

**Pinedale Anticline Working Group**

**APPROVED**

**Meeting Minutes**

**1:00 PM Thursday, March 25, 2010**

**Rendezvous Conference Room**

**Pinedale Field Office**

**1625 West Pine St.**

**Pinedale, Wyoming**

**In Attendance**

PAWG Members

Cathy Purves (Chair/Environmental) Paul Hagenstein (Livestock Operators), Bart Myers (Sublette County), Kevin Williams (Oil and Gas Operator), Nylla Kunard (Town of Pinedale), Scott Smith (State of Wyoming), Gary Rees (Public-at-Large), Jackson Schwabacher (Adjacent Landowner) via conference call.

PAWG Task Group Members

Jocelyn Moore (Water Resources), Clint Gilchrist (Cultural/Historical), Pete Guernsey (Wildlife), Tony Gosar (Water Resources).

BLM / Agencies

Brian Davis (BLM PFO FM/DFO) John Ruhs (BLM HDD DM), Larry Jensen (BLM), Dave Crowley (BLM), Jim Lucas (BLM), Deej Brown (BLM), Lorraine Keith (BLM), Shelley Gregory (BLM), Kellie Roadifer (BLM), Therese Hartman (WGFD), Dan Stroud (WGFD).

Public

Sandy Wise, Linda Baker, Stephanie Kessler, Courtney Skinner, Aimee Davison

Press

Derek Farr (Sublette Examiner), Caitlyn McAvoy (Pinedale Roundup)

**Discussion**

Introductions went around the room and Brian Davis (PAWG DFO) introduced Don Maruska.

Don Maruska was hired by the BLM to help the PAWG become a more effective and focused group to Mr. Maruska introduced himself and presented a memo regarding recommended actions to enhance effectiveness of PAWG and BLM collaborations. Those are:

- 1 – Focus PAWG’s work on the core tasks related to the Pinedale Anticline Project Area, specifically, a)provide advice about key issues (Wildlife, Water, Air) and b) foster communication with the public.
- 2-Adopt a new charter for the PAWG before June 15, 2010
- 3-Adopt a set of bylaws the provide guidance for the creation of subgroups.

4-Redirect interested members of the public and activities of the remaining current task groups that do not fit squarely with parameters of #1-#3 above.

5 - Boost flow of information between PAPO and public.

Don Maruska then presented a slideshow about FACA charter/resources advisory groups and his role in the facilitating the PAWG. PAWG should be effective way for public to become informed and provide input on PAPA development.

In order to make the PAWG more effective, we are looking for clear set of roles and responsibilities for the PAWG and the PAPO and to have a good understand and appreciation of roles. Some of the key points important for completion of this task are:

- constructive communication among PAWG members,
- consistent support from the BLM,
- having a limited number of key meetings, with key topics on which BLM seeks advice for its management responsibilities in the PAPA,
- timely feedback on disposition of recommendations that the BLM receives,
- Active participation of PAWG members during PAWG meetings.
- use the PAWG as a vehicle to get information back out to public

Some of the issues or concerns expressed by PAWG members related to this task are:

- how to create the framework and structure for processes that the people in the roles on the PAWG can be effective
- frustration of current and past members of the PAWG regarding roles responsibilities and impact – “spinning our wheels”
- changes in BLM leadership and staffing have created a lack of consistent direction
- mixed level of participation among PAWG members
- mixed level of participation from TGs

Some options for consideration to help the PAWG succeed:

- narrow focus,
- prepare info in advance for review,
- used County meetings as venue to discuss socio-economic issues,
- tap outside expertise,
- increase public understanding,
- publish info,
- provide feedback,
- provide continuity

