

DRAFT MINUTES

Pinedale Anticline Project Office (PAPO)
Joint Meeting of PAPO Agency Managers Committee
and

PAPO Pinedale Anticline Mitigation Management Board
Held at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Pinedale Field Office
1625 West Pine Street, Pinedale, Wyoming 82941
Rendezvous Conference Room

Monday, March 15, 2010, 12:40 PM to 4:36 PM

(This event was a Public Meeting)

(Please contact Jim Lucas, PAPO Coordinator, 307-367-5361, for additional information)

12:40 PM: Meeting called to order and beginning of working lunch. PAPO Chairman John Corra asked when does the public wanted to be back for The Nature Conservancy (TNC) agenda item. During the working lunch, the Committee/Board (the "Board") would talk about 1st and 2nd items on the agenda (approval of minutes and financial business). Chairman Corra stated that the public should plan on 1:15 PM to begin with the TNC agenda item.

PAPO Board Members and Others present: Chairman John Corra, Director, Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ), Steve Ferrell, Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WG&FD), Don Simpson, Director, Wyoming State Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Jason Fearneyhough, Director, Wyoming Department of Agriculture (WDA), and Joel Bousman, Sublette County Commissioner, as well as Jim Lucas, BLM PAPO Coordinator, John Ruhs, BLM High Desert District Manager, Brian Davis, Acting BLM Pinedale Field Manager, and Renee Dana, Coordinator for the Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative (WLCI).

PAPO Committee/Board Meetings of September 29, 2009, and January 20, 2010: review and approval of meeting Minutes

Jason Fearneyhough motioned to approve the Minutes (January 20th Minutes were amended at the JIO Meeting this morning). Don Simpson seconded the motion. Discussion -- none. Vote on the motion was unanimous – motion passed.

JIO/PAPO Communication Structure and Team Functionality, PAPO Updated Budget Summary, 2009 Year-End Accountant's Report from Wildlife Heritage Foundation of Wyoming (PAPO Escrow Agent), Well Spud Report, and Project Status Table: presentation by Sheila Keating, BLM Budget Analyst, and Jim Lucas, JIO/PAPO Coordinator

Sheila Keating on the Budget Summary/Spreadsheet: Refer to the spreadsheet in your packet, it's just like the Jonah Interagency Office (JIO) one, except the three items at top are different --they are pre-Record of Decision (ROD) projects. The two industry reimbursements are subject to action at this

meeting. Joel Bousman thought that we took action on them already, but we were waiting on their letter to get their exact amount. Chairman Corra: there is a member of the public that wants to talk with us about what this proposal is versus the ROD. Sheila Keating pointed out the \$2 million add-on for groundwater characterization, which is also listed under "other" with a highlight. Budget Summary shows the \$2 million as committed. The checkbook is the same as JIO's; it is as of the end of December and includes any disbursements to date. Again, the escrow agent's financial statements are 60-90 days behind. The groundwater item – was it to go directly to DEQ? What was the earmark? Not part of the \$36 million. Might be a good thing to collect and put in the pot to draw interest. It was strictly a line item on top of the \$36 million. Not based on the well-spud funding formula. Need to check the Record of Decision. Jim Lucas will do that and report back. We will want to look at that disbursement as a separate item. Chairman Corra senses that it should go into the master pot. Rich Schuller will be a point of contact. For the operations/administrative costs, Sheila Keating will come up with a plan. Jim Lucas will do the same as with the JIO budgets. Sheila Keating is starting a detailed spreadsheet like the auditors did for JIO. Don Simpson suggests doing a budget for JIO/PAPO on one spreadsheet with a line down the middle, so that it will be simpler to see the spread of costs among staff members and operations/administrative items.

