

BUREAU of LAND MANAGEMENT
PINEDALE ANTICLINE PROJECT AREA
WILDLIFE MONITORING & MITIGATION PLAN

03.31.2009

I. PURPOSE

The development of a Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WMMP) is in accordance with the 2008 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Pinedale Anticline Record of Decision (SEIS ROD):

Chapter 4, 4.5

“A wildlife monitoring plan will be developed by the BLM, WGFD, and the Operators and will be approved by the BLM AO before April 1, 2009”

Chapter 2, 2.12

“The decision to adapt management in order to meet resource objectives will be made and implemented by the BLM AO. This ROD includes a Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Matrix (Appendix B) that will trigger mitigation responses based upon monitoring information.”

Chapter 2, 2.8.3

BLM and the Operators will comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA), and Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Realizing the benefits of the systematic development as analyzed in the Final SEIS, the BLM will work cooperatively with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to develop and utilize measures to comply with these laws and allow for the systematic development of this area.”

Chapter 2.9

“Based upon the impacts and assumptions contained in the SEIS, Ultra, Shell, and Questar have voluntarily proposed, and the BLM acknowledges the creation of the Pinedale Anticline Monitoring and Mitigation Fund (Monitoring and Mitigation Fund or Fund) to mitigate potential impacts to wildlife, air, and other resources identified in the Final SEIS (BLM, 2008).”

“The Fund will be used for both on-site and off-site mitigation and project-related activities in the PAPA vicinity including additional air quality monitoring, additional wildlife, livestock, vegetation and reclamation research, analysis, monitoring, and mitigation.”

Chapter 2.10

“The purpose of the PAPO is to obtain, collect, store, and distribute monitoring information to support adaptive management and analyze mitigation projects.”

Chapter 3.6

“Wildlife issues focus on the impacts of development in the PAPA resulting from direct habitat loss, indirect loss through animal avoidance of areas proximal to developments, and habitat fragmentation.”

“Relief from seasonal restrictions for mule deer and pronghorn crucial winter range and greater sage-grouse habitat is based upon this ROD affording equal or greater protection for the big game and greater sage-grouse populations than those afforded by seasonal restrictions given the current level of development in the PAPA.”

“The Monitoring and Mitigation Fund is to be used to implement appropriate projects, such as habitat improvements, to further mitigate impacts.”

II. DISCUSSION:

The Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WMMP) must address the intent of the SEIS ROD to monitor wildlife populations while tracking their response to energy development. The data gathered will provide management guidance for field development and mitigation projects.

The ROD also outlines the Wildlife Monitoring Matrix (Matrix) for mule deer, pronghorn, sage grouse and sensitive species. The matrix is imbedded within the WMMP. The ROD monitoring methods emphasize the collection of data specifically needed to address the ROD requirements.

The following considerations will be addressed as monitoring proceeds:

- Wildlife monitoring data will address the species, criteria, methods and changes as defined in the Matrix.
- Current studies will need to be realigned to meet the WMMP/Matrix requirements. As examples:
 - The current pronghorn monitoring reports do not address ROD monitoring requirements.
 - The current sage grouse monitoring needs to be expanded¹

¹ The current level of data collection is insufficient to address the Matrix. While the lek count data is being done by Wyoming Game & Fish Dept. (WGFD), the rest of the monitoring is only being collected on the Mesa. The nesting success data and winter distribution data needs to be gathered throughout the PAPA as well as the reference areas east of Highway 191 and Ryegrass. The habitat selection data (avoidance of disturbance data) needs to be gathered throughout the entire PAPA. In addition, the noise levels at leks need to be measured throughout the PAPA.

- The data must be collected on a defined timeline to meet agency review and comments prior to an annual meeting, which is scheduled in February of each year.
- The data will serve the purpose of meeting the Matrix requirements as well as guiding the development and mitigation planning as discussed at the annual meeting.
- Implementation of the monitoring will begin prior to the April 2009 deadline as stipulated in the ROD

Prior to the implementation of the SEIS ROD, the USQ operators funded the Mule Deer Study, the Pronghorn Study, the Sage Grouse Study and the annual wildlife data collection in coordination with the BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish. These data will be aligned in future contracts to meet the Matrix and ROD requirements. Monitoring and annual wildlife data collection will be coordinated with the Operators, BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish Department.