The PAWG was created in the Anticline EIS and continued in SEIS. The role of the PAWG is to provide advice to BLM and provide mechanism for sharing information with the public. The “advice role” that the PAWG plays for the PFO must fit with Federal regulations (FACA). Formal advisory groups must be structure to proved fair approach under FACA. Also BLM has regulations regarding resource advisory groups. The key factors for success with advisory groups are: establish clear roles and responsibilities, focus on topic which BLM seeks advise, provide feedback, target subgroups on specific objectives, and

bring in the necessary expertise. For example, if there is a specific issue, the PAWG may want a TRT (technical resource team). It may involve only fed and specialist or a few more, but it is specific to the need of the PAWG and the BLM. Also, the BLM and PAWG must engage in collaboration with public and non-profit through defined projects. BLM and PAWG can engage the public in a more effective and successful way and boost the utility of information it receives from public.

A few things make the PAWG unique vs. other FACA groups. PAWG is only group that meets once a month. This change was made because of timing questions. PAWG is 9 members but has 7 task groups. No other group has almost as many TGs as members. It is challenging to have so few people keep track of so much.

Don Maruska developed a few recommendations for the PAWG based on his preliminary analysis of the situation. Those are:

- Focus PAWG's work on core tasks of PAPA
- Provide advice about key monitoring and mgmt issues (Wildlife, Air Quality, Water Resources)
- Foster communication with public: receive comments and concerns; serve as forum to provide info about PAPA and results of monitor and mitigation.
- The PAPO should be used as a key partner to obtain collect, store, distribute monitoring info to support adaptive management, analyze mitigation projects, and increase coordination with BLM, PAWG, JIO, and BOARD.

Don Maruska then asked if there were any comments or questions regarding the presentation.

Bart Meyers asked for clarification between the roles of the PAWG and PAPO.

Don Maruska indicated that the PAWG has the role of surfacing issues and concerns from the public in the PAPA. The PAPO, through the Board, is the engine to get monitoring and mitigation projects done. PAPO does the action; the PAWG can give opinions about management issues.

John Ruhs explained that he has struggled with questions. The PAPO is made of four entities – BLM, Dep. of Ag, WYGF, and WYDEQ. BLM provides oversight on how those agencies work together. BLM provides tools – specialists, resources, and FACA group -to provide advice and help make decisions. BLM uses those tools to take to the PAPO table to make management decisions. PAWG is forum that BLM has to provide input on what we take to the table. Other agencies don't have a means so PAWG serves as conduit for public.

Stephanie Kessler asked to speak and indicated that there has been a lack of integration between PAWG and PAPO. Last year I was encourage to write a grant to the PAPO and last meeting I saw the same thing from another TG. PAPO has rejected both proposals but because of lack of integration. I am not willing to do that kind of work, especially when BLM encourages one thing and PAPO questions why we are here. In the PAPO meeting last week, there was not even a mention of how the PAWG fits in with the PAPO goals.

Don Maruska stated that Ms. Kessler's comment leads us to the question of how we can be more constructive or productive in what BLM, PAWG, PAPO is trying to accomplish. That is why we are here.

Paul Hagenstein asked about the need to adopt a new charter.

The new administration is taking a hard look at FACA group charters, and in talking with the Washington Office, they are very much scrutinizing charter renewals and they are required charters to be rewritten if they don't meet current standards. We must make sure we keep groups in compliant modes. Industry and NGOs have litigation advisory groups. By not keeping the group compliant we are risking dissolving the group.

Taking into account specifics in the SEIS ROD and dialogue with the BLM Washington Office, we have formulated a draft. Brian Davis has sent out a draft of new charter for review. This is a two month process or more that we will have to walk through the Secretary's office. Mike Poole, Deputy Director of BLM is aware of the importance and timeline for this. Revising the charter is key to making the PAWG more effective. Time is of the essence but we can get it done.

Another issues with is Bylaws. Specifically how do you develop and guide subgroups. We will develop subgroup template, communication guidelines, and membership applications. We are now calling them 'sub-groups' so that there is not the perception that these are independent groups. They are subgroups of the PAWG responsible to the PAWG and the FACA charter.