Please look at new Communication Structure chart in the packet, as the intent is to get everything on a single page. The brown boxes (on the communication chart) are funded by the JIO/PAPO mitigation funds. Does the \$36 million pay for the 5 boxes on the lower right? No, not entirely, those work months divided by JIO, PAPO, and the BLM. Issues that come up during day to day operations should travel "color coded" up through the chain. Question from Kathy Purvis: In the ROD, the PAPO is supposed to communicate specifically with the PAWG. John Ruhs answered that the key between the PAPO and PAWG, is the Pinedale Field Manager. Kathy mentioned that the PAWG is not mentioned in the communication chart. Action Item: put dotted-line link from Pinedale Field Manager to PAWG on the Communication Structure chart. The associated JIO/PAPO Team Functionality chart as designed by John Corra was also discussed. The Board agreed that the charts look good.

Well Spud Report was briefly discussed as related to the website discussion during the JIO meeting this morning. As shown on the website, the well spud report showed (as of Feb. 12th) 149 well spuds since September 2009.

Project Status Tables – Jim Lucas discussed the new template in the packet: Therese Hartman presented her wildlife updates and discussed her handout entitled "Pinedale Anticline Project Office Wildlife Monitoring Update." Refer to handout. Mule deer Monitoring: we will cancel March flight to monitor since they are moving out of their winter habitat. Pronghorn: collars are also dropping off and reports coming in. Sage grouse: meeting tomorrow with final report ready by the end of the month.

New wildlife contracting process related to the newly approved Recommended Procedures for Financial Administration: Therese Hartman has been directed to prepare potential RFPs and contracts through the WG&FD's contracting process. She would like to award new wildlife monitoring contracts via competitive bid process as soon as possible (so to follow monitoring protocol) and hopes to get approval on these between now and the next board meeting. The new contracts are proposed for awarding by

April 2nd. Steve Ferrell commented that the monitoring RFPs are already out; they close soon. Steve Ferrell stated that the Board can electronically approve the recommended wildlife monitoring contract awards before the upcoming April 21st Board Meeting. Question: will the raptor contract be done before the April 21st meeting? The award on this one could be postponed until the board meeting, but could do email approval on this one too – for raptors. The final monitoring reports, when finished, will be on the website. Joel Bousman asked a question about the purpose of the University Coop Review – Therese Hartman stated the review is to look at all data and recommend how to improve RFP process. Joel Bousman would like to have a copy of the final University Coop Review – it was discussed that the final review would be sent to the entire Board. Joel Bousman wants to know what Therese’s thoughts are on the final review as well.

1:15 P.M.: Focus Areas for the Pinedale Anticline Project Area Mitigation – an Analysis by The Nature Conservancy: a presentation by Joe Kiesecker, PhD, and Holly Copeland, Spatial Ecologist with The Nature Conservancy (TNC).

Joe Kiesecker and Holly Copeland made their PowerPoint presentation – an update on their Marxan Model and analysis work for the PAPO:

Energy and development by design work funded by Questar and is an extension of the work done with JIO. Don Simpson asked about the overall model boundary and how hard would it be to go concentrically to I80, or other areas. Steve Ferrell asked if JIO established a mitigation boundary. Dan Stroud stated that he took TNC’s efforts from their first go-round, and then looked at other things done by other groups. He drew some focus areas, and then accepted proposals within that boundary. Don Simpson asked if there was some merit to going outside of this boundary (Nature Conservancy’s). We should draw priority boundaries. Joe Kiesecker said that they struggled with migratory corridors, and could use that data to connect. All TNC data will be provided to Dan Stroud. There was some discussion about future oil and gas activity. They worked with Questar and identified 90% of the oil and gas development areas. Jim Lucas asked if there are distinguishing characteristics from one “priority area” to another. Targets are driving this. They don’t have a good indicator of range health in each area. On the ground “human” knowledge should be added/considered in the analysis. One of the tools you can use in the model is to click on a site and get a list of existing data. Jason Fearneyhough asked, if there is no data, does that mean that they do not occur (vegetation viability possibly – threshold). Joel Bousman commented that at some point, we will need information on sage grouse nesting, for example, early brood rearing occupied habitat. CCA, CCAA – to further develop this – in relation to winter grazing, and to answer questions about fencing, water management, etc. We don’t have enough information about where the birds are yet to make those decisions. Dan Stroud: When you start filling in migration corridors (refer to the maps in the back of the room), and start looking at the information, you can do it one of two ways. You can look at each specific resource, and prioritize; then either draw polygons, or take the wildlife resource specific, and identify specific goals and objectives for those. The mitigation team may want to sit down with that information. A question on how to handle things outside the boundaries as shown, and concern about areas that have fallen outside the boundaries as drawn. Steve Ferrell commented that the word prioritization is important; maybe existing boundaries

