bp

David R. Brown
Manager, Regulatory Affairs-HSSE

BP America Production Company
U.S. Onshore Business Unit-HSSE
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80264

Telephone: 303-830-3241
Facsimile: 303-830-3292
Cellular: 303-887-3695

April 6, 2007

Mr. Matt Anderson
Bureau of Land Management-Pinedale Field Office
P.O. Box 768
Pinedale, Wyoming 82941
Email: WYMail_PAPA_YRA@blm.gov.

RE: Comments To The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Pinedale Anticline Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Project, Sublette County, Wyoming

Please find attached our comments to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) regarding the Pinedale Anticline Oil and Gas Project. BP is a leaseholder within the Anticline and currently operates wells within the project area. BP is the leading producer of natural gas in North America and a global producer and manufacturer of oil, natural gas, petroleum products and petrochemicals. The company is also internationally recognized as a leader in environmentally responsible operations and corporate transparency.

We have conducted a thorough review of the DSEIS and attempted to produce a commentary document that highlights our areas of concern and clearly explains each along with recommendations. Our comments are arranged in sequential order by section and page number, and as needed by sentence.

Thank you for considering our comments to the DSEIS.

Sincerely,

cc: Ron Kainer - BP Houston
Tom Robinson - BP Jonah OC
Don Brooks - BP Jonah OC
Gary Austin-BP Denver

BP America's Comments:

Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Pinedale Anticline Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Project

General

PA-1 BI-4-1

Item: Concentrated Development Area Concept
Comment: The DSEIS focuses on the "Core Area", and the "Concentrated Development Areas" (CDAs). The BP leases are outside of the Core Area (in both alternatives), and there is little to no description on development outside of the Core Area. It is unclear from the DSEIS how operations are supposed to proceed outside of the Core Area. That is, do the operational parameters described in the DSEIS for development apply to areas outside the Core Area, or are those areas managed with the 2000 ROD?

PA-2 BI-4-2

Item: Staged Development
Comment: BP is very concerned about the potential precedent established by BLM's use of staged or phased development as expressed in the BLM Preferred Alternative (Alternative C). Staged development, which allows development in one area of the field while prohibiting development in another area may be applicable to the PAPA based upon the land configuration and ownership pattern. However, the approach will not be appropriate in most other natural gas development projects. The main reason is the fact that lease ownership in other natural gas fields may not allow similar management techniques. Lease ownership may be more fragmented, such as in checkerboard areas, that are not conducive to staged development. In certain circumstances, staged development could actually deny operators the right to develop their leasehold in a timely manner which would be a violation of their lease rights and obligations, or allow certain operators to unfairly benefit from, or bear the burden of, changes in commodity prices. Staged development could also create an imbalance of impacts on other public land users where impacts of development would be concentrated in one particular geographic area. Therefore, the application of staged or phased development in this particular case should not be interpreted as being appropriate to other natural gas development NEPA analyses.

Executive Summary

Item: page V. **Offsite Mitigation**
Comment: The Executive Summary under Alternative B states "The Operators have offered 3:1 offsite mitigation for wildlife, if necessary." Appendix C states , "the Proponents have agreed to a 3:1 acre off-site mitigation ratio in the event that off-site mitigation is required to compensate for loss of on-site habitat (i.e., for every acre of

long-term on-site habitat disturbed by the project, Proponents will improve three acres off-site habitat)." Also, in Appendix C (page C-34) The Proponents commit to developing a comprehensive off-site mitigation plan within one year of SEIS ROD release.

PA-3 BI-4-3

This mitigation measure seems vague. How was a 3:1 ratio arrived at as fair compensation? Who determines the "if necessary" and what criteria will be used for this decision. If offsite mitigation is "necessary", where, when and to what extent will offsite improvements will occur? What type of habitat would qualify for the 3:1 mitigation requirement? Will offsite mitigation be applicable and/or optional to the flank areas outside the Core and CDA's? These are all important questions that must be answered in order to proceed with an effective offsite mitigation program.

Chapter 2 Public Participation, Existing Development and Alternatives

AL-1 BI-4-4

Item: Section 2.5.2.14, **Alternatives**
Comment: This section and subsequent sections (2.5 - 2.14) present the various alternatives to the DEIS. While BLM has provided a range of alternatives as required by NEPA, BP supports the "Preferred Alternative" Alternative C, as revised in a separate joint operator communication to BLM commenting upon the DSEIS, and suggesting an expansion of DA-5. This alternative was developed with a commitment to various mitigation measures including onsite and offsite compensatory mitigation. We believe that with the mitigation, monitoring and other revisions, being proposed by the companies that this alternative is viable and should be selected.

Item: page 2-29, Section 2.4.2.4, **Alternative C Reclamation**
Comment: Alternative C – BLM has developed Performance-Based Objectives, which would apply to Alternative C (Appendix E). For each objective, the performance, or outcome, is the basis for judging the effectiveness of whatever measure is actually implemented. Some developed performance-based objectives may not be obtainable due to circumstances beyond operators control and the Plan of Development within each development area needs to take such circumstances into consideration.

BI-4-5

Performance Based Objectives states that "On existing well pads that would not be fully developed within the upcoming annual cycle, all bare ground would have at least a 75 percent protective cover." .. ."During the period when an existing well pad is not being fully developed, the well pad would be vegetated prior to the first winter after the ROD to achieve at least 50 percent vegetative cover of desirable herbaceous species by the following spring."... and "Once a well pad has been fully developed, full site restoration and reclamation would begin as soon as the ground is not frozen and would be completed before the onset of winter."

PA-4 BI-4-5 These conditions may be impossible to achieve within the referenced time-lines based on site specific situations (i.e. weather conditions, soil composition, animal foraging etc.).

Chapter 4 Environmental Consequences

Item: Wildlife Impacts

W-1 **Comment:** The PAPA SDEIS appears to misinterpret the potential impacts to pronghorn antelope from oil and gas development in the vicinity of Jonah Field. In particular, on page 4-130 of the PAPA SDEIS, the BLM cites the Berger (2006) study that antelope do not utilize habitat within the Jonah Field. However, the DEIS does not acknowledge the more important conclusions from the Berger study; especially a lack of significant differences noted among pronghorn populations exposed to oil and gas development near PAPA and Jonah Field for such important viability factors as overall survivability, body mass, stress hormones (glucocorticosteroids), disease antibodies, and vitamins and minerals. *See* Berger, pgs. 16, 19, 22, 31, 35, 45. Further, the fact that the pronghorn populations studied by Berger did not utilize habitat within the Jonah Field during the study period does not demonstrate that pronghorn will generally avoid the Jonah Field. The studied populations may simply not have ever utilized the relatively mediocre habitat within Jonah Field. *See* JIDP FEIS, pg. 3-55 (indicating Jonah Field does not contain any crucial winter range or crucial winter/yearlong range for antelope).

BI-4-6 W-2 The PAPA SDEIS also fails to note the significant increase in antelope populations in the vicinity of Jonah Field and PAPA in recent years. In 2005, antelope population in the Northern Sublette Herd Unit and the Pronghorn Sublette Herd Unit were at all-time highs of 27,537 and 47,930, respectively. *See* PAPA SDEIS, pg. 3-107. These levels are dramatically higher than those seen in the late 1990's prior to major oil and gas operations in Jonah Field and PAPA. According to the BLM's analysis in the JIDP EIS, antelope populations in the Northern Sublette Herd Unit were estimated at 19,900 in 1994 and 17,900 in 1998, compared to the reported 27,537 in 2005. *See* JIDP FEIS, pg. 3-54; PAPA SDEIS, pg. 3-107. Therefore, it appears antelope populations in the vicinity of Jonah Field are not only stable, but improving. With the approval of habitat improvement projects such as those sponsored by the Jonah Interagency Office ("JIO") last year, population trends will likely continue to improve. The BLM should revise the information in the SDEIS regarding existing antelope population and impacts from oil and gas development. W-3

BI-4-7 W-4 W-5 W-6 The BLM also places a reliance on the Holloran (2005) study regarding the potential impacts of natural gas development activities on sage-grouse. However, in discussing the Holloran study, and any potential conclusions derived therefrom, the BLM should specifically disclose and acknowledge the fact that the agency purposefully waived the seasonal and timing stipulations normally associated with sage-grouse leks and specifically allowed oil and gas development activities near an active lek during the strutting season in order to assess the potential impacts. The conclusion in the Holloran study that existing stipulations are not adequate cannot be supported considering the manner in which the leks were allowed to be impacted. Further, prior to the release of the Holloran study, the Wyoming State BLM issued new policies to provide additional

W-6 BI-4-7 measures to protect sage-grouse. The new measures include new surface use restrictions, timing limitations, and additional surveys prior to operations in sage-grouse habitat. *See* Wyoming Instruction Memorandum 2004-057 (August 16, 2004). These mitigation measures were eventually incorporated into the Pinedale Resource Management Plan ("RMP") through a maintenance action. Therefore, it is important to understand the complete context in which Mr. Holloran's study was conducted and take into account recent BLM policies regarding actions to protect sage grouse.

W-7 BI-4-8 W-8 The PAPA SDEIS also fails to include a discussion about the significant increase in sage-grouse populations since 2003. According to the information presented in Figure 3.22-2, it appears sage-grouse populations on the Mesa and in the vicinity of PAPA and Jonah Field are at all time highs. The dramatic increase in the sage-grouse population since 2003, a time period that has included significant increases in oil and gas development in Jonah Field and PAPA, may indicate that oil and gas development is not adversely impacting sage-grouse to the extent previously disclosed. In fact, this data suggests that BLM's mitigation, including seasonal timing stipulations, are effective and that recent declines may not be linked to oil and gas development. The BLM should revise section 3.22.1.2 of the PAPA SDEIS to more accurately reflect the current trends and protections available for sage-grouse in the Pinedale Resource Area.

BI-4-9 **Item:** Section 4.4.3.1, Page 4-34, **Road funds**
Comment: "Reduced federal funding would limit highway maintenance opportunities on roads used to access the PAPA. Increased traffic in the PAPA would accelerate deterioration of area roads beyond the maintenance capabilities of the responsible agency".

T-1 This statement does not account for partial funding from county taxes generated from Operators.

BI-4-10 **Item:** Section 4.64, Page 4-48, **Recreation Impacts**
Comment: "The cumulative impact to public recreation areas in the PAPA (Table 4.6-2) is based solely on estimates of surface disturbance within the areas by well-field development projected by each alternative."

R-1 It is not clear how Recreation Resources related to OHV-orientated recreational areas limited to existing roads and trails would be directly affected by surface area disturbance. It would be more appropriate to analyze closure and disturbance to the existing roads and trails combined with any well-field related restrictions on recreational travel.

BI-4-11 **Item:** Section 4.7.3.1, Page 4-51, **Alternative Impacts, VRMs**
Comment: Below is an excerpt from the BP Amoco letter (Kirk Steinle) to BLM related to comment on the DEIS dated Feb 4, 2000. This comment still applies.

"The discussion relative to the VRM III classification and the interpretation of its management objective must be tempered with the fact that in some circumstances it will be impossible to "screen activities and facilities so they do not dominate the view of the casual observer." This possibility exists in the event some level of development occurs

V-1 BI-4-11

on the south of the PAPA . BP Amoco clearly understands the concerns that the BLM and public have relative to this VRM issue. I also believe the BLM understands that implementation of the management objective for this VRM III area, as defined above, could be problematic in a number of cases as it relates to oil and gas exploration and development in this area. I also question the definition interpretation of the VRM III management objective. What is the basis for that definition? BP Amoco would like the BLM to consider in its management of this issue an obvious recognition that the east side of Hwy. 191 (Wind River Mountain viewshed) is likely more sensitive than the west side of Hwy. 191 and that the implementation of this management objective interpretation, if carried forward, be balanced considering this fact."

Item: Section 4.10.2, Page 4-75, **Alternative Impact Mitigation, Noise**
Comment: Below is an excerpt from the BP Amoco letter (Kirk Steinle) to BLM related to comment on the DEIS dated Feb 4, 2000. This comment still applies.

N-1 BI-4-12

"...The document merely comments that the 10dBA above background proposed limit is likely acceptable. If there is no scientific basis for this proposed mitigation and therefore the proposed mitigation is arbitrary and capricious, the BLM decision maker should not consider this proposal for inclusion in this EIS/ROD."

The SEIS defines significant noise impact as greater than 49 dBA (10dBA above background).

Item: Section 4.16.2, Page 4-99, **Vegetation Resources**
Comment: "sagebrush, the predominant shrub within the PAPA, may take 10 to 20 years to become reestablished"

RC-1 BI-4-13

This should be considered in the performance based objectives for reclamation.

Item: Section 4.19.3, Page 4-114, **Threatened and Endangered Species**
Comment: The FWS recommended the following spatial and timing constraints: avoid activities within 1 mile of active bald eagle nests from courtship (February 1) through fledging (August 15); avoid activities within 1 mile of roosts used during winter, November 1 through April 1; and strive to conserve potential nesting, roosting, and foraging habitats of mature and old growth trees, particularly within 0.5 mile of water.

This only leaves September and October for any activities within 1 mile of bald eagles.

Proponents proposed:
1. Avoid potentially disruptive activities or permanent aboveground structures in the bald eagles' direct flight path between their nest and roost sites and important foraging areas."

TE-1 BI-4-14

Recommend this be reworded to add, "...to the extent practicable...".

BI-4-15

Item: Section 4.20.2, Page 4-127, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: "Evidence collected since the PAPA DEIS has shown that the functions of some wildlife habitats, those classified as "vital" or "high value" by WGFD, has declined as wellfield developments have progressed. Such evidence has been based on species' use of habitats before and after development. In other cases, species' use of habitats proximate to disturbance has declined whereas use of habitats farther away from disturbance has not."

W-8

Consideration should be given to emigration. Species which have emigrated may return after restoration and reclamation.

BI-4-16

Item: Section 4.20.3.1, Page 4-128, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: "Another measure of fragmentation is the amount of edge created by wellfield development. In the context of habitat fragmentation, edge is the portion of habitat (or ecosystem on a larger scale) 'near its perimeter, where influences of the surroundings prevent development of interior environmental conditions'" (Forman, 1995).

W-9

Little research on edge effects has occurred regarding oil and gas development in the western United States. Studies that have occurred in the western US focused on roads - this may not be an applicable measurement of impacts for this area in regard to pipelines and well pads.

W-10 BI-4-17

Item: Section 4.20.3.1, Page 4-133, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: "Any demographic response to wellfield development would be a significant impact." This statement is much too conclusive and is not supported by the text which states that, "There is <u>potential</u> for a declining population" that "Current understanding is insufficient to predict how such a demographic response would be manifested" and contains phrases such as 'may' and 'could'.

Item: Section 4.20.3.1, Page 4-134, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: "Noise from drilling rigs can exceed 10 dBA above background noise, even if drilling is farther than 0.25 mile from noise sensitive sites such as a greater sage-grouse lek (see Section 3.12 – Noise). The 10 dBA above background limit was specified in the PAPA ROD (BLM, 2000b) as an Administrative Requirement and Condition of Approval. The PAPA DEIS (BLM, 1999a) assumed that a 0.25-mile buffer around leks was sufficient to limit noise from wellfield traffic to 10 dBA above background levels. Holloran (2005) indicates that the 0.25-mile buffer surrounding leks may be insufficient to maintain function of lek habitats due to wellfield development and associated noise."

