

PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP (PAWG)

Lovatt Library, Sublette County, Pinedale, Wyoming

April 22, 2005

9:00AM - 5:00 PM

Decisions

1. Linda should meet with the BLM for discussion regarding funding issues as they relate to the ROD.
2. Strike section 1.3.4 of the Air Quality TG report
3. Mary will make an intern available to the PAWG for support services in early May.

Recommendations

1. Forward the Socioeconomic TG Recommendations to the BLM which will include the newly written job description for a new hire
2. No Water Quality TG recommendations will be passed along to the BLM at this time.
3. Forward Air Quality TG Report to the BLM with the following top priorities: sections 1.1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.1.3, and 1.1.3
4. Forward the Reclamation TG report to the BLM for review

Action Items

1. Report back to pawg regarding BLM/ PAWG funding discussion. (Linda)
2. Look into setting up a demonstration of the SOLABON system for the PAWG (Catherine)
3. Water Quality TG to report back about timeline for providing water quality data to PAWG. (TG)
4. Forward all appropriate TG recommendation reports to the BLM for review. (Linda)

PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP (PAWG)

Lovatt Library, Sublette County, Pinedale, Wyoming

April 22, 2005

9:00AM - 5:00 PM

In Attendance:

PAWG Members:

Robin Smith, PAPA Oil and Gas Operators; Mary Flanderka, State of Wyoming (by phone); Susan Kramer, Landowners Bordering/Within PAPA; 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: Bob Barrett, Public-At-Large

Task Group (TG) Members:

Socioeconomic - Carmel Kail, Steve Reynolds, Roy Allen (by phone)

Air Quality – Perry Walker, Terry Svalberg (USDA-FS)

Water Quality – Mark Thiesse (DEQ), Catherine Woodfield (BLM)

Reclamation – Dessa Dale, Adrienne Peterson (Weed and Pest), Doug Vickery (Department of Agriculture)

Questar: Mike Golas

Pinedale BLM/PAWG Liaison: Mike Stiewig

Citizen Representatives: Tom Burns, Jocelyn Moore

Meeting Facilitated By: Linda Baker, co-chair

Meeting Recorded By: Susan Webster

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

Transportation TG

The PAWG reviewed the last 6 items of the Transpiration TG report not covered in yesterday's meeting.

1. A proposal to provide alternate access to the north end of the Mesa, to reduce / eliminate traffic on Tyler Street.
 - a. Socioeconomic group is working on this, as well as Sublette County and the BLM. A small piece of private land and some crucial winter range habitat are issues of concern. The PAWG members reviewed a map to identify the location of this proposal. We will revisit this after lunch when we have a better map to review.
2. A proposal to create a bridge across the New Fork River that would connect the Boulder South Road to Paradise Road.

- a. Robin- I have a process question. If PAWG makes a recommendation to BLM about these, what happens?
- b. Mike- BLM will forward this to whoever can act on it.
- c. Robin- Should we really discuss these in detail without the TG here?
- d. Linda- No, I don't think we should.
- e. Kirby- I'd like to encourage dialogue about this.
- f. Carmel- Roads don't just happen. It's a process and someone needs to file a right-of-way before anything can happen.
- g. Mike- There is set process for this type of thing
- h. Robin- We have been through some of these before. There is a lot of history associated with these.
- i. Linda- I have no problem forwarding the turn lane proposal recommended in 3, 4 and 5.
- j. Paul – How much traffic would be there?
- k. Robin- That's hard to say. Delete the one that is one mile north. It would concentrate turning traffic into one spot. It's not going to eliminate the highway traffic. The decision was made 4 years ago.
- l. Paul- Who will maintain this road?
- m. Robin- The operators will pay for it. Is it worth it to them?
- n. Kirby- We need Charles to give us more history. We should table this one too.

3. Proposal of turn lane off 191 onto Paradise Road (23-136)
4. Proposal of turn lane off 351 onto Paradise Road (23-126)
5. Proposal of connector road between the Antelope Area and Luman Road.
6. Highway 351 traffic plans to be reviewed by WDOT for safety considerations.

Socioeconomic TG

Presenting-Tom Burns, Carmel Kail, Steve Reynolds, Roy Allen (by phone)

Carmel- We're passionate about the subject and this is a BLM issue. See pages 15-16 of the combined report. This is not just a local and state government issue. The issue is a direct response to a federal action and the BLM needs to get involved.

