

Pinedale Anticline Working Group

Approved Minutes

Pinedale Field Office, Pinedale

1625 West Pine

Rendezvous Conf. Room

1:00 PM, Thursday, October 23, 2008

In Attendance

PAWG Members – Robin Smith (Chair /Operators) , Cathy Purves (Vice-chair/Environmental), Scott Smith (State of WY), Nylla Kunard (Town of Pinedale), Paul Hagenstein (Livestock Operators)

PAWG Members Callie Domek and Chris Corlis are absent.

With five members present the PAWG has a quorum.

PAWG Task Group Members – Therese Hartman, Jocelyn Moore, Darrell Walker

BLM – Chuck Otto (Pinedale Field Manager) – arrived late from meetings in Cheyenne, Dave Crowley (BLM PAWG DFO),

Public – Cally McKee, Kevin Williams, Mary Lynn Worl, Will Roscoe, Tom Hakonson, Tom Curry

Press – Stephen Crane (Sublette Examiner), Derek Farr (Pinedale Roundup)

The ground rules for PAWG meetings were explained for the benefit of those members of the public who are unfamiliar with PAWG meetings. PAWG members have primacy during PAWG meetings. Other attendees may ask the PAWG Chair if they are permitted to join the conversation on specific topics. At a minimum, public comment will be taken at the end of the meeting. The PAWG task groups provide suggested recommendations to the PAWG. The PAWG members discuss the recommendations and may forward those, completely or in part, by a consensus vote to the BLM for adaptive management implementation.

Meeting Minutes

Copies of meeting minutes from the previous PAWG meeting were distributed by email prior to the meeting and were available at the meeting. Robin Smith made some spelling corrections to the minutes and provided those to BLM DFO. Mr. Smith then asked for clarification in the minutes about the New Fork 30 sampling site, the presence of the aquatic worm, and the source of sedimentation. Is it correct that the worm is an indicator of erosion and sedimentation, but that we do not know exactly from where it is coming? Jocelyn Moore responded that the worms have been detected twice. During the first detection there was no specific source of erosion and sedimentation identified, but during the second detection Dr. Brett Marshall of River Continuum Concepts, who conducted the analysis, went down to the sampling site and identified potential erosion and sedimentation problems from a nearby gravel pit and well pad. Darrell Walker added that the Sublette County Conservation District (SCCD), who hired Dr. Marshall to conduct the New Fork River analysis, first thought that the erosion and sedimentation could be coming from Sand Springs Draw or Alkali Draw. However, the SCCD still does not know the exact source. There is no hard evidence to indicate where the

problem lies and it is difficult to say if the erosion and sedimentation is actually linked to development on the Anticline or not. The SCCD is continuing to investigate the problem.

Robin Smith then clarified his concern by saying that if the erosion and sedimentation was tied to a known location or cause, we could ask the operators to correct the problem, but since we still don't know we can't force any action. Cathy Purves explained that during the PAWG tour she saw channeling, slumping, and erosion at the boat ramp site and that industry is now using that location to take water from the river. Ms. Purves then asked Mr. Walker if the SCCD has a monitoring plan around potential erosion sites. Mr. Walker said that the SCCD does some of their own monitoring, but if it is related to the Anticline, monitoring would only be done if it was approved through the PAWG task group and the PAWG.

Robin Smith suggested a change to meeting minutes to explain that "the report shows ongoing sedimentation but the cause is unknown" rather than severe erosion at specific locations. Cathy Purves also requested that the three "weak links" that were identified in September be included in the minutes. **Mr. Smith then made a motion to accept the minutes of the PAWG meeting from September 25, 2008 and Cathy Purves provided a second. There were no objections and the motion passed with a unanimous vote. The minutes will be posted to the PAWG website.**

At this point the agenda was rearranged to allow Chuck Otto time to arrive from meetings in Cheyenne. The discussions and recommendations from the Water Resource Task Group were postponed until later in the meeting so that Mr. Otto would be in attendance.

