

Pinedale Anticline Working Group  
**DRAFT**  
MEETING MINUTES  
10AM Thursday, November 4, 2010  
Rendezvous Conference Room  
BLM Pinedale Field Office

**Action Items**

Scott Smith to get deer road kill numbers from WYDOT.  
Ensure Oct. 20 Adaptive Management Memo posted on PAPO website.  
Invite Air Quality Task Group members and DEQ staffers to attend next meeting.

**In Attendance**

PAWG Members

Cathy Purves (Chair/Environmental), Bart Myers (Sublette County), Kevin Williams (Oil and Gas Operator), Nylla Kunard (Town of Pinedale), Gary Rees (Public-at-Large), Paul Hagenstein (Livestock Operator), Absent: Jackson Schwabacher (Adjacent Landowner)

PAWG Task Group Members

BLM

Shane DeForest, Shelley Gregory, Merry Gamper via phone from WY SO

DEQ Via phone: Deb Harris in Lander.

Public

Scott Smith (WYG&F), Stephanie Kessler (Wilderness Society)

Press

10:04 Cathy called the meeting to order

**Approval of Previous Minutes**

**Paul Hagenstein moves to approve the October 1, 2010 minutes as amended; Nylla Kunard seconds. All in favor to approve as amended. Motion passes.**

**BLM Field Office Report**

Shane DeForest: Projects proposed for PAPO funding deadline was 10/31. Proposals are available for public review. A new resource advisory council (RAC) was approved for Wyoming. LaBarge Platform draft EIS still under development. NPL EIS contractor selection process underway with the Federal Register Notice of Intent under review. Noble Basin draft EIS ongoing – currently being reviewed internally and will be out for public review sometime in the next 30 days. Trigger has been met on mule deer. Presentation & notes from Wildlife Annual Planning Meeting available on web. Received a lot of useful comments from public - working on response/evaluation. Will have follow-up meeting in a month with G&F, operators and BLM to review and identify additional actions. January will be next public meeting. Note that the ROD is working the way it was meant to do. Intent of matrix was to intervene if trigger was met. We don't want to overreact. ROD identifies adaptive management process – but didn't go into any depth on how to implement this. We've prepared a procedure to receive, consider, and take

action for adaptive management. We also went through the Co-Op review process and developed recommendations in three areas: mule deer, antelope and sage grouse. G&F and BLM concurred with these recommendations. Next step is for FM to make info available to public and PAWG for 14 day comment, then adopt or make decision on the adaptive management change proposal. Nov 29<sup>th</sup> is deadline for PAWG nominations; the BLM will expedite the review process and follow through with commitment. Cathy Purves: Will PAWG have an opportunity to comment through this process? Shane: PAWG is a federally chartered advisory board, so it cannot make a recommendation without going through the public meeting process. Individual members can still submit comments as individuals, as members of the PAWG – not from the PAWG. Cathy: The PAWG will be notified that they have 14 days to comment. Shane: For PAWG board, during course of one of these meetings, if they have interest or concern on particular thing, we can adapt the next meeting agenda. But don't avoid opportunities to comment - two different kinds of venues for the PAWG to provide feedback – one is official as per charter; two is through comment process. Cathy offers to gather comments, then collectively submit them to the BLM. Cathy: Annual wildlife meeting...many suggestions made at meeting and by the deadline (11/3), but PAWG didn't get to participate. Now we're asking for suggestions and recommendation(s). Linda Baker: Now that we have the wildlife monitoring data, trigger met, obviously we've exceeded the ability to act proactively. Does PAWG have any recommendations now for the BLM? Shane: Based on PAPO requests, Co-op and G&F have pulled those portions of the matrix for further review and analysis. We'll come back to the next PAWG meeting, after other meeting to review recommendations, and ask for advice. Darrell Walker: What is relation between PAWG and PAPO and what role for co-op agencies, Anticline RMP, and implementation of RMP? Implementation never a clear thing. Shane: PAWG to PAPO – document was prepared identifying that relationship. Co-op agencies role defined narrowly to be involved during development of planning document. Once decision in place, we move to implementation. The PAWG is the instrument through which additional recommendations are provided. As opportunities present, we go out to the public asking for input. Darrell: BLM review, NEPA process, public lands process with county commissioners and SCCD. Would like to discuss at break.

