Categorical Exclusion 3 (CX3),
WY-070-390CX3-15-266
WY-070-390CX3-15-267
Section 390, Energy Policy Act of 2005
Burnett Oil CO., INC. Application for Permit to Drill (APD)
Durham Ranch 44572-S4PH, Durham Ranch 84572-N4PH
Bureau of Land Management, Buffalo Field Office, Wyoming

Description of the Proposed Action.
The proposed action is to explore for and possibly develop oil reserves in geologic formations leased by Burnett Oil. The proposed project consists of drilling 2 horizontal oil wells to the Parkman formation from 2 separate pads. The lateral lengths and direction are approximately 2 miles to the south for the Durham Ranch 44572-S4PH and approximately 2 miles to the north for the Durham Ranch 84572-N4PH location. Burnett Oil proposes to drill, complete, produce, and eventually reclaim the locations. Associated infrastructure will include tank batteries and access roads. No gathering pipelines are proposed. Any future gathering pipelines or other infrastructure will have a sundry submitted and analyzed in a separate NEPA document.

The notice of staking (NOSs) for the proposed wells were filed February 17, 2015 and NOS onsites were conducted on March 31, 2015 and June 8, 2015. Applications for permit to drill (APDs) were submitted June 14, 2015. The BLM sent a post-onsite deficiency letter to Burnett Oil August 3, 2015. All deficiency responses were received by October 16, 2015.

The well access and well pad are located on fee surface owned by Durham Ranches above federal fluid minerals. Right-of-way grants are not required since no federal surface land will be crossed.

Table 1.1. Proposed Wells

Well Name/Well #	Qtr	Sec	Twp	Rng	Lease	CX #
Durham Ranch 44572-S4PH	NWNW	4	45N	72W	WYW-130571	**WY-070-390CX3-15-266**
Durham Ranch 84572-N4PH	SWSW	8	45N	72W	WYW-104539	**WY-070-390CX3-15-267**

The proposed horizontal oil and gas wells project area includes approximately 1,280 acres. The project area is approximately 15 miles north of Wright, Campbell County, Wyoming. Elevations range from 4800 to 4966 feet above sea level. The topography is primarily flat with a few gently rolling hills. A few shallow draws intersect the project area, including the Belle Fouche River drainage. Rock outcrops and exposed scoria are present on hilltops in the project area. The climate is semi-arid, averaging 14-16 inches of precipitation annually, more that 60% of which occurs between May and September. CBNG development exists throughout the project area, as well as existing conventional oil well development. The majority of the surface ownership is private, with livestock grazing being the other land use in the general area. Currently the area is experiencing active oil field development of federal and fee minerals. The Administrative Record (AR) is available for public review at the Buffalo Field Office (BFO).

The BLM's need for this project is to determine whether, and if so, and under what conditions to support the Buffalo Resource Management Plan's (RMP) goals, objectives, and management actions with permitting the operator's exercising of conditional lease rights to develop federal fluid minerals. APD information, which BLM incorporates here by reference, is an integral part of this CX. Conditional fluid mineral development supports the RMP, the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA), and other laws and regulations.

Drilling, Construction & Production design features include:

- The operator anticipates completing drilling and construction in 2 years. Drilling and construction is year-round in the region. Weather may cause delays, but delays rarely last multiple weeks. Timing limitations in the form of COAs and/or agreements with the surface owner may impose longer temporal restrictions. The estimated time to construct a well pad is 7-14 days, estimated time to drill a well is 10-20 days, and the estimated time for completion activities is 6-16 days.
- A road network that will consist of existing improved all-weather roads; existing primitive (2-track) roads to be upgraded to all-weather improved roads; and proposed improved well access roads.
- There will be a reserve pit or closed loop system at each proposed well during drilling and completion.
- Hydraulic fracturing (HF) operations are planned as a 'plug and perf' operation done in stages. All water used for HF will come from municipal water supplies from Wright or Gillette, Wyoming. All fresh water will be contained in 400-500 bbl rental HF tanks and no surface pits will be used to hold this water. No additional well pad disturbance is anticipated for HF operations. Completion flowback water will be held in tanks on location and trucked offsite to a disposal facility permitted by Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ).
- No off-site ancillary facilities are planned for this project. No staging areas, man camps/housing facilities are anticipated to be used off-site. Working trailers and sleeping trailers will be placed on the well pad during the drilling and completion of the well.
- If a well becomes a producer, production facilities will be located at the well site and will include a pumping unit (powered by propane), storage tanks, buildings, oil-water separator (heater-treater). There will be no pits at producing oil well locations. There are no plans for electric power to be installed.
- See Table 1.2 for well pad disturbance information. Once a well is completed, the operator will reclaim any area of the well pad not needed for production as interim reclamation (IR) (see MSUP submitted IR drawings).