Lower Explosive Limit (LEL) Alarms on Water Wells

A draft letter to the operators was provided to the PAWG members for review. This letter outlines the BLM's new policy on LEL alarms and water well testing on the Anticline. It explains the operator's responsibility to test the water wells, what they are required to do in the event that a lower explosive limit is detected, and how the operators are to communicate and coordinate with the BLM and the SCCD. A brief discussion followed regarding the notification timing. Kevin Williams suggested that language be added to the letter to provide for immediate remediation of the problem if possible. Mr. Williams indicated that he would like to be made aware of the problem immediately so that Questar could investigate the scene to determine the cause and assess the immediate danger. Darrell Walker commented that safety is the primary concern and the SCCD samplers could immediately contact the operator and wait for the operator representative to correct the issues. Dave Crowley will revise the language to capture the discussion and the final letter will be presented at the next meeting. Darrell Walker will discuss the letter at the next WRTG meeting and possibly add it to the sampling strategy. The letter will be sent out as an order from the Authorized Officer. No further action was required from the PAWG

Record of Decision (ROD) Ongoing Implementation Process

BLM has had a series of internal meetings with the cooperators to figure out how to implement the SEIS ROD. It will be a difficult and complicated process to implement all of the requirements within the allotted time-frame. The first requirement is the development of the Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. Merry Gamper is in Rock Springs today beginning the development process. The hope is to have the draft completed and available by mid-December. The BLM would like the PAWG and the WRTG to comment on the draft plan but the time frame required in the ROD is very short and the PAWG may not have time. The PAWG will be able to review that plan at the next meeting. Cathy Purves expressed her frustration at the short timeline and the inability of the PAWG to

participate in the development of the plan. The discussion was tabled until later in the meeting to include Chuck Otto in the discussions.

Produced Water

The topic of produced water was added to today's agenda as a result of discussions at the PAWG meeting in September. There were many questions raised about produced water; is all the produced water accounted for, what is being done with it, where is it going, is it being reused, dumped, cleaned etc.? On this subject, Chuck Otto asked that the variance submission for Ultra's plan to use produced water be passed around. This is proposed plan that outlines changes to Ultra's produced water use plan and would use produced water for a number of purposes, including dust abatement, surface drilling, etc. The plan is simply for information purposes only to show an example of what operators may wish use produced water for and how they would submit that plan to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission.

Robin Smith stressed that "the most important question about produced water is: Is all of the produced water being accounted for? People have a concern that there are large quantities of water being produced from Anticline wells and nobody has a clear and comprehensive picture of what is happening with that water. The reason is because there are different operators and different disposal methods; recycling, evaporation, reinjection". Mr. Smith continued to explain that "there are so many parts to the story and this document is a good example of it. Ultra is requesting to take produced water, reduce the constituents of that water, and use it for beneficial purposes like dust control and drilling the surface hole. That is why I resist the discussion about trying to figure what is happening to every drop of that produced water. In my opinion it will be difficult for someone to find and track that information. Not that I think it is a bad idea, I want to be clear about that, but I think it would be a herculean task maybe beyond the scope of any of our task groups." Perhaps that would necessitate a Produced Water Task Group.

Jocelyn Moore followed-up with the concerns of the Water Resources Task Group and indicated that the WRTG has pushed to have the PAWG create a produced water task group because the produced water issues are beyond the scope and ability of the WRTG. The Transportation Task Group has looked at this issue also and has found a shortfall in the produced water numbers. With millions of barrels produced and not enough capacity to dispose of it there are concerns that the produced water is being discharged in ways that it should not. The WRTG could assist a produced water TG but does not want to take on that task.

Robin Smith reiterated Mrs. Moore's sentiments in that it is an important issue and there is reason for concern but it is too much to ask a new task group to take on. He then asked Cally McKee of Ultra and Kevin Williams of Questar how hard would it be for operators to provide information about produced water amounts. Is it readily available? Is there much data digging and additional work to get those numbers?