There are some monitoring efforts that can be combined and used for all species, including measurements of direct habitat loss, traffic monitoring, and snow depth measurements. As implementation of the ROD proceeds, a goal is to avoid duplicating data collection efforts while ensuring that sampling procedures are consistent. As a result of past data collection, additional data monitoring will be included in the WMMP. Additional data may be required when impacts or changes are detected, and additional contributing factors other than field development activities are impacting or changing the wildlife behavior.

Attached are tables that include a summary of ROD-required monitoring for deer, pronghorn, sage grouse, and sensitive species, along with a description of current monitoring and results, and recommended future monitoring protocols to satisfy ROD requirements.

Data would be reviewed by PAPO and the Review Team (federal, state and local agencies p. 18 PAPA ROD). Recommendations for future monitoring or adjustments would come from the PAPO, the Review Team and the PAWG. The BLM AO would have final decision on changes.

III. PROPOSAL:

The Operators, BLM and WGFD will co-develop the requirements for the 2009 monitoring contracts. The PAPO will manage those contracts. Future contracts will be developed and approved by the PAPO.

Any monitoring contracts that are issued must include:

- The monitoring methods in the Wildlife Monitoring and Mitigation Matrix (B.1). All data collected must remain as the joint ownership BLM and WGFD. Operators and interested public entities have access to the data as well as any federal agency records and information (the Freedom of Information Act 5 U.S.C. § 552).

- Quarterly reviews will be held with the contractor, BLM, WGFD and the operators to monitor contract compliance and implementation.
- A draft report will have a third party review before moving to final print. The BLM, WGFD and operators will identify the compilation of the third party review.

IV. TIMELINE:

See Attachment A

V. DATA REQUIREMENTS

TABLE 1: PINEDALE MULE DEER MONITORING

| ROD Criteria: Change in Mesa deer numbers 15% decline in any year, or cumulatively over all years, compared to reference area (Sublette mule deer herd unit [average 05/06 herd unit population is 27,254], or other mutually agreeable area). | | |
|--|--|---|
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| GPS Radio-Collared deer winter locations | Maps of collared deer locations and migration routes, RSF modeling | Continue |
| Abundance (Feb helicopter trend count, 50% of area) | Estimated total deer number | Continue |
| Recruitment (December helicopter classification count) | Observed fawn: doe ratio | Continue, WGFD will coordinate but paid for by Mitigation fund |
| Adult female survival (based on collared deer mortality) | Estimated survival rate | Continue |
| Fawn survival (April ground classification count, adjusted for adult mortality) | Estimated fawn survival rate | Observed fawn: doe ratio Conducted by WGFD, not an RFQ component |
| Big Game and Winter Range Observations | Empirical winter location data (visual estimates) | Discontinue |
| ROD Criteria: Avoidance distances Average of .5 km change per year over 2 years, and a concurrent 15% decline in deer numbers in any year, compared to reference area (Sublette mule deer herd unit (average 05/06 herd unit population is 27,254), or other mutually agreeable area). | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Direct habitat loss (satellite imagery/ArcView) | Satellite map of PAPA, summary of disturbed acres (Dates of data) | Continue. This data has value for additional species that are being monitored and does not need to be duplicated among monitoring contractors, but data need to be shared |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Traffic monitoring (measured) | Average daily traffic rates | Continue. This data has value for additional species that are being monitored and does not need to be duplicated among monitoring contractors, but data may need to be shared |
| Daily movement rates (calculated from deer location data) | Figures showing movement rates | Discontinue |
| Habitat avoidance (RSF model and actual measured distances) | Maps of predicted levels of deer use and predictions of avoidance distances | Continue |

Potential Mitigation Action(s) if a substantive negative trend is determined or threshold is met:

On-site:

- Protection of flank areas from disturbance (e.g., voluntary lease suspensions, lease buyouts, voluntary limits on area of delineation/development drilling) to assure continued habitat function of flank areas, and to provide areas for enhancement of habitat function.
- Habitat enhancements of SEIS area (both core/crest and flanks) at an appropriate (initially 3:1) enhancement-to-disturbance acreage ratio.
- Other avoidance/mitigation practices that address the specific identified trend.