Below is an excerpt from the BP Amoco letter (Kirk Steinle) to BLM related to comment on the DEIS dated Feb 4, 2000. This comment still applies.

W-11 BI-4-18

'The mitigation in the RPA states, "Noise from project activities on Federal lands and minerals would be managed near leks while they are actively attended (approximately

W-11 BI-4-18

March 1 to May 15) during the hours from midnight to 9:00 am so that no more than a 10 dBA increase in background noise occurs at the lek." In Chapter 4 of the document the BLM explains that the male grouse mating display involves an acoustic signal coupled with visual displays so that **constant** (emphasis added) noise could interfere with females attraction to male's displays.... Although the noise level for heavy trucks, dozers, and scrapers exceed the maximum 49dBA suggested limit, these sources are not constant and would likely not overlap the proposed time restrictions..'

W-12 BI-4-19

Item: Section 4.20.3.1, Page 4-135, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: "As discussed earlier, edges are one component of habitat fragmentation. Fragmentation and the amount of edge between disturbed surfaces and wildlife habitat has been considerable through 2006, particularly due to wellfield roads (Table 4.20-1). A study of migratory bird (sagebrush obligate species) includes effects by wellfield development in the Jonah Field Project Area (King and Holmes, 2005). Results of effects of fragmentation on populations are not yet available. Effects of fragmentation to migratory breeding birds and other wildlife (small game, furbearers, and small mammals) would increase considerably from 2006.

This statement is much too conclusive and is not supported by the text in the paragraph it attempts to summarize.

W-13 BI-4-20

Item: Section 4.20.3.1, Page 4-136, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: With the implementation of BMPs and an Erosion Control Re-vegetation and Restoration Plan these surface disturbance impacts identified on this page would be mitigated. ERRP's are required under the 2000 ROD.

Item: Section 4.20.3.1, Page 4-137, **Wildlife Impacts**
Comment: "BLM imposes temporal and spatial limitations for pipeline construction activities around active raptor nest sites. Pipeline construction would not occur within 0.5 mile of active raptor nests or within 1 mile of active bald eagle or ferruginous hawk nests between February 1 and July 31.

These temporal and spatial buffers may be adjusted, based on site-specific conditions. Raptor surveys would be conducted prior to commencement of construction activities from February 1 to July 31 in the nesting season. No impacts to nesting raptors are anticipated as a result of pipeline construction."

W-14 BI-4-21

The phrase '*to the extent practicable*' should be appended to BLM imposed temporal and spatial limitations to read, 'BLM imposes temporal and spatial limitations *to the extent practicable*'. This statement is supported by adjustment of temporal and spatial buffers based on site-specific conditions.

Appendix C Development Procedures for Well-field Activities

BI-4-22 T-2

Item: Transportation Plan, page C-9, Proponent Committed Measure Item #7
Comment: Item #7 states that - "Between November 15 and April 30 in a given year in crucial big game winter range and sage grouse winter concentration areas, Proponents will make reasonable effort to bus rig crews from appropriate vehicle staging areas to minimize commuting traffic. Proponents will not tolerate workers who miss the bus and drive personal vehicles to the pads during this time period." Yet in estimating traffic volumes for drilling, Appendix C states that "Each person will have a vehicle." If personal vehicles are not tolerated between Nov 15 and April 30 in sage grouse winter concentration areas, then the traffic estimates should be adjusted to reflect this.

BI-4-23 T-3

Item: Transportation Plan, page C-10, Proponent Committed Measure Item #18
Comment: "After construction, the BLM would maintain the gates....Proponents will assist BLM with signage....." It is not clear how the proponents would assist the BLM with signage. It may be best to indicate that the BLM would maintain the gates *and signage*. Operators can provide information on current or planned areas of activity.

BI-4-24 N-2

Item: Wildlife and Habitat Mitigation Plan, page C-30, Proponent Committed Measure Item #6
Comment: "Prohibit activities that produce extremely loud noises within 1 mile of active bald eagle nests during nesting periods unless greater tolerance to the activity (or similar activity) has been demonstrated by the particular pair of bald eagles through monitoring."

The definition of 'extremely loud noises' is subjective and arbitrary. In order to demonstrate tolerance to the activity, the bald eagles must first be subjected to the activity.

Air Quality Comments on the Pinedale Anticline Supplemental Draft EIS

Alternative C Phase I and II

As BLM correctly notes in their discussion of "Regulatory Authority" in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Section 4.9 Air Quality, Subsection 4.9.3, BLM's responsibility and legal authority in regards to air quality is limited. BLM's extensive air quality analysis provides BLM a basis for meeting this responsibility. However, it does not provided BLM a legal basis for regulation air quality.

BI-4-25

AQ-1

The air quality "Alternative Impact Mitigation", introduced in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Section 4.9 Air Quality, Subsection 4.9.5, imposes emissions caps and emissions reduction requirements that are the responsibility of the Wyoming DEQ Air Quality Division or EPA under their regulatory authority. These emission caps and emissions reduction requirements are beyond the BLM's regulatory authority. Setting of emissions caps and/or restrictions in EIS actions has been tested in prior legal proceedings. The answer is no. Exhibit A to these comments provides examples of two such prior tests. BP requests BLM remove emissions caps and emissions reductions, expressed or implied, from the Alternative C proposal.

(Even if BLM had authority for such regulation, which it does not, its air quality modeling is not consistent with over 20 years of monitoring data. More discussion follows on this point.)

BLM proposes to impose these emission caps and emissions reduction requirements both through explicit emissions reduction requirements and goals and through their requirement for periodic air quality modeling to demonstrate impact levels meeting the goals articulated. BLM notes that *"The method by which the Operators would determine project visibility impact would be determined by BLM in consultation with WDEQ, EPA, USFS, and NPS."* Presumably the modeling protocol established by BLM in consultation with these same agencies and used in this

DSEIS, represents the collective view of the agencies on the most appropriate modeling approach to use in evaluating potential air quality impact from the proposed action and would continue to be viewed by this same group of agencies as the most appropriate protocol and approach. Given the overly conservative approach of this modeling protocol and approach, discussed later in these comments, the only way to meet the performance objectives set forth in this subsection is through imposing the emissions limits and reductions or restricting development.

In addition to BP's contention that BLM lacks authority to regulate air quality by imposing emission caps and emission reductions, BP is very concerned about the approach the BLM has taken in proposing the Alternative C Phase II emissions and modeling demonstration. Our understanding is that BLM took the following approach to establish this emissions scenario:

AQ-2 BI-4-26

- Using the model and inventory as configured for analysis of Alternative C Phase I, and then doing iterative modeling of 20% step reductions, to a maximum of 80% reduction of 2005 actual drilling rig emissions – which itself represents a reduction from current and project proponent proposed drilling rig emissions. There appears to have been no consideration of the technical or economic feasibility of actually making the reductions required and modeled.

This approach ignores almost three decades of well established air quality management regulation and practice regarding analysis and implementation of emission control measures and practices through the "Best Available Control Technology (BACT)" process. Instead, BLM has apparently chosen to arbitrarily establish the level of emission control necessary through the use of dubious predicted impacts from an overly conservative modeling exercise. Although we are supportive of lower emissions and actively pursue emission reduction, we believe these efforts

need to be grounded in established technology, cost effective emission reductions and regulation and implemented through a properly crafted and established regulatory program (Wyoming DEQ) or voluntary actions rather than a NEPA analysis and action.

BLM continues this development of Alternative C Phase II by discussion that even this 80% reduction in actual 2005 rig emissions will likely not meet the goal of 0 days of modeled visibility degradation greater than 1 deciview and that additional emissions reductions may be required. BLM properly observes that current compression conforms to Best Available Control Technology (BACT) requirements and that future compression would be required to conform to BACT emission requirements and that most of the engines associated with portable well completion and servicing equipment already meet Tier 2 requirements. BLM also recognizes and states that any further reductions from these sources would be limited. As the following table illustrates, the proposed 80% reduction of rig emissions from 2005 actual emissions levels actually represents an emission reduction of about 87% from the project proponents proposed action rig emissions – which already included Tier 2 equivalent emissions from all new rigs.

2005 Drilling Rig NOx tons/year	**2008 Drilling Rig NOx tons/year (proponent proposed action)**	**Alternative C Phase II Drilling Rig NOx tons/year (would occur in 2012)**	**Required Rig Engine Reduction % (from proponent proposed action - 2008)**
2,590	3,965	518	~87%

AQ-4 AQ-3 BI-4-27

As this table clearly illustrates, meeting the Alternative C Phase II rig emissions limits is not feasible with current technology (regardless of how much is spent on control cost). Further, BLM did not consider potential offsetting impacts from suggested control mechanisms (natural gas fired lean burn, selective catalytic reduction, and electric drives and the environmental

BI-4-27 ramifications of these control mechanisms). Also, meeting this alternative may not result in any perceivable improvement in visibility as discussed below.

AQ-5 AQ-6 BI-4-28 BLM should modify the document to acknowledge that the Alternative C emission scenario does not represent achievable emission rates using the "best" current technology. BLM also should explicitly acknowledge that operators will not be required to somehow go beyond current technological limits in achieving emissions goals, and that implementation of current technologies will be subject to the BACT process, through the Wyoming DEQ AQD, which includes economic feasibility and offsetting impact analysis.

Comments on Far Field Visibility Modeling

For the following reasons, BP believes that BLM's use of the CALPUFF modeling approach in this project is arbitrary, irrational, and capricious and accordingly is invalid as a matter of law under the US Administrative Procedures Act.

AQ-7 BI-4-29 BP further believes that the Pinedale far field CALPUFF visibility modeling has fundamental flaws that must be corrected in order for BLM to present an accurate disclosure of potential impacts for the proposed Pinedale development with respect to estimating the change in visual range in adjacent Class I Areas. The following issues need to be addressed in a more complete manner:

1) Accuracy of the CALPUFF model with respect to the formation of NO_3 fine particulates that can cause light scattering and reduce visual range;

2) The manner in which concentration predictions are converted into visual range; and

3) The interpretation of what constitutes a "just noticeable" change in visibility.

Accuracy of the CALPUFF Model

BI-4-30 AQ-8

During the public comment process of the modeling protocol, BP submitted detailed comments that strongly recommended that an emission inventory of actual emissions be developed which would then be used in a modeling analysis where model predicted concentration estimates would be compared to actual monitored concentrations in the Class I Areas and the model predicted impacts scaled against this comparison. This comparison would identify any bias (amount of over or under prediction compared to measurements) in the CALPUFF model in Class I Areas and would "ground truth" the analysis. Although BLM did model 2005 actual and potential emissions, this information was not used to scale the predicted impacts against the ratio to the actual monitoring data and correct for the model bias.

BI-4-31 AQ-9 AQ-10

BP and others have previously submitted detailed comments to BLM and other agencies regarding the lack of model evaluation of CALPUFF with respect to secondary aerosols. Previous BP comments (dated January 2006) regarding the Jonah EIS were not adequately addressed by BLM between draft and final in that EIS nor has BLM considered the importance of those comments in the current Pinedale analysis. EPA has recognized the importance of evaluating model accuracy in calculating the effects of secondary aerosols in its draft modeling guidance. In summary, EPA recommends that because of the large uncertainty in accurately predicting secondary aerosols, a model evaluation should be performed and the model should then be used in a relative mode (ratio of model prediction to monitored value) to estimate future case impacts. This draft guidance should be followed by BLM in the Pinedale analysis.

BI-4-32

As part of the Pinedale analysis, BLM chose to compile an emission inventory of actual emissions for 2005 oil and gas operations. This inventory was compiled based on operator input, was modeled using CALPUFF and represents current modeled baseline conditions. BLM does

AQ-11 BI-4-32

not discuss in the Technical Support Document (TSD) why this inventory was developed nor how the modeling impacts should be interpreted.

As the document stands, the 2005 baseline analysis leaves the reader with the false impression that as a result of current activities, visibility in the Bridger Class I Area (as well as other Class I Areas) is experiencing substantial degradation from oil and gas operations based on CALPUFF modeling. Conversely, the monitoring data at the Bridger Class I Area has indicated no change in visibility over the period of record (even though emissions have increased). Figure 1 presents the visibility monitoring results at Bridger over the period of record. (Note: BP calculated the statistical data for 2005 using IMPROVE equations.) This figure indicates that visibility is unchanged over the period of record, a very different impression than left by review of the modeling results. This figure presents the best, mid and worst 20 percent of the data, as expressed in inverse mega meters of degradation.



Figure 1. Trends in Visual Range 1988 through 2005

Note: Straight line is least square fit

BI-4-33

For the best 20 percent case (i.e., the cleanest days), Figure 1 indicates that there has been a slight trend toward improved visibility. The straight line represents a least square fit through the data and while there is a downward trend, the correlation coefficient is not sufficient to suggest a strong correlation. For the mid 20 percent case, the same trend is apparent as for the best 20 percent data. The trend for the worst 20 percent case appears to be relatively flat. Unfortunately, IMPROVE does not provide error bars on these data in terms of accuracy so it is impossible to identify the significance of these trends. The conclusion is that, at best, there is a slight improvement in visibility and, at worst, there has been no change over the period of record. BLM developed an actual emission inventory which was used in conjunction with 2001, 2002 and 2003 meteorology to estimate current baseline conditions. In order to correct the deficiencies with the Pinedale analysis, BLM must compare the accuracy of the modeling

AQ-12

2007 JUN -9 AM 10:27

AQ-12

BI-4-33

impacts of secondary aerosols to actual monitored secondary aerosols. An analysis using 2005 meteorology data would be the most desirable method of conducting such an analysis. However, in lieu of 2005 meteorological data, the use of maximum impacts over the period 2001 through 2003 could be used. In reality, as indicated in the BLM document, the difference in predicted impacts between years is not substantial and such an analysis using 2001 through 2003 meteorological data would provide an indication of the accuracy of CALPUFF.
Because detailed information contained in the draft document is very limited, BP has attempted to conduct analyses that substantiate the need that additional model evaluations are warranted. BP requested modeling input files from TRC and those were used to perform focused analyses that demonstrate the magnitude of the potential over prediction of CALPUFF relative to monitoring data.

BI-4-34

AQ-13

The first part of the BP analysis was to examine the relative contribution of NO_3 to visibility. The TRC modeling files provided a CALPOST listing of visibility impacts by day as well as the relative contribution of various PM species including NO_3. Table 1 presents this information from the TRC file using the RHR Average Days sorted in descending visual range. The average predicted NO_3 contribution for days where visibility impairment was in excess of 1 dv was found to be 94 percent. Review of the monitoring data at the Bridger IMPROVE site indicates that for the worst visibility days the NO_3 contribution to the extinction budget was only 3 percent. This comparison provides conclusive evidence that the CALPUFF model, in the mode that BLM chose to run it, does not accurately predict secondary formation of NO_3 particles.