Kevin Williams indicated that for Questar, actual produced water volumes would be fairly simple to track because it is all going into the new liquids gathering system. It is just a matter of reading the meter on a daily basis. Projected water volumes would be more difficult and that relates back to the Transportation Task Group and how they attempted to track, predict, and determine the amount of water produced across the field. They took the amount of water produced when each well is brought on line and multiplied it by the number of wells, but did not take into account the decline in produced water over the life of the well and so those numbers are a little skewed and any projections would not be accurate.

Robin Smith then raised additional related questions: what is being done with the produced water now, is it being disposed of in an environmentally safe way, how are we going to handle all of this water as we develop projections for

the future? These are important questions but Mr. Smith does not feel that this it is the PAWGs responsibility or authority to make decisions on, especially how the operators will handle the volume of produced water in the future.

Kevin Williams discussed the ROD requirements to have the liquids gathering facility installed and enough disposal wells to handle produced water. Ultra and Shell are still trucking water, but that means they have somewhere to put it. Questar is not trucking water but they are piping it to Anticline Disposals. The operators must have a plan to handle produced water before they are permitted to drill for gas. The operators have a business and economic incentive to ensure they have some place to put the produced water.

Jocelyn Moore asked if there was a need and a way to come up with a revised study or estimate of produced water volumes and disposal capabilities. A revised plan may address some of the public concerns. Robin Smith indicated that produced water should be discussed in the upcoming Resource Management Plan, but that he had not read it and was unsure.

Robin Smith reminded the assembly that the PAWG has been discussing a produced water task group for at least three years or longer and Paul Hagenstein concurred. Mr. Smith feels at this point it would be a good idea to form a produced water task group or as an alternative, the BLM could require operators to submit produced water reports to the BLM.

Cathy Purves agreed that both were good ideas and should be implemented simultaneously because of the significant amount of knowledge that would be needed to really understand the produced water situation. Jocelyn Moore reiterated that the water resource task group has been discussing this issue for years also, and have come to the conclusion that this issue would necessitate a new task group because if the produced water question becomes a giant monitoring undertaking, the water resource task group does not have the time and expertise to deal with it. Ms. Moore feels that the Wyoming DEQ and State Engineers Office should be contacted to get their perspective about the produced water issues.

Kevin Williams pointed out that the operators are already required to report produced water volumes to the Wyoming Oil and Gas Commission. The difficult part is to extrapolate the projected volumes of water from the numbers reported to the state.

Darrell Walker announced his concern that another task group could complicate the job of the PAWG, the Water Resource Task Group, and the SCCD and that the problems with having another task group are larger than the produced water problem. He then asked what possible recommendations the task group could develop to address the produced water issue.

Cally McKee then provided her perspective on the produced water issue and stated that the important question is not how much water is being produced, but where is it all going? What the PAWG needs to know is how much is being injected, how much is going to Anticline Disposal, how much is being recycled. Ms. McKee believes that part of the problem can be solved by looking at state records of injection wells because the total volume of produced water injected also must be reported to the state. The operators report all their volumes to the oil and gas commission but private facilities, like Anticline Disposal, have to report the volumes on hand to the DEQ because that is under a surface use permit. The different agencies responsible for regulation of different disposal methods makes it difficult to track.

Cathy Purves continued the discussion by saying that surface disposal locations like Anticline Disposal also have to report on the quality of the water they have on hand and they have to meet DEQ water quality standards before they can discharge. Ms. Purves is very concerned about the additional volumes as more and more of the 4000 additional wells come online.

Jocelyn Moore reminded the group that one of the issues the WRTG has struggled with is asking the PAWG to recommend to the BLM that they include trend analysis in the Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Ms. Moore recognizes that there is all lot of water data out there, but somebody needs to pull it all together. She is worried that nobody is keeping and managing this data and nobody is interpreting the data for the public benefit. That purpose for creating a new produced water task group, but If the BLM could have assign a hydrologist look at it or hire someone to track and interpret the data and present it to the water resource task group then we don't need a new task group.