Cathy Purves provided her perspective as PAWG chair. Task Group efforts have high interest value to the PAWG and Public so I think we should make it clear that we don't simply eliminate Task Groups but rather seek additional ways to make those topics stay in the flow of what we are doing on the PAPA. It is very important that, for example, if the SETG is not part of the PAWG, the BLM will support and encourage the county or other groups to pick up those issues. Because PAPA is not the only contributor to some of these issues, it is important to have these socioeconomic discussions, even if the PAWG not the place to do it. Also we need to be very sure at the end of the day that we all understand the roles.

Paul Hagenstein then asked about the status of the Socioeconomic Task Group.

Don Maruska stated that the SEIS really put socioeconomic issues in the hands of the county and the state. If PAWG or TGs are going to be effective, they need a path to get resolution. If there is no path available to the TGs through the PAWG or BLM then the best thing the PAWG can do is to shuttle the issues, with force, over to the agencies that are responsible. As I understand the BLM and the county and town have a plan of how to begin dealing with these issues. What we are saying here is that the SETG is not the child of the PAWG but rather should be the child of the County or the Town. PAWG should really focus on the issues that they are required to focus on like Air Quality, Water Resources, and Wildlife. An action you may want to take at the next meeting is to look at the results, responsibilities, and requirements of the Task Groups and what agencies are responsible for the resources and you may want to make a statement regarding how you want the BLM to carry those issues to the county.

Paul Hagenstein then expressed his frustration with the observation that we are right back to where we are before we had a Socioeconomic TG.

Nylla Kunard agreed. Our understanding is that the Socioeconomic TG was concerned with what PAPA oil and gas is going to do to our community. There is no way you can take out the human issue of Socioeconomics and say we are only going to look at the wildlife. I have seen the issues and we need (the TG) and the counties and the town are not dealing with it. Are we going to do away with all the task groups and only deal with Air Quality and Wildlife? Are we starting from scratch?

Don Maruska said that we are taking a look at where we are now and where we go from here. How does the PAWG move forward from here? We need to make sure that we aren't dealing only with what is important to the community but also what are the requirements of the SEIS. There may be very important issues but we must make sure that we reconcile that with what the PAWG can do. It may be that the PAWG can only serve as a vehicle for bringing those issues to other agencies

Cathy Purves stated that these TGs were developed because of the issues identified in NEPA. Socioeconomics is one of those issues and that is why the TG came about. A few years ago, BLM said socioeconomics is not important and not our responsibility. BLM is surface only, but it is very offensive to the public to suggest that socioeconomics is not important and we need to find a way to bring socioeconomic issues to the front and expect BLM to be proactively involved and supportive this go-around than they were in the past.

Don Maruska then directed the group to look at the recommendations proposed in his memo. The first issue is revision to Charter. The group looked at the Draft Charter. Some of the changes are: clarification of duties, quorum requirements, new framework for advisory groups (PAWG is model C), identifies additional member (10 total), ethics responsibilities, etc.

Jackson Schwabacher expressed a concern that the 'adjacent landowner' member had been removed

Brian Davis said he would double check but I don't think it is a problem to include that. Normally, adjacent landowner don't make sense but this case is different

Jackson Schwabacher then asked about the ethics of holding a grazing lease when under ethics section you say you cannot hold a lease.

Don Maruska stated that what that means is if the topic of a leasehold comes up you should recuse yourself from that discussion and that the purpose of the ethics section is to keep people as a member of the advisory council from making personal gain from your participation – keeping 'arms length' representation.

Linda Baker then asked to speak. She has served 2 terms on PAWG and participated for 10 years. Regarding ethics, how can those with direct financial interest participate in the decisions on monitoring and mitigation, especially oil and gas operators. How do they participate and what level and how do they separate direct financial interest from PAWG duties.