Robin- How?

Carmel- We would like funding. We have many recommendations here.

Linda- You would like these recommendations forwarded to BLM?

Carmel- We want to make it clear that we don't want to be on the bottom of the pile.

Linda- We never intended to shortchange any TG. We are looking for priority items for funding work to be done in 2005.

Mike- The \$300,000 has stipulations from the federal government.

Linda- The state office indicated that there may be additional funding from various sources. I think your recommendations are so well founded. Your work is stellar.

Tom- We have more than twenty-five monitoring and twenty-five mitigation issues. Our primary recommendation is that there needs to be a contract worker inside the BLM to oversee this work. It's significant because of the changes on the Anticline.

Carmel- We prioritized the items. We propose we look at the action items we have come up with.

Robin- You propose to hire someone to do these things?

Tom- Our recommendations come from all agencies throughout the county. The biggest problem agencies have is being able to forecast and respond appropriately to conditions.

Nylla- I think this will help the town significantly.

Kirby- Do we need a full-time person to do this?

Tom- Rig counts tie to activity. This will be the most difficult job. It may be bigger than it appears.

Kirby- This may be a 2 month job.

Susan- Randy has been doing this for a year.

Roy- You need to look at this as a multiphase industry. The affected agencies all collect the information differently. There is very little automation here. That will take a while and will require time to set up. Once it is routine, it will require less time. Once we get into the actual mitigation with grant writing, that will be another portion of that person's job. Randy generated population numbers from the Jonah report. I can see the concern you have about whether this is a full-time job.

Kirby- I sense there will be a lot of resistance from the BLM to hire a full-time employee.

Mike- The town and county agencies all have problems.

Tom- If the BLM is allowing this work to take place and they should take responsibility for it.

Kirby- I disagree.

Steve- The purpose of this is to look at Adaptive Management in the Pinedale Anticline area. We shouldn't lose sight of cause and effect here. We found a multiplicity of data information and supposition in the oil and gas information. We feel we need an expert to look at this to test the sensitivity and relevance related to socioeconomic issues. We are looking for someone who can guide this along. People on the street believe the impacts are significant.

Kirby- It's not just the Pinedale Anticline that is impacting this. I would have concern about BLM coordinating the information. I think it should be county government. I have a hard time with the BLM doing the hiring. I expect the county commissioners to do the work and they are way behind. They don't seem to know how to manage the growth.

Roy- We are trying to identify a need. We are also trying to identify funding sources and whose responsibility it really is. Carmel is not recommending that Prill hire someone and put them in the Pinedale field office. There is a definite need here. There is a monitoring component and BLM has a responsibility.

Carmel- There are other likely funding sources, but we want some partnership.

Susan- This is an important issue and all agencies should report and collaborate.

Linda- We are all talking about a collaborative effort.

Steve- Remember why you are here. This is a mechanism to start the ball rolling. I believe the county should step up. If we try to put a collaborative effort together, we may be way beyond our mandate and authority and wind up in court again.

Kirby- This is the richest county in Wyoming. I don't think the BLM should fund this and step up.

Tom- In this case where we have the person doing the work they need to be able to make decisions.

Kirby- The bulk of the issues are county issues. I believe the BLM should get involved.

Carmel- You don't think the BLM should put up the money to hire someone?

Linda- We all benefit from the boom. How that works logistically, I don't know.

Kirby- The commissioners should step up.

Mike- We are talking about planner jobs. I don't think the city will go for this. All data is available to use.

Roy- We asked industry representatives if they could do a good job with forecasts. How much information do we have regarding drug use? There is a lot of work that needs to go on and we need to get it to the right agencies.

Kirby- The issue is not the need, but how we make the recommendation.

Steve- I don't believe the mechanism exists in the state to look at this.

Susan- Have the county play a lead role. They have the money.

Paul- You've got a big problem and someone needs to do the job.

Nylla- If we suggest this to the BLM as a cooperative project, do you think they would talk to the commissions?

Mike- I would think so.

Kirby- We should make a recommendation that we need someone to do this work because we are not going to do it. I will support getting the buy-in of county commissioners.