Table 1.2. Disturbance Summary

Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Acres of Disturbance	Interim Disturbance
Durham Ranch 44572-S4PH constructed pad, including spoils	350	425	6.2	3.11
Access Road	229	50	0.26	
Total Disturbance for this location			6.50	

NOTE: The operator will build 229 ft. of new road, while using about 2.3 miles of existing improved road and 2.4 miles of existing road improvements will be required, culvert installation and minor road widening (width of working area ~35 ft.).

Activity	Length (feet)	Width (feet)	Acres of Disturbance	Interim Disturbance
Durham Ranch 84572-N4PH constructed pad, including spoils	450	500	8.5	2.73
Access Road	3707	50	4.26	
Total Disturbance for this location			12.8	

NOTE: The operator will build 3707 ft. of new road, while using about 4.7 miles of existing improved road and 2.5 miles of existing road improvements will be required, culvert installation and minor road widening (width of working area ~35 ft.).

For more details on project area access, design features, construction practices of the proposed action and details regarding reclamation refer to the (MSUPs pp.1-15) in the APDs. The plans are written and

reviewed to ensure that environmental impacts to both surface and subsurface resources are minimized. Also see each APD for a map showing the proposed access road, existing roads and pad location.

Plan Conformance, Compliance, and Justification with the Energy Policy Act of 2005.
The Energy Policy Act of 2005, Section 390(a) subjects oil or gas exploration or development to a rebuttable presumption that the use of a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) applies. Thus BLM must use an Energy Policy Act, Section 390(b), CX unless BLM rebuts the presumption. This CX analysis is NEPA compliance categorically excluded from an EA or EIS or their analysis; it is not an exclusion from all analysis. (40 CFR 1508.4 and BLM H-1790, p. 17.) The proposal conforms with the terms and conditions of the approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the public lands administered by the BLM, BFO, 1985; its amendments (2001, 2003, 2011) as required by 43 CFR 1610.5, 40 CFR 1508.4, and 43 CFR 46.215. BLM finds that the conditions and environmental effects found in the senior EA and PRB FEIS remain valid. The applicable categorical exclusion from the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Section 390, is exclusion number (b)(3) which is *drilling an oil or gas well within a developed field for which an approved land use plan or any environmental document prepared pursuant to NEPA analyzed such drilling as a reasonably foreseeable activity, so long as such plan or document was approved within 5 years prior to the date of spudding the well.*

BLM has 3 requirements to use a Section 390 CX3, (BLM H-1790, Appendix 2, #3, p. 143):
1) The proposed APD is in a developed oil or gas field (any field with a completed confirmation well).

Table 1.3 is a list of NEPA analysis that are within or adjacent to the project area. This information shows that BLM conducted analysis and BLM incorporates these here by reference.

Table 1.3. Overlapping NEPA Analyses by Decision Date

#	POD / Well Name	NEPA Analysis #	#/ Type Wells	Mo/Yr
1	Durham Ranches 1 POD	WY-070-EA13-83	4/oil	2/2013

See also: SDR WY-2013-005, particularly noting pp. 2-3, incorporating the entirety here by reference.