are a good place to focus, but maybe share other areas outside of the overall boundary to get the biggest bang for the buck. Steve Ferrell would like some analysis and the Team's recommendations.

Don Simpson commented that it also helps in the TNC model – if someone meets the criteria, even if it's outside the boundary, we should entertain the idea. Renee Dana stated that WLCI is starting its conservation process which is very similar to this (from the Nature Conservancy) as shown. WLCI is not a mitigation program. They work outside of development areas as well. Their focus is on ecosystem function. She feels that there is a lot of commonality among JIO/PAPO/WLCI and they are just starting to identify key focus areas and issues. They differ on the broader scope – maybe JIO and PAPO are looking at crucial winter range, but WLCI is also looking at summer range. WLCI would like to take the line and stretch it one way or the other. Renee Dana sees a lot of opportunities to work together. Jim Lucas expects to use this information to guide them in their PAPO focus area analysis and subsequent Strategic Plan. Holly Copeland stated that the model is ready to go, and they can drop down to at least where the two mountain ranges start. Maybe go just a bit more south. Dan Stroud stated that two of the biggest impacts are mule deer and sage grouse. Don Simpson suggested that, as other projects are brought in, bounce it off of the (drop-down) list, and then do the analysis and recommendation. Cathy Purves asked: In terms of oil & gas potential, to what extent was the analysis included in that? Questar's team ran the analysis – they looked at the underlying geology and the producing formations in the Upper Green, did overlying maps and other kinds of modeling work. Producing formations were the key data sets. Another question: When this was done for the JIO, the thing Cathy noticed, is that offsite mitigation areas were identified, but what happened down the road? How to deal with the likelihood of this not happening again? Joel Bousman suggested that for the JIO work, potential oil and gas may be built in. Don Simpson doesn't think that happened. Don Simpson thinks that land use planning is the only piece missing. This map is to be used for staff and others who might have a project idea to bring forward to the Board. Staff needs to look at the land use plan. Chairman Corra's comment: The WLCI has a similar process in place, and absent the PAPO project, WLCI might have done some work inside the black boundary. PAPO is a good thing for WLCI. Is the flip side also good? Yes. Info also helps determining where to fight fires, etc.

Focus Areas for WLCI in relation to PAPO Focus Areas: discussion by Renee Dana, BLM, Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative (WLCI)

Renee Dana – please refer to the map of preliminary focus areas for WLCI. Discussion on projects and partners is still early in the process, and there is a need for a lot of refinements and discussions. Renee Dana thinks that there are a number of opportunities for the WLCI and PAPO to collaborate on. BLM, USGS and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, plus other sources may be available for ideas and funding. Funding is a little bit down from last year but maintaining well.

Snow Depth and Traffic Monitoring Project Amendment: memorandum by Therese Hartman, Wildlife Mitigation Biologist with Wyoming Game & Fish Department (WG&FD), PAPO Staff member and Chair of the Pinedale Anticline Working Group (PAWG) Wildlife Task Group

Therese: please refer to Memorandum in your packet. Another snow route recommended with 5 stations. Our contractor has since determined that the 4k monitors were not enough and are seeking funds to purchase two 8k monitors to replace the 4k monitors. There was also vandalism – one stolen and one shot to pieces. Steve Ferrell motioned to accept the staff recommended motion as stated in the Memorandum in the packet for the additional funds of \$8,187.40 for the project. Joel Bousman seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous and motion passed.