A discussion followed regarding the deer population and the effect of vehicle traffic on it. WYDOT tracks road kill. G&F responsible when they're alive and WYDOT responsible when they're dead. Gary Rees: Agrees with Paul. Thinks highways, BLM, oil companies might be getting a bad rap. Look at number of dead animals on highways. He would like information on mortalities from the road kills - more deaths on highways than from oil field causes. Kevin Williams would like to see the numbers also. Agrees with Shane that the ROD is working. Scott: Pursue additional data from WYDOT. As discussed last week, he is open for any kind of additional mitigation. Bart Myers: We don't know that the highway quality is a factor in the decline in populations (the 60% decline in mule deer). Motion: The review team factors WYDOT mortality numbers into the follow-up for the BLM to develop additional mitigation. Shane: We will address this information next month (provided by Scott). Paul: Is traffic on Anticline and Jonah as bad or worse at 35 mph as it is at 65 mph on the highways? Bridge needed across New Fork at Boulder and keep the traffic out there. Cathy: Is there a high mortality on the Anticline and Jonah for mule deer and sage grouse? Scott: No. Paul is suggesting traffic through winter range - has issue with what is crucial winter range. Motion to redirect traffic from Trappers Point, highways 191/189, to south end of Jonah, the Anticline crest road. Kevin: Big problem is the actual, physical closure of north Anticline road, on the north end. Gates get shut and locked from 1/1 to 5/1 each year. Trying to redirect all operator activity traffic to middle crest and north Anticline roads (would need bridge) would result in BLM and G&F having to figure out if they can lift the closure on the road itself. Cathy: Have the review team factor for mortality - consider redirecting traffic & speed, slowdown in gas exploration, LGS impact, and physical closure of road? Paul moves that we recommend the elements just defined to the review team.

Gary Rees seconds. All in favor. Kevin not necessarily opposed, just a bunch of stuff lumped together, too much into one motion.

**Paul motions to ask review team to factor in highway mortality trends. Gary Rees seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.**

Kevin: Road issue Paul brought up...should this be an actual recommendation? Paul: BLM needs to provide information on redirecting traffic on specific roads, and/or what are the impacts of redirecting traffic from 189 to other roads? Where are the animals? Shane: To clarify – what would be the impacts of redirecting traffic from 189/191 to the Pinedale/Jonah industrial road to the Anticline road? Cally McKee: BLM needs to provide the last two years of traffic data. Linda: Recommend that PAWG consider taking a look at wildlife monitoring and using that monitoring to determine what impacts are causing mortalities and addressing mitigation thusly. What are the impacts, how can we improve the monitoring, rather than casting about for potential reasons. Is monitoring adequate to determine causes of wildlife population declines? Cathy: Does the PAWG want to consider Linda's recommendation? Scott: PAWG can forward this recommendation back to the BLM, and they can address Linda's request. Again, the wildlife monitoring in place now is directly addressing the ROD. Linda is asking if it's adequate to prove cause and effect of population change. Cathy: Do we want to move this forward as a recommendation? Based on Linda's recommendation, Cathy motions that the PAWG asks the BLM and/or the review team to consider alternative population monitoring. There was no second. Motion failed.

### **Fencing Update**

Tim Zebulsk: Question came up about how pads, reserve pits, etc. are fenced. How it can affect wildlife and cattle (migration and movement). Operators required to fence. Some operators prefer to fence the entire pad, rather than just the pits. Operators may also opt to fence an area in reclamation to give the vegetation a chance to get established (protect from animals). Handout of fence guidelines. BLM considers whether existing fences and proposed fencing will provide a pinch point or interior corners for wildlife and/or cattle. We also determine if the pad is directly in the corridor (migration) of historical cattle movement (drift), especially as related to a water source. These are some of the considerations when we do the on-site visits to the well site(s). Definitely try to keep animals out of the pits. Operators are increasingly using closed fluid systems which negates the need for open pits. Paul H: Have you discussed wildlife friendly fencing with WYDOT? WYDOT maintains all of the fences along the highways. Shane: Two different philosophies...WYDOT fences to meet their obligation to public safety (liability), so their fencing designs are meant to prevent animals from moving onto the road. That approach is different from the purpose of BLM's fences. Have to balance all competing needs. Individual decisions made per site. The operators are very well aware of the needs/requirements. Kevin Williams: Beneficial to just fence cuttings pit, but other operators have different needs. Tim: Conflicts include others who use the areas and cause issues that the oil and gas operators may not be aware of, but they are generally quick to respond once they know. Courtney Skinner: Doesn't the BLM have a fencing design that is wildlife friendly like GRVLT? Tim: Yes – very similar. G&F, GRVLT, and operator requirements (BLM) are very similar. BLM enforces these requirements depending on the purpose(s) of the fence(s). Older fences will be rebuilt to standard as time goes on and they need rebuilt.