Table 1. Summary of Modeled 2005 Actual Impacts from Oil and Gas

YEAR		HR	RECEPTOR	COORDINATE	(km)	TYPE	DV(Total)	DV(BKG)	DELTA DV	F(RH)	%_SO4	%_NO3	%_OC	%_EC	%_PMC	%_PMF
2001	316	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	7.812	1.96	5.853	2.5	0.99	94.95	0	0	0	4.06
2001	40	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	6.259	1.96	4.299	2.3	1.27	94.58	0	0	0	4.15
2001	39	0	735	-10.785	7.622	D	5.803	1.96	3.844	2.3	2.86	94.07	0	0	0	3.07
2001	332	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	5.794	1.96	3.834	2.5	2.47	95.24	0	0	0	2.29
2001	13	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	5.523	1.96	3.563	2.5	2.97	94.60	0	0	0	2.44
2001	334	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	5.318	1.96	3.358	2.5	2.26	91.91	0	0	0	5.83
2001	344	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	5.24	1.96	3.28	2.4	2.34	95.51	0	0	0	2.15
2001	326	0	443	15.436	-22.821	D	4.966	1.96	3.007	2.5	2.08	93.77	0	0	0	4.16
2001	44	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	4.924	1.96	2.964	2.3	1.99	94.65	0	0	0	3.36
2001	55	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	4.739	1.96	2.779	2.3	4.01	93.23	0	0	0	2.76
2001	80	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	4.638	1.96	2.678	2.3	2.03	93.10	0	0	0	4.87
2001	322	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	4.613	1.96	2.653	2.5	1.82	94.00	0	0	0	4.18
2001	333	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	4.471	1.96	2.512	2.5	1.49	93.98	0	0	0	4.53
2001	315	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	4.372	1.96	2.412	2.5	1.70	94.71	0	0	0	3.59
2001	43	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	4.356	1.96	2.396	2.3	1.44	95.03	0	0	0	3.54
2001	96	0	392	23.337	-28.171	D	4.276	1.96	2.317	2.1	2.17	92.83	0	0	0	5
2001	324	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	4.247	1.96	2.287	2.5	1.24	95.23	0	0	0	3.53
2001	45	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	4.093	1.96	2.134	2.3	2.02	95.56	0	0	0	2.42
2001	46	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	4.074	1.96	2.114	2.3	2.69	94.61	0	0	0	2.7
2001	63	0	638	-2.946	-1.343	D	4.004	1.96	2.045	2.3	2.24	95.27	0	0	0	2.49
2001	10	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.925	1.96	1.965	2.5	1.55	95.81	0	0	0	2.64
2001	97	0	735	-10.785	7.622	D	3.916	1.96	1.957	2.1	3.43	94.10	0	0	0	2.47
2001	98	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.869	1.96	1.909	2.1	2.30	93.89	0	0	0	3.81
2001	354	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.839	1.96	1.879	2.4	2.97	92.93	0	0	0	4.1
2001	279	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.798	1.96	1.838	2	1.04	88.59	0	0	0	10.37
2001	310	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.766	1.96	1.806	2.5	1.31	92.98	0	0	0	5.71
2001	9	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.717	1.96	1.757	2.5	1.62	96.50	0	0	0	1.88
2001	314	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.717	1.96	1.757	2.5	1.71	94.97	0	0	0	3.32
2001	81	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.642	1.96	1.682	2.3	1.10	94.57	0	0	0	4.33
2001	338	0	409	23.331	-26.379	D	3.622	1.96	1.662	2.4	2.91	91.70	0	0	0	5.38

2007 MAR -9 AM 10:27

2001	11	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.609	1.96	1.649	2.5	1.70	93.39	0	0	0	4.91
2001	105	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.608	1.96	1.649	2.1	1.60	92.45	0	0	0	5.95
2001	349	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.594	1.96	1.634	2.4	2.22	90.55	0	0	0	7.23
2001	104	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.572	1.96	1.612	2.1	0.66	93.49	0	0	0	5.85
2001	79	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.566	1.96	1.606	2.3	0.98	92.36	0	0	0	6.66
2001	41	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.563	1.96	1.603	2.3	2.01	94.23	0	0	0	3.76
2001	321	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.496	1.96	1.536	2.5	1.78	93.96	0	0	0	4.25
2001	301	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.476	1.96	1.516	2	1.53	88.40	0	0	0	10.06
2001	49	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.437	1.96	1.477	2.3	1.25	95.65	0	0	0	3.1
2001	51	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.388	1.96	1.428	2.3	3.61	93.22	0	0	0	3.17
2001	318	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.352	1.96	1.392	2.5	2.53	93.74	0	0	0	3.73
2001	112	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.35	1.96	1.39	2.1	1.17	93.45	0	0	0	5.39
2001	313	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.348	1.96	1.388	2.5	1.60	95.25	0	0	0	3.15
2001	156	0	377	25.974	-29.952	D	3.338	1.96	1.378	1.8	0.69	79.91	0	0	0	19.39
2001	65	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.33	1.96	1.37	2.3	1.22	95.67	0	0	0	3.11
2001	311	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.249	1.96	1.289	2.5	1.77	93.61	0	0	0	4.61
2001	61	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.241	1.96	1.281	2.3	1.93	96.06	0	0	0	2.02
2001	42	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.236	1.96	1.276	2.3	2.55	94.25	0	0	0	3.2
2001	62	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.188	1.96	1.229	2.3	1.90	95.87	0	0	0	2.23
2001	346	0	276	51.107	-47.717	D	3.183	1.96	1.223	2.4	2.55	94.96	0	0	0	2.49
2001	54	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.169	1.96	1.209	2.3	1.86	94.51	0	0	0	3.63
2001	352	0	442	14.122	-22.824	D	3.145	1.96	1.185	2.4	2.93	92.85	0	0	0	4.22
2001	250	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.127	1.96	1.167	1.8	0.92	86.57	0	0	0	12.51
2001	320	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.093	1.96	1.133	2.5	2.76	93.19	0	0	0	4.05
2001	50	0	343	25.989	-33.535	D	3.092	1.96	1.132	2.3	1.11	94.51	0	0	0	4.38
2001	69	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.079	1.96	1.119	2.3	1.70	96.24	0	0	0	2.06
2001	345	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.071	1.96	1.111	2.4	2.15	96.03	0	0	0	1.82
2001	85	0	392	23.337	-28.171	D	3.069	1.96	1.109	2.3	2.96	95.00	0	0	0	2.04
2001	84	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.058	1.96	1.098	2.3	2.40	94.40	0	0	0	3.2
2001	304	0	636	-5.564	-1.341	D	3.027	1.96	1.067	2	1.52	88.01	0	0	0	10.47
										Average	**1.96**	**93.58**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**4.46**

2007 MAR -5 AM 10:27

AQ-14

AQ-15

BI-4-35

Unfortunately, BLM did not report secondary aerosol concentrations in the TSD. Presentation of that information is very important because it enables review of the individual species that contribute to visibility impairment without the uncertainty of the assumptions used to convert concentrations into visual range. In the future BLM needs to provide more complete information so that reviewers can better interpret the modeling results. As a result of this serious deficiency, BP conducted a limited evaluation of secondary NO_3 for each day and the receptor that had the highest visibility impacts for the 2005 actual case. In the BP analysis the only thing that was changed from what TRC performed was that impacts at only receptor 134 (one of the receptors with highest impact from the TRC modeling) were modeled. In addition, the option for printed 24-hour concentrations of NO_3 in the output file was turned on. As in the TRC modeling, 18 separate modeling runs were made. The 24-hour predicted NO_3 concentrations for each day of the year were extracted and input into an EXCEL Workbook where the results were combined into total daily NO_3 concentrations. This approach was used in order to bypass the CALPUFF post processing programs and obtain the desired output of daily concentrations. Table 2 presents a listing of the combined daily NO_3 concentrations and indicates that the maximum **predicted** NO_3 concentration as a result of oil and gas operation in 2005 was 5.3 ug/m^3.

BI-4-36

The 2005 Bridger **monitored** NO_3 concentration data were obtained from the IMPROVE web site and the maximum measured concentration was 0.12 ug/m^3 (Table 3). In actuality this was the lowest NO_3 concentration at the Bridger monitoring site over the period of 1988 through 2005. This provides a strong indication that CALPUFF is substantially over predicting NO_3 concentrations at the Bridger Class I Area.
There are minor limitations to the BP analysis such as the unavailability of 2005 meteorological data therefore requiring the use of 2001 meteorology. As a result, it is not possible to compare specific days of model output with days that monitoring data were collected. Changes in meteorology alone are not likely to cause such a large model over prediction. A second minor limitation is that since the IMPROVE data are only collected every 3 days, high NO_3 occurred on days when sampling was not collected. This possibility was examined by reviewing NO_3 concentrations over the period of record

AQ-16 BI-4-36

(1998-2005). Over this period the maximum NO_3 concentration was 0.82 ug/m^3 (in 2002). Clearly, as a result of this comparison there is a very strong indication that CALPUFF is substantially over predicting measured NO_3 concentrations.

Table 2. Predicted NO_3 Concentrations for Maximum Receptor
model run = total

				ug/m^3			
Day	Receptor No.	SO4	NOX	HNO3	NO3	PMC	PM25
2	1	0.0000	0.8750	0.0016	0.0000	0.4439	0.1178
3	1	0.0019	61.7529	0.2106	0.1351	1.2939	2.3527
4	1	0.0013	20.6177	0.0648	0.0563	1.0807	0.9396
5	1	0.0014	35.0763	0.0906	0.1348	1.0765	1.5042
6	1	0.0014	14.8265	0.0191	0.2005	1.4352	0.9775
7	1	0.0000	0.4504	0.0005	0.0000	0.2335	0.0600
8	1	0.0010	2.9012	0.0109	0.0329	1.6465	0.4075
9	1	0.0006	3.3240	0.0217	0.0311	1.7378	0.4985
10	1	0.0035	3.1180	0.0113	0.3364	1.2555	0.4465
11	1	0.0000	3.1007	0.0107	0.0005	1.7619	0.4286
12	1	0.0001	4.4014	0.0267	0.0001	2.4980	0.6200
13	1	0.0005	3.8657	0.0034	0.0494	0.6421	0.2814
14	1	0.0008	11.6041	0.0389	0.0512	1.6278	0.6793
15	1	0.0000	0.5023	0.0006	0.0000	0.2611	0.0671
16	1	0.0000	0.5590	0.0006	0.0002	0.2946	0.0745
17	1	0.0000	0.8271	0.0012	0.0000	0.4480	0.1111
18	1	0.0000	1.2263	0.0025	0.0000	0.6604	0.1657
19	1	0.0000	0.9154	0.0018	0.0000	0.4761	0.1237
20	1	0.0009	8.6099	0.0360	0.1058	2.6550	1.0139
21	1	0.0000	0.9479	0.0018	0.0009	0.4571	0.1223
22	1	0.0007	10.1475	0.0522	0.0662	2.1633	0.7627
23	1	0.0001	0.8396	0.0010	0.0039	0.4562	0.1127
24	1	0.0007	2.5537	0.0091	0.0496	1.4429	0.3578
25	1	0.0000	0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
26	1	0.0045	92.3846	0.2561	0.0524	1.1832	4.6496
27	1	0.0000	0.9938	0.0015	0.0007	0.5478	0.1334
28	1	0.0000	0.5441	0.0007	0.0002	0.2903	0.0728
29	1	0.0000	0.7714	0.0014	0.0004	0.3995	0.1036
30	1	0.0007	36.1962	0.1225	0.0276	0.6607	1.2768
31	1	0.0009	44.4349	0.1434	0.0364	0.8569	1.5988
32	1	0.0020	45.4411	0.0998	0.0501	1.0969	2.3621
33	1	0.0014	23.4821	0.0655	0.0497	0.8571	1.2889
34	1	0.0001	4.0001	0.0180	0.0001	0.7449	0.3821
35	1	0.0030	105.0897	0.5655	0.0827	1.9646	3.6912
36	1	0.0000	3.1767	0.0135	0.0025	1.7857	0.4395
37	1	0.0002	9.9034	0.0563	0.0031	1.5853	0.6073
38	1	0.0008	0.9327	0.0013	0.0196	0.5111	0.1256
39	1	0.0039	16.8757	0.0894	0.1748	1.7636	1.6081
40	1	0.0004	2.3733	0.0072	0.0050	1.3456	0.3268
41	1	0.0058	85.1691	0.7064	0.0804	1.9209	7.9876

42	1	0.0001	2.4897	0.0111	0.0015	1.4026	0.3424
43	1	0.0030	9.6403	0.1004	0.3290	5.2539	1.5228
44	1	0.0143	27.2949	0.1443	1.5302	4.9285	2.4595
45	1	0.0030	0.7836	0.0011	0.0732	0.4367	0.1165
46	1	0.0004	8.2218	0.0142	0.0263	0.9869	0.5672
47	1	0.0008	19.6073	0.1285	0.0635	3.3004	0.9016
48	1	0.0021	19.6932	0.0369	0.3029	2.1392	1.2745
49	1	0.0153	14.6720	0.0794	1.6914	6.3601	2.2890
50	1	0.0071	37.2346	0.2089	0.7860	4.6568	4.0298
51	1	0.0109	58.3462	0.6635	0.1648	4.0363	3.7428
52	1	0.0006	19.4845	0.0806	0.0439	2.3063	0.6765
53	1	0.0007	7.7765	0.0254	0.0452	2.2449	0.7329
54	1	0.0000	0.9986	0.0016	0.0001	0.5534	0.1342
55	1	0.0094	90.7257	0.2795	0.1383	1.0441	4.5113
56	1	0.0007	8.2338	0.0376	0.1186	3.2499	0.9353
57	1	0.0008	9.5200	0.0530	0.0844	2.7624	1.1087
58	1	0.0000	0.6471	0.0007	0.0001	0.3410	0.0864
59	1	0.0000	0.8193	0.0012	0.0001	0.4446	0.1101
60	1	0.0046	107.1102	0.2232	0.1453	1.5421	5.3972
61	1	0.0003	4.3024	0.0254	0.0212	2.4478	0.6107
62	1	0.0000	1.3182	0.0038	0.0000	0.7378	0.1799
63	1	0.0014	13.1512	0.1390	0.2840	6.9333	1.8619
64	1	0.0143	36.4094	0.5688	1.0991	6.8572	2.4322
65	1	0.0000	1.3615	0.0029	0.0004	0.7406	0.1848
66	1	0.0000	0.5038	0.0006	0.0001	0.2666	0.0673
67	1	0.0000	0.7587	0.0010	0.0005	0.4094	0.1019
68	1	0.0003	1.5622	0.0038	0.0077	0.8589	0.2139
69	1	0.0007	0.7881	0.0018	0.0310	0.4296	0.1094
70	1	0.0183	24.7210	0.0107	1.9869	1.6490	1.6195
71	1	0.0009	39.9410	0.1346	0.0474	0.7531	1.4534
72	1	0.0001	6.0986	0.0183	0.0064	0.5414	0.3011
73	1	0.0007	6.5459	0.0341	0.0242	1.7388	0.5939
74	1	0.0000	1.0005	0.0019	0.0005	0.5014	0.1315
75	1	0.0000	0.7902	0.0014	0.0000	0.4383	0.1064
76	1	0.0001	0.7018	0.0009	0.0020	0.3751	0.0943
77	1	0.0000	0.7031	0.0012	0.0000	0.3687	0.0944
78	1	0.0000	1.2048	0.0022	0.0000	0.6369	0.1627
79	1	0.0006	12.0577	0.1527	0.0245	6.8444	1.7950
80	1	0.0004	5.5097	0.0214	0.0961	3.1081	0.7962
81	1	0.0061	156.9367	1.2719	0.0517	2.2845	5.2785
82	1	0.0000	2.2640	0.0062	0.0000	1.2669	0.3102
83	1	0.0002	0.6597	0.0010	0.0089	0.3489	0.0896
84	1	0.0009	3.1755	0.0168	0.0750	1.6277	0.4130
85	1	0.0006	3.5684	0.0101	0.0189	0.4728	0.2066
86	1	0.0011	14.7016	0.0477	0.0505	1.0514	0.9062
87	1	0.0013	21.6584	0.1242	0.0712	1.8629	1.0882
88	1	0.0001	3.8604	0.0121	0.0258	1.6934	0.4599
89	1	0.0003	5.7184	0.0052	0.0669	0.8366	0.3873
90	1	0.0000	1.1060	0.0019	0.0001	0.5694	0.1489
91	1	0.0006	17.8503	0.0983	0.0237	0.9922	0.4298