Reimbursement to Questar for Pre-PAPO Mule Deer Studies: memorandum by Jim Lucas, JIO/PAPO Coordinator

Jim Lucas stated that Questar has requested reimbursement for mule deer studies as detailed in the Memorandum in the packet. At the April 2009 PAPO Board meeting, the amount of \$86,600.00 was approved for payment to Questar for the study. The Board approved that contingent upon the receipt of all of the data. Also, we now have a complete set of invoices which total \$97,134.77. All data has been received from Questar to the satisfaction of the BLM, WG&FD and PAPO staff. Staff recommendation is for full reimbursement to Questar. Chairman Corra: a member of the public asked a question during the noon hour, having to do with the language in the ROD which references the mitigation fund, and that it may not be appropriate to reimburse funds to operators. Stephanie Kessler with The Wilderness Society just noticed it in the ROD, page 17 -- what the monitoring and mitigation fund can be used for. Fund is in addition to all other costs and does not include existing research. Her question is to clarify what counts as Pre-rod vs. post-rod. How is the Board interpreting this? Therese Hartman stated that in December 2008, a team of operators, BLM and WG&FD were assigned to develop the monitoring projects. Request for bids – they knew that they needed to get the data without losing a year of data prior to PAPO organization. The PAPO budget was not yet established at that time, so the operators stepped forward and said that they would pay for these things, assuming that they would get reimbursed. Steve Ferrell commented that there was discussion about whether to reimburse through crediting future spud fees, or by check. Jim Lucas said that they had the same conversation for the Murdock easement and it was a credit. Don Simpson said it might be fairer to apply it to what they owe. They pay the PAPO Escrow Agent December 1st each year. How do the checks come in for what wells each operator did? Funding goes directly to the escrow agent by each operator. Questar was the only one who spent this money (for the mule deer studies). Mike Smith and Pete Guernsey with Questar (in the audience) agreed, and the Board concurred that when Questar sends in their check this coming December, they should deduct this amount (\$97,134.77) from their obligation as a credit. Questar wants to make sure that this is remembered, years down the road. Could it be part of Sheila Keating's budget spreadsheet – yes. Amend the proposed staff recommended motion to show a credit amount. Joel Bousman motioned to accept an amended recommended motion as follows: "Motion that the PAPO Agency Managers Committee and Mitigation Management Board approve of the revised 'credit' amount of \$97,134.77 paid by Questar Exploration & Production Company for monitoring work related to the Winter 2008-2009 Sublette Mule Deer Study. This credit may be applied to 2010 payments to the PAPO Mitigation Fund." Don Simpson seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous and motion passed.

Reimbursement to Shell/SWEPI for Pre-PAPO Pronghorn Antelope Studies: memorandum by Therese Hartman, WG&FD/PAPO

Discussion of the credit for Shell for the Pronghorn Antelope Studies – refer to the Memorandum in the packet. Who do the data/collars belong to? Wildlife Conservation Society is worried that the data could be acquired via FOIA if PAPO has the data. They want to wait for 3 years. They provided us with the 2005 data. Shell made the payment to them (the contractor). Chairman Corra stated that the staff's motion is consistent with last April's Board approval. Steve Ferrell suggested that the Board postpone any additional approval. Jason Fearneyhough state that Board only approved 230k, dollars possibly incorrect.

Chairman Corra: if we are postponing, then we don't need a motion, just agree to table payment until we get data and invoiced. Chairman Corra: in our records is a motion to approve \$144k pending receipt of the data. His thought is that we are done with the subject. If we are successful in getting the data, we should go ahead and pay since we already have the motion. Perhaps an e-mail could be sent letting the board know that the transaction was completed. If the invoices are more than the approved \$144k, then send an email letting them know.