Darrell Walker expressed his concern that there is not enough data to make trend analysis statistically significant. The first step is to analyze the data to determine if trend analysis is appropriate. Dave Crowley then indicated that trend analysis may not really be what we are looking for, instead we would like an overview presented in a graphical format of the water situation, including produced water, groundwater pollution, aquifer characterization etc. On part of this recommendation, dealing with industrial water wells, was already sent to the BLM in September: the PAWG recommended that "a BLM hydrologist or other qualified person prepare a water well testing overview to be presented to the PAWG and task groups in layman's terms focusing on the patterns of water wells on the Anticline that have tested positive for hydrocarbons. A hydrologist will also review water well drilling logs to report to the PAWG on stratigraphy and permeability." These recommendations to not include produced water, do we need to provide additional recommendations or look at the issue differently?

Jocelyn Moore then clarified her goals and indicated that she did not want a trend analysis per se, but would like the BLM to have someone who is knowledgeable about the issue to review the produced water data in order to compile and present a multi-year, user-friendly, cumulative overview report of produced water – much like the recommendation to the BLM to create an industrial water well report. Instead of the PAWG creating a new task group, if the BLM or someone qualified can create this kind of report then that is all we would need and the WRTG could handle it.

Robin Smith stressed that the primary goal of the produced water report is to get a handle on the accounting of produced water disposal. It is not a quality issue. We need to make sure that the produced water is accounted for. If we cannot, then we should be worried what is happening to it because it is poor quality water. Mr. Smith volunteered to talk to the engineers at the oil and gas commission in Casper. They commission has a great database and may be able to produce the data we are looking for and if it is possible I will forward it to the Water Resource Task Group.

Paul Hagenstein commented that it seems most or all of the produced water is accounted for one way or another. Cally McKee agreed and said that the vast majority of produced water is documented and that data is accurate and available. The difficult part will be separating the disposal of produced water from one gas field to another. For example, Ultra has a water disposal well in Jonah that disposes Anticline water and Shell disposes Anticline water over in Big Piney and LaBarge. It will be difficult to determine where all the water is going unless you take into account all of the fields together. That has been Robin Smith's concern as well. We will never be able to get a complete balance of produced and disposed water.

Paul Hagenstein inquired about Anticline Disposal's reporting requirements and asked how it would be possible to track produced water at that facility since some is evaporated, some is recycled and some is reused. Water is going in and out and we don't know how much. Robin Smith indicated that he would attempt to identify all the ways that produced water is handled and find out if there is a discrepancy between the numbers.

Cathy Purves then raised a question about produced water reinjection. She noted that some of the disposal wells are near surface water like the New Fork River and asked if there is hydrologic information available that delineates, identifies and ensures that injected water does not contaminate aquifers. Robin Smith responded that there are

different classes of injection wells depending on what is being injected. The rules and regulations for injection wells come from EPA and are enforced by Wyoming DEQ. The operators are required, as part of the injection well application process, to provide data about the formation they are injecting into and show that it does not have drinking water quality and is not connected to any high quality aquifers, although Mr. Smith does not know how that information is verified. The operators have to do pump tests and submit regular reports about the wells with regards to the class of water being injected. Cally McKee added that the applications and authorizations are posted on the WOGC website and that injection wells are drill between 5000 and 7000 feet, well below drinking water aquifers.

Dave Crowley then asked if produced water would still remain an issue once all of the liquid gathering facilities have been installed. If water produced during the drilling process is placed directly into the gathering system and produced water is no longer trucked by Shell, Ultra, and Questar, can we simply take the volume of water added into the system and compare that with the volume of water injected or sent to Anticline Disposal? It seems that trucking water is the only place where water can be disposed of improperly. Jocelyn Moore agreed but reminded the group that there are still the smaller operators who would be trucking their produced water.

Cathy Purves then continued the discussion by asking about the reserve pits, possible contamination from them, and any monitoring that is being done at the pits. Dave Crowley responded that the pits are not supposed to contain hydrocarbons, but currently the environmental protection specialist position at the BLM is vacant and so only the NRS would be looking at the pits, and realistically that happens infrequently. Robin Smith replied that the Oil and Gas Commission does monitor occasionally. Mr. Crowley then followed-up by asking if produced water is being stored in the pits. Mr. Smith responded that produced water or hydrocarbons should not be in the pits and the pits should only be used for drilling fluids. Kevin Williams added that occasionally hydrocarbon residue will come up with the drilling fluids and may end up in the pits. Mr. Smith continued to say that the Oil and Gas Commission regulations required that if hydrocarbons are introduced they are supposed to be removed in 24 hours. If the hydrocarbons are not cleaned or they are continually reintroduced, the pits must be flagged or have some sort of bird deterrent installed. Cally McKee added that Ultra has pit skimming units that follow closely behind the completions operations to remove hydrocarbons, usually within 24 hours.