### **USGS Presentation on GIS Database**

Dan Sprangers from BLM State Office and Chris Emerick and Don Brown with USGS discussed the current Jonah Infill Data Management System. They explained how it is set up, what information is submitted by operators, and how to navigate through the site. A similar database (PADMS) is being developed for the PAPO/PAPA to capture wildlife data as well as operator-submitted disturbance and reclamation data. They welcome any comments on how to make improvements. Stephanie Kessler: Are you going to have

time indication (it is collected seasonally). Would be interesting to pull up drilling information for a particular period, and where the collared wildlife are... A: Not sure how interactive it can be, but there will be some level of temporal data. Linda Baker: Wildlife data sheets – will the information be extracted and how will it appear in the final product? A: Still up for negotiation and discussion. It will be linked to the reports at a minimum and probably store a spatial representation of the data. Cally McKee: When will the PAPO version be up and running? A: Tentatively April or May of 2011. First, it's rolled out to the operators. If the BLM and operators agree on the functionality, then it goes out to the public.

### **Geomatrix Update**

Merry Gamper: Geomatrix has not presented any data to date. Currently characterizing aquifers under the Pinedale Anticline and how they interact with one another. Next week will begin sampling the wells (15' to 780' deep). Cathy: Will the information be out for public comment? Merry: They are discussing this now. Need answers before finalizing implementation. Some level of public comment needs to be included. Early spring – March – will have draft final report. ROD says it must be finalized in 6 months. Revamped monitoring program by late spring 2011. Now finalizing the technical memorandum. In the next two weeks, two years of work will culminate. Linda: Looking for potential petroleum hydrocarbon – will other kinds of chemicals (specifically, total dissolved solids) be discussed? Merry: TDS are standard water quality. Actually 2 phases - TDS is natural component. Now trying to tie natural sources of petroleum hydrocarbons. Baseline data has been collected from all of these wells. Linda: Natural background high TDS area very interesting. There are clusters of high TDS. It is important to recognize that. Will DEQ be providing a section of this report? Merry: Study looking at some of these wells. Deb: Kathy Brown or Vickie Meredith can answer this question. All files are public information, but she doesn't know that they'll be posted on the web.

### **SCCD Update**

Delsa Allen: We're currently sampling around 300 wells. Work started the Geomatrix project. Overview of changes seen from 2004 to current. Focus on hydrocarbons today. Important to know changes in methods. Remember that 2010 data is preliminary! Gary: Bad tests not necessarily all in the same area. There is a summary in last spring's presentation of where the wells are. Mike Kramer: 8260 – any compounds identified? Delsa: Getting a lot less detections. Not done with 2010 data yet. Deb: How are we looking for 8260? Delsa: Haven't received all the data yet. Aida Farag: 146 and 237 looks like, for 2007, 9 and 10 – in the red – she's curious where those are. Delsa: SCCD not in position to come up with theories as to what's going on, just collect the data. Spring report is on BLM's website. It shows where these wells are and what's going on. Cathy: How do people find out why this is happening? Is this what Geomatrix has been tasked to do? Merry: Yes. Lots of different interplay trying to get this complex info. Deb: These are not monitoring wells being sampled - they are industrial or other kinds of supply wells. Later, wells will be monitored that have been put in specifically for the purpose of monitoring ground water. Merry: Wells installed for this study were done under very strict controls. None of the initial samples showed any evidence of hydrocarbons. Jim Sewell: 146 Antelope Well, south end of field is by T4, an existing industrial well that's been sampled for years. Consistently gets low level of *benadine*. Good question for Merry's study. Delsa: Low levels of benzene...5 is cleanup level. Last one on 146 was 5.9, very low level, and a non-detect for anything else. Keep in perspective. Linda: 2006 shows one well above federal standards to protect clean water. 2006 there were 89 wells with levels above. Merry: We will see full data set soon. Linda: What about the 36 in 2008? Wells showing hydrocarbon detections – remembers one report. Above standards would kick them into the VRRP program. At one point 89 wells had detection of hydrocarbons in Jonah as well as Anticline. Deb: Antelope 116 – AMI 187 is a VRRP well in Anticline. Shelley Gregory: Delsa mentioned that some of the wells dropped out of sampling program – is the state doing anything to bring these back into the sampling program? Merry: Those wells not