Purchase of Wildlife Monitoring Trial Cameras: memorandum by Dan Stroud, Wildlife Mitigation Biologist with WG&FD, PAPO Staff Member, and Cara Farr, BLM Mitigation Team

Cara Farr – trail cameras: Purchased 3 trail cameras last year (BLM \$) to monitor, and the request is to buy six more. Note that the card readers only \$40 each – not what it shows on the slide, so the correct amount is \$6,300.00 for six more cameras. Steve Ferrell asked what project(s) are we advancing by buying these cameras. Joel Bousman commented that they converted an existing windmill to solar. It verified (the camera) that wildlife was actually using this enclosure like we thought that they would. Cameras would be placed on existing, as well as new sites. Results would go into monitoring. Some of these photos are in newest newsletter. The three current cameras are BLM property. Joel Bousman motioned to accept an amended staff recommended motion as follows: "Motion that the PAPO Agency Managers Committee and the Pinedale Anticline Mitigation Management Board approve the funding, \$6,300.00, to purchase 6 more cameras and associated equipment." Steve Ferrell seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous and motion passed.

Purchase of Miscellaneous Sage Grouse Monitoring Equipment: memorandum by Therese Hartman, WG&FD/PAPO

Therese Hartman: Sage grouse capture equipment. It is tied to contract lag with sage grouse. Because we don't have a contractor in place, staff now doing noise monitoring and sage grouse capturing. We have 26 collars in possession. Need nets, spotlights, small tools. Two BLM employees to lead the team - - need to fund their overtime. Noise monitors (4) to rent and circulated between 16 leks. Nets would be owned by PAPO. We tried to borrow the equipment, but it is all in use. Any options to the overtime? Would this equipment be used again? Possibly. Chairman Corra: Money from the funds go into a BLM account, and the payroll department does some allocation. If we approved the \$3,200 for overtime, BLM would handle it through contributed funds. Steve Ferrell suggested that the WG&FD

buy two new nets for PAPO to borrow. Don Simpson suggested that the BLM eat the overtime for the BLM biologists. Do \$12,000 edit for noise monitors. Staff recommended motion in the Memorandum changed to strike amount requested and replace with \$12,000.00 – motion made by Don Simpson and seconded by Jason Fearneyhough. Vote was unanimous and motion passed.

Request for Funds for Mule Deer Recruitment Flight: memorandum by Therese Hartman, WG&FD/PAPO

Therese Hartman: Wildlife monitoring and mitigation plan developed and signed in April. WG&FD ordered wildlife monitoring flights done by Savage air services – cost was \$4,500.00. Flight was done in December. This is retroactive. This flight will happen every year as it is required in the monitoring plan. Steve Ferrell stated that WG&FD will pay the cost. No motions made by Board.

Observation from the chair: This board and some of its members have been saying for a long time that they want to see things in advance, before it happens. Chair wants to make sure that the staff is aware of what just happened with WG&FD eating the costs.

New Funding Application from PAWG Socioeconomic Task Group for Technical Support for 2010 Monitoring Report: discussion by Jim Lucas, PAPO Coordinator

New Funding Application: No memo in packet. Staff Analysis of PAWG for technical support for 2010 monitoring. Karmel Kail here to present. Staff analysis standpoint: Staff felt that this request was beyond the intent of mitigation measures in the ROD. Most objectives related to air, water and wildlife. This issue was discussed at length at the Feb. 25th PAWG meeting, and a vote of 4:2 on the matter to bring this to the PAPO board. Karmel: task groups have to present an annual report to the PAWG. When things were first starting, volunteers, and a grant, and the County commissioners co-funded a position. All of this is over, now they are back to reconstruct/reinvent. Chuck Otto encouraged this work to go on. Proposal was to take the very first spreadsheet because it was the broadest, not the best, to a contractor and sort through various data and update the spreadsheet. Part of the application was a component called focus groups. Once the report was out, it was to go to various agencies and interest groups and have them take a look at the info and see if it could be used. Also focus on the way that it could be done. Formats were taken into consideration. Joel comments on the background: Karmel is correct in that the county contracted with Ecosystem Research out of billings to do an in depth area-wide review on socio-economic issues that occurs with energy development. They did this in 2 phases. Phase I was impacts, and Phase II was how to deal with the economic fallout. The County identified their need for continual updates associated with energy development. Rob Winthrop, BLM, worked with the County developing language in the RNP that provides for an annual update within the county to give them a better means of planning for the impacts. On January 12, as a follow-up, a letter was sent to Rebecca Spurgin, AFM, requesting a meeting to get these updates. The PAWG charter is restricted to the Pinedale Anticline. The local governments do not get a broad enough report with only the Pinedale Anticline. Many of the workers come from Rock Springs, etc. The county thinks that there is another way to get the info needed without violating the Charter. Don Simpson comments that they plan to work with the greater socio-economic entities. Brian Davis agrees that we need to address the