On-site/Off-site:

- Conservation Easements or property rights acquisitions to assure their continued habitat function, or provide an area for enhanced habitat function (e.g., maintenance of corridor and bottleneck passages, protection from development, establishment of forage reserves, habitat enhancements at an appropriate (initially 3:1) enhancement-to-disturbance acreage ratio).

Modification of operations:

- Recommend for consideration by BLM and Operators, adjustments of spatial arrangement and/or pace of ongoing development.

TABLE 2: PINEDALE PRONGHORN MONITORING

| ROD Criteria: Change in Anticline pronghorn numbers | | |
|--|--|---|
| 15% decline in any year, or cumulatively over all years, compared to reference area (Sublette pronghorn herd unit or other, mutually agreeable area). | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Adult female survival (based on collared pronghorn mortality) | Estimated survival rate | Continue |
| GPS Radio-Collared pronghorn year-long locations | Snow depth vs. distribution/group size | Continue: Maps of collared pronghorn locations and migration routes |
| Sex and age ratio (buck, doe, fawn) (Dec, Jan, March ground counts) | Comparison between control and development | Continue |
| Pronghorn distribution and group size (winter monthly flights) (RSF model and actual measured distances) | Maps of locations of groups, and group sizes vs. snow depths | Discontinue, south end and group size data not meaningful, rest of data available for north end from sex and age counts |
| ROD Criteria: Size of habitat fragments used | | |
| 10% decline in habitat availability for one year, and a concurrent 15% change in pronghorn numbers for that year, compared to reference area (Sublette pronghorn herd unit or other mutually agreeable area). * Conversation to take place in 2009 to the North Sublette pronghorn herd subunit. | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Direct habitat loss (satellite imagery/ArcMap) | Map of disturbed areas, summary of disturbed area | Continue |
| Traffic monitoring (measured) | Average daily traffic rates | Continue |
| Snow depth (measured) | Maps of snow depths | Continue and add temp/precipitation data, also for deer and sage grouse |
| Habitat selection model and actual measured distances | Patch selection description, probabilities of use, and maps | Continue |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Behavior assessment (measured) | Foraging rate vs. group size | Discontinue, does not inform WMMP/Matrix |
| Body mass (measured) | Comparison between years | Discontinue |
| Corticosteroids and progesterone (measured) | Comparison between control and development | Discontinue |

Potential Mitigation Action(s) if a negative trend is determined or threshold is met:

On-site:

- Protection of flank areas from disturbance (e.g., voluntary lease suspensions, lease buyouts, voluntary limits on area of delineation/development drilling) to assure continued habitat function of flank areas, and to provide areas for enhancement of habitat function.
- Habitat enhancements of SEIS area (both core/crest and flanks) at an appropriate (initially 3:1) enhancement-to-disturbance acreage ratio.
- Other avoidance/mitigation practices that address the specific identified trend.

On-site/Off-site:

- Conservation Easements or property rights acquisitions to assure their continued habitat function, or provide an area for enhanced habitat function (e.g., maintenance of corridor and bottleneck passages, protection from development, establishment of forage reserves, habitat enhancements at an appropriate (initially 3:1) enhancement-to-disturbance acreage ratio).

Modification of operations;

- Recommend, for consideration by BLM and Operators adjustments of spatial arrangement and/or pace of ongoing development.

TABLE 3: PINEDALE SAGE GROUSE MONITORING

| ROD Criteria: Number of active leks | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 30% decline in total number of active leks, or 30% decline in the number of leks in a single complex (Mesa, Duke's Triangle, Yellow Point complexes). (See Page B3 PAPA SEIS ROD Footnote 1). | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Annual lek monitoring at each lek in each complex (WGFD) | Number of active leks Number of males at each lek/complex on PAPA and reference leks | Continue - WGFD. |
| Sage Grouse Lek Name Status of Lek Location 10 yr use by Male Sage Grouse Nearby Project features Monitoring/other actions (# times lek monitored, if perimeter has been gps'ed) Lek Location Parameter of Lek Lek Name Individual nest data Winter observations Hens with broods observations Dead individuals found | | Continue |
| Sage Grouse MAPS Management areas under 2000 ROD (9) | | Continue - WGFD. |