92	1	0.0000	1.1124	0.0022	0.0069	0.6084	0.1489
93	1	0.0004	20.2044	0.0946	0.0015	0.7803	0.7701
94	1	0.0000	0.0003	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000
95	1	0.0000	1.6868	0.0064	0.0045	0.9225	0.2257
96	1	0.0001	3.0107	0.0132	0.0046	1.7120	0.4233
97	1	0.0018	19.0299	0.0757	0.0801	1.4935	1.1697
98	1	0.0028	1.8848	0.0051	0.3280	0.5180	0.2623
99	1	0.0001	3.3124	0.0151	0.0035	1.4217	0.3813
100	1	0.0000	0.9994	0.0017	0.0000	0.5383	0.1347
101	1	0.0000	0.9861	0.0016	0.0001	0.5097	0.1327
102	1	0.0000	0.5633	0.0008	0.0001	0.3136	0.0754
103	1	0.0000	1.9881	0.0054	0.0000	1.1038	0.2711
104	1	0.0052	49.4413	0.5734	0.1937	4.8055	5.0427
105	1	0.0000	0.8484	0.0013	0.0000	0.4597	0.1141
106	1	0.0000	0.7072	0.0009	0.0000	0.3780	0.0948
107	1	0.0000	0.4819	0.0005	0.0011	0.2623	0.0644
108	1	0.0000	1.8078	0.0046	0.0000	1.0187	0.2458
109	1	0.0003	0.8697	0.0090	0.0272	0.1151	0.0686
110	1	0.0000	0.5431	0.0009	0.0021	0.2954	0.0727
111	1	0.0034	40.6536	0.4830	0.0050	2.1611	3.8609
112	1	0.0002	0.7727	0.0014	0.0015	0.4267	0.1041
113	1	0.0000	1.4137	0.0018	0.0077	0.4452	0.1338
114	1	0.0000	1.4953	0.0034	0.0000	0.8173	0.2034
115	1	0.0000	1.0891	0.0019	0.0000	0.5689	0.1468
116	1	0.0002	0.7273	0.0013	0.0026	0.3878	0.0982
117	1	0.0000	1.3251	0.0024	0.0000	0.7409	0.1797
118	1	0.0027	9.0710	0.1907	0.1211	0.9604	0.5503
119	1	0.0006	7.2689	0.0448	0.0134	1.2463	0.5616
120	1	0.0003	18.2454	0.0636	0.0160	0.8248	0.6588
121	1	0.0000	2.1506	0.0073	0.0002	3.3235	0.9580
122	1	0.0000	1.3871	0.0024	0.0003	2.1391	0.6155
123	1	0.0000	0.9317	0.0011	0.0000	1.4166	0.4137
124	1	0.0000	1.2069	0.0015	0.0001	1.8900	0.5372
125	1	0.0042	8.8522	0.0563	0.2898	10.6314	3.1879
126	1	0.0010	20.1403	0.0442	0.0770	4.6852	2.2269
127	1	0.0000	1.1674	0.0018	0.0000	1.8224	0.5217
128	1	0.0008	8.5844	0.0327	0.0763	5.5733	1.8564
129	1	0.0011	15.1236	0.1572	0.0564	13.5237	4.5721
130	1	0.0007	9.1004	0.0429	0.0298	9.1740	2.7606
131	1	0.0000	2.2697	0.0047	0.0000	3.6130	1.0259
132	1	0.0000	1.5990	0.0033	0.0000	2.4411	0.7193
133	1	0.0015	9.7750	0.1695	0.1331	15.1365	4.6156
134	1	0.0000	3.8331	0.0146	0.0012	6.1165	1.7544
135	1	0.0000	2.0350	0.0057	0.0001	2.3185	0.7175
136	1	0.0000	4.2150	0.0133	0.0025	4.2658	1.2008
137	1	0.0023	31.6316	0.1109	0.0995	6.0469	3.1056
138	1	0.0003	8.4054	0.0447	0.0340	9.9127	2.9939
139	1	0.0000	1.9642	0.0044	0.0000	3.0650	0.8863
140	1	0.0005	7.3035	0.0321	0.0114	3.5529	1.2252
141	1	0.0000	1.3197	0.0023	0.0002	2.0837	0.5904

142	1	0.0012	14.4130	0.0541	0.1107	5.4280	2.1483
143	1	0.0000	1.5899	0.0033	0.0003	2.3959	0.7088
144	1	0.0000	0.9418	0.0011	0.0000	1.4345	0.4187
145	1	0.0000	1.4145	0.0020	0.0000	2.2406	0.6298
146	1	0.0000	0.8344	0.0009	0.0000	1.3054	0.3704
147	1	0.0001	4.9178	0.0220	0.0002	7.9319	2.2640
148	1	0.0001	0.0029	0.0009	0.0018	0.0027	0.0017
149	1	0.0056	139.8094	0.9795	0.1701	10.7884	7.2192
150	1	0.0000	1.9723	0.0060	0.0016	2.9699	0.8637
151	1	0.0000	1.6304	0.0040	0.0017	2.2738	0.6748
152	1	0.0000	1.8114	0.0039	0.0000	2.8344	0.8169
153	1	0.0037	20.3827	0.6696	0.1279	27.2164	8.8712
154	1	0.0002	2.4607	0.0163	0.0257	3.3226	1.0110
155	1	0.0000	3.5101	0.0155	0.0011	5.7031	1.6228
156	1	0.0001	4.1491	0.0179	0.0062	6.7347	1.9303
157	1	0.0003	7.1375	0.0477	0.0407	9.9628	2.8945
158	1	0.0000	1.7453	0.0048	0.0011	2.5897	0.7576
159	1	0.0000	2.8634	0.0086	0.0000	4.6244	1.2993
160	1	0.0001	6.5975	0.0518	0.0005	10.7323	3.1001
161	1	0.0000	3.0422	0.0080	0.0000	4.8965	1.3874
162	1	0.0010	14.2765	0.1570	0.0356	8.9920	2.9259
163	1	0.0056	102.1895	0.3690	0.0201	5.6147	6.4066
164	1	0.0011	13.1881	0.0540	0.0306	3.7745	1.5237
165	1	0.0015	43.6955	0.0831	0.0279	2.5192	2.7869
166	1	0.0001	6.1598	0.0286	0.0023	9.9144	2.8441
167	1	0.0000	3.3559	0.0093	0.0000	5.4099	1.5312
168	1	0.0001	8.1020	0.0759	0.0026	6.8153	1.9439
169	1	0.0030	18.2851	0.2162	0.0960	11.3664	3.8074
170	1	0.0000	1.1070	0.0014	0.0000	1.7195	0.4927
171	1	0.0027	1.0216	0.0214	0.0224	1.6001	0.4788
172	1	0.0001	1.1254	0.0018	0.0006	1.7549	0.5009
173	1	0.0002	1.2667	0.0036	0.0008	1.9938	0.5687
174	1	0.0000	2.3154	0.0057	0.0000	3.7377	1.0466
175	1	0.0001	5.1104	0.0360	0.0025	8.3631	2.4126
176	1	0.0210	88.3171	1.3960	0.5173	12.7738	7.6480
177	1	0.0001	0.9109	0.0176	0.0037	1.3444	0.3948
178	1	0.0031	25.9022	0.2518	0.0325	6.3204	2.8977
179	1	0.0123	16.8980	0.7257	0.1655	6.4914	2.8382
180	1	0.0000	2.1468	0.0053	0.0000	3.4019	0.9745
181	1	0.0000	1.3961	0.0023	0.0000	2.2139	0.6252
182	1	0.0003	0.7627	0.0197	0.0032	1.1849	0.3418
183	1	0.0000	1.3183	0.0022	0.0000	2.0746	0.5910
184	1	0.0000	1.0841	0.0014	0.0000	1.6811	0.4827
185	1	0.0000	0.7212	0.0008	0.0000	1.0790	0.3193
186	1	0.0010	1.1060	0.0077	0.0015	1.7292	0.4995
187	1	0.0003	5.9356	0.0567	0.0074	4.7561	1.4897
188	1	0.0000	3.2132	0.0126	0.0003	5.1419	1.4632
189	1	0.0000	3.4294	0.0103	0.0003	5.3844	1.5383
190	1	0.0000	1.4744	0.0022	0.0000	2.3385	0.6588
191	1	0.0006	1.9644	0.0238	0.0212	3.1057	0.8785

192	1	0.0011	8.0458	0.0873	0.0535	12.9446	3.8552
193	1	0.0000	2.1066	0.0051	0.0003	3.3992	0.9526
194	1	0.0014	1.0406	0.0222	0.0152	1.6767	0.4767
195	1	0.0001	0.0008	0.0009	0.0001	0.0014	0.0009
196	1	0.0032	4.4916	0.1366	0.0529	5.9009	2.2430
197	1	0.0005	6.1710	0.0529	0.1046	10.2159	3.0544
198	1	0.0001	4.4494	0.0350	0.0026	7.2468	2.0972
199	1	0.0093	31.6441	0.6299	0.1392	21.2041	7.1895
200	1	0.0000	1.9863	0.0047	0.0003	3.2012	0.8969
201	1	0.0007	2.8001	0.0404	0.0494	4.0081	1.1808
202	1	0.0048	31.1676	1.1294	0.1528	46.8469	15.5662
203	1	0.0042	52.7453	0.9512	0.0822	35.3644	11.5662
204	1	0.0000	1.2400	0.0018	0.0000	1.9468	0.5540
205	1	0.0001	2.3678	0.0112	0.0014	2.8493	0.8506
206	1	0.0000	3.6562	0.0127	0.0001	5.9501	1.6836
207	1	0.0000	3.3041	0.0090	0.0000	5.3034	1.5102
208	1	0.0043	152.8438	0.9081	0.0098	5.9978	6.2058
209	1	0.0000	2.5828	0.0111	0.0006	4.1119	1.1558
210	1	0.0009	14.2789	0.1176	0.0166	4.8255	1.8954
211	1	0.0000	2.2369	0.0053	0.0000	3.6142	1.0111
212	1	0.0026	17.2728	0.2591	0.0588	6.6849	2.5774
213	1	0.0000	4.1386	0.0145	0.0006	6.6243	1.8766
214	1	0.0000	1.6924	0.0040	0.0000	2.6236	0.7650
215	1	0.0000	1.6398	0.0033	0.0000	2.6275	0.7352
216	1	0.0001	3.7395	0.0198	0.0021	6.0417	1.7328
217	1	0.0002	9.8540	0.0737	0.0015	13.9683	4.1583
218	1	0.0000	1.1309	0.0016	0.0000	1.7482	0.5049
219	1	0.0013	1.3770	0.0107	0.0018	2.1902	0.6240
220	1	0.0014	1.3774	0.0099	0.0018	2.0940	0.6234
221	1	0.0000	0.8597	0.0009	0.0000	1.3382	0.3806
222	1	0.0071	28.4767	0.3428	0.2699	5.9431	3.2122
223	1	0.0000	2.6831	0.0078	0.0000	4.2959	1.2270
224	1	0.0000	2.3758	0.0056	0.0000	3.8432	1.0776
225	1	0.0019	0.0029	0.0181	0.0046	0.0215	0.0153
226	1	0.0003	4.7154	0.0481	0.0079	3.4461	1.0850
227	1	0.0000	2.4882	0.0062	0.0000	4.0161	1.1250
228	1	0.0000	1.7418	0.0030	0.0000	2.7840	0.7833
229	1	0.0000	1.2420	0.0019	0.0000	1.9517	0.5550
230	1	0.0000	0.8449	0.0014	0.0001	1.3332	0.3755
231	1	0.0012	13.6241	0.1447	0.0208	5.2444	2.0448
232	1	0.0004	15.8566	0.0997	0.0042	7.5075	2.4668
233	1	0.0005	7.9513	0.0641	0.0672	10.2752	3.0237
234	1	0.0109	28.8071	0.3434	0.8284	26.4023	9.3707
235	1	0.0158	100.4925	1.3944	0.4523	13.1785	12.7142
236	1	0.0001	4.2790	0.0194	0.0008	6.6851	1.8965
237	1	0.0000	1.5684	0.0043	0.0001	2.3777	0.6992
238	1	0.0000	1.5294	0.0029	0.0000	2.3947	0.6875
239	1	0.0000	1.0767	0.0013	0.0000	1.6624	0.4792
240	1	0.0000	1.8029	0.0038	0.0000	2.8037	0.8121
241	1	0.0000	2.4579	0.0075	0.0002	3.8673	1.1078