Linda- Where is the description of this proposed position for a socioeconomic statistician? Do we need more of a description on this? This recommendation is for a coordinator, a socioeconomic analyst. If all agencies contributed to this position, and the person reported to all of the agencies, and vice versa, they could be located in Sublette County. BLM will provide appropriate professional assistance, primarily information reporting. We could use the information to plan appropriately. *(Linda passed a position description around that was submitted by Carmel)* We all agree that this person is needed.

Kirby- There is a consensus that this is needed.

Nylla- Doesn't this need to be submitted today?

Steve- It is a necessary condition in order to fund this recommendation. The state has solicited a proposal for state funding.

Linda- The job description includes the entities with whom we would collaborate and those who would contribute funding.

Carmel- To quote Prill: "Forget the money."

Nylla- Since this is a national policy, can we request money from the BLM?

Mike- I am not the right person to ask.

Linda- I suggest we forward this recommendation to the BLM.

Kirby- I like the phrase in the recommendation that the BLM needs to encourage the county to drive this. If the county won't do it then the BLM needs to. Have Prill go to the county and pitch the case. Somebody needs to take leadership.

Linda- The state might help. The county could take the lead but we don't want to let anyone off the hook.

Kirby- This will state our case very strongly.

Carmel- We talked about how the monitoring would be the responsibility of the BLM. Anything that comes from planning and mitigation would come from the county.

Mike- How do you get your arms around this?

Carmel- What are we going to do about data collection monitoring. That's another thing.

Kirby – The county has the biggest vested interest in this.

Paul- We have a lot of good points here that need to be addressed and put into action. Look at what has come out of the Sonoran Institute-- a lot of talk and no action.

Kirby- We need to be clear about giving Prill the support she needs.

All- The group worked on wording of the recommended position.

Susan- We could create a BLM manager and enter into an MOU with agencies to coordinate data collection.

Linda- Good idea. All other recommendations in the TG report can be handled by the county?

Steve- If you want to get the county involved. I don't think you understand. If you leave it up to an agency that hasn't been involved in this before, it isn't going to happen. If you get agreement from these entities, that would be the agreement.

Linda- We have to try.

Kirby- Reiterated the importance of trying.

Linda- There are any number of agencies that may be unwilling.

Kirby- If we can't get the county to do it, we should get the BLM to do it.

PAWG believes it's a critical issue that needs to be addressed. This is an urgent matter.

Linda- This would apply to all groups.

Steve- Amen, now you've got it. This is a high priority and I think it should happen.

Linda- Do we agree that the recommendations from the TG be forwarded with the new position--all 53 of them?

The new position description for the recommended hire reads as follows:

The PAWG believes this is a critical position and deserves top priority. We recommend that the BLM take the lead role on establishing this position.

We recommended that this position be funded by the following agencies:

- Bureau of Land Management
- State of Wyoming
- Sublette County
- Impacted Communities
- Oil and Gas Operators

We also recommend that reporting occur between the new hire and the following agencies:

- State of Wyoming
- Impacted communities and counties
- Bureau of Land Management
- PAWG Socioeconomic Task Group

*****Break*****

Linda- In an e-mail sent by Bob Barrett, he stated that the ROD is very specific regarding funding. How does the group feel about the clear mandate of the ROD and the flexible funding issues with other entities? Will the BLM require operators to fund certain projects? We don't need a written policy, but I am interested in how you feel about this.

Robin- You characterize the ROD as a clear mandate. I can find instances where its flexible. I believe the ROD suggests that the operators are the sole funding source. As long as the monitoring and mitigation is headed in the direction of the ROD, operators will consider funding for these projects. It's likely they would like to see other funding sources as well.

Mike- Unless it says in the ROD that we require someone to do something, we cannot require it. Is that your understanding?

Linda- In my mind the ROD is a legally binding document that the BLM can implement.

Robin- It says that in some places and not in others, so it's not always clear. We have a recommendation coming from TGs that I'm not sure will be funded.

Kirby- Yesterday, Prill said that we should submit recommendations and the BLM will look at them. My interpretation of this is that she is willing to look at these and all funding sources. I think we have to stay focused on doing the right thing and work on the problems down the road.

Mike- They really want you to submit your recommendations and not worry about how you are going to fund each one.

Linda- Yes, but at some point we are going to run out of funding.

Kirby- I assume we will get feedback from BLM when we don't have any money for it.

Mike- Just because something is not supported doesn't mean it won't get funding.