Cathy Purves then brought up the point that the Groups are listed according to permits. Group 1 has financial interest, Group 2 is NGO, and Group 3 is agency and academic. What about the scenario where Group 1 who has a financial interest could override groups 2 and 3?

Don Maruska indicated that the PAWG majority vote is designed to make sure that no single group can over influence the PAWG. The goal of the PAWG is to reconcile multiple interests to provide advice. A 5-4 vote is really not considered good advice. It doesn't help. Highest and best value is to listen to one another and find ways to work out issues among all parties.

Brian Davis reminded the group that this is a unique situation; PAWG is a programmatic project specific group. In larger groups there is more diversity, but we want to focus on objectivity of the PAWG and making good recommendations to BLM that BLM can use and implement. Unity of the group is very important to getting things done.

Scott Smith asked if membership in the PAWG is designed to trickle down to membership of subgroups.

Don Maruska stated that membership in SGs should be representative of membership on PAWG.

Cathy Purves then opened discussion on moving the draft charter forward for approval

CP – the original charter gave us 2 public at large. Now there is only one. Is there an issue with that?

After hearing concerns about the fact that the new charter only has one public-at-large member. Don Maruska stated that the charter doesn't specify that there has to be one from each category in each group but rather the Secretary may consider applications from those specific categories but those may include more than one specific member, such as public at large. The administration wants us to maintain balance. We are balancing desirable expertise and who are the best candidates.

Scott Smith asked if we are missing someone from one group, we don't have a quorum?

Don Maruska indicated, yes, but by increasing the importance of this we can encourage people to show up. When we complete the charter, we will solicit new membership. The Secretary's office will look for balanced membership.

After a few more minutes of discussion, **Bart Meyers made a motion to accept the draft charter as written with the assurance that Jackson's concerns are addressed. Scott Smith provided a second vote. All in favor none opposed. Motion passed.**

The next topic of discussion was the PAWG Bylaws and the creation and operation and selective formation of subgroups. The critical resources on the Pinedale Anticline Project area are Wildlife, Air Quality, and Water Resources. The PAWG itself should be focused on those core elements. Instead of a two-step process, advice regarding those issues would come straight from PAWG to BLM. How would a PAWG meeting function this way? You would hear from BLM specialists regarding issues. You would hear issues from the public or other PAWG members. You would hear from technical specialists. You would hear management and BLM employees discuss trade-offs between resources.

How do subgroups fit into this scenario? Subgroups are not independent groups. They don't require charter or other FACA requirements but should still be balanced within the intent of the PAWG. Subgroups should be used sparingly. If there are topics that need technical specialists, the TG would continue on. PAWG must provide template for subgroups: specify mission, expertise, # members, terms of membership, schedule, reporting process, etc. Subgroup should include at least one PAWG member and membership terms should not exceed 3 years. BLM sends out announcement for openings in subgroups, BLM recommends appointees. PAWG approves or denies recommendations. The PAWG must also follow-up and periodically review the mission and performance of subgroups.

Don Maruska then presented a template for how to review the mission and performance of subgroups.

What are current activities and next steps?

Who is responsible for decisions to those items?

What is timeframe for actions?

How does it relate to PAWG?

Who does what where, who, when?

Communication Guidelines: - goal is to get good product

## Membership Applications

Mr. Maruska stated that he wanted to give the PAWG a sense of some direction but not to prejudice or bias the results of the subgroup review. But, since you were asking about what might happen with these groups I will give you some preliminary thinking. This is very draft, very preliminary. Don't read too much into it.

The first idea is to transition wildlife, air quality, water resources, and reclamation into PAWG because these are key issues the PAWG is responsible for. Rather than being stand-alone task groups, these would become the role of the PAWG. Then for the other task groups I suggest the following course of action:

Cultural Historical - form subgroup and/or partner

Socio Economic – shift to County/Towns/State with BLM having key role as participant and continue to take 10 year forecast and make projections as Socioeconomic Specialist has done.