242	1	0.0005	2.0130	0.0239	0.0244	3.0406	0.8783
243	1	0.0042	20.4636	0.4118	0.0929	14.0162	4.6642
244	1	0.0052	113.1051	1.0502	0.0776	12.7074	6.8148
245	1	0.0007	12.9811	0.1121	0.0110	12.0148	3.9796
246	1	0.0001	4.1065	0.0185	0.0002	6.6551	1.8936
247	1	0.0001	2.9476	0.0108	0.0008	4.7609	1.3403
248	1	0.0020	17.9378	0.4768	0.0701	28.9733	8.9507
249	1	0.0157	21.8228	0.5637	0.8269	19.7604	7.1462
250	1	0.0004	9.9721	0.0290	0.0134	2.3087	1.1984
251	1	0.0000	0.8173	0.0011	0.0000	1.2613	0.3631
252	1	0.0030	23.2429	0.1302	0.0897	7.4254	2.9011
253	1	0.0040	20.4504	0.1867	0.2448	13.6908	4.4921
254	1	0.0002	7.5352	0.0762	0.0165	12.2931	3.5706
255	1	0.0003	0.0982	0.0116	0.0175	0.0489	0.0279
256	1	0.0013	5.8244	0.1702	0.0258	4.5157	1.6109
257	1	0.0291	58.2700	0.9660	1.5057	17.3271	8.8474
258	1	0.0166	33.0847	0.2767	1.5612	11.7153	5.0545
259	1	0.0014	16.0642	0.1948	0.2089	20.7978	6.1819
260	1	0.0001	0.9368	0.0021	0.0005	1.4607	0.4183
261	1	0.0002	1.8732	0.0061	0.0040	3.0312	0.8520
262	1	0.0022	27.3702	0.2354	0.1445	12.7201	4.3419
263	1	0.0007	14.4468	0.0655	0.0099	6.5522	2.4510
264	1	0.0002	6.7699	0.0402	0.0130	10.4206	2.9691
265	1	0.0048	74.6154	0.3112	0.0231	7.5773	5.4807
266	1	0.0003	0.2341	0.0084	0.0261	0.0637	0.0333
267	1	0.0023	5.1929	0.1346	0.1507	8.6313	3.6043
268	1	0.0003	2.6939	0.0170	0.0089	4.2959	1.2161
269	1	0.0035	16.8341	0.3758	0.0936	17.2980	5.4796
270	1	0.0003	9.0011	0.0701	0.0004	14.8201	4.4159
271	1	0.0215	104.4219	1.3592	0.0094	6.1561	6.6351
272	1	0.0000	2.1950	0.0049	0.0000	3.5356	0.9881
273	1	0.0007	0.9537	0.0090	0.0079	1.5228	0.4345
274	1	0.0000	0.0002	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001
275	1	0.0013	22.4302	0.0907	0.0123	5.5339	2.5196
276	1	0.0015	13.0856	0.0926	0.0568	7.8042	2.6308
277	1	0.0001	2.7752	0.0094	0.0069	4.3175	1.2155
278	1	0.0096	11.0976	0.0281	0.9272	2.4054	1.3682
279	1	0.0438	64.2802	1.1061	2.6696	43.4989	15.5331
280	1	0.0000	3.3704	0.0118	0.0022	5.3604	1.5280
281	1	0.0010	30.5858	0.1316	0.0005	3.4296	3.5557
282	1	0.0002	4.0382	0.0158	0.0149	3.2992	1.1037
283	1	0.0031	59.5680	0.1766	0.0353	5.1670	4.1675
284	1	0.0000	3.6016	0.0118	0.0012	5.4352	1.5475
285	1	0.0006	24.5523	0.0572	0.0428	2.2991	1.5346
286	1	0.0000	4.7996	0.0124	0.0022	3.7061	1.1475
287	1	0.0001	2.6096	0.0101	0.0051	3.3117	0.9926
288	1	0.0003	12.5261	0.0466	0.0256	3.7135	1.4054
289	1	0.0024	60.5170	0.4921	0.1037	14.4934	5.7328
290	1	0.0063	18.1650	0.2084	0.5001	19.0989	6.2464
291	1	0.0009	13.4871	0.0526	0.0211	3.6796	1.4490

292	1	0.0010	10.9430	0.0451	0.0306	3.8165	1.4843
293	1	0.0000	3.1901	0.0107	0.0042	4.8442	1.4389
294	1	0.0000	3.4492	0.0112	0.0003	5.5881	1.5808
295	1	0.0000	3.8026	0.0118	0.0002	5.8023	1.6357
296	1	0.0012	33.3438	0.1610	0.0016	3.7326	3.8734
297	1	0.0004	9.3455	0.0312	0.0089	1.8684	0.7950
298	1	0.0006	8.5599	0.0388	0.0306	9.5844	2.8372
299	1	0.0012	14.8879	0.0662	0.0640	4.8687	1.9609
300	1	0.0080	22.4583	0.1703	0.7791	27.2386	8.8187
301	1	0.0001	6.6450	0.0333	0.0081	10.7910	3.0887
302	1	0.0182	47.6775	0.5664	0.8082	22.6927	8.5546
303	1	0.0195	47.8715	0.8685	0.7409	17.8657	7.7734
304	1	0.0000	1.4302	0.0032	0.0004	2.0680	0.6395
305	1	0.0001	4.7023	0.0147	0.0000	0.4451	0.4566
306	1	0.0012	11.5195	0.0452	0.0446	1.1656	0.6619
307	1	0.0000	2.6949	0.0081	0.0001	1.5245	0.3710
308	1	0.0032	0.0215	0.0055	0.1150	0.0155	0.0226
309	1	0.0121	25.4467	0.2461	1.0940	8.8757	3.2114
310	1	0.0046	14.7497	0.1931	0.4701	8.1335	2.2784
311	1	0.0007	6.6243	0.0395	0.0474	1.6314	0.7430
312	1	0.0004	1.8078	0.0039	0.0434	0.9115	0.2417
313	1	0.0042	13.7685	0.1250	0.6416	7.3983	2.1185
314	1	0.0001	4.2244	0.0266	0.0094	2.4002	0.5914
315	1	0.0489	56.5244	0.5314	4.0076	4.6381	4.1490
316	1	0.0001	4.0140	0.0180	0.0131	2.2742	0.5588
317	1	0.0000	1.5804	0.0091	0.0073	0.9023	0.2246
318	1	0.0015	39.8034	0.1826	0.0875	1.5886	1.6439
319	1	0.0000	2.4267	0.0065	0.0000	1.3569	0.3325
320	1	0.0383	41.9642	0.2753	3.6977	8.8853	4.3287
321	1	0.0069	23.4667	0.2970	0.8918	13.2254	3.9363
322	1	0.0049	7.0322	0.0488	0.5900	3.3852	1.0345
323	1	0.0031	8.3766	0.0380	0.2578	3.6084	1.1111
324	1	0.0015	20.7181	0.1159	0.1084	2.3041	1.2203
325	1	0.0001	5.2562	0.0251	0.0115	2.9834	0.7367
326	1	0.0087	59.8440	0.5638	1.1286	4.0640	2.6686
327	1	0.0000	2.5665	0.0098	0.0024	1.4212	0.3516
328	1	0.0020	36.4808	0.1011	0.0638	1.0381	1.9441
329	1	0.0000	0.9153	0.0027	0.0001	0.5098	0.1239
330	1	0.0032	91.8069	0.1946	0.0193	0.9350	4.5345
331	1	0.0559	25.4025	0.0276	5.2719	2.3232	2.8668
332	1	0.0339	56.0690	0.5652	3.2180	3.8752	3.9265
333	1	0.0017	12.6116	0.0384	0.2199	2.2927	1.3810
334	1	0.0003	7.5333	0.0464	0.0331	2.6342	0.6742
335	1	0.0000	2.3603	0.0068	0.0006	1.3224	0.3223
336	1	0.0003	3.0664	0.0056	0.0297	0.7993	0.2957
337	1	0.0001	3.8396	0.0133	0.0068	0.7795	0.4129
338	1	0.0045	37.1237	0.2009	0.2751	3.3751	1.4586
339	1	0.0000	1.7710	0.0072	0.0015	0.8954	0.2211
340	1	0.0000	8.1298	0.0178	0.0002	0.1582	0.0481
341	1	0.0001	9.6747	0.0315	0.0043	1.6077	0.4101

342	1	0.0003	6.2667	0.0206	0.0217	0.8680	0.5522
343	1	0.0008	12.9456	0.1100	0.1280	6.6153	1.7596
344	1	0.0010	2.9965	0.0111	0.0329	1.7004	0.4189
345	1	0.0294	41.9499	0.1301	3.1833	6.9490	3.5097
346	1	0.0000	0.8799	0.0021	0.0006	0.4646	0.1173
347	1	0.0002	6.7481	0.0220	0.0095	0.6961	0.4707
348	1	0.0000	2.4239	0.0103	0.0020	1.1611	0.3163
349	1	0.0003	6.0892	0.0292	0.0133	1.8489	0.5475
350	1	0.0012	29.8015	0.0578	0.0605	1.1994	1.6351
351	1	0.0002	5.2846	0.0192	0.0299	2.6962	0.7102
352	1	0.0005	9.7798	0.0490	0.0251	1.1236	0.8368
353	1	0.0036	21.3652	0.1028	0.4162	2.5907	2.2225
354	1	0.0094	47.9310	0.1487	1.4020	3.8458	3.5603
355	1	0.0000	0.0004	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000
356	1	0.0001	2.8557	0.0052	0.0136	1.0121	0.3092
357	1	0.0000	2.0213	0.0049	0.0001	1.1202	0.2753
358	1	0.0000	1.3395	0.0030	0.0000	0.7359	0.1815
359	1	0.0000	1.2016	0.0023	0.0000	0.6390	0.1620
360	1	0.0000	1.4917	0.0029	0.0001	0.8343	0.2024
361	1	0.0002	4.5028	0.0144	0.0343	1.9545	0.5107
362	1	0.0010	19.8959	0.0652	0.0259	1.1889	1.3499
363	1	0.0010	24.1417	0.0564	0.0700	2.5370	1.5640
364	1	0.0005	2.7570	0.0107	0.0210	1.5487	0.3786
365	1	0.0004	3.1367	0.0171	0.0148	1.6489	0.4129
	Max	0.0559	156.9367	1.3960	5.2719	46.8469	15.5662
	Min	0.0000	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	Average	0.0024	14.1372	0.1084	0.1567	4.3179	1.7602
	Sigma	0.0064	23.9575	0.2309	0.5372	5.8710	2.2791

Table 3. 2005 Bridger IMPROVE Monitoring Data

Date	NO3 (ug/m^3)
01/01/2005	0.073
01/04/2005	0.155
01/07/2005	0.096
01/10/2005	0.016
01/13/2005	0.066
01/16/2005	0.025
01/22/2005	0.025
01/25/2005	0.031
01/28/2005	0.053
01/31/2005	0.033
02/03/2005	0.020
02/06/2005	0.195
02/09/2005	0.561
02/12/2005	0.026
02/15/2005	0.155
02/18/2005	0.017
02/21/2005	0.018
02/24/2005	0.035
02/27/2005	0.173
03/02/2005	0.058
03/05/2005	0.146
03/08/2005	0.190
03/11/2005	0.168
03/14/2005	0.070
03/17/2005	0.271
03/20/2005	0.248
03/23/2005	0.025
03/26/2005	0.092
03/29/2005	0.076
04/01/2005	0.074
04/04/2005	0.362
04/07/2005	0.141
04/10/2005	0.064
04/13/2005	0.255
04/16/2005	0.129
04/19/2005	0.142
04/22/2005	0.128
04/25/2005	0.147
04/28/2005	0.032
05/01/2005	0.165
05/04/2005	0.142
05/07/2005	0.061
05/10/2005	0.113
05/13/2005	0.063
05/16/2005	0.164
05/19/2005	0.089
05/22/2005	0.038
05/25/2005	0.091
05/28/2005	0.033
05/31/2005	0.087
06/03/2005	0.048
06/06/2005	0.146
06/09/2005	0.031
06/12/2005	0.118
06/15/2005	0.063
06/18/2005	0.124
06/21/2005	0.079
06/24/2005	0.180
06/27/2005	0.007
07/15/2005	0.040
08/14/2005	0.046
09/07/2005	0.078
09/10/2005	0.164

2007 JAN -9 AM 10:27

09/13/2005	0.185
09/16/2005	0.142
09/19/2005	0.039
09/22/2005	0.040
09/25/2005	0.159
10/07/2005	0.055
10/10/2005	0.048
10/13/2005	0.018
10/16/2005	0.133
10/19/2005	0.0824
10/22/2005	0.021
10/25/2005	0.039
10/28/2005	0.139
10/31/2005	0.075
11/03/2005	0.068
11/06/2005	0.043
11/09/2005	0.018
11/12/2005	0.073
11/15/2005	0.039
11/18/2005	0.025
11/21/2005	0.017
11/27/2005	0.016
11/30/2005	0.135
12/03/2005	0.063
12/06/2005	0.110
12/09/2005	0.005
12/12/2005	0.012
12/15/2005	0.023
12/18/2005	0.112
12/21/2005	0.017
12/27/2005	0.027
12/30/2005	0.072
Maximum	**0.561**

2007 APR -9 A10:27



Figure 2. Cumulative Frequency Distribution for Bridger Class I Area NO3 Concentrations Modeled versus Monitored 1988-2005

AQ-17 BI-4-37

It appears that the magnitude of the CALPUFF over prediction is in the range of a factor of 6 to 35 and a model having such a magnitude of over prediction CANNOT be used to forecast future conditions. Unfortunately, BLM has chosen to ignore the recommendations previously made by BP to identify model performance and unless between draft and final a thorough model evaluation is conducted, the modeling results will mislead the public regarding potential impacts of development and will result in improper environmental management policies.

Because the above comparison focused simply on the highest predicted and measured NO_3 concentrations, care must be exercised to ensure that such a comparison is not affected by outliers. In order to address this issue, a comparison of 2005 monitored NO_3 frequency distributions was compared to the 2005 modeled frequency distribution (Figure 2). This figure demonstrates that the NO_3 frequency distribution for the monitoring data is substantially lower than the NO_3 frequency distribution for the modeling results. This

again indicates that CALPUFF is not accurately replicating observed concentrations. The fact that the CALPUFF model is not replicating any portion of the frequency distribution is a very strong indication that the any differences between monitor location and maximum receptor or sampling interval are not significant, but rather inaccuracy in the model formulation and application. Figure 3 presents the frequency distribution for all measured NO_3 concentrations over the period or record (1988 through 2005) and demonstrates that the frequency distributions for all years of monitoring data are similar. This clearly illustrates that 2005 monitoring data are consistent with measurements made during other years.



Figure 3. Cumulative Frequency Distribution for Bridger Class I Area NO3 Concentrations 1988-2005

AQ-18

BI-4-38

It should be stressed that the 2005 actual emission inventory only includes oil and gas operations from the Pinedale Study Area. Emissions from oil and gas operations beyond the Pinedale Study Area, emissions from non oil and gas industrial sources (trona and power production), mobile sources, residential emissions, etc. are not included in inventory. If these additional emissions were included in the modeling analysis as they are in the monitoring data, modeled NO_3 concentrations would become larger, thus further increasing the amount of model over prediction compared to monitored impacts.

AQ-19 BI-4-39

In conclusion, the BP analysis comparison provides conclusive evidence that the CALPUFF model as configured by BLM in the Pinedale analysis is not providing accurate estimates of NO_3 impacts from development and such a serious deficiency must be corrected between draft and final.

Potential Reasons for Model Bias

In a recent paper, Environ conducted a critical review of the chemistry modules in CALPUFF[1]. The MESOPUFF II chemistry module contained in CALPUFF reduces thousands of reactions and hundreds of species into the four equations listed below .

1) $SO_2 \xrightarrow{k_1} SO_4$

2) $NOx \xrightarrow{k_2} HNO_3 + RNO_3$

3) $NOx \xrightarrow{k_3} HNO_3$

4) $HNO_3\,(g) \xleftrightarrow{NH_3} NO_3\,(PM)$

where:

$k_1 = 36 \times R^{0.55} \times [O_3]^{0.71} \times S^{-1.29} + k_{1(aq)}$

$k_{1(aq)} = 3 \times 10^{-8} \times RH^4$ (added to k_1 above during the day)

$k_2 = 1206 \times [O_3]^{1.5} \times S^{-1.41} \times [NOx]^{-0.33}$

$k_3 = 1261 \times [O_3]^{1.45} \times S^{-1.34} \times [NOx]^{-0.12}$

In the MESOPUFF II chemistry module used in CALPUFF, SO_4 formation is described by 4 variables:

1) Solar Radiation;
2) Background Ozone (surface, user provided);
3) Atmospheric Stability; and
4) Relative Humidity (surrogate for aqueous-phase).