Robin- Who asks for the funding when this happens?

Kirby- I don't see anything in the ROD that says the TGs should be looking for funding.

Robin- Originally, Carol said that funding *is* part of our task. But that has changed.

Mike- When the government has fallout money, high priority projects that are sitting on the shelf get moved up.

Linda- The 1988 RMP promised monitoring and the BLM said they couldn't fund it. I am looking for opinions regarding whether or not the BLM can give us a sense of how things are funded, and if they are funded equitably. I think we could lose a lot if we aren't flexible about funding, whether or not operators fund equitably. Maybe we can make a recommendation on how this will happen.

Kirby- I would like to see feedback from the BLM about this before we tackle it. I believe Prill will give us honest feedback regarding this. All of the industries will have fits if we don't get this straightened out.

Robin- BLM has the legal authority to enforce the ROD.

Linda- As PAWG, we have the ability to make a recommendation about this.

Kirby- If they don't have the authority to do this under the ROD then our work will not be worthwhile. Maybe we can get clarity on this.

Linda- It will be a problem because we might have this discussion under the weight of a need.

Kirby- We should revisit this. If we are all reading the ROD differently, maybe we should have a legal opinion about it.

Robin- There will be a long list of things we think should be funded.

Susan- It's spelled out on pages 14 and 15. This gives us something to lean on.

Robin- BLM needs to get clarity from their counsel regarding who has the authority.

Kirby- If they don't, then everyone will lose the benefit of the AEM and EIS. Maybe we should empower Linda to have a discussion with BLM about this.

All-The group agreed to have Linda do this and perhaps get documentation that the PAWG can review.

Public Comment

None at this time

Robin- Is there something set up for a sub-group meeting for the process issue discussed at yesterday's meeting?

Kirby- Rollie had a lot of information. I would take an overall framework idea and bring together the Adaptive Management philosophy and report back to you guys either in hard copy or by e-mail. I'm optimistic that this will work. This has been very helpful to other companies. It sets a framework for process, procedure and training and includes goals for Adaptive Environmental Management.

Linda- I think it's a good idea. We are loosely structured and there are many things that are not being dealt with.

Kirby- There is enough collective experience in this group to make this happen.

Water Quality TG Report

Presenting: Mark Thiesse (for Gene), Catherine Woodfield

Linda- The TG didn't prioritize. The BLM has indicated that we don't have to worry about the limitations we imposed last time. None of the items on your list will be dropped. If you would like to add anything, please feel free.

Mark- Regarding #3 in our plan, we are concerned about use of oil based mud and how it is reclaimed. Originally we thought about an open system. We toured Questar's site and saw the closed system and how well it is handled. It was a relief. Oil and Gas commission member Greg Ebberman is going to talk to us about the process (the Solabon system) Shell takes old debris, scoops it out with a loader and dumps it into a pit. Solabon mixes

the debris with fly ash. They mix it and bury it. This mixture is covered with topsoil and then reseeded. Our question is, how safe is this for the long-term? I am not aware of any water contamination from this procedure. They are comfortable with this solution. It may take a different priority down the road.

Robin- Some other operators are composting their cuttings. This is done in New Park.

Mark- We struggled with this, how to test and sample, and what will happen 10-20 years down the road.

Susan- Are you aware of any hazardous materials in the Solabon?

Mark- No. It is comprised of fly ash, cement, calcium, aluminum and silica. It's pretty innocuous. Catherine will try to set up a demonstration of the system and suggested that interested PAWG members join.

Kirby- Do most operators have steel reserve tanks or just reserve pits? A reserve pit wouldn't have any residue.

Mark- It's a lined pit that will get pumped out. This sampling analysis plan is not final. We are wondering about 2 issues:

- Do we want water testing done in the wells?
- What about data sharing ...the conservation district data is being turned over to BLM

Gene was going to talk to the lab that is sending data to the conservation district and the BLM at the same time. Operators usually get the data because they pay for it. BLM wants to make sure they get to review the data before it's made available the public. DEQ wants the data to go to the public immediately via a special database. How can we make good data available?

Linda- How long does it take to review it?

Mark- Ground water data started being collected last fall and that will be reported at our next meeting. We will spend part of that meeting deciding how much data we should actually review. We are trying to figure out how much data we will need to make an appropriate decision.

