '06, PAWG needs to get the information to BLM for consideration. Final budget package is submitted around August 1. After submission, if a budget request is approved, it happens in Jan., Feb. or sometimes even as late as March. You get your notification of the money in April of 07 for FY07. The money is awarded in May and June. If the money is obligated to a contractor in a fiscal year, work does not necessarily have to be done in that fiscal year.

Linda- This year is different. For 2006 we have big hole.

Prill- Right, we don't have any of those projects in the planning system.

Linda- Is that where cooperators save the day?

Prill- It's easier if it is ongoing. Air and Wildlife have gotten priority in the past because they were ongoing. We have already submitted our project budgets.

Mary- A letter to the congressional folks would be good too. We can start going to the cooperators in August once we know what congress has done. Requests for state funding need to be in August. This is a new concept for legislatures to consider-- monitoring on state land. Monitoring prevents injunctions. There is a reason why a conversation should take place. Monitoring is not popular.

Linda-Another team of PAWG could put the letter together and face to face meetings with the state legislators.

Mary- Regarding the Bridger Teton Class One Air Shed, do we know if this is done? Who is the regional forester, is it Jack Troyer?

Terry – I will check on how much the forester has requested for '06. It might be good for this group to talk to Niffy Hamilton too.

Mary- will work with Terry on this.

Linda- Any volunteers to work on the state letter? Carol and Linda will write one letter that can be modified. Susan and Bob will work on this as well.

Kirby- Is there a key person we should be looking at?

Mary- Patty is a good one to contact.

Bob- What is timeline with the state legislatures?

Mary- Does the EPA have any additional funding for this?

Terry- I don't think they will leverage dollars for a state agency.

Linda- What about DOE?

Terry- I heard the forest service was approaching DOE for money.

Linda- We will do the best we can for 2006. Next meeting?

Mary- I recommend August.

Carol- How are you going to communicate with the TGs about their monitoring?

Mary- Who manages BPS's.

Prill- It would depend on who the logical party would be. It should be written into the project proposal.

Carol- The TGs are in charge of monitoring and follow-up monitoring.

Prill- Who ever is doing the work needs to submit a report on their monitoring and submit it to BLM.

Carol- TGs need to make sure it gets done this summer and take the data this fall, evaluate the data against drilling plans, and make their recommendations in February.

Mary- This is complicated. The TGs don't have the authority to implement the BPS's.

Prill- You have to go back to the ROD and follow what they are charged with. We are required to consider.

Mary- What do you need?

Prill- PAWG looks for changes, then sends it to BLM and we send back to the PAWG.

Mary- I thought we were passed this.

Kirby- I thought so too.

Linda- BLM awards the contract.

Kirby- Now that money is approved, who is in charge of implementation?

Prill- We assign a lead for projects.

Kirby- The TGs won't implement them?

Prill- There is language in the Appendix "c" describing this.

Mary- The language suggests implement and review.

Prill- I don't know the answer to this.

Mary- It says "oversee implementation".

Linda- The TG or PAWG representative would take it as far as the liaison who administers the contract.

Prill- We need to write the contract showing the TG or PAWG, the scope of work. I'm hoping it doesn't create a coordination issue for us.

Linda- What I want know is how you are going to get the information to the TGs? The BLM has the contract experience. The ball is in the BLMs court to identify projects for this summer and who the contractors are going to be.

Prill- The TG can evaluate the scope of work from the BLM.

Linda- BLM reports to PAWG, PAWG can't get back to the TGs until we know what the BLM said.

Prill- When we submit projects we identify contractors to use. There is an agreement with the partners as to who will provide what.

Susan-I have a question about funding. Let say there was a testing program that would achieve "x" results and the BLM doesn't agree. Where does that monitoring program stand? I'm thinking specifically of Air, Water and Wildlife.

Mary- TGs should get and send out financials; here is how the flow of information works:

1. Send out completed spread sheet with non –BLM agencies to show this is what’s happening out on the ground
2. Ask operators and non-BLM agencies to update PAWG monthly -sent to Linda.
3. Send out draft scope (June) of work. For BLM projects they are sent out electronically and then reports go back to TG who can get back to the BLM with questions

Both groups get the reports and they are shared for reviewing and commenting purposes Each PAWG member follows up with their assigned TGs.

All- In agreement to use this process.

Linda-The TGs are going to wonder about all the other monitoring.

Mary- We could put in a disclaimer.

Carol- Keep in mind that the operators manage there own information. They could send it to the PAWG who could then send it to the TGs. I don’t think this will be a problem. The easy way it to ask them to provide the reports.

Prill- The key is finding out what needs to be done and find out where the gaps exist.

Linda-We should send the proposal list to the TGs.

Mike –I will prepare a PDF of the PAWG Monitoring Proposal document with “BLM” added to the title and send to all TGs.

Paul-On item #1 on that proposal list, why is funding more than cost?

Carol- Someone else’s project is piggy backed on this.

Prill- There is other information beside the PAWG information included.

Carol- We will fix that.

\*\*\*Next Meeting Tuesday August 9<sup>th</sup>, Lovatt Library\*\*\*

Linda-Requested that Mike or Prill would bring a phone and a nice map of the PAPA to the next meeting.

Linda- Requested that Susan move action items to the top of the cover page in all future minutes.

Carol- Would you (Susan) send all minutes to Carol for signing including the March 15<sup>th</sup> minutes.

Mary- Made recommendations that August agenda include a discussion on mitigation spreadsheet, funding matrix, and reviews of monitoring from TGs. Check in with Robin for Kirby about being an alternate chair.

Mary- In Appendix C 4 of the ROD, it talks about going on a field trip to look at monitoring “conduct annual field trip inspection” and calls it a primary function.

Kirby- We should ask TGs to report any exceptions, shortfalls, or issues. Have TGs send reports to PAWG before the next meeting.

**Meeting Adjourned 5:00 PM**

---

**Certified as Accurate**

---

Linda Baker, Co –Chair

Date