owned by State of Wyoming – we cannot force compliance with BLM’s ROD. There has always been an issue of wells on state or private land. Cathy: It’s a loophole. Kathy Raper: Gave surface water update. Nothing changed in New Fork River for 11 years. Sample BTEX, GRO, DRO and TPH. Never had any detects. In 2008, upstream site used to be NF1 below the dam, now moved control site downstream NF80. Last year, prior to sampling, well drilled on Noble’s private property, so moved control site to bull pasture on Ehman Lane NO90. Brett Marshall: I have worked with SCCD since 2005 and do identification analysis on what Kathy Raper collects. Invertebrates are the most important creatures in the world. If they all disappeared today, everything else would die within 5 years (all other life on earth). Recreation is also dependent on them. Bugs are important! The purpose of the study is to evaluate the ecology of the system. If certain species start disappearing, they leave tracks behind that an experienced bug person can read. I look for a lot of subtle things with bugs; had sort of a pink flag that came up in 2004 and persisted. It was a shift in the community structure to a warm community in the vicinity of the pipeline crossing. He didn’t consider it a red flag because of the many prior years of drought and he expected a buildup of fine sediments. There could have been extenuating services that may have been exacerbated by the pipeline. Community dominance by worms was 10,000 - 20,000 per square meter, which were high densities. They are 1/8” long or smaller worms. They like to be deep in the sediment, in the backwater, and 7-5% is representative of the community. Up to 2008, these worms comprised more than half of the community in the location which is a disconcerting trend, and correlated with sediment embeddedness - quality of sediment. They like to eat fine particles. 2009 was first high sustained spring runoff since monitoring program was started. The worm problem went away, and is now about 10%. Kevin: How does more environmental input that affects this? Brett: My gut feeling is that it has to do with riparian activities. I would rather see lots of trout bugs. Disturbances of river bottoms exacerbate this issue (deep, where water percolates). Nine samples on river, one on the East Fork, the bull pasture down to the confluence of the Green. This is a very complex system. Linda: What is the significance of sustained elevation of these oligochaete worms? Brett: Oligochaetes are a natural constituent. Tubefix is whirling disease co-host. Nais is the one to worry about. Sampling - square foot put down in fast-flowing water with net. Fines get washed back into the net. Mayflies usually dominate those communities, as do stone and caddis flies: all three are good environmental indicators. Potential negative connotations if alarming abundance were to continue. Lloyd Dorsey: On the 54 year average; it is set back to normal now. USGS knows more about the 54 year averages. Was it reset back to normal by normal regime? Brett: What is seen for future with global warming? New Fork River much more resilient to drought than the Green River and that is probably related to Anticline activities. Les Sparrow: Need to give SCCD a tremendous amount of compliments for taking this on! They are true professionals – extent of what has been done probably better than anywhere else in Wyoming. Cathy: Where do we need to go with information that we have? At one time there was a push to complete some sort of summary of this data, produced annually, in a layman’s document for the community. Do we need an executive summary of this data, implementation of a sub-committee? Kevin: Does BLM still want that type of report from PAWG, or does the SCCD report provide sufficient information? SCCD summarized it very well. Cathy: Can we put the info into a one or two page summary and put on the web without getting into the technical side of things? Gary: Would the PAWG be able to condense the info? Are we getting in over our heads? Cathy: That’s what we need to decide. Paul: Let the water group compile this, forward to us, and then we can forward on to BLM. Shane: We are producing data and making it available. Public just wants to know what’s important. Provide what you found, what the changes are, and why they are important. Give BLM recommendations based on data out there – what is important, how you want it presented. Then BLM can develop a template. Cathy: We heard from SCCD, and Merry on Geomatrix. It is important information. Should we make assignments to the subcommittee on water quality – give direction – combine the data? Merry: This is an opportune time. Interpretation and summary are two different things. Now we have baseline data, so we could see something once, twice,