Linda-The PAWG's job is to make the best recommendation to the BLM. The public really needs to know how safe our community is. I don't feel like we know that yet.

Mark-. Surface water data is available. Ground water still needs to establish a baseline. We think we will get 2 to 3 reports from the conservation district. We hope those are in a public friendly format. Then we can make an evaluation. We hope they give the public the information.

Robin- Surface water has been done. You haven't looked at them?

Catherine- We have yet to see a report.

Linda- It's raw data. There is no report. These reports could exist now. My concern is that the public is not being involved in this.

Robin- The TGs are supposed to analyze data. Are you asking for raw data before it is analyzed?

Catherine- I just got the data a few weeks ago and we are supposed to review it.

Mark- BLM wants data as soon as possible. They don't care if it is in raw form. Their sampling season will start soon and they will submit a report sometime between February and April. There will be a data lag.

Susan- You will get chemical data before the bug data?

Robin- Do you have a process you will use?

Mark- Once the data is confirmed, we can relay that information to the BLM and DEQ. It's a several week process.

Linda- If we get a red flag with a sample, will it have to wait a year before it get addressed?

Mark- No. It will happen immediately. For re-sampling, the whole process will take a couple months. They can look at the data immediately where there is detection.

Robin- The 2002 water samples included micro invertebrate information.????

Susan- Contaminated water can be addressed in a short period of time and affected parties can be notified?

Mark- They will probably resample first. A couple of weeks are not going to be a big problem. BLM can work to find out how it happened and then the operator would be responsible for the clean up.

Robin- The first thing you do is get fresh drinking water to the site.

Linda- The livestock wells are used to water animals.

Kirby- There has been a lot of press about this. Do you think it deserves additional monitoring?

Mark- It is an issue in the coal bed methane area for deep wells where there are fracturing at 8-10 feet. If DEQ and BLM are doing their jobs there shouldn't be a problem.

Kirby- If we had a blowout it would need to be reported.

Mark- My big concern is the condensate pipelines. They are going to leak and it's going to be a problem.

Susan- How would you catch problems?

Mark- Flying over and driving through the area would provide good observational information.

Susan- Is there a way to monitor this?

Kirby- Gas tank leaks are hard to see because of atmospheric pressure. Pipelines run at high pressure and can erupt on the surface. Most onshore pipelines don't have detection.

Catherine- The pipelines are buried about 20 feet. There is fine detection. They can tell when there is there is a change in flow. Any drop in pressure can be detected.

Kirby- Are they using detection methods full-time?

Catherine- Yes

Mark- Re-injecting is a problem in this area.

Susan- What is the recharge rate of the water table?

Mark- The only good information we have is from the Dynamac Report done for the BLM. According to regional ground water studies, there is more recharge going on than withdrawal at this time. The infiltration rate is 1 inch per year. At 14,000 acre feet it is different. There is more going in than coming out. This report was done in 2002 and the ROD was done in 2000. This goes back to our task. Our concern is, how much of what the ROD charges us with should we wrap our arms around? We are just thinking that we should stick with monitoring. If PAWG thinks that our responsibilities should be broader than this, they need to tell us that. Change in water well elevation is going to be a very complicated issue, if we see problems. It will be hard to determine whether water wells are affected by industry or other things. The TG group will look at this.

Susan- Can the water produced be purified for use?

Mark- You can clean it up and put it in a stream, but you can't put it onto a road. We are questioning some of this and how to work round it.

Linda- Susan raises a good issue. I would like to see the TG tackle this problem. I have a document that talks about this. We should be addressing this. It would be good to know how much water will be going in, how much is coming out, and how much of that is going to be a problem. How much capacity can our 6 produced water facility handle?

Robin- You're asking them to monitor something that is already being monitored-3.4 & 3.5. There will be sedimentation if culverts are not maintained.

Linda- We should be aware of how this will work.

Susan- Maybe we could establish ponds.

Linda- That presents a host of other problems.

Mark- It's not a question of permitting. It's a bigger question. What are we going to do with all the water and how are we going to treat it? The water is currently being treated by reverse osmosis.

Kirby-You want reporting about how much water is produced so you have a feel for the treatment and disposal capacity? We have to add water for other places beyond the Anticline.

Catherine- We have wells now and will have more wells later; the question is, how will we deal with this in the future?