2) The reasonably foreseeable activity (RFA) is found in the PRB FEIS and BFO's RMP for this and adjacent areas which includes oil/gas exploration on 320 to 640 acre spacing or more for horizontal wells and 40 to 80 acre spacing for vertical wells. (This does not preclude the RFA spacing analysis in the PRB FEIS or applying to drill multiple wells from a pad further reducing the surface disturbance per well.) The RFA in the projects analysis area is well within the RFA of the 2015 RMP total of 4,494 proposed federal fluid mineral wells; 1,773 oil and 2,721 CBNG wells. Potential APD submittals or reasonably foreseeable activity included in this analysis could consist of more, single and/or multiple wells on existing or proposed pads and would, as much as possible, tie into existing supporting infrastructure; tank batteries, pipelines, power lines, and transportation networks.

3) The tiered NEPA document was finalized or supplemented within 5 years of spudding (drilling) the proposed wells. This CX3, for the proposed PODs, tiers to the NEPA analysis listed in Table 1.3.

In summary, the analyses in Table 1.3, analyzed in detail the anticipated direct, indirect, residual, and cumulative effects that would result from the approval of these APDs and associated support structure in the proposal is similar to both the qualitative and quantitative analysis in the Table 1.3 tiered-to and incorporated NEPA analyses. The BLM reviewed the analyses and found that the analyses considered potential environmental effects associated with these proposals at a site specific level. The proposed APDs' surface use and drilling plans are incorporated here by reference and show adequate protection of surface lands and ground water, including the Fox Hills Formation. The proposal's acres of surface disturbances are within the analysis parameters of the PRB FEIS.

Plan of Operations.
The proposal conforms to all Bureau standards and incorporates appropriate best management practices, required and designed mitigation measures determined to reduce the effects on the environment. BLM reviewed and approved a surface use plan of operations describing all proposed surface-disturbing activities pursuant to Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended. This CX3 analysis also incorporates and analyzes the implementation of committed mitigation measures contained in the SUP, drilling plan, in addition to the Standard COAs found in the PRB FEIS ROD, Appendix A.

Soils / Vegetation.
The predominant major ecological site in the project area is classified as Loamy. Impacts anticipated occurring and mitigation considered with the implementation of this proposal is similar to those analyzed in NEPA document WY-070-EA13-83, Sections 3.2 and 4.2 included in Table 1.3, incorporated here by reference.

Water Resources.
The historical use for groundwater in this area was for stock or domestic water. A search of the WSEO Ground Water Rights Database showed 0 registered stock and domestic water wells within 1 mile of the proposed wells in the project area. For additional information on groundwater, refer to the PRB FEIS, pp. 3-1 to 3-36. Adherence to the drilling COAs, the setting of casing at appropriate depths, following safe remedial procedures in the event of casing failure, and using proper cementing procedures should protect any fresh water aquifers above the target coal zone. This will ensure that ground water will not be adversely impacted by well drilling and completion operations. The depth to the Fox Hills Formation is 5351 to 5400 ft. The Fox Hills, the deepest penetrated fresh water zone in the PRB lies well above the target formation. The operator will verify that there is competent cement across the aquifer, from 100 feet above to 100 feet below the Fox Hills Formation and that centralizing stabilizers are adequately placed on the casing to insure cement sealing through the Fox Hills Formation. This will ensure that ground water will not be adversely impacted by well drilling and completion operations.

At the time of permitting, the volume of water that will be produced in association with these federal minerals is unknown. The operator will have to produce a well for a time to be able to estimate the water production. In order to comply with the requirements of Onshore Oil and Gas Order #7, Disposal of Produced Water, the operator will submit a Sundry to the BLM within 90 days of first production which includes a representative water analysis as well as the proposal for water management.

Historically, the quality of water produced in association with conventional oil and gas has been such that surface discharge would not be possible without treatment. Initial water production is quite low in most cases. There are three common alternatives for water management: Re-injection, deep disposal or disposal into pits. All alternatives would be protective of groundwater resources when performed in compliance with state and federal regulations.

Wetlands/ Riparian.
No wetlands/ riparian areas are in the project area.

Invasive Species.
Impacts anticipated occurring and mitigation considered with the implementation of this proposal is similar to those analyzed in NEPA document WY-070-EA13-83, Sections 3.6 and 4.4 incorporated here by reference.