whatever; specific trends, response to impacts, etc. – think about it in those terms. Geomatrix is a study, not monitoring. Shane: Use Delsa's presentation as an example. Pulled several years' data together and showed trends. Her presentation did what everyone has been asking for. Kevin: We have a desire for an executive summary (like's Delsa's). The Geomatrix study will be different. Make sure that a lot of interpretation is not done – transfer of info would be good. Be careful about misinterpretation. Merry: There will be a final report. The redesigned monitoring program will begin to collect data again, and we need to specify what the contractor will provide. Implementation falls on the BLM, separately from PAPO (at this time). Reporting requirements need to be built into final plan. Bart: We may be premature with Geomatrix. SCCD – what they did – could that be released to the public? Cathy: This year's summary is a lot more palatable than what we have received in the past. Kathy Raper: Bug report – looking at 50 page document – executive summary will be on website, and it is already condensed as much as possible. Cathy: Need a summary that includes summaries/references/contacts. Bart: We need link(s) to entire reports and where to get more information. Delsa: Today's report is not the annual report. That will be given this spring.

Linda Baker: With respect to SCCD's hard work – we can look at one well and see from 2004 – 2009 every parameter that was monitored. That is very useful, but, most folks don't understand why we are monitoring. A summary of why we are monitoring what we're monitoring would be helpful. We also have DEQ, BLM, SCCD, and the State Engineer's Office – information from all those agencies and three names for each well; it is confusing. Ultimately – what does this mean to the human population? We should start with basic premise that no one knows much about water chemistry and explain that, then interpret cumulative data changes. Darrell Walker: The operators are paying for all of this water quality stuff. Overall – what was this program started for – what are the guidelines and goals? We need to reiterate this. It was all spelled out originally. Mike Kramer: On Linda's point - we need definitions for what's on the website – what is TDS, etc. There are misconceptions about the data because people don't know what the terms mean. Maybe break down water into domestic, stock, and industrial. Shane: This is exactly what the public is saying they need. We are asking the PAWG for bullets as recommendations – consolidated. Comprehensively, the PAWG needs to say what they want to see. Mike: Also need a summary at the end, very concise. Cathy: We need a subcommittee to be formed to bring back the data (a consolidated list for Shane). Shane: From the PAWG's perspective, a consolidated list of the top 20 or 50 things that they want from the BLM, then the BLM can react and deal with as many at one time as possible. Clearly need to have publics with specific wishes as to how the data should be presented. That's the reason the subcommittees were set up. Merry: SCCD, DEQ, State Engineers data collected – geospatial database – is where the data resides now. They have had preliminary conversations with USGS to produce canned reports. Shane: We now have an opportunity to define what we want delivered (like from Merry's study). Cathy: Merry can provide a summary of all data and analysis, definitions, etc. Merry: There will be one database. They're getting there. Nylla: When can they expect the data? Merry: A draft final report is expected out in late March 2011. Cathy: PAWG can move forward, or wait and see what the BLM comes out with. Merry: Do you want annual, bi-annual...? And what on? How do you want the data presented? Stephanie: There is a need for a public report to give them the big overview context – what it's all about. All of the information is very complicated. It would be useful to have an overview report to put in context for the public, later on with more detailed data – will be complicated also. Cathy: Maybe we can provide a summary of various reports and why things are being studied. Then wait for data to come out. Nylla: Who's in mind to do the recap? Cathy: Subcommittee? Cathy: The goal is to protect water quality. Can we format our executive summary that way? Who's doing the studies, monitoring, how long, what does it say, what does it mean – and get it out to the public. Are there water quality task group members here that would be interested in doing this summary? Linda Baker, Darrell Walker, Jim Sewell, Mike Kramer volunteered. Shane: Next step is

for the PAWG to identify for the subcommittee what they are interested in: the purpose, the expected product, and when they want the info. The function and purpose of subcommittees is to carry out work and make recommendations to the PAWG. PAWG makes assignments to the subcommittees. Subcommittee members have opportunity to clarify what's been asked of them.