Linda- Before we forward this to BLM we will need some kind of report on surface and ground water, and produced water. We need a timeline for an expected report and a monitoring plan. We also need to know the communication techniques you plan to use.

Susan- Can they do this before we need to report to the BLM?

Mark- Our next meeting is May 12th. We are supposed to get data then. We should be able to answer to most of these issues and get back to you by the May 19th meeting. He stated that the TG would come up with a timeline for when they will be able to provide water quality data to the PAWG.

No recommendation will be made to the BLM for this TG at this time.

Paul- How can we make recommendations if we don't have the information we need to do that? I am frustrated by all this.

Mark- We should have the data we need by the end of the month.

Paul- I used to test water and turn it around in 10 days. There is something wrong with this process in that we don't have what we need.

Mark- The problem is the volume and minor differences can make a big difference. The macro invertebrate data is what we need and it takes time. For surface water, the chemical testing goes much faster.

Susan- Are we testing for the important parameters?

Mark- Yes. We look for salts and hydrocarbons.

Air Quality TG

Presenting: Terry Svalberg and Perry Walker

Linda- Explained the new BLM funding and priority information.

Terry- We were asked to list existing projects are high priority. We decided on the existing monitoring that loses funding September 30th. On January 1st, we were short on money to go forward--2 adaptive sites and bulk deposition sites are showing a \$160,000 annual loss. Table 2 in our report has the breakdown.

Robin- Is the Forest Service going to apply for money? I've been told to look for additional sources.

Perry- The land stewards, the BLM and the Forest Service, are being strangled to death by funding cuts. The only places we can go for money are to the industries and the state. It seems to me we are in the jaws of the vice.

Kirby- The article in the paper implied pressure on air quality. The concern is protection of class one air shed. It seems a different slant is needed to help us understand.

Terry- We have responsibility but no authority to do anything.

Linda- What actions are being taken to try to get funding?

Terry- The state gave us \$32,000 to get us through this year. We tried submitting grant proposals but nobody want to give money to the government.

Susan- It seems like nobody wants to engage in preventative measures.

Linda- We need to look at funding seriously.

Perry- In section 7474 it states that project operators have the responsibility to demonstrate that there won't be an impact on air quality. I submit to you that political will is missing in the Forest Service and BLM hierarchy. We are between a rock and a hard place.

Linda- It's our responsibility to impress land managers with these points.

Kirby- We know the pass is going to increase. We shouldn't take our eyes off this.

Linda- I wish your recommendation had stronger words.

Kirby- Wasn't there some special stipulation for air quality monitoring, regarding the available \$300,000?

Mike- We need to focus on the recommendations and not the money.

Kirby- Are they in order? I think visibility is a key concern, but it is lower on your list.

Perry- We could continue that in a quick, easy, cheap way with photos. The improved aerosol monitor gives good data, but analysis takes time.

Linda- Visibility is important. If you go to the website, you can see the comparison for the air quality and see that the computer program is a powerful tool. We could recommend it as a high priority. It's one we can submit as it stands, and let the BLM fund what they can.

Perry- NADP sites are the most important (priority 1 and 3)

Kirby- Information should be obtained in a timely manner. Did you say that there is an extended time regarding the data coming back to us?

Perry- NADP is reported quarterly and is currently 6 month behind. A nephelometer might be a good tool to use for this.

Perry- We feel the instrumentation up at Fremont Lake is in the wrong place. It's not positioned in such a way that it can pick up developments on the south side.

Susan- Air pollution from other areas is affecting us.

Kirby- Should we move the monitor?

Perry- Well, it gives us good trend data.

Paul- Where would you relocate the monitor and when could you do it?

Perry- I would put it around the South Pass area and Big Sandy. Dan Olsen is interested in putting in this monitoring.

Susan- Does it determine the type of air pollution that exists?

Perry- It's upwind of the development. People often think that air only goes in one direction. Air flow will often split and go north and south. There is a perpetual trust fund financed by industry. It is however beyond the scope of this project.

Perry- We have 3 monitoring stations. The Encan station is not of much value. It would be beneficial if we could put in a station near Pinedale, plus a series of stations along the fields, and additional stations along the foothills. In addition, I would add another one on the rim at Green Lakes or Jackson. I don't think we have the wind pattern figured out enough to be able to monitor air quality properly. .