Wildlife

The Buffalo Field Office Proposed RMP and FEIS (2015) identified wildlife species occurring in the Buffalo planning area, Vol. 1 pp. 469 to 496. Species of the region potentially impacted by this project are also discussed in the PRB FEIS pp. 3-113 to 3-206. BLM performed a habitat analysis of the project area, and compared resource concerns with those identified by a third party consultant representing the operator. The BLM biologist evaluated impacts to wildlife resources and recommended project modifications where wildlife issues arose. BLM wildlife biologists also consulted databases compiled and managed by BLM BFO wildlife staff, the Buffalo Field Office Proposed RMP and FEIS, the PRB FEIS, Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) datasets, and the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database (WYNDD) to evaluate the affected environment for wildlife species that may occur in the area. A wildlife survey and habitat report completed by Anderson Environmental Consulting was submitted by the operator. The survey was performed by Bob Anderson during the 2015 survey season (see report in Administrative Record). Site specific information is described below for known species suspected to occur and become impacted beyond the analysis of the PRB FEIS 2003 and the Buffalo Field Office Proposed RMP/FEIS. Rationale for species not discussed in detail below can be referenced in the administrative record ((Table W.1.(Summary of Sensitive Species Habitat and Project Effects) and Table W.2. ((Summary of Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat and Project Effects)).

Land uses and other disturbances occurring within the proposed project area include, livestock grazing, ranching operations, overhead power lines, conventional oil and gas, and improved and unimproved roads. Habitats within the proposal are comprised of sagebrush grassland and mixed-grass prairie. The dominant vegetation is Wyoming big sagebrush and the understory is a mix of grasses (western wheatgrass, needle and thread, bluebunch wheatgrass, blue gramma, threadleaf sedge, and cheatgrass). The habitat is similar in nature to the habitats (sagebrush obligate migratory birds and Greater sage-grouse habitat) discussed in the Durham Ranches 1 POD, WY-070-EA13-83, incorporated here by reference. The Buffalo Field Office Proposed RMP and FEIS discusses impacts to wildlife on pp. 1119 to 1120 and impacts specifically from fluid mineral resources development on pp. 1123 to 1124. Additionally, the PRB FEIS discusses impacts to general wildlife on pp. 4-179 to 4-181.

Big Game

Pronghorn antelope and mule deer inhabit the project area. The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discussed the affected environment for pronghorn antelope (*Antelocapra americana*) and mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) in Vol. 1 on pp. 473 to 474 and pp. 474 to 476, respectively. No crucial winter range, parturition areas, or migration routes for these big game species overlap the project area (WGFD 2012); however, year-long range for pronghorn and mule deer are present at the proposed project area (WGFD 2012). The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discusses impacts to wildlife, including big game, on pp. 1119 to 1120 and impacts specifically from mineral resources development on pp. 1123 to 1124. The PRB FEIS discusses impacts to big game on pp. 4-181 to 4-186 and specifically addresses impacts to pronghorn and mule deer on pp. 4-187 to 4-190 and 4-198 to 4-201, respectively. Impacts to big game occur at varying levels through alterations in hunting, increased vehicle collisions, harassment and displacement, increased disturbance from noise and dust, changes to forage or forage availability, alterations to reproductive success, increased habitat fragmentation or degradation, or other factors that result in population declines.

Greater Sage-Grouse (GSG)

GSG habitat exists within the proposal area, in that adequate sagebrush cover and height are present for grouse to use the area. Sagebrush canopy cover is variable, and according to the wildlife report, the areas in proximity to the proposed well locations and access routes are not considered to be suitable sage-grouse breeding, nesting or winter habitat. The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discusses the affected environment for GSG in the special status species section found in Vol. 1 pp. 502 to 512, and the PRB FEIS discusses the affected environment on pp. 3-194 to 3-199. The proposal is not within a Core Sage-grouse Area, as designated by the State of Wyoming. The project is not within priority habitat (Core) or

within 2 miles of any known occupied GSG leks. This proposal is similar to a recent approved project (Durham Ranches 1 POD) BLM analyzed. Therefore, the Durham Ranches 1 POD, WY-070-EA13-83 analysis is incorporated here by reference: Affected Environment (Section 3.7.41, p.10-11), Effects (Direct and indirect, Cumulative, Mitigation, and Residual, Section 4.6.2.1, pp. 17-19) to GSG from surface disturbing and disruptive activities associated with development of horizontal oil wells. Effects to GSG can be referenced in the PRB FEIS as well, on pp. 4-257 to 4-273.