Dave Crowley asked Cally McKee and Kevin William how wells are drilled and completed without the use of reserve pits. Robin Smith indicated that they generally use a closed loop centrifuge to separate the fluids. Kevin William added that it varies by operator and Questar's system was a result of the winter drilling EA which prohibited reserve pits but allowed cuttings pits if the drill cuttings were sorted by centrifuge. Cally McKee indicated that Ultra was in the process of installing closed loop systems.

Robin Smith explained the difference between reserve pits and cuttings pits. Reserve pits are divided into two parts. One contains a reserve of water and drilling mud for the drilling process, especially when water is being lost in the hole and not recovered for reuse. The other part is where the cuttings and are separated from the drilling mud so that the mud and water can be reused during the drilling process. A cuttings pit is where a closed loop system is employed, separating the solid and the water, and the only thing that goes into the cuttings pit is are the separated solids from the centrifuge.

To resolve the produced water questions, Robin Smith asked if the group was in agreement with and comfortable with his plan to meet with the State Engineers Office and report back to the PAWG before any additional steps were taken to deal with produced water. All PAWG members were in agreement.

PAWG Meeting Schedule for 2009

A brief discussion about meeting schedules occurred. The PAWG members decided on the following dates for upcoming meetings in 2009: January 15, March 26, May 28, July 23, and September 24. A potential meeting in October or November will be discussed at future meetings.

Task Group Updates

Water Resources Task Group (WRTG)

Now the PAWG heard from Water Resource Task Group Chairwoman, Jocelyn Moore on the status of the WRTG. As background history, Ms. Moore explained that the WRTG has never been able to speak as one voice. This TG has always been so diverse that there has been no consensus recommendations sent to the PAWG, instead they have just packaged everything together and forwarded recommendations as a whole. The WRTG has not met since September, primarily since the WRTG did not have anything in hand to review. Instead, Ms. Moore asked that if task group members had any suggestions they would like to submit to the PAWG, email them to her and she would bring them up to the PAWG. So she is presenting two sets of suggestions to the PAWG. The following points (1-8) are the suggestions brought forward for consideration by the PAWG during the September meeting of the WRTG. They are not consensus suggestions but rather they include all of the suggestions for considerations, regardless of consensus.

- 1 – Have the BLM test the water wells that were not tested because of LEL alarms.
- 2 - Ask BLM to put water well data into a user-friendly, analyzed format.
- 3- Install new monitoring wells to replace wells closed by State Engineers Office so that data points are not lost
- 4- Ask BLM to increase awareness and monitoring of erosion and storm water management issues and requirements for industrial development.
- 5 – Task Group will select another baseline sampling site. Once that site is selected, the WRTG we will ask PAWG to recommend changes to BLM water monitoring plan.
- 6 – Ask BLM to require installation of back-flow preventers
- 7– Ask BLM, if possible, to prohibit use of hydrocarbon-based pipe grease (“pipe-dope”).
- 8- When Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Plan is released, allow the WRTG to review the plan and submit comments to the PAWG for their consideration.

The second set of recommendations, (A-F) are suggestions from WRTG members that have not been discussed during the WRTG meeting but that the Chairwoman feels are important issues that need PAWGs attention. These are not consensus recommendations either, but if there had been another meeting these issues would have been included above.

A-The ROD only names the BLM and industry in the development of the Interim Groundwater Pollution, Prevention Plan, but the public should have a voice in the development of the plan. Ask BLM to include a member of the public in the planning process.

B - Allow the WRTG to comment on the Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Plan and submit those comments to the PAWG before the plan becomes final.