Linda- This report says that we have some in place. Let's also expand what we have.

Perry- We will talk more.

Kirby- When BLM looks at cumulative effects, they have a model. You're saying we have the wrong description and erroneous results?

Perry- Regarding Calpuff, they had to do estimates and assumptions, which produced error bars. TRC relied on air quality from La Barge in 1995. I have results that differ. The key factor is the shifting wind patterns. I am convinced we are in a poor state to do effective monitoring for air quality and hang our hat on Calpuff.

Perry- The state wants to step the work up and come back with a better product.

Linda- Is there any question on current or additional monitoring? So, we want to talk about the status. I am satisfied with the way it is right now. With all of the monitoring going on there are many factors involved. This report emphasizes the need for money too. I want to assure you that the TGs do not need to emphasize securing funding. Section 1.3.4 of this report can be struck.

Nylla- Perry has mentioned putting more monitoring devices up there. Should we put that in the report?

Terry- The TG needs to discuss this first. It can be implemented at any time when funding is acquired.

Perry- Most of what I have said has not been run by the task group. These are personal observations.

Nylla- My concern is that we know what is going on in Pinedale.

Terry- In 1.2.4 it says that the state will put in a PM₂ monitor.

Perry- My endeavor is to chase the monitoring issue with new technologies that are cost effective, mobile, very accurate and to personally raise funding to purchase one and demonstrate it's effectiveness to the DEQ.

Susan- What is the cost?

Perry- The French version is \$90,000. The American version is \$85,000.

Robin- Are they new?

Perry- They have been used for a awhile. American industry concentrates in the infra red and these are extremely expensive.

Paul- You say you have mobile unit?

Perry- Yes. I would have to sit with Dan Olsen and discuss testing protocols including place, time, etc. This would be a pilot project.

Paul- What area of the Wind Rivers would this cover?

Terry- It would cover 10-15 miles in each direction, depending on which way the wind is blowing. Without the data from the station we really can't express that at this point.

Paul- I'm looking at the density of the air.

Terry- Perry's idea will probably work better if you have several monitors along an area. We will have to balance with the federal regulatory measures with this.

Perry- Dust storms from Afghanistan create air quality issues hee. They come here via the strong jet streams. It has happened three years in a row.

Linda- I recommend forwarding these recommendations to the BLM.

Mike- I would like to see the delineation between your high and low priorities.

Terry- We tried to do that.

Linda recapped the priority items and they are as follows: Sections 1.1.1.1, 1.1.2., 1.1.1.3, 1.1.3

Mary- I will make an intern available for the needs of PAWG starting in early May.

Reclamation TG

Presenting: Dessa Dale, Doug Vickery, Adrienne Peterson

Dessa- Can we make a decision about this today since the PAWG has not yet read this?

Linda- Everything I would expect to see, and a lot more, is in this report. I can't see priorities se, though. Would you take a stab at the priorities?

Dessa- I know the priority issue has changed. We have had difficulty deciding on our top priorities. I am trying to get funding for 4.1 and 4.2. Item 4.3 is being pushed for funding this year also. We do not have funding for 4.4, but it is a priority. We are in the process of establishing 4.5. We have some money for all these except for 4.4, but we felt it was important to include this. Efforts are being made in all areas which is why it was tough to prioritize. In addition, these are all baseline.

Doug- The big building block is funding. We need a funding source established. This is a huge issue. The first priority is a funding issue that will start with BLM and trickle down. Oil and Gas folks on our task group are interested in supporting this.

Adrienne- Invasive species has a weak management area. We have a successful weed management program in the south part of the county.

Dessa- We thought it was important to keep this in the table form. A recommendation like this can help in the planning process.

Linda- Regarding cooperative funding, is it separated out as a specific item?

Doug- In order to have a good, viable product we have to involve everyone monetarily.

Linda- Where is the expression of this intention in the recommendation? It should say, "this task group makes a recommendation that you establish a method for cooperative funding for the project".

Dessa- BLM should initiate the process of finding money and determining funding.

Linda- You've broken it down into specific projects and the agencies responsible?

Dessa- All agencies would have representatives that could then go to the appropriate group. BLM needs to provide initial stable funding. This new format brought the recommendation into this new format. The problem is the enforcement of the ROD. This is not necessarily what was in the ROD.