Not to say that socioeconomics not important, but based on roles and responsibilities, this is the appropriate course.

Transportation – shift to County/Towns

We are not asking for decisions today, but this should be topic of discussion for next meeting.

### Next Steps:

- Submit revised charter
- Plan next meeting after approval
- Address one or more key issues on which BLM is seeking advice
- Review existing Task Groups and determine which will become subgroups
- Receive comment from public
- Discuss ways to decimate information

Discussion continued regarding how the proposed changes would work. Specifically how the PAWG could make decisions on the Wildlife, Air Quality, Water Quality, and Reclamation without the task groups? Would the PAWG really be relying on the PAPO and the specialists? There was some disagreement and concern about the task group proposals.

Don Maruska indicated that, yes, the PAWG would be hearing directly from those groups rather than TGs. He then tried to clarify by providing some “decision points” on which to focus the group's concerns

- Are you as the PAWG willing to make decisions about WL, AQ, WR, and REC?
- Will having meetings less frequently lead to more meaningful discussion. You would be reviewing information that comes from various specialists.
- Your job at the PAWG is to comment on the information from the specialists and other groups
- Can PAWG address key issues directly
- Existing TGs and liaisons and DFO review effectiveness and need and report to PAWG
- PAWG resolves roles of existing TGs (i.e. dispositions, other venue, subgroups etc)

Brian Davis then spoke about issues that precipitated this change in the subgroups: highly technical issues; some technical specialist in the TGs feel that they are trying to appease a whole room of people rather than develop technical recommendations. TGs are not individual FACA groups and are not the forum for public discussion. Also, we need to have the right people and right presentations so that PAWG can understand the issues and make recommendations

Cathy Purves then expressed a concern mirrored by other PAWG members. I see a tremendous amount of work and transparency necessary to make this work. We can't just depend on BLM we need to depend on agencies if we can't depend on TGs to get the information in front of the PAWG. This will have to be completely different from how we have done things in the past. I am worried about the burden that will be placed on underfunded and understaffed BLM and we need a clear written direction about how this will work.

Linda Bakers stated that we need a clear written role of the specific BLM people who will be providing information to the PAWG with a specific time frame. There needs to be a response back to the PAWG and TGs to make sure they are on the right track and as PAWG provides recommendations, the BLM must answer back in a timely way.

Don Maruska asked is the pathway going to be useful to the PAWG or do you feel something else would work better. I've heard from the task groups that they are unclear about their roles, I've heard that TGs have made decisions about XYZ – but under FACA that is not how task groups function, I've heard that the TGs do all this work with no resolution; overall, there is too much going on, too many boats, but the question is the pathway, will this path work to making the PAWG more effective

Bart Meyers indicated that this is helpful. One thing I see is that we will have time to review recommendations before we make them. I think that would be more effective and work better.

Jackson Schwabacher asked how many “boats” or subgroups we should have at one time.

Don Maruska responded; no more than 2 or 3 at a time. And they don't live forever. They are created for a purpose and when completed they are dissolved. It creates flexibility to get the job done and ownership, these are your children that you have controls over

Scott Smith indicated that we have these seven major issues that aren't going away over the life of the project. Are you saying that these groups would have one two or three things that groups should be focusing on, not the seven issues?

Don Maruska clarified that issues may come and go from the forefront. Issues remain but importance of management decisions may change. The TG chairs, liaisons, and the DFO will need to cull the Task Groups and figure out their responsibilities and how they change over time.

### **Previous Minutes**

The group then reviewed the minutes from the February 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

A few minor spelling, and name changes were made. Cathy Purves requested that page numbers be added to minutes in the future.