Since the proposal is not within a State of Wyoming designated core or connectivity area and is not within two miles of an occupied sage-grouse lek. According to the WY BLM policy, the State of Wyoming's Greater Sage-Grouse conservation strategy (Executive Order (EO) 2011-5 Greater Sage-grouse Core Area Protection), and the BFO RMP, timing limitations are not warranted for the protection of greater sage-grouse at this location.

With application of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's), Design Features and Conditions of Approval identified for other wildlife, impacts caused by surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with the Burnett Durham Ranch proposal would be minimized.

Raptors

The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discussed the affected environment for raptors in Vol. 1 on pp. 486 to 491, and pp. 512 to 517 for those considered special status raptors. An Anderson Environmental biologist utilized the BLM raptor database, and conducted ground surveys in the project area in order to comprehensively depict the raptor scene in the area. In total, seventeen raptor nests were identified as occurring in the project area vicinity on the BLM database. Additionally, there was a burrowing owl nest identified through survey efforts. Species documented nesting in the area include red-tailed hawks, ferruginous hawks, burrowing owls, and golden eagles. Of the 18 nests that have been documented, eleven were found to still be present. Two of the nests in the project area were active in 2015; one by red-tailed hawks and the other by burrowing owls. The remaining 9 nests were constructed on substrate and in a manner characteristic of ferruginous hawks. These remaining nests were found to be inactive and most were in poor condition (2015 wildlife report). The affected environment for this proposal is similar to a recent approved project (Durham Ranches 1 POD) BLM analyzed. Therefore, the Durham Ranches 1 POD, WY-070-EA13-83 (P.15) analysis is incorporated here by reference. The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discusses impacts to wildlife, including raptors, from mineral resources development on pp. 1123 to 1124. Impacts to raptors are further discussed in more detail in the PRB FEIS on pp. 4-216 to 4-221. Due to the proximity of the proposal to documented nests, to reduce the risk of decreased productivity or nest failure, the BLM BFO will require a species specific timing limitation for surface disturbing activities during the breeding season around active/biologically important raptor nests.

Migratory Birds

The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discussed the affected environment for migratory birds, Vol. 1 pp. 491 to 493. The affected environment for migratory bird species that are considered special status species can be found in the Buffalo Field Office FEIS in Vol. 1 pp. 517 to 522. Sagebrush habitat suitable for nesting sagebrush obligate migratory birds, including those listed as BLM sensitive species, is present throughout the proposal area. Impacts to migratory birds associated with oil and gas activity is discussed in the PRB FEIS on pp. 4-231 to 4-235. A timing limitation, prohibiting activity from May 1 – July 31, is warranted as a condition of approval (COA) for surface disturbing activities in order to reduce the possibility that a violation or "take" may occur as defined by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

Swift Fox

Dens of adequate size for swift fox use were located at both pad locations, and the proposed access road bisects an active prairie dog colony likely used by foraging swift fox. The affected environment for swift fox is included in the wildlife section within the Buffalo Field Office FEIS, Vol. 1 pp. 469 to 496, and is

specifically outlined in the special status wildlife species section found on pp. 524 to 525. In addition to being listed as a BLM WY sensitive species, swift fox is also listed as a WGFD SGCN, with a rating of NSS4, because population status and trends are unknown but are suspected to be stable, and habitat is vulnerable but is not undergoing substantial loss. The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discusses impacts to wildlife, including swift fox, on pp. 1119 to 1120 and impacts specifically from mineral resources development on pp. 1123 to 1124. In addition to those impacts, site-specifically, the project will impact swift foxes or their habitat. The construction of well pads, roads, and pipelines in prairie dog colonies and suitable grasslands will cause direct habitat loss and may disrupt foxes ability to forage, breed, raise young, or find adequate shelter. During construction of these facilities, there is the possibility that swift foxes may be killed by earth moving equipment. Constant noise, movement of equipment, and habitat alterations puts considerable stress on the animals and is likely to cause a decrease in fox reproductive success. Construction can remove protective cover and expose individuals to predators. Project related traffic may result in swift fox road mortalities. A timing limitation will not mitigate habitat loss, but will reduce direct mortality. Swift fox dens and prey availability will still be impacted through loss of prairie dog colonies, despite the restriction on the timing of construction. To alleviate impacts to swift fox in the area, before access road construction through the prairie dog colony, a spotlight survey must be conducted within 0.25 miles of prairie dog towns between April 15 and June 15 each year for the duration of surface disturbing activities. A seasonal disturbance-free buffer of 0.25 mile shall be maintained between March 1 and August 31, unless trail/motion cameras are used prior to surface disturbing activities and prove no use of the burrows is occurring.