| ROD Criteria: Peak numbers of males attending lek complexes | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Average of 30% decline in numbers over 2 years compared to reference area. If the number of leks decline but the bird numbers on lek complexes do not, the mitigation threshold would not be surpassed. If the number of leks does not decline but the bird numbers on lek complexes does decline, the mitigation threshold would be surpassed. | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Annual lek monitoring at each lek in each complex (WGFD) | Number of active leks Number of males at each lek/complex on PAPA and reference leks | Continue - WGFD. |
| Sage Grouse Lek Name Status of Lek Location 10 yr use by Male Sage Grouse Nearby Project features Monitoring/other actions (# times lek monitored, if perimeter has been gps'ed) Lek Location Parameter of Lek Lek Name Individual nest data Winter observations Hens with broods observations Dead individuals found | | Continue |
| Sage Grouse MAPS Management areas under 2000 ROD (9) | | Continue - WGFD. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>ROD Criteria: Nesting success and habitat selection</p> <p>Average of 15% per year decline over 2 years in nesting success compared to reference area, or a 0.5 km increase in avoidance distance per year over 2 consecutive years and a concurrent change of an average of 15% per year decline over 2 years in nesting success compared to reference area.</p> | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Sample area is small | NA | Mapped ground relocations of collared birds for nesting success on development and reference areas, and data logger/ground relocations for habitat selection on development areas |
| | | Utilize same direct habitat loss, traffic monitoring, snow depth, temperature, and precipitation data as used by deer and pronghorn monitoring |
| <p>ROD Criteria: Winter concentration area use</p> <p>Average of 15% per year decline in amount of winter habitat used over 2 years compared to reference areas, and a concurrent average of 30% decline in numbers over 2 years compared to reference area.</p> | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Current monitoring of winter distribution on the Mesa only | Not reported as to location or change in distribution | Data logger and/or twice monthly ground relocations of collared birds, plus monthly winter flights Dec-Feb of both development and reference areas |
| <p>ROD Criteria: Noise levels</p> <p>Decibel levels at the lek more than 10 dBA above background measured from the edge of the lek (2000 ROD, p.27), and a concurrent average of 30% decline in peak numbers of male birds over 2 years vs. reference area.</p> | | |
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| Currently collecting in a small area. | NA | Measurement of noise levels at edge of leks from March 1 – May 15 |

TABLE 4: OTHER SPECIES MONITORING NEEDS

| <p>ROD Criteria: Occurrence of species and change in numbers of each species, compared to control area.</p> <p>3 consecutive years of decline in presence or absence of a species or an average of 15% decline in number of individual each year over 3 years.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|
| CURRENT MONITORING METHODS | CURRENT RESULTS | RECOMMENDED MONITORING METHODS |
| <p>TECP and BLM, FWS Species Habitats and Populations</p> <p>Pygmy Rabbit location, numbers/burrows</p> <p>Prairie Dog colony nested in</p> <p>Prairie Dog Colony parameters (burrow density, number of active burrows)</p> | <p>There are no population estimates at this time.</p> | <p>Continue, but expand to:</p> <p>Detect population changes for the Mesa</p> |
| <p>Bald Eagle</p> <p>Winter observations</p> <p>Winter Roosts and one mile buffer</p> <p>Winter forage and one mile within New Fork River</p> | | <p>Continue in accordance with p. 25 PAPA ROD.</p> |
| <p>Raptor Nests</p> <p>Nests monitored within the PAPA and 1 mile buffer (per 2000 PAPA Wildlife Monitoring Plan)</p> <p>Location of nest</p> <p>Activity status</p> <p>Nest ID</p> <p>Monitoring consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 yr activity status cumulative • past 3 yrs individual status • most recent confirmed raptor activity | <p>All raptors nests and nesting habitat in the PAPA including:</p> <p>Golden Eagle, Red-tailed Hawk, Ferruginous Hawk, Great Horned Owl, Bald Eagle, Swanson's Hawk, Northern Harrier, Prairie Falcon, American Kestrel, Merlin, Osprey, Short-eared Owl, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Coopers Hawk, Northern Goshawk, Burrowing Owl, Long-eared Owl</p> | <p>Continue monitoring in accordance with p. 25 PAPA ROD.</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Location-UTM coordinates | | |
| Nests removed from active status | | |
| Nesting Success | | |
| Trends | | |
| Raptor Territories | | |

AVIAN MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT

Avian mitigation will be employed to reduce, minimize, rectify, or compensate for future impacts to migratory birds when those impacts are unavoidable to support the intended year round development as outlined by the ROD in particular the overriding concept of “once on a pad – stay on a pad”. Mitigation will be done in a manner that will avoid “take” as defined under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT

The MBTA protects migratory birds and their nests from possession, sale, purchase, barter, transport, import, and export, and take. The regulatory definition of take, as defined by 50 CFR 10.12, means to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect any migratory birds, nests or eggs. Under the MBTA, the BLM and its applicants have a legal obligation to protect the many species of migratory birds, which may occur on lands under their jurisdiction.

