

Principal: CN=George Diwachak/OU=UTSO/OU=UT/OU=BLM/O=DOI  
\$LangPrincipal:  
\$AltPrincipal: CN=George Diwachak/OU=UTSO/OU=UT/OU=BLM/O=DOI  
\$AutoSpell: 1  
Logo: StdNotesLtr15  