Shane: We are looking at the agreement format and the five areas – does it represent the essence of what the PAWG board wants back from the subcommittees?

**Bart Motions to accept the format as presented in attachment one. Gary Rees seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.**

Shane: Next, makeup of the subcommittee: Each subgroup must contain at least one PAWG member. *Gary Rees volunteers.* Do we need to define the makeup of the subcommittees? Do we need to revise the bylaws for the make-up of the committee? Cathy: Need a balance representing a variety of interests. Darci Sinclair: Industry expert could be resident of some other state. A vote would be required to revise the bylaws in some way to include that person. Kevin: PAWG group could decide to include by individual. Shane: PAWG decided that the bylaws would be their SOPS.

**Kevin Williams motions to remove the requirement that PAWG subcommittee members have Wyoming residency; instead, the PAWG board will approve all subcommittee assignments. Bart Myers seconds. Motion passes with Paul Hagenstein opposed.**

Identify committee members: Linda Baker, UPGRA/Environmental; Darrell Walker, SCCD; Jim Sewell, Shell Exploration; Mike Kramer, landowner; Gary Rees, PAWG rep. Mike nominates Darrell as chairman of subcommittee: Darrell agrees.

**Bart motions to amend bylaws that currently require the PAWG appoints a chair to the subcommittees and nominees, Kevin seconds. Motion passes with Nylla Kunard opposed.**

Cathy: Next, develop a brief, concise guide - a summary. Linda: Not that much info from the state or oil & gas commission – she's already created a spreadsheet on these wells. Thinks we could add to it.

Shane: If the info is readily available, there is no reason that the group cannot come back to the PAWG and say what they want pulled out from each area. That would comprise the format. Darrell: We can sort out what's important and what isn't. Cathy: Develop a brief concise summary for understanding reports being generated on water quality data. *Tasks: Broaden scope of years. Provide data available. Get summary with individual points of interest, identify data points.* Shane: We're not asking for output. Instead, what the PAWG would like presented. Don't give the whole book - come up with key headers for a table of content. Kevin: The purpose is to identify specific data points and information from the various monitoring and studies to be used in an annual summary to be presented to the public. Cally: Is the subcommittee actually there to vet what is out there and provide what info summary data pulled from there? Shane: Take the info out there and present. Cally: That's totally different than asking for more information. Shane: We haven't asked for info on what else could be collected. Not discounting that there are unanswered questions. First – cannot go back and re-collect; second – we have a collection of input from lots of sources. Cathy: Other reports may be out with info also, by then. Kathy: FYI, the bug report always a year behind.

Water Subcommittee Tasks:

1. Review readily available data.
2. Develop brief layout report of summary data in common language for the public which can then be provided to a graphic artist to develop a brochure.
3. Okay as written (Linda wants this considered as a future item). Shane put that on there because of the desire to move forward. (A timesaving thing – not an essential component.)

*Deliverables:*

1. Okay as written
2. Okay as written

3. Okay as written

*Due date: Feb 3.*

### **Closing Remarks**

Cathy Purves notes that it is her last meeting as chair and thanks all for their devoted efforts. Been a long year but things are going in the right direction. Appreciate all efforts.

### **Public Comments**

Courtney Skinner: Thanks PAWG. Knows of no other forum within the County where public can sit down with industry, Governments and other interested individuals. Doing a very valuable service as far as public, press, and those in the peanut gallery. PAWG shouldn't think that it's a thankless job. He goes out of the meetings with more questions than answers, and that is good!

Linda: Echo what Courtney said. Thanks to everyone for hard work and attendance. Sometimes confusing serving on the PAWG. Especially thanks to Cathy for bringing order and common sense to the process. Brought a lot of value to the group.

### **Focus of Next Meeting**

Air quality.

Summary of past year findings, monitoring efforts (similar to water quality). Point source information.

Linda: new air quality position – could hear from that person. Report available. – air toxic study draft report available by January? Sublette County air toxics inhalation study conducted by DEQ and Sublette County.

Water quality subcommittee report.