**Bart Meyers made a motion to approve the minutes with notations and changes as discussed. Kevin Williams provided a second vote. All in favor none opposed. Motion carried.**

## **Cultural Historical Task Group**

Clint Gilchrist, Cultural Historical TG Chair then presented the results of the last Cultural Historical Task Group Meeting. There were no new recommendations today. Last year the CHTG made recommendations to consider looking at willing private landowner river crossings as conservation easements. That is currently being worked on by BLM. Since the inception of the TG, we have been seeing impacts to some cultural sites in the area. We have tried to get a handle on this through volunteer efforts, but it has proven to be spotty. Last year the CHTG recommended a monitoring program for keeping an eye on sites a result of direct or indirect impacts from the PAPO. Investigation of Lander Road hinted at additional segments of the trail to be investigated. Dave Crowley found the original route of the Lander Road through the Pinedale Anticline. This has had pretty big impacts on Shell and Ultra. Also, there is evidence to suggest a Ferry Route running south of the NF river crossing. Not yet a documented part of the trail but it should be. There are three projects that the CHTG would like to reinstate – Lander Trail Viewshed Monitoring Project, the Ferry Route recording, and NRCS soil studies which can be very helpful in predicting buried cultural resources. Soil studies are completed but have never been incorporated and would like to see those incorporated. The CHTG would like to evaluate the process of discovering archaeological sites. There is a process with BLM, SHPO and operators to protect avoid and evaluate sites. Would like to see a predictive model about where sites are likely to be found. 1428 sites found total on the Anticline, with 550 found in the last 5 years. Using those data points we may be able to improve process of archaeological discoveries. In 2005 the contract ended for cultural resource summary report to be written. It summarized types and kinds of sites and details about important sites and was a very technical document but very helpful. This internal document is 5 years old and needs to be updated. CHTG will explore ways to get that done.

## **Avian Management Plan**

Lisa Solberg then discussed the Avian Management plan for Anticline. This topic has been ongoing since the beginning of the SEIS ROD. The Wildlife monitoring plans said we will develop an Avian Management Plan because in the ROD there was conflict between MBTA and BEPA. Specifically, we cannot allow known 'take' but the ROD is going to cause take. Internally, BLM developed a plan under the ROD using tools that the ROD specified. It was brought forward whether you could use deterrents a tool. Last week we presented the Avian Plan to the PAPO Board so that the PAPO realizes this is an issue and applies for money to get a contractor to develop and write the plan. Goal is to have it complete by 2011. One item discussed internally was including the WLTG in the development of this plan. It is more appropriate to tweak the plan that has been started to bring up the issues that were brought to the board and then have the TG give input to the plan. Part of what we are facing now is because we have year round development, particularly in DA-2 and DA-3 is that Air Quality and the adaptive management process in the SEIS was to facilitate migration of big game and not having clustered development. The issue we are finding is when you are concentrating development where you have an active raptor nest, we cannot tell operators to leave the area because it negates the 'once on a pad, stay on a pad' concept and hurts AQ issues. But, doing that, we cannot avoid take. We've been struggling with how to do both. We are also trying to figure out a way to observe the requirements of MBTA, but the SEIS says that if you consult with G&F and the FWS, we can develop a plan. How do we implement the ROD and manage the birds at the same time

Brian Davis stated that he wants to have the bios (Lisa, Theresa, Theresa) prepare a draft plan, with assistance from the PAPO to help complete the plan. We need to move it forward, get a draft, and bring it through the PAWG. Industry has asked why the agency hasn't developed a plan yet. We need a plan

but we have this checkerboard of ownership which makes it difficult. It would be better to have all on board so we can understand the avian situation. If we have a better picture of the area, we can develop better ideas when the operators come to us. If we take the big picture, we can come up with solutions. Also, the operators have some leverage with land owners that BLM doesn't have. It's difficult because we have a long narrow strip to manage. If we look on a landscape level, that will allow the operators to come back with proposals that will allow us to manage the birds and meet the requirements of the law

Linda Baker stated that the BGEA is very clear on the laws so I don't think that determent meets the law and also you are not considering fidelity to a nest bird. By looking at the landscape you may be protecting habitat but you are causing take on the fidelity of the nesting birds

Don Maruska illustrated this issue as a heads-up scenario that BLM is notifying PAWG about. As an example, BLM should ask the PAWG, what are the issues or concerns that PAWG wants to be certain that BLM address in the development of an avian plan? Or, if you don't have one that comes to mind, maybe you know sources of expertise that could help us to understand the issues? Mr. Maruska then asked PAWG members if they had an idea or an example of how this scenario could play-out and PAWG members provided some examples and a discussion ensued.