broader areas - need to look at the big picture. Brian plans on scheduling a meeting. The County's intent in doing the original assessment, (the best way to capture the changes) is a rig count and the fallout with additional rigs. Brian comments that some of the rigs pulled out because they weren't going to meet EPAS emission standards.

Chairman Corra: staff is recommending "no" to this. PAPO's evaluation is that this does not meet any of the provisions of the ROD. Karmel was tying it to the other resources. Joel says that he thinks there are other avenues to get the information (BLM). Don S. thinks that this can be done in a collective fashion with all of the local governments. No motion being presented. Chairman Corra thanks Karmel for bringing this to their attention. Does the board need to say something more definitive to Karmel? The PAWG meeting voted to submit the idea to the board and to take the board's advice. It feels to Chairman Corra that Karmel's task force is kind of at loose ends, so maybe they should approach someone that needs data. The PAWG task group has changed. Karmel feels that the group is somewhat frustrated with different signals received. Chairman Corra: Advice is free: Brian needs to examine whether the subgroup should continue. We are not willing to pay for feeding the group some information, but is not suggesting that they disband the group. Brian needs to define the tasks better. Chairman would like a motion that either approves or says no to this project. **Motion is for approval of the project. Jason moves to approve. No second. The motion dies for lack of a second.** Karmel has two questions: would the PAPO consider funding socio-economic or mitigation in theory, and if so, can you give guidelines, and that sort of thing? The PAWG needs to figure out where they stand. Joel thinks that the BLM should define that. Chairman Corra thinks that the short answer is no. There may be an occasion where, in the group, via the PAWG process, something comes up. This group is always willing to listen, but it would not be good to give a false expectation. John Ruhs strongly supports Joel's statement. The question needs to come from the PAWG to the BLM. Brian thinks that the problem is that the focus is on the Pinedale Anticline, rather than the big issue. Kathy Purvis comments that the frustrating part is trying to interpret what the ROD says on how to use the funds - i.e., funding for road dust abatement. The PAWG is trying to figure out how the PAPO board can help the PAWG understand what their roles are, and if there is an opportunity to get funds to help gather data. Chairman Corra states that, somewhere down the road, if there is a real socio-economic impact, perhaps there would be appropriate funding. The agenda item called for Karmel to make the presentation, and the board to provide an answer. There is no time to discuss philosophy at this meeting.

BLM Avian Management Plan: presentation by Brian Davis, Acting Field Manager of the BLM Pinedale Field Office, and Lisa Solberg, Wildlife Biologist, BLM Pinedale Field Office, and discussion of the potential of PAPO funding the Avian Management Plan

Avian management plan for the anticline: (2009 in the wildlife management plan) If we do this operator by operator, and keep using the determination of habitat as the only means, we will be getting in trouble with the Fish and Wildlife service. We think that this approach (the proposal) needs to be done. \$30-50k range, working with the State leads. One of the goals is to determine how to manage raptors. The ROD doesn't indicate clearly how raptors fit into the progression of development. We've come into a problem, where the only method approved was to deter those nests so we wouldn't provide take under the migratory bird treaty act. The F&WL service does not think that we have enough