Susan- You have got all the bases covered here.

Dessa- The group should look at the basis for pulling those out.

Linda- We are seeing some similar components throughout the TG reports. For instance, regarding soil and vegetation.

Dessa- It would include a mapping component that would be saved through the GIS database.

Susan- How long would it take?

Dessa- Looking at 4.1, we will monitor 20%. The goal is a minimum of 20%. Section 4.5 involves invasive weed monitoring and deals with identification and mapping of these. Weed and Pest is willing to locate these on a map and they have the ability.

Susan- Do we know what all the weed control people are doing?

Dessa- All groups that release substances on federal land are required to document and report what they do. They are also required to submit weed control proposals. The main thing is to try to get a sense of what we can do about this.

Linda- On the second page, in the second item down can we add “and identify” to the language. There are four pages under invasive species. How might that work?

Dessa- It’s a contentious problem. If the process of mapping reveals a noted increase in invasive species, this would trigger a recommendation. There is a plan for what to do, given the recommendation made by Adrienne Peterson.

Adrienne- We live in one of the cleanest counties in the Western United States. The use of power washing equipment is a practice Schlumberger and Halliburton have implemented.

Paul- There was a question about acceptable seed. Is that resolved?

Dessa- Bridger will donate seed. We will want to get soil conservation district support for this.

Paul- What’s the problem?

Dessa- I think it is largely political. We felt if we had something to work with we would be better off.

Paul- They could learn something from the history of the area if they asked a few questions.

Dessa- We felt the same way. We could have a better idea of what might work.

Paul- They should be less political and more practical.

Doug- We couldn’t see why the seed trial wouldn’t be a win/win for everyone. I still am not certain why they don’t understand this.

Dessa- Many projects could fall under this MOU to get more funding from agencies. Any agencies could submit proposals.

Susan- Are we looking at forage to grow that will sustain the wildlife?

Dessa- Yes.

Linda- I wouldn't add anything.

Doug- When I was asked to join this group I did not know what I was getting into. This has been a group that has one main goal in mind. This group is awesome and full of a lot of forward thinkers.

Paul- All the groups are like that.

Doug- It's been an eye-opener

Linda- Should anything be changed?

Susan- The section on public education could be moved up a little.

Robin- Regarding wildlife and habitat, you are making a wildlife recommendation in the monitoring. Could you explain that?

Dessa- Dan Stroud felt it should be adopted because wildlife monitoring and mitigation were not being addressed.

Doug- We had to tone down our recommendations. At one point we felt like we were the wildlife group because so many wildlife issues came up.

Dessa- Regarding 4.2, there has been a lot of discussion about amounts of forage vs. grass. We have looked at many key indicators. We tried to balance these out. It should benefit both.

Linda- Is that the reason the fencing stays up so long?

Adrienne- It is a big concern for the visual group that observes the reclamation site.

Dessa- Many thought that the fencing should be moved as soon as it is possible.

Paul- What's protocol for fencing regarding reclamation?

Robin- It should be fenced on three sides. When the rig leaves, a fourth side is put up and taken down a year later.

Dessa- So this is why fences are left in place for long periods of time. After reclamation is established the fences should be moved.

Paul- You can't measure an adequate protection period by year because climatic conditions affect plant survival.

Doug- When a fence is up someone needs to maintain it. A few did address that.

The PAWG recommends the report be submitted to BLM.

Doug- When will the recommendation be made, and when can we expect information back from the BLM?

Linda- Very soon. There is no timeline in place for reporting back.

Linda will forward the reports and meet with Prill to identify the top priority.

Mike- At some point PAWG will have to review all of the recommendations and make a recommendation about what the top priorities will be.

Linda will set up meeting with Prill next week

Agenda For Next Meeting

Linda- We have the May 19th meeting next. I'd like to suggest these agenda items:

- Revisit Water Quality TG Report
- Review Linda and Prill's meeting
 - Discuss funding issue and solicit opinion
 - Develop a timeline on 2005 projects
 - Make decisions regarding what is most important
- Invite all TG chairs
- Co-Chair
- Discussion about alternates
- Going forward with a report on 2005 season projects and looking forward to 2006

Mike- FOCA BLM has asked the Secretary of The Interior for a replacement for Bob Reese's position

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 PM

Certified as Accurate

Linda Baker, Co –Chair

Date