Don Maruska then explained that this is a quick example how these issues would be "teed-up". The next stage would be what advice we could give to the BLM to help them make their management decisions. This is an example of how the BLM specialists would provide input instead of the Task Groups and an example where we would get rid of an extra loop instead of going to the WLTG. It would go straight to the PAWG from specialist review.

Cathy Purves then asked about time-sensitive issues.

Mr. Maruska stated that one of the things that the review of the task groups will do is to map the timeline and the issues together so that the PAWG can decide how frequently to meet or the PAWG can schedule a special meeting.

Clint Gilchrist then added one observation; I agree that PAWG and TGs had a problem, but the TGs had provided a lot of input from a lot of people with specialized information. The TGs are very useful for that. When you get rid of the TGs you lose the focus of those people who care about specialized issues. I don't want to comment on air and water and wildlife so I wouldn't want to be on this kind of board, but I do want to comment on cultural resources and that's why I am willing to serve on a TG. Also, BLM should find a way to get passive opinions. The active opinions are here today but the TGs allowed the groups to gather the passive input and it puts a lot of work on the PAWG members specifically who are good for general knowledge but not specific information. Don't allow the process to become too bureaucratic. If a targeted task group could go out and ask peoples opinion that would be a good compromise.

Don Maruska reminded the groups that there is a distinction between those people who have an interest or concern vs. those people who have data and expertise. Opinions and concerns should be expressed in public comment, but technical specialty should be made part of subgroups.

Linda Baker agreed. I feel hamstrung in this process without many opportunities to comment but I really appreciate Clint's comments. I also appreciate the mention of having a targeted focus group. There are so many questions about the avian management plan, but how do I engage when I don't have the information of what has been said and done.

Larry Jensen then provided an update on the water resource issues that the PAWG has recommended.

First item: a recommendation to allow change in Groundwater Sampling Process to allow sampling for Naphthalene and 2 methyl Naphthalene. BLM's response: – what is being sample now is sufficient

Second item: a recommendation to add chloride and fluoride (already sampled but not reported) to sampling results. BLM's response – this has been added to the results.

Third item: a recommendation that BLM request frac fluid constituents. BLM's Response: this is currently being addressed by the EPA and WYOGC and we may see it come from a Washington Office level response as well.

### **Action Items and Other Business**

Gary Rees would like to use personal email instead of work email

Chris Corlis voluntarily resigned from public at large position.

Dan Stroud would send mule deer final draft EA to PAWG.

Jim Lucas handed out PAPO monitoring and mitigation handout and discussed requirements of monitoring and mitigation then demonstrated the new website.

Therese Hartman presented an update of WL monitoring and mitigation projects.

Third Party review from the CO-OP review should be received by the end of the month.

Dan Stroud apologized for not having the Mesa vegetation treatment proposal available. Sommers Grindstone maps are hanging in the conference room for review.

The April 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting needs to be rescheduled. Is there an alternative date we could consider?

**Kevin William made a motion that we cancel April and May meetings and reschedule for May 6<sup>th</sup>. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed. PAWG meeting scheduled for May 6<sup>th</sup>.**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Courtney Skinner asked that the PAWG please think long and hard about the cultural historical task group. Also, what about recreation? The PAWG should consider recreation.

**Nylla Kunard made a motion to adjourn. Kevin Williams provided a second vote. All in favor.**

**Meeting adjourned at 5:40pm**