[1] Ralph Morris, Steven Lau and Bonyoung Koo, 2005, Evaluation of the CALPUFF Chemistry Algorithms , Presented at A&WMA 98th Annual Conference and Exhibition June 21-25, 2005 Minneapolis, Minnesota

NO_3 formation is described by 3 variables:

1) Background Ozone;
2) Atmospheric Stability; and
3) Plume NOx Concentration

The Environ paper cites the following theoretical limitations of CALPUFF using the MESOPUFF II chemistry module.

1) Aqueous-Phase SO_4 Formation is inaccurate and is solely based on surface relative humidity (RH). In reality, aqueous-phase SO_4 formation is not at all affected by RH and this assumption is incorrect.
2) The MESOPUFF II transformation rates were developed using temperatures of 86, 68 and 50°F. The lack of temperature effects and 50°F minimum temperature used in development will overstate SO_4 and NO_3 formation under cold conditions.

As part of the Environ paper, comparisons of NO_3 formation using the MESOPUFF II chemistry module in CALPUFF were compared to the IMPROVE and CASTNet monitoring data and Figure 4 present these comparisons. The blue points represent the MESOPUFF II predictions and the red points represent model predictions from CMAQ (a current state of the art photochemical model). As indicated in these figures, the MESOPUFF II chemistry module overstates NO_3 formation where the CMAQ model, using a complete chemical module, correlates better with the observations.

2007 MAR -5 AM 10:27

Figure 4. Predicted and Observed NO_3 Levels



Conclusions Regarding CALPUFF Chemistry

AQ-20

Based on information provided in the Pinedale analysis, it is inappropriate for BLM to issue a Record of Decision (ROD) for development that includes additional mitigation that is predicated on the draft CALPUFF analysis without supporting evidence that the model is accurately predicting concentrations and changes in visibility.

BI-4-40

A potential reason that CALPUFF is over predicting observed NO_3 concentrations is the assumed use of the IWAQM default NH_3 concentration of 1 ppb. This assumption is in direct conflict with the modeling analysis that was done for the South West Wyoming Technical Air Forum (SWWYTAF). One major finding of the SWWYTAF modeling verification analysis was that CALPUFF would not replicate observed NO_3 concentrations in the Bridger Class I Area using the IWAQM default NH_3 concentrations. An extensive analysis of air quality measurements in the region concluded that NO_3 formation was limited by NH_3 concentrations. Once this finding was included in the modeling along with boundary conditions, CALPUFF replicated the observed NO_3 concentrations. In the Pinedale EIS analysis, ignoring this finding and using an arbitrary default value adds unnecessary conservatism to the analysis. Figure 5 illustrates the effect on predicted NO_3 concentrations based on background NH_3 concentrations.

AQ-21

Figure 5.



Comparison of NO_3 Predicted Concentrations for Various NH_3 Levels As a Function of Distance

As indicated by this figure, there was approximately a 60 percent difference in predicted NO_3 concentrations by changing the background concentration from 1 ppb to 0.5 ppb. The application of how NH_3 concentrations are used in CALPUFF is very conservative because the model assumes that the NH_3 concentration is uniform between the ground and plume height. In reality, this assumption is not likely to be true and NH_3 concentrations at plume height will be less than those at ground level.

BI-4-41

As part of the BP review, an analysis was conducted of estimated mass flux calculations based on a uniform 1 ppb concentration throughout the mixed layer. The CALPUFF modeling was based on a 4 kilometer grid size and a modeling domain of 116 cells by 138 cells. Emission flux estimates were based on assumed wind speeds and mixing heights and were converted into an emission rate based on the size of the modeling domain. Table 4 present regional estimates of NH_3 emissions using this approach. It was assumed that the wind speed did not vary with height in the screening calculations and as a result this will underestimate emissions. The screening estimates were compared

AQ-22 BI-4-41

to NH_3 emission calculations developed by WRAP that indicated that emissions were at a maximum of 1 ton/day in very limited 36 kilometer grid cells and many grid cells had no NH_3 emissions. Based on the mass flux calculations, the assumption of ambient NH_3 concentrations of 1 ppb is inconsistent with the work performed by WRAP and significantly overstates the mass of NH_3 available in the region. Appendix B presents maps of NH_3 emissions prepared by WRAP for the first day of each month of 2002. It should be noted that the maximum modeled visibility impacts occurred in December, however, the 2002 WRAP inventory indicates almost no NH_3 emissions.

2007 APR -9 AM 10: 27

Table 4. NH_3 Mass Flux Calculations

Assumptions

Assume 4 km grid square

Assume 1 ppb of NH3 = 0.695011 ug/m3 mw of NH3 =17

Assume 100 meter mixing height

Calpuff assumes a uniform NH3 profile

This means that NH3 concentration will be 1 ppb up to mixed height

Case 1 - 3 m/s 1000 m mixing height

Upwind face of grid square =	4,000 meters	
height of box =	1,000 meters	Average for day
Vertical area =	4,000,000 m2	
Average wind speed (for a day)	3 m/s	at 10 -meters
Flux	2.09 ug/m2-sec	
mass rate across a grid square	8340132 ug/s	
	8.34 g/s	
	1.05 lbs/hr	
	0.0126 tons /day per grid square	
	15,776 number of grid squares	
	198.9 Tons/day over entire modeling domain	

Case 2 - 10 m/s 1000 m mixing height

Upwind face of grid square =	4,000 meters
height of box =	1,000 meters
Vertical area =	4,000,000 m2
Average wind speed (for a day)	10 m/s
Flux	6.95 ug/m2-sec
mass rate across a grid square	27800440 ug/s
	27.80 g/s
	3.50 lbs/hr
	0.0420 tons /day per grid square
	15,776 number of grid squares
	663.1 Tons/day over entire modeling domain

Case 3 - 1 m/s 100 m mixing height

Upwind face of grid square =	4,000 meters	
height of box =	100 meters	Average for day
Vertical area =	400,000 m2	
Average wind speed (for a day)	1 m/s	at 10 -meters

Flux	0.70 ug/m2-sec
mass rate across a grid square	278004 ug/s
	0.28 g/s
	0.04 lbs/hr
	0.0004 tons /day per grid square
	15,776 number of grid squares
	6.6 Tons/day over entire modeling domain
WRAP Calculates Approximately	1 ton per day in selected grid squares Approximately 10 percent of the grid squares the rest of the grid cells indicate no NH3 emissions
	49 Tons/day for the modeling domain

Comparison of Mass Flux and WRAP

	Mass Flux	WRAP	Ratio
Case 1	199	49	4.09
Case 2	663	49	13.62
Case 3	6.6	49	0.14

BI-4-42

Another issue with the treatment of NH_3 is the manner in which BLM ran CALPUFF. The modeling was separated into 18 individual runs and then the results were added together. This was done to enable source group attribution and because CALPUFF has a limitation of 200 sources. For cases with overlapping plumes as exists in Pinedale, it was assumed that each individual CALPUFF modeling run had 1 ppb of NH_3 available for conversion of SO_2 into SO_4 and NO_2 into NO_3. Thus, as an upper limit the modeling assumed that there was 18 ppb of NH_3 available for conversion. The CALPUFF post processing programs allow combining CALPUFF runs and repartitioning of NO_3 based on NH_3 conditions, however, this option was not used in the BLM analysis.

AQ-23

As indicated in BP's comments regarding model accuracy, it is strongly recommended that BLM take steps to address the issue of large bias (over prediction of actual conditions) of CALPUFF. BP believes that there are several approaches that BLM could take.

1) Abandon CALPUFF and use CMAQ or CAMx for both visibility and ozone.

2) Perform a model evaluation of CALPUFF

2007 APR -9 AM 10:27

AQ-23 AQ-24 BI-4-42

3) Develop a scaling approach for CALPUFF

Regardless which option BLM chooses, BLM must correct these deficiencies in the analysis and document.

Conversion of Concentrations into Visual Range

In the TSD, BLM presents five different calculation methods for converting concentrations of fine particulate into changes in visual range. Figures 6 and 7 present the number of days greater than 1 dv and the maximum change in visibility using the five calculation procedures for the 2005 actual case. In these figures the underlying modeling is constant (i.e., the modeled concentration estimates are unchanged). Comparing these methods indicates that there are substantial differences in the perceived change in visibility depending on what calculation method is used. For example, the number of days in excess of 1 dv increases from 40 to 62 in the 2005 actual emission inventory case if the BART calculation procedures are used versus Method 2 that assumes hourly concentration estimates. Similarly, the maximum change in visual range increases from 3 dv (using the RHR and average background concentrations) to almost 14 dv (using Method 2). This perceived change in visibility is simply a function of different calculation methods. It is important to keep in mind that this information is for 2005 actual conditions and such projections are inconsistent with the monitoring data.

BI-4-43

AQ-25

It is recommended that BLM adopt the RHR using average conditions. There is a technical basis for this selection as all of the other calculation procedures assume very clean background conditions (IMPROVE cleanest 20% days or FLAG default) for every day of the year, an unrealistic assumption. Maximum visibility impacts are based on the maximum modeling impacts that occur under worst case meteorological impacts and assuming that they coincide with the days having the best visual range is counter intuitive. In addition, the RHR using average air quality is consistent with the methodology that is being used by EPA and the States to determine if a source is exempt from performing a BART analysis. The other suggested calculation procedures have no regulatory basis.

AQ-25

It is also recommended that BLM adopt the revised IMPROVE calculation procedures that were established in 2006.

2007 JUN -9 AM 10:27


Figure 6. Change in Visual Range by Methodology
2005 Actual
Number of Days GT 1 dv
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
RHR Average
RHR Best
Flag =6
Flag = 2
IMPROVE
Method



The Interpretation of What Constitutes a "Just Noticeable Change" in Visibility

BP has previously submitted extensive comments regarding the application of a Just Noticeable Change (JNC) of 1 dv. BLM has not address these concerns in the past; however, it is important to point out the limitations in the assumed JNC of 1 dv threshold. While BLM and Forest Service have established a level of concern regarding source impacts and visibility, it is important for the public and decision makers to understand the basis for estimating the just noticeable change (JNC) in visual range as specified by EPA and used in the analysis. The following presents a discussion of those procedures. One basis of the JNC is the National Acidic Precipitation Program (NAPAP) Report. A review of the information provided in the NAPAP Report indicates that the JNC was based on the Quadratic Detection Model proposed by Carlson and Cohen that was used to predict thresholds of perceived image sharpness in video type image displays[2]. While the theory used for defining a JNC threshold in a video monitor may be applicable to air quality visibility issues, neither EPA nor the NAPAP Report have provided any

[2] Carlson and Cohen. 1978. Image Descriptors for Displays: Visibility of Displayed Information. RCA Laboratories, Princeton, NJ.

supporting evidence that the JNC threshold in video monitors is in any way applicable to determining changes in visual ranges in the atmosphere over long sight paths.

Universal Applicability of JNC Over Long Sight Paths

The NAPAP reference raises several important questions regarding the JNC threshold over long sight paths. First, there is no clear definition of what the statement "a change in extinction coefficient of approximately 5% will evoke a just noticeable change **in most landscapes**" means. Second, it is also unclear how universally applicable this threshold could be over a large range of sight paths. Figure 8 presents a plot of the JNC threshold as a function of sight path and indicates that the JNC threshold is dependant on the sight path[3]. This suggests that the establishment of a human perceivable JNC threshold may be dependant on the longest sight path within a Class I Area and that the establishment of a single JNC threshold might not be appropriate and therefore contrary to what EPA has proposed.

Deciview Visibility Unit of Measure

BI-4-44

An additional reference provided regarding a human JNC threshold is an Atmospheric Environment paper written by Pitchford and Malm[4]. This paper outlines the concept of the deciview visibility unit of measure in which the authors conclude, based on what

[3] National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program (NAPAP). Acid Deposition: State of the Science and Technology Report 24, Visibility: Existing and Historical Conditions-Causes and Effects, Washington, DC, 1991. See Appendix D. p.24-D2.

[4] Pitchford M. L. and W. C. Malm, 1994 "Development and Applications of a Standard Visual Index" Atmospheric Environment Vol. 28, No. 5 pp. 1049-1054

appears to be a sensitivity analysis, "From this it seems **reasonable to**



Figure 8. Just Noticeable Change Surface Plotted as a Function of Observer Distance and Atmospheric Extinction.[5]

AQ-27
BI-4-44

presume that a fractional change in extinction coefficient between 5 and 20 % would produce a JNC in a scene"[6]. The use of what appears to be a **presumptive** sensitivity analysis to develop a JNC threshold is not appropriate. The authors also conclude "a 1 to 2 dv change corresponds to a small visibility perceptible change in a scene appearance **where the assumptions used in developing the deciview scale are met.**"[7] This would translate to a change of 10 to 20 percent in extinction. Because a 1 to 2 deciview change is perceivable only if the assumptions used to develop the deciview scale are met, it is important to review the assumptions that were made in the development of the deciview

[5] National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program (NAPAP). Acid Deposition: State of the Science and Technology Report 24, Visibility: Existing and Historical Conditions-Causes and Effects, Washington, DC, 1991.
[6] Pitchford M. L. and W. C. Malm, 1994 "Development and Applications of a Standard Visual Index" Atmospheric Environment Vol. 28, No. 5 pp. 1049-1054
[7] Pitchford M. L. and W. C. Malm, 1994 "Development and Applications of a Standard Visual Index" Atmospheric Environment Vol. 28, No. 5 pp. 1049-1054

2001 AUG 9 AM 10:27

scale because they define the limitations on universal applicability of this visibility unit of measure. Other deciview assumptions are:

1) Contrast is a good indicator of visibility. The apparent contrast of an element of a scene can be used to estimate whether the element can be perceived and, when it can be perceived, the apparent contrast can also be used to evaluate the visual quality of its appearance.
2) The magnitude of the change in apparent contrast of a distant terrain feature against the horizontal sky required for a JNC is proportional to the apparent contrast of the terrain feature.
3) The apparent contrast of a distant terrain feature against the horizontal sky is given by the following equation:

$$C=C_o \exp(-r\, B_{ext})$$

Where: C is the apparent contrast

C_o is the initial contrast

B_{ext} is the average extinction coefficient for the sight path

r is the distance to a distant terrain feature

The first assumption regarding contrast being an indicator of visibility is generally accepted.

Inherent in the second assumption is that, for a change to be noticeable, the magnitude of the change is proportional to the change in contrast as stated in the following equation.

$$\text{delta } C_{JNC} = L\, C$$

Where: L is a constant that depends on spatial frequency but not contrast

The work of Carlson and Cohen has shown that this equation is not generally considered valid, but may provide a reasonable approximation in viewing environments such as a

2007 MAR -5 AM 10:27

view of a terrain feature against the horizontal sky[8]. As such, this assumption could be considered in development of a JNC threshold.

The third assumption is valid if the horizontal sky radiance has the same value at each end of the sight path. Further, it can be regarded as a restriction that the use of the deciview index or extinction applies to terrain features against the sky. In general, the use of the deciview index only applies to the special case where the sight path is equal to the visual range. This assumption is also applicable to the manner in which the 5 percent change in extinction was defined as a JNC threshold. This is a significant over simplification of the proposed JNC threshold.