Although migratory bird habitat is not specifically protected under the MBTA, activities that impact habitat resulting in the take (Take means to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, 50 CFR. 10.12) of migratory birds would violate the MBTA. Similarly, activities affecting individual birds directly or indirectly and resulting in take are also prohibited by the MBTA. Many migratory birds, particularly raptor species, are sensitive to disturbance when nesting and roosting; should such disturbance result in the wounding or killing of adult birds, immature birds, or their eggs, the activity causing the disturbance would violate the MBTA’s take prohibition. Activities involved in the development, operation, and maintenance of natural gas fields have the potential to result in take of migratory birds.

In situations where it is necessary (i.e., for public safety) to remove (destroy) a nest that is occupied by eggs or nestlings or is otherwise still essential to the survival of a juvenile bird, an FWS permit may be available pursuant to 50 CFR parts 13 and 21, in order to allow the take under MBTA of individual birds.

BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLE PROTECTION ACT

The BGEPA prohibits knowingly taking, or taking with wanton disregard for the consequences of an activity, any bald or golden eagle or their body parts, nests, chicks or eggs, which includes collection, molestation, disturbance, or killing. The term “disturb” is defined as “to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, (1) injury to an eagle, (2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or (3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior” (50 CFR 22.3 [72 FR 31132]). Activities that disturb (50 CFR 22.3) foraging eagles are prohibited by the BGEPA. The BGEPA protections include provisions not included in the MBTA such as the protection of unoccupied nests and the definition of take that includes the prohibition of disturbing eagles.

The BGEPA includes limited exceptions to its prohibitions through a permitting process. The FWS has issued regulations concerning the permit procedures for several of the BGEPA exceptions, including permits to take golden eagle nests which interfere with resource development or recovery operations (50 CFR 22.25). The regulations identify the application requirements as well as the issuance criteria that must be met in order for a permit to be issued. The FWS has proposed a new permitting process that addresses all of the exceptions to the BGEPA (72 FR 31141).

In addition to immediate impacts, the prohibition on disturbance also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagle's return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that injures an eagle or substantially interferes with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits and causes, or is likely to cause, a loss of productivity or nest abandonment.

APPROACH

The approach for dealing with migratory birds is to first strive to avoid impacts to migratory birds and their habitats. When impacts cannot be practically modified to avoid impacts and still support the intended development as outlined in the ROD, the Operators will mitigate impacts by planning their actions in accordance with the measures described below, while avoiding “take” as defined under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and in coordination with annual planning efforts with the BLM and WGFD.

Habitat mitigation efforts shall focus on enhancement and conservation of habitat that meets the ecological needs (feeding, breeding, or sheltering) of migratory bird species. Habitat mitigation efforts may focus on onsite or on offsite habitat mitigation, as needed. The Operators, BLM, and WGFD will ensure that these efforts do not exacerbate negative impacts to other sensitive species.

The BLM and Operators are working toward an Avian Management Plan. Until this plan is completed and approved, exceptions to seasonal restrictions protecting raptor nesting habitat and other migratory birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) will be approved on a case-by-case basis by BLM in accordance with applicable law and existing USFWS instructional memorandums and Avian Protection Planning Guidelines. Exceptions will reflect BLM's ROD intent (p. 20) "The Final SEIS analysis demonstrates notable benefit from the systematic development of the oil and gas resource afforded through year-round development within the Core Area and PDA. To adequately capture this benefit, it is BLM's intent to implement a concept of enabling Operators to stay on a well pad until the well pad is completely drilled out; so long as the "drill out" complies with all applicable laws and regulations, including, but not limited to the ESA, BGEPA, and MBTA. Once areas have been cleared for development at the annual planning meeting (decision portion), monitoring, mitigation, and if needed, deterrence measures within limits identified above will be employed to ensure that "once on a pad; stay on the pad" concept can be successfully implemented."