Paul: *do you know what life is? Life is not waiting for the storm to pass, but learning to dance in rain.*

**Gary Rees motions to adjourn. Bart Myers seconds. Motion passes unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.**

SIGN-IN SHEET  
**PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP**  
 Thursday, November 4, 2010

Name	Representing Organization/Company/Interest <small>(livestock production, resident, recreation, oil and gas, hunting, employment, etc)</small>	Mailing Address	E-mail Address	Phone
Dennis Bueaszer	BLM RSTFO	280 HWY 191N R5 82901	dennis.denis@blm.gov	807-352-0207
Atly Purves	TU / PAWG	PO Box 64 250 N. 1st St, Lander	cpurves@tu.org	307-332-6700 x10
Kaitlyn Macky	Powdercup	P.O. Box 100 Powdercup WY	kmackyn@powdercup.wy.gov	307-312-3123
Paula Klapstein	PAWG	PO Box E Pinedale, WY	pklapstein@wy.gov	367-2366
Scott Smith	WGFCD	Box 850		
Wayd Bracey	GYC	Box 485 JVA WY 83001	lbracey@youthofland.com	307-7346009
Dick Far	Salt Creek Service		thorblake@earthlink.net	307-367-5305
Dave Harper	USGS	Box 1039 Jvss	david.harper@usgs.gov	307-733-2344
Jim Swadell	Shell	Owner	jim.swadell@shell.com	307-222-6365
Kevin Williams	OSP/PAWG	Pinedale	kevin.williams@epos.com	367-3441
Phyllis Kucera	Town Pinedale	"	phylkucera@pinedale.wy.gov	367-6363
Pat Oullman	US Rep Lummis	Therpe Ct	patoullman@weill.lummis.gov	307-885-1682
Pete Guernsey	QEP	Box 2125 Pinedale	peteguernsey@qep.com	367-3943

SIGN-IN SHEET  
**PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP**  
 Thursday, November 4, 2010

Name	Representing <small>(livestock production, resident, recreation, oil and gas, hunting, environmental, etc.)</small>	Mailing Address	E-mail Address	Phone
Jim Morr	P AUG	Box 747 Big Pine Way	Jim Rees 49@yahoo.com	307-276-4477
Jeff Leav	Dis. Area	Box 747 B.P.	---	---
A. Shuman	SELF	BOX 184	Barbrey 130@aol	855 5808
Sandy Wise	Shell	POB 1558		
Linda Baker	UWRA	994		
Emily Kelley	QEP	Denve	Emily.kelley@qep.com	
LES BARROCK	SCAF	Box 363	lesbarrock@mycomcast.com	307-2192
Carl Yanson	Asso. - canyon	Box 1704	carly@asfor.canyon.com	307-6824
Mike Kramer	Land Owner	Box 682, Pinedale	mike82941@yahoo.com	360-2394
Steff Kessler	TWS	(your home!)		
Aida Faras	USGS	P.O. Box 1089 Tulson, WY 83001	aidafaras@usgs.gov	307-433-2314
Marc Sineclair	Shell	Denver CO	Marc.Sineclair@shell.com	713-382-0717
Bart Myers	Saltwater Country	Box 506 Pinedale	bartmyers@saltwater.com	307-437-4375

SIGN-IN SHEET  
**PINEDALE ANTICLINE WORKING GROUP**  
 Thursday, November 4, 2010

Name	Representing <small>(livestock production, resident, recreation, oil and gas, hunting, environment, etc.)</small>	Mailing Address	E-mail Address	Phone
Paul Hagensten	Parks	Box E Pinedale WY 8294	p.hagensten@wy.gov, com	307 367 2866
Kathy Roper <small>Bret Marshall</small>	SCCA River Cont. Museum	Box 36 Pinedale PO Box 13 / Pinedale WY 8294	kropre@subitland.com bretH@RiverContinuum.org	307-367- -2257 #102 406 585 1259
Cody McKee	Uth	PO Box 1200	cody.mckee@utah.gov	307 889 8605
Courtney Skinner	Self	PO Box 1000	courtney.skinner@utah.gov	367-7904
Anna Dawson	Shell	Box 1000	anna.dawson@shell.com	303 222 6360
Jim Sawell	Shell	Dover	jim.sawell@shell.com	
Marey Gimpou	ViaPhone Bureau			
Nels	ViaPhone DEQ			