mitigation in place to use the deterrents as the sole management tool. What other tools are available or acceptable, particularly in DA2 and 3? With staffing constraints, plus we are in a limbo period, the raptors have arrived. We do feel that we need assistance from a 3rd party. Our goal would be to have the plan in place by fall. Ultra, Shell and Questar have approached us as to why we aren't doing an avian plan. This would benefit the operators the most. Today, we need a decision on whether to proceed with this proposal or not, and by next board meeting have it fleshed out. Joel is interested in feedback from the operators and how they feel that it would benefit them. New Fork River corridor is where most of the conflicts are. The nests are mostly on private lands, but with the .5 or 1 mile buffer, it comes out on BLM lands with federal mineral rights. Could be a combination of both BLM and Private Lands – developing relationships. Cottonwood habitats – can we preserve, or plant more, but most of it would be on private land. Possibly put platforms up on the flanks for hawks. Of all of the species on the anticline, the ferruginous hawk is doing the worst. Joel suggests including the private landowners in the meetings coupled with some economic incentives. Steve F. comments that this seems to be an issue that needs to be resolved within existing jurisdictional parameters. Why couldn't BLM and Fish and Wildlife Service deal with this? We could spend 30-40k and have no traction because of no jurisdiction. John Ruhs states that the BLM still maintains primary jurisdiction, and feels that this is something we need to work with F&WL and other agencies. Don S. – avian plan – companies with fish – they write it up, so don't call it an avian plan – call it a raptor plan or something else. What we really need is a proactive tool kit instead of reactive. Work with private landowners and other agencies to build a toolkit. If we are going to do it, get everyone together and build the toolkit. Steve F. asks how is a 40k plan going to help us? Don S. suggests that we could possibly get that third party involved, since we've already spent 80k and have gotten nowhere. Brian says that sooner or later we are going to hit the wall on the current mitigation. Perhaps they need to see the big picture (operators). Chairman Corra states that the conversation should be tied into the development area concept. This concept has informed other plans, such as LGS in DA5. The operators came and asked for adjustments to the plan of operations specified in the EIS. This changed the schedule for the LGS, which changed other schedules. Is the current plan after modification of DA5? DA5 was not critical. DA2 and 3 were. We are trying to keep the corridors and balance with wildlife. The whole idea of having the development sequence was to balance, thus the timeline. Brian states that the operators need some guidelines for the mitigation. The operators are throwing the onus back on BLM and "why aren't we doing something". Brian thought it might fit into the PAPO. Don Simpson suggested that the proposal be written and see what it is that we are trying to create. Then talk with John and sit down with the Game and Fish and a couple of others and go from there. They will write it up and try to get some PAWG input. Chairman says try to tackle the questions that Steve raised, and keep one eye on his concerns – the potential development pattern (in the EIS), and the conflicts.

Outreach meeting to be discussed now? Don Simpson – Jim Lucas to put together the outline, and then discuss through emails. **Jim will do that this week.** A list of topics and who will be there to assist. The basic idea, since it's a first time, is to meet and greet with maps, etc., Make sure that someone is there to address the issues. WDEQ is hosting a meeting soon to address some issues on April 13th, some of the CURED's Issues.

Public comments: No hands raised.

Chair's prerogative: Heard a lot of input about public involvement early on that the staff works on. Is there a way of getting a public review process? Concern is that, for instance, there is a group of experts that get together and discuss this, but the public doesn't get a chance to weigh in on thoughts or ideas on the project. He is suggesting and encouraging the staff to get some public input into these plans. Perhaps a notification in the paper, outreach meetings, etc. Don Simpson comments that his goes with his comment to have the outreach meetings fairly regularly. Don Simpson stated that Mr. Corra did a fine job with the Board Meeting!

Chairman Corra: a question directed to the County, on this socio-economic issue, that PAPO will go on for 15 to 20 years? Based on the socio-economic language in the Pinedale RMP, the County's expectations is that the contractor who is doing the NEPA on this, sit down with the county and towns, etc. for planning purposes.

4:36 P.M.: Motion to adjourn the meeting by Joel Bousman, seconded by Don Simpson. Motion carried.