VI. WILDLIFE MONITORING AND MITIGATION PLAN REVISION

In accordance with page B-4 of the 2008 PAPA ROD "This plan will be updated each year, based on the monitoring and mitigation results and future needs that are apparent at that time. Monitoring methods, changes requiring mitigation and mitigation responses are also subject to discussion and change as part of the annual planning meetings, and are subject to change in response to new research and other information as it becomes available."

Attachment A

REQUEST FOR QUOTATION SCHEDULE

SAGE GROUSE

Team:

Therese Hartman (Lead) and Dean Clause (WGFD)

Lisa Solberg and Jenna Casey (BLM)

Aimee Davison (SWEPI LP)

Process:

- Review RFQs
- Score proposals
- Conference to determine if additional reviews are necessary
- Make recommendation to BLM AO
- BLM AO to inform operators of contract details
- Operators to execute contract
- PAPO to administer contract.

Timeline:

- Completed contract no later than March 9, 2009.
- Contract renewals will be considered at the 3rd Quarter annual meeting.

Approving Officer: Chuck Otto

MULE DEER

Team:

Therese Hartman (Lead) (WGFD)

Theresa Gulbrandson (BLM JIO)

Pete Guernsey (Questar)

Process:

- Develop existing contract extension deliverables (data, collar collection, analysis, data transfer).
- Vet the contract extension language through BLM, WGFD, and Operators.
- Lead to make recommendation to BLM AO.
- Chuck to notify Shell concerning contract deliverables and cost.

- Shell to execute contract/PAPO to administer
- Coordinate new RFQ language with Pronghorn RFQ language
- Vet draft RFQ language through BLM AO, WGFD, Operators, and BLM.
- Issue RFQ August 1.
- Collect proposals.
- Review and score
- Determine need for interviews
- Make recommendation to BLM AO
- PAPO to issue and administer RFQ contract.
- Reimburse Shell for collar costs.

Timeline: RFQ issued August 1, 2009

Approving Officer: Chuck Otto

PRONGHORN

Team:

Therese Hartman (Lead) (WGFD)

Theresa Gulbrandson (BLM JIO)

Pete Guernsey (Questar)

Process:

- Coordinate new RFQ language with Mule Deer RFQ language
- Vet draft RFQ language through BLM AO, WGFD, Operators, and BLM.
- Issue RFQ August 1.
- Collect proposals.
- Review and score
- Determine need for interviews
- Make recommendation to BLM AO
- PAPO to issue and administer contract.

Timeline: Aug 1 2009

Approving Officer: Chuck Otto

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Team:

Lisa Solberg (Lead) (BLM)

Therese Hartman (WGFD)

Pete Guernsey (Questar)

Process:

- Vet draft RFQ language through BLM AO, WGFD, Operators, and BLM.
- Issue RFQ
- Collect proposals.
- Review and score
- Determine need for interviews
- Make recommendation to BLM AO
- PAPO to issue and administer contract.

Timeline:

- Issue RFQ by 4/1/09
- Contract renewals will be considered at the 3rd Quarter annual meeting.

Approving Officer: Chuck Otto

RAPTORS

Team:

Lisa Solberg (Lead) (BLM)

Therese Hartman (WGFD)

Aimee Davison (SWEPI LP)

Process:

- Vet draft RFQ language through BLM AO, WGFD, Operators, and BLM.
- Issue RFQ April 1, 2009.
- Collect proposals.
- Review and score
- Determine need for interviews
- Make recommendation to BLM AO
- PAPO to issue and administer contract.

Timeline:

- April 1, 2009
- Contract renewals will be considered at the 3rd Quarter annual meeting.

Approving Officer: Chuck Otto

PYGMY RABBIT & WHITE -TAILED PRAIRIE DOG

Team:

Therese Hartman (Lead) (WGFD)

Theresa Gulbrandson (BLM JIO)

Cally McKee (Ultra Petroleum)

Process:

- Vet draft RFQ language through BLM AO, WGFD, Operators, and BLM.
- Issue RFQ May 1, 2009
- Collect proposals.
- Review and score
- Determine need for interviews
- Make recommendation to BLM AO
- PAPO to issue and administer contract.

Timeline:

- May 1, 2009
- Contract renewals will be considered at the 3rd Quarter annual meeting.

Approving Officer: Chuck Otto