C- Include existing USGS water well data into analysis of industrial water wells for user-friendly format.

D – Include a component in Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention plan requiring result of water well testing to be reported to the WRTG.

E – Study and characterize the aquifers

F – Require and enforce more and stricter inspections of water well sites for sources of pollution and have a standardized defined mitigation procedure that would be enforced when detection occurs and incorporate that into the sampling and monitoring plan.

Some of these comments and suggestions overlap others and some have already been implemented in part or completely. Regardless, these are the comments of the WRTG members for the PAWGs consideration and may not be a consensus of the group.

Cathy Purves appreciated the question about the planning team for the Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Plan and who is allowed to participate in that. Is the public-at-large or an NGO appointed to be involved in that effort?

Chuck Otto indicated that it is his intent to have both the PAWG and the WRTG review the draft Pollution Prevention plan. As soon as we have the draft plan we will supply it to the PAWG and WRTG but we don't have anyone assigned to attend the meetings.

Jocelyn Moore said she would be more comfortable having somebody assigned to attend the meetings and provide input, especially since the operators have seat at the PAWG and also in the Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Plan meetings, but the public does not, they are simply being represented by the government. Mr. Otto then said that through the PAWG the public could have representation at these meetings and the PAWG could recommend a member to represent the public at the meetings. Mr. Otto also he reminded the PAWG that the ROD had strict timelines and while they may not have allotted enough time to get it done, we were going to try very hard to do it on time.

Cathy Purves then made a motion to ask the BLM to allow a member of the PAWG or the PAWG WRTG to participate in the development of the Interim Groundwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Paul Hagenstein provided a second and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Purves then asked the PAWG chair to assign a representative, suggested Jocelyn Moore, and asked that the PAWG and the assigned members be provided with minutes from the meeting today. Mrs. Moore volunteered to accept the responsibility and Ms. Purves agreed to fill in for her if necessary.

The conversation then moved to a discussion about the loss of data points in the monitoring of water wells. Robin Smith recalled that one of the water wells that the State Engineers office required to be closed tested positive for hydrocarbons and then asked why the WRTG was concerned about the water well closure and the need to install monitoring wells. Ms. Moore indicated that the WRTG was concerned that if contamination is occurring, without a water well to test there is no way to find it, the loss of sampling points will result in "false negative" results, and that without the test wells, there is no way to know if pollution is ongoing, increasing, spreading, or declining.

The discussion continued to include the merits of maintaining data points, the validity of data points replaced with new wells, who is responsible for closing wells, who is responsible for monitoring contamination or detection of

hydrocarbons, who is responsible for ground water pollution and storm water plans? Can BLM better enforce erosion and storm water management practices? Or is that strictly the DEQ?

The State Engineers Office required the wells to be closed but the DEQ was not informed of the closures. Jocelyn Moore indicated that the DEQ recommended that monitoring wells be installed to replace closed wells.

Robin Smith reminded the assembly that there are data gaps everywhere and closed well data points can never be replaced, it would just create a new data point. There is no point drilling wells to find leaks and contamination, rather we should just continue to test existing wells to make sure contamination is not happening at existing wells.

Another topic discussed was the water well drilling practices. Poor practices could lead to water well contamination. The BLM does not have authority to require specific practices, but DEQ or State Engineer does. BLM has issued a moratorium on water wells on the Anticline so operators may have a permit from State Engineer, but BLM will not approve the surface location.

The discussion then returned to the list of recommendations provided to the PAWG from the WRTG. All members were in agreement that since some of the recommendations had already been forwarded to the BLM in a previous PAWG meeting, and other items cannot be regulated by the BLM, thus PAWG recommendations would be limited to new items. On this topic Ms. Purves indicated that recommendation F is appropriate, but goes beyond the water sampling and monitoring plan and should be considered an independent action. Ms. Smith followed up by saying that recommendation F is unclear and we should check back with Dr. Kramer, who offered the recommendation, to see if he was referring to all water wells, all gas wells, wells that had positive detections, etc.