In a review of the aforementioned Pitchford and Malm deciview scale, Richards indicated, "For example, more than a 40 % change (more than 4 – dv change) in regional haze is required for the change to be perceptible in sight paths shorter than 20 % of the visual range."[9] Richards also states that in some cases a 5 percent change in contrast can be perceivable but it is commonly assumed that features with only a 2 percent change in contrast can be perceived. Using this information, Richards shows that the Pitchford and Malm equations can be rewritten as follows:

For a 2 percent case

$$\text{delta } b_{JNC} = 0.4 / r$$

and a 5 percent case

$$\text{delta } b_{JNC} = 0.32 / r$$

These equations apply to sight paths of any length less than or equal to the visual range and give the value for delta b_{JNC} equal to those calculated by the Pitchford and Malm work when the sight path is equal to the visual range.

AQ-28 | BI-4-45

Based on the importance of the inclusion of sight path in the determination of the JNC, it seems imperative that EPA incorporates this approach into the JNC threshold

[8] Carlson, C.R. and R.W. Cohen 1978 "Visibility of displayed information. Image descriptors for displays" RCA Laboratories, Princeton N.J.

[9] Richards, L.W., 1999,"Use of the Deciview Haze Index as an Indicator for Regional Haze", AWMA

AQ-28
BI-4-45

determination. This would require that the JNC threshold be site specific for each Class I Area and that individual states would be required to develop their own JNC threshold for each Class I Area. Incorporation of this approach would ensure that the JNC threshold would be based on the "best science".

Practical Perspective of the Deciview Assumptions

It is important to place the assumptions used by Pitchford and Malm into practical perspective. Figure 9 presents a comparison of the longest lines that can be drawn within 35 Class I Areas as well as the estimated lengths of the longest visual range sight paths within these areas[10]. The visual ranges were calculated from the average light extinction coefficient for the 20 percent of the days that were the least impaired (clean) as well as the 20 percent of the days that were the most impaired (hazy). A point on a line indicates the percentage of the parks that have a ratio equal to or smaller than the value at that point. Most ratios are less than 1 and therefore sight paths are typically shorter than the visual range and contrary to the assumptions used in the development of the deciview index. This indicates that for a vast number of Class I Areas, the basic assumption of the deciview calculation has not been met. Thus, assuming that the sight path is equal to the visual range simply adds a layer of unnecessary additional conservatism to the calculation.

2007 APR -9 AM 10:27

[10] Richards, L.W., 1999,"Use of the Deciview Haze Index as an Indicator for Regional Haze", AWMA



Figure 9. Comparison of Lengths of the Longest Lines for 35 National Parks and the Estimated Sight Path Within These Parks[11]

Also, FLAG (a guideline, not a regulation) considers a 0.5 dv change in visibility significant for a single source and 1.0 dv significant for a cumulative analysis. Based on the above information, the public and the decision makers should not consider the Forest Service LOC of 0.5 dv as a decision point for this analysis. Further, based on the information presented in these comments, it is important to keep in mind the conservative nature of a 1.0 dv threshold.

Comments of Ozone Analysis

BP believes that current WDEQ air quality permitting practices, air quality monitoring, the composition of VOC emissions from oil and gas operations and realistic VOC emission growth projections will ensure that the ozone air quality standard in Wyoming will not be exceeded. Ambient air monitoring is being used as used as the tool to demonstrate compliance with the standard and evaluate if the current control levels are adequate. In addition, Wyoming DEQ has been conducting a major field/modeling analysis to understand winter ozone formation in southwest Wyoming. It is believed that

[11] Richards, L.W., 1999,"Use of the Deciview Haze Index as an Indicator for Regional Haze", AWMA

the Supplemental Ozone modeling analysis prepared by BLM does not add any substantial new information regarding ozone formation in southwest Wyoming. Until the results of the Wyoming DEQ analysis are completed and ozone formation during the winter is understood, conducting additional modeling analyses will not provide any new meaningful information.

Level of Emission Control in Wyoming

Important factors in analyzing the growth of emissions from new wells in the Pinedale Field are the stringent Wyoming DEQ VOC regulations. All new wells must comply with these regulations and the result is a substantial reduction in VOC emissions. These regulations are summarized in the following:

Control Requirements for Single Well Facilities

Flashing Emissions

1) Emission controls meeting BACT requirements are required for projected average annual VOC flashing emissions equal to or greater than 30 tons per year. In this context, WDEQ requires a control efficiency of 98 percent.

2) Controls required for flashing emissions must be installed within 90-days of the First Date of Production

3) Controls for flashing emissions when installed will remain operational for at least one year after the date of installation. After this time, the controls may be removed provided the previous 30-day, uncontrolled, annualized VOC emission rate is less than 20 tons per year.

Dehydration Emissions

If projected potential annual VOC or total HAP emissions from dehydration units are equal to or greater than 15 tons per year VOCs or 5 tons per year total HAPs, controls must be installed within 90 days of the First Date of Production.

2007 APR -9 AM 10 27

Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (RICE)

As part of the permitting process, BACT is required to be installed on all new natural gas fired engines. This regulatory requirement mandates the installation of emission controls for NOx and HAPs (HAP controls will result in a reduction of VOC emissions).

CALGRID Modeling Analysis

The BP review of the CALGRID ozone modeling is summarized in Table 1. This table presents a ratio of 2005 emissions and the WRAP 2018 oil and gas emissions that were used in the CALGRID modeling. As indicated in this table, NOx emissions in this analysis were 8 times the 2005 emission level and VOC emissions were 38 times 2005 levels. The table also presents the ratio of predicted to observed ozone levels for the highest and 4th highest modeled and monitored values. As indicated in the table, the using the 2018 WRAP emissions in the modeling is over predicting the highest monitored values by approximately 40 percent. For the 4th highest concentrations CALGRID is replicating the monitored values, however, emissions used in the modeling are substantially higher than actually occurred.

AQ-30 AQ-29 BI-4-46

2007 APR -9 AM 10:27

Table 1. Summary of BLM Ozone modeling Results

	Emission Summary			
	NOx	CO	VOCs	SO2
2005 emissions (t/yr)	3,988	3,174	2,731	231
WRAP 2018 oil and gas (t/yr)	32,686	2,469	103,709	8
ratio wrap/2005	8.20	0.78	37.97	0.03

Predicted		Monitored		Ratio of monitoring to modeling
Max	Location of Model Prediction	Max	Monitor	
97	Yellowstone	97	Yellowstone	1.00
77	Yellowstone	77	Yellowstone	1.00
118	Northeastern Lincoln County	82	Daniel	1.44
114	Western Fremont County	81	Bolder	1.41
105	Western Sublette County	98	Jonah	1.07

Predicted		Monitored		Ratio of monitoring to modeling
4 th high	Location of Model Prediction	4 th high	Monitor	
68	Yellowstone	68	Yellowstone	1.00
59	Yellowstone	59	Yellowstone	1.00
69	Northeastern Lincoln County	74	Daniel	0.93
69	Western Fremont County	72	bolder	0.96
76	Western Sublette County	70	Jonah	1.09

2007 NOV -9 AM 10:27

NO2 Increment

BI-4-47

AQ-31

The Draft PAPA SEIS (DSEIS) articulates modeled near field NO_2 concentrations which exceed the PSD increment of 25 ug/m^3 when modeling an actual 2005 PAPA NOx emission inventory of 3512 tons/year. The direct project model predicted impact concentration in the document is shown in Table 1.8 of Volume 2 Appendix I as 31.6 ug/m^3 NO_2 compared against an allowable PSD increment consumption of 25 ug/m^3. Review of the modeling files indicate that this predicted concentration is likely attributable to sources at the Pinedale Compressor Station. The maximum predicted receptor is located within approximately 200 meters of 9 compressor engines. When this source was permitted with Wyoming DEQ Air Quality Division part of the permitting process would have been to perform a modeling study that demonstrated that this facility is in compliance with air quality standards including PSD Class II increment for NO2. Wyoming DEQ could not have issued a permit for construction if that analysis indicated an exceedance of the NO2 PSD increment. This is in contrast to the BLM analysis that indicates an exceedance of the increment.

This is in stark contrast to the regulatory PSD increment demonstration conducted by the Wyoming DEQ where a modeled inventory of 10,978 tons of increment consuming NOx (of which 2,900 was located directly in the Jonah/Pinedale complex) yielded a maximum near field predicted concentration of 11.5 ug/m^3 NO_2 – which is compliant with the PSD increment for NO_2. Given the likely installation date of the Pinedale Station compressors, it is believed that these sources were included in the Wyoming DEQ analysis. The excerpts from this report directly below illustrate the inventory modeled and the predicted increment consumption.

2007 MAR -5 A11:10:27

Table SR-1. Annual NO_x emissions (tons) for sources in Sublette County and the Bridger and Naughton power plants.

	Source Category	Current	Baseline
	Jonah-Pinedale Development Area oil & gas production	2,908	9
	Other Sublette Co. oil & gas production	1,383	445
	Point Sources	1,602	910
	On-Road vehicles	515[1]	766
Other Area Sources	Agricultural Equipment	161[2]	182
	Recreational Equipment	58[1]	55
	Other Area Sources	59[1]	86
Sublette Co. Total:		6,686	2,453
	Bridger Power Plant	34,321	28,115
	Naughton Power Plant	13,240	12,701
Power Plant Total:		47,561	40,816
Grand Total:		54,247	43,269

	Increment Consumed ($\mu g/m^3$)	Maximum PSD Allowance ($\mu g/m^3$)
Class I	0.14	2.5
Class II	11.50	25

AQ-32 BI-4-48

Based on the Wyoming DEQ increment demonstration conducted in 2005 for an emissions year of 2004, the Draft SEIS predicted direct modeled concentrations of NO_2 for the 2005 baseline year are unreasonably high and not a valid representation of potential impact.

This gross over-prediction in the Draft SEIS extends through all of the alternatives modeled and yields direct model predicted impacts exceeding the PSD increment for NO_2 in all cases except the "Alternative C – 80% mitigation" case.

AQ-33 AQ-34 BI-4-49

The Draft SEIS and Air Quality Technical Support Documents do not contain enough detail to ascertain exactly how the modeling of NOx was conducted, where the sources were located, and where the maximum predicted impacts occurred or even what the resolution of the receptor grid was in the near field. Also, modeled stack heights for drilling rigs are not consistent between the nearfield and mid and far field analyses. Due to this lack of detail, in-depth analysis and comments are not possible.

2007 MAR -9 A 10:27

AQ-35 BI-4-50

To correct the overstated impacts and allow full evaluation of the modeling, the NOx modeling must be refined through a more complete source description, facility boundaries and perhaps using an hourly ozone limiting analysis. The results of this refined analysis need to be fully described, and the document amended.

AQ-36 BI-4-51

The document is also deficient in its discussion of the modeled NO_2 concentrations that are greater than the PSD allowable of 25 ug/m^3. It does include repeated qualifications that the modeling is not a regulatory PSD increment comparison and is intended to "evaluate a threshold of concern for potential impacts" (Air Quality Impact Analysis Technical Support Document (AQTSD), Vol. 1, Paragraph 3.4 and elsewhere throughout the document) based on some criteria not explained. BP agrees that BLM cannot regulate PSD increment, but it must disclose such projected impacts. As BLM notes in Chapter 4 of Vol. 1 of the Supplemental EIS, BLM cannot authorize an action that is not in compliance with applicable air quality laws and regulations. The only statement that partially addresses this dilemma is one in paragraph 3.4.3 of Vol. 1 of the AQTSD that simply states *"In addition, because the emissions from drilling rigs are temporary and do not consume PSD increment, and as a result, are excluded from increment consumption comparison."* If the NO_2 modeling analysis is not intended as an increment consumption comparison, rigs do not consume increment, and the BLM's authority for regulation of air quality is simply assuring that they do not approve an action that is in conflict with applicable air quality laws and regulations it is unclear what purpose BLM intends for the modeling and discussion of NO_2 increment in the document. As noted above, the Wyoming DEQ AQD recently completed a regulatory increment comparison which, as the agency with primary jurisdiction for air quality management in the State of Wyoming, does have the weight of regulatory applicability and certainty.

AQ-37 BI-4-52

The BLM's intent in conducting the NO_2 PSD increment comparison in the document should be clarified along with what the BLM's authority for using this as a "threshold of concern" is, what criteria BLM intends to use to evaluate the modeled impacts against this "threshold of concern", and what actions, if any, BLM believes are within their authority to take based on the modeling analysis for NO_2 increment.

2007 08 -9 11:10:27

AQ-38 BI-4-53 The fact that the Wyoming DEQ AQD included rig emissions in its 2005 regulatory PSD increment comparison for NO_2 also calls into question the agreement of the cooperating agencies with the statement that rig emissions do not consume increment. Although we believe BLM is correct, this needs to be more fully described in the document.

PM_{10}

AQ-39 BI-4-54 The annual ambient air quality standard for PM_{10} was rescinded in December of 2006 and reference to it should be removed from the document.

AQ-40 AQ-41 BI-4-55 The DSEIS also articulates modeled PM_{10} concentrations which are above both the 24 hour and annual PSD allowable increments. Similar to the NO_2 increment discussion above, BLM's intent in conducting the PM_{10} PSD increment comparison in the document should be clarified along with what the BLM's authority for using this as a "threshold of concern" is, what criteria BLM intends to use to evaluate the modeled impacts against this "threshold of concern", and what actions, if any, BLM believes are within their authority to take based on the modeling analysis for PM_{10} increment. BLM should also include a discussion of whether the source (s) culpable for the modeled impact are increment consuming or not and why.

AQ-42 BI-4-56 The document does not contain enough information to ascertain what source (s) is culpable for the modeled PM_{10} impacts nor where these impacts are occurring. This lack of information should be corrected to enable a robust analysis and review of the PM_{10} model analysis described in the DSEIS.

Completion Operations

AQ-43 AQ-44 BI-4-57 The discussion of "green completions" in Volume 2, Appendix C, Page C-5 should be modified to note that completion operations proposed under this proposal would continue to comply with the Wyoming DEQ AQD flaring permits for the Pinedale Anticline operations. Any further discussion of recovery percentages, equipment to be utilized, and techniques to be utilized should be removed. Portions of the draft discussion are not

necessarily in conformance with the specific permit requirements and language. Modification of the Wyoming DEQ AQD flaring permits in this action are beyond the scope of BLM's authority.

AQ-45

BI-4-58

Item 33, on page E-7 of Volume 2 Appendix E, should be modified to read that "Operators would continue to comply with the provisions and stipulations contained in the Pinedale Anticline "Green Completions" flaring permits issued by the Wyoming DEQ AQD." Establishing a redundant requirement under this action that would require "case-by-case" proof that flareless completions would be unsafe is a modification of the existing flaring permits which is beyond BLM's authority.