Mountain Plover

The Buffalo Field Office FEIS discussed the affected environment for Mountain plover in Vol. 1 pp. 519 to 520. During the onsite, a BLM biologist noted that the proposed access road crossed a prairie dog colony where the amount of bare ground and grass heights less than or equal to 4 inches were positive habitat indicators suggesting plovers could potentially use the area for nesting purposes. Also, prairie dog colonies are themselves a very strong indicator of plover nesting habitat. The PRB FEIS analyzed the direct and indirect impacts to mountain plover, pp. 4-254 to 4-255. To minimize impacts to plover breeding and nesting activities, no surface-disturbing activities shall occur within 0.25 mile of potential mountain plover nesting habitat, annually, from March 15 through July 31, prior to a nesting survey. This timing limitation will be in effect unless surveys determine the habitat to be unoccupied. This TL applies to the prairie dog colony and areas within 0.25 miles thereof.

Cultural

In accordance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, BLM must consider impacts to historic properties (sites that are eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)). For an overview of cultural resources that are generally found within BFO the reader is referred to the *Draft Cultural Class I Regional Overview, Buffalo Field Office* (BLM, 2010). A Class III (intensive) cultural resource inventory (BFO project no. 70150068, 70150084) was performed in order to locate specific historic properties which may be impacted by the proposed project. No cultural resources are located in the proposed project area.

BLM policy states that a decision maker's first choice should be avoidance of historic properties (BLM Manual 8140.06(C)). If historic properties cannot be avoided, mitigation measures must be applied to resolve the adverse effect. No historic properties will be impacted by the proposed project. Following the *State Protocol Between the Wyoming Bureau of Land Management State Director and The Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer*, Section V(E)(iv) the Bureau of Land Management electronically notified the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on 10/19/15 that no historic properties exist within the area of potential effect (APE). If any cultural values (sites, features or artifacts) are observed during operation, they will be left intact and the Buffalo Field Manager notified. If human

remains are noted, the procedures described in Appendix L of the PRB FEIS must be followed. Further discovery procedures are explained in Standard COA (General)(A)(1) and in Appendix K of the Wyoming Protocol.

List of Preparers: Persons and Agencies Consulted (BFO unless otherwise noted)

Position/Organization	Name	Position/Organization	Name
NRS/Team Lead	Eric Holborn	Archaeologist	Seth Lambert
Supr NRS	Casey Freise	Wildlife Biologist	Wyatt Wittkop
Petroleum Engineer	Jonathon Shepard	Geologist	Kerry Aggen
LIE	Karen Klaahsen	Supr NRS	Bill Ostheimer
Soils	Arnie Irwin	Assistant Field Manager	Clark Bennett
Assistant Field Manager	Chris Durham	NEPA Coordinator	Tom Bills

Decision and Rationale on the Proposal.

The COAs provide mitigation and further the justification for this decision and may not be segregated from project implementation without further NEPA review. I reviewed the plan conformance statement and determined that the proposed project CX3 APD and infrastructure conform to the applicable land use plan, 43 CFR 1610.5, 40 CFR 1508.4, and 43 CFR 46.215. I reviewed the proposal to ensure the appropriate exclusion category as described in Section 390 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is correct. I determined that there is no requirement for further environmental analysis.

/s/ Duane Spencer 11/25/2015

Field Manager Signature Date

Contact Person, Eric Holborn, Natural Resource Specialist, Buffalo Field Office, 1425 Fort Street, Buffalo WY 82834, 307-684-1100