Paul Hagenstein expressed frustration that since 2001 all the PAWG has done is monitoring and that what we need now is mitigation. We know there is a problem and we need to fix it by adding a standardized mitigation plan to the monitoring plan. The discussions about the frustrations associated with multiple agencies responsible for industrial water wells and the inability to identify and solve the problems with hydrocarbon detection continued.

At this point, Robin Smith made an attempt to summarize and move forward with the recommendations from the WRTG. The members agreed that many suggestions were all already being implemented or would be included in the Groundwater Pollution and Prevention Plan and did not need additional action from the PAWG. **Cathy Purves then made a motion to recommend item 2; specifically that the BLM develop a user-friendly guide to the water resources in Sublette County, including a report explaining the water well testing scenario in layman 's terms for the benefit of the public to be released by the PAWG annually. Scott Smith provided a second and the motion passed unanimously.**

After additional discussions of probable causes for hydrocarbon detection, Ms. Purves amended her motion to include the recommendation that the BLM also prepare in the annual report a discussion of the remediation and contamination status of those wells that have tested positive for hydrocarbons. Scott Smith provided a second and the amended motion passed unanimously.

Paul Hagenstein continued discussions about the WRTG recommendations. The PAWG members discussed the WRTG suggestions with regard to previous PAWG recommendations and the ROD requirements. All members agreed that items 3, 4, and 7 had not yet been included as part of other recommendations or as requirements in the ROD. **Paul Hagenstein made a motion to forward recommendations 3, 4, and 7 to the BLM: specifically that BLM require operators to install new monitoring wells to replace wells closed by State Engineers Office so that data points are not lost; and that BLM to increase awareness and monitoring by its employees of erosion and storm water management issues and requirements for industrial development; and that BLM, if possible, prohibit use of hydrocarbon-based**

pipe grease (“pipe-dope”) for water wells. Cathy Purves provided a second. Mr. Hagenstein, Mrs. Kunard, Ms. Purves, and Scott Smith voted yes. Robin Smith voted no because he felt that additional monitoring wells would not provide valuable data. The motion passed 4 votes to 1.

Other Topics

PAWG Nominations close tomorrow. We have received nominations for Kevin Williams – Oil and Gas Operators and Bart Meyers – Sublette County Government and hope to have those appointments approved before the new administration takes over in January.

PAWG member Callie Domek regrets that she has not attended any PAWG meetings yet and was wondering if someone can take her place. She was under the impression that PAWG meetings would not resume until spring. Robin Smith suggested that the BLM contact her and stress that she needs to attend the meetings.

The Pinedale RMP public protest period has closed. We have received 12 protests, much fewer than expected and that resolution should be completed by the end of November with the RMP signed sometime in December.

Other Projects in Pinedale includes:

Cimarex/Rand’s Butte – public scoping meeting was held last week.

Aspen Regeneration Project – burn is scheduled for the spring.

Paradise Powerline 230kv – surveys are being done through the anticline now and will continue in the spring.

NPL – EA development is ongoing. The operators have proposed shifting the core area to the northwest. That would create a new alternative in the EA.

EOG LaBarge Platform – Notice of Intent is in the State Office and will go out for scoping after publication in the federal register.

The Lander Road PA is being amended to recognize the new development scenario allowed by the ROD on the Anticline.

191 Bypass road – BLM has done our part, waiting on county to do their part.

Seismic – four seismic projects proposed, Shell and EnCana on BLM, and two on private. Shell is the only active project with one line across the Mesa.

PAWG Chair

At the last meeting, PAWG Chairman Robin Smith announced his intention to resign from the PAWG at the end of his term today. Now the PAWG needs to appoint a new chairperson. Paul Hagenstein made a motion to appoint vice-Chair Cathy Purves as new PAWG Chair for the 2009-2010 term. Scott Smith provided a second and the motion passed unanimously. Cathy Purves will be the new PAWG Chairwoman effective at the next meeting.

Public Input

At this time the floor was opened for public comment or input. There was no response from the members of the public present.

Adjourn

Scott Smith then made a motion to adjourn, Paul Hagenstein provided a second and the motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.