2007 MAR -9 AM 10: 27

EXHIBIT A

The parties to IBLA 97-309 and IBLA 97-346 agree that the appeals filed by the State of Wyoming and Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, et al., should be dismissed, subject to the following amendment and clarification of the records of decision for the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch natural gas development projects:

1. With respect to the discussion in the records of decision regarding a "level of concern" for NO_X emissions, the parties agree as follows:

> "If this level of emissions is reached, BLM will notify EPA, the Forest Service, and the Wyoming DEQ that further emissions may have an adverse impact on air quality related values. Further, BLM, consistent with its Letter of Agreement for Tracking Nitrogen Oxide Emissions with the Wyoming DEQ dated June 20, 1997, and in cooperation and consultation with Wyoming DEQ, EPA Region VIII, USDA-Forest Service, and other affected agencies, will continue to track air quality in the affected region, and will verify the level of emissions, determine visibility impacts through additional modeling, and determine whether unanticipated visibility impacts are predicted or occurring in order to produce additional documentation that may be required under NEPA. BLM will use this information in making recommendations to EPA regarding air quality and to DEQ regarding permitting for existing leases, and in making decisions regarding future leases on BLM lands.
>
> If visibility impacts are determined to be greater than predicted at 977 tons of NO_x and/or if increased contributions of other pollutants (such as VOCs) result in higher emission levels than stated in the BLM's cumulative air quality impacts analysis, then BLM will conduct additional NEPA analysis and/or additional monitoring. The additional information will be used to make recommendations to DEQ regarding permitting of further development under existing leases, as well as BLM decisions regarding future leases. To the extent authorized by the lease terms and federal or state law, operators may be required to cooperate in the implementation of a supplemental coordinated air quality monitoring program or emissions control program."

2007 APR -9 AM 10:27

2. With respect to the discussion in the records of decision regarding well site and compressor site emissions, the parties agree that the emission figures referred to are not emission limitations. If actual emissions will exceed the figures referred to, additional NEPA documentation may, however, be required. The State of Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality is the permitting authority for air emissions from well and compressor sites.

3. The discussion in the records of decision regarding use of liners on production facilities is amended and clarified by the BLM's September 24, 1997 letter to public land users, attached to BLM's Answer in IBLA 97-346.

2001 MAR -9 AM 10:27

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

State of Wyoming,	)	IBLA 97-309
	)	
Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, Amoco Production Company, Texaco Inc., Vastar Resources, Inc., Union Pacific Resources Company, Snyder Oil Corporation, Marathon Oil Company, Petroleum Association of Wyoming, Enron Oil and Gas Company,	)	IBLA 97-346
	)	
Appellants.	)	

JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF ORDER
AMENDING AND CLARIFYING RECORDS OF DECISION

The Bureau of Land Management, the State of Wyoming, and Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation, et al., jointly request the Board to issue an order amending and clarifying the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch records of decision that are at issue in IBLA 97-309 and IBLA 97-346. The clarifying language agreed to is attached as Exhibit A. With the entry of an order incorporating this language, the parties agree that these appeals are fully and finally resolved and should be dismissed by the Board. The grounds for this motion are as follows:

1. In IBLA 97-309, the State of Wyoming appealed from an air emissions "level of concern" for NO_X that the BLM included in records of decision for the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch gas development projects located in southwest Wyoming. See Amended Record of Decision for Fontenelle Natural Gas Infill Drilling Projects, March 4, 1997, at 6-8, 13-16; Record of Decision for Expanded Moxa Arch Area Natural Gas Development Project, March 5, 1997, at 5-7, 15-18.

2001 APR -9 AM 10:28

2. In IBLA 97-346, Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation, along with several other companies and the Petroleum Association of Wyoming, appealed the same NO_X "level of concern" in the same records of decision, as well as what appeared to be emission limitations on well and compressor sites. See id. Cabot and three other companies also appealed the "liner requirements" set forth in Appendix A to those records of decision and filed a separate statement of reasons on that issue.

3. The BLM has filed answers in IBLA 97-309 and 97-346. With respect to the NO_X emissions issue, BLM explained that the "level of concern" in the two records of decision was not intended to regulate air quality in southwest Wyoming or otherwise to establish a "cap" on air emissions or oil and gas development. Further, BLM recognized that it does not have authority to limit development on existing leases when the NO_X emissions level of 977 tons is reached. BLM then offered two paragraphs of clarification to amend statements made in the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch RODs. BLM Answer (on air issues) at 3-4.

4. With respect to the well and compressor sites, BLM clarified that the emission figures in the two RODs "are not emission limitations but are merely the point at which emissions would require additional analysis pursuant to NEPA." BLM Answer (on air issues) at 4. BLM also acknowledged that the permitting authority for air emissions in Wyoming is the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. Id. at 8.

5. Finally, with respect to the liner issue, BLM pointed out that, on September 24, 1997, the Wyoming State Director issued an amendment and clarification of the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch RODs. BLM Answer (on liner issue) at 3.

2007 APR -9 AM 10:28

6. Since BLM filed its answers, counsel for the parties have met to discuss the clarifying language. With some modifications to the clarifying language on the NO_X issue, all parties agree that the BLM's clarification is satisfactory and resolves the issues on appeal.

7. The parties agree that the BLM's clarification of the records of decision on the NO_X issue should be revised to read as follows:

> "If this level of emissions is reached, BLM will notify EPA, the Forest Service, and the Wyoming DEQ that further emissions may have an adverse impact on air quality related values. Further, BLM, consistent with its Letter of Agreement for Tracking Nitrogen Oxide Emissions with the Wyoming DEQ dated June 20, 1997, and in cooperation and consultation with Wyoming DEQ, EPA Region VIII, USDA-Forest Service, and other affected agencies, will continue to track air quality in the affected region, and will verify the level of emissions, determine visibility impacts through additional modeling, and determine whether unanticipated visibility impacts are predicted or occurring in order to produce additional documentation that may be required under NEPA. BLM will use this information in making recommendations to EPA regarding air quality and to DEQ regarding permitting for existing leases, and in making decisions regarding future leases on BLM lands.
>
> If visibility impacts are determined to be greater than predicted at 977 tons of NO_x and/or if increased contributions of other pollutants (such as VOCs) result in higher emission levels than stated in the BLM's cumulative air quality impacts analysis, then BLM will conduct additional NEPA analysis and/or additional monitoring. The additional information will be used to make recommendations to DEQ regarding permitting of further development under existing leases, as well as BLM decisions regarding future leases. To the extent authorized by the lease terms and federal or state law, operators may be required to cooperate in the implementation of a supplemental coordinated air quality monitoring program or emissions control program."

8. To conclude administrative proceedings regarding the issues raised in these appeals, and to avoid disputes in the future over the interpretation of the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa

Arch records of decision, the parties jointly ask the Board to issue an order that dismisses these appeals subject to the clarifying language agreed to by the parties. The agreed-upon clarifying language is attached as Exhibit A.

Dated: January 14, 1998

Respectfully submitted,

(see next page)

Mary A. Throne
Senior Assistant Attorney General
123 Capitol Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-7580

Attorney for the State of Wyoming

Andrea S.V. Gelfuso
Office of the Solicitor
Rocky Mountain Region
755 Parfet Street, Suite 151
Lakewood, CO 80215
(303) 231-5353 x445

Attorney for the Bureau of Land Management

John F. Shepherd
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
Post Office Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201-8749
(303) 295-8309

Marilyn S. Kite
Michael J. Brennan
HOLLAND & HART
175 South King Street, Suite 2
Jackson, Wyoming 82001
(307) 739-9741

Attorneys for Cabot Oil and Gas Corp., et al.

DENVER:0810333.01

2001 MAR -9 AM 10:28

Arch records of decision, the parties jointly ask the Board to issue an order that dismisses these appeals subject to the clarifying language agreed to by the parties. The agreed-upon clarifying language is attached as Exhibit A.

Dated: January 14, 1998

Respectfully submitted,

Mary A. Throne
Senior Assistant Attorney General
123 Capitol Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-7580

Attorney for the State of Wyoming

Andrea S.V. Gelfuso
Office of the Solicitor
Rocky Mountain Region
755 Parfet Street, Suite 151
Lakewood, CO 80215
(303) 231-5353 x445

Attorney for the Bureau of Land Management

John F. Shepherd
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
Post Office Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201-8749
(303) 295-8309

Marilyn S. Kite
Michael J. Brennan
HOLLAND & HART
175 South King Street, Suite 2
Jackson, Wyoming 82001
(307) 739-9741

Attorneys for Cabot Oil and Gas Corp., et al.

DENVER:0810333.01

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS
Interior Board of Land Appeals
4015 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22203

IN REPLY REFER TO:

CERTIFIED

JAN 28 1998

IBLA 97-309 STATE OF WYOMING	:	Amended Records of Decision
	:	Fontanelle Natural Gas Infill Drilling Projects
IBLA 97-346 CABOT OIL & GAS CORPORATION	:	Expanded Moxa Arch Natural Gas Development Project
	:	Appeals Dismissed, Cases Remanded

ORDER

The State of Wyoming (the State) and the Wyoming State Office, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), have filed a Joint Motion for Entry of Order Amending and Clarifying Records of Decision (Motion), which was received by this Board on January 15, 1998. Also joining in the Motion are Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation; Amoco Production Company; Texaco Inc.; Vastar Resources, Inc.; Union Pacific Resources Company; Snyder Oil Corporation; Marathon Oil Company; the Petroleum Association of Wyoming; and Enron Oil and Gas Company, all of which filed the appeal docketed as IBLA 97-346. All the parties had appealed from BLM's March 4, 1997, amended Record of Decision (ROD) for the Fontanelle Project and the March 5, 1997, amended ROD for the Moxa Arch project. We had not consolidated the two appeals, although the issues presented are very closely related.

In support of their Motion, the parties state that they have drafted language that clarifies language contained in the two ROD's pertaining to a "level of concern" for certain emissions and the circumstances and manner in which these emissions will be handled. These issues were raised in the State's appeal, IBLA 97-309. The use of liners on production facilities, also discussed in the two ROD's, was satisfactorily clarified by a BLM letter to public land users dated September 24, 1997, and submitted to this Board in IBLA 97-346. The parties state that "[w]ith the entry of an order incorporating this language [in Exhibit A of the Joint Motion], the parties agree that these appeals are fully and finally resolved and should be dismissed by the Board." (Motion at 1.) In light of the agreement reached regarding the language of the clarifications, the Motion to dismiss the appeals is granted.

Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to the Board of Land Appeals by the Secretary of the Interior, 43 C.F.R. § 4.1, the appeals are

2007 MAR -9 10:28

dismissed subject to the clarifications herein described, and the case files are remanded to BLM.

T. Britt Price
Administrative Judge

I concur:

Will A. Irwin
Administrative Judge

APPEARANCES:

Andrea Gelfuso, Esq.
Office of the Regional Solicitor
U.S. Department of the Interior
755 Parfet Street, Suite 151
Lakewood, CO 80215
Counsel for the Bureau of Land Management

William U. Hill, Esq.
Thomas J. Davidson, Esq.
Mary A. Throne, Esq.
Cynthia L. Harnett, Esq.
123 Capitol Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
Counsel for the State of Wyoming

John F. Shepherd, Esq.
Holland & Hart
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, CO 80201-8749
Counsel for Cabot Oil & Gas Corp., et al.

Marilyn S. Kite, Esq.
Michael J. Brennan, Esq.
Holland & Hart
175 South King Street, Suite 2
Jackson, WY 82001
Counsel for Cabot Oil & Gas Corp., et al.

2007 APR -9 AM 10:28

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

State of Wyoming,	)	IBLA 97-309
	)	
Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, Amoco Production Company, Texaco Inc., Vastar Resources, Inc., Union Pacific Resources Company, Snyder Oil Corporation, Marathon Oil Company, Petroleum Association of Wyoming, Enron Oil and Gas Company,	)	IBLA 97-346
	)	
Appellants.	)	

JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF ORDER
AMENDING AND CLARIFYING RECORDS OF DECISION

The Bureau of Land Management, the State of Wyoming, and Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation, et al., jointly request the Board to issue an order amending and clarifying the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch records of decision that are at issue in IBLA 97-309 and IBLA 97-346. The clarifying language agreed to is attached as Exhibit A. With the entry of an order incorporating this language, the parties agree that these appeals are fully and finally resolved and should be dismissed by the Board. The grounds for this motion are as follows:

1. In IBLA 97-309, the State of Wyoming appealed from an air emissions "level of concern" for NO_X that the BLM included in records of decision for the Fontenelle and Expanded Moxa Arch gas development projects located in southwest Wyoming. See Amended Record of Decision for Fontenelle Natural Gas Infill Drilling Projects, March 4, 1997, at 6-8, 13-16; Record of Decision for Expanded Moxa Arch Area Natural Gas Development Project, March 5, 1997, at 5-7, 15-18.

2001 MAR -9 AM 10:28

BEFORE THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

BP America Production Co.,	)	
	)	IBLA No. 2006-158
Appellant.	)	

JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL

BP America Production Co. ("BP") and the Bureau of Land Management, Wyoming State Office ("BLM"), jointly move for dismissal of BP's appeal. The parties agree that the appeal should be dismissed based on the following:

(1) BP interpreted the BLM's Record of Decision for the Jonah Infill Project ("Jonah ROD") as possibly establishing a "cap" on air emissions from oil and gas operations. In two prior appeals involving other oil and gas projects in southwest Wyoming, BLM agreed that it could not impose a cap on air emissions from oil and gas development, and that other agencies regulate air emissions. A copy of the joint motion and order resolving the prior appeals (IBLA Docket Nos. 97-309, 97-346) are attached as Exhibit A.

(2) The BLM has advised BP that, consistent with the resolution of IBLA Docket Nos. 97-309 and 97-346, the 80% emissions reduction scenario described in the Jonah ROD does not impose a cap on air emissions (directly or indirectly through modeling). Accordingly, BP has determined that it need not pursue this appeal.

(3) The parties recognize that the BLM's modeling of air impacts for the Final Environmental Impact Statement was designed to and does conservatively overestimate likely air impacts of the Jonah Infill project. In re-running the air dispersion model as

contemplated by the Jonah ROD and processing permit applications for specific operations, BLM will take into account available monitoring data and other information on actual emissions in an effort to develop a model configuration that yields more accurate estimates of air impacts.

(4) The parties agree and acknowledge that, if BLM subsequently denies a permit to conduct operations based on the air quality provisions of the Jonah ROD, BP can appeal such a decision at that time and the dismissal of this appeal shall be without prejudice to the issues BP may raise in such an appeal.

(5) BP and BLM represent that both intervenors, the State of Wyoming and EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc., support this motion.

Dated: May 10, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Lyle K. Rising
Office of the Regional Solicitor
Rocky Mountain Region
U.S. Department of the Interior
755 Parfet St., Suite 151
Lakewood, CO 80215
(303) 231-5353 x444

ATTORNEY FOR THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

John F. Shepherd, P.C.
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200
Post Office Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201-8749
303-295-8309

Jeffrey C. Conrad
BP America Production Co.
501 Westlake Park Boulevard
Houston, TX 77579
281-366-1859

ATTORNEYS FOR BP AMERICA PRODUCTION CO.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal was sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, on May 10, 2006, addressed to the following:

Laura Lindley
Robert C. Mathes
Bjork Lindley Little PC
1600 Stout Street, Suite 1400
Denver, CO 80202

Mary A. Vivano
EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc.
370 17th Street, Suite 1700
Denver, CO 80202

Patrick J. Crank
Vicci Colgan
Nancy E. Vehr
Office of the Attorney General
Water and Natural Resources Division
123 State Capitol
Cheyenne, WY 82002

3550665_1.DOC

2006 MAY -9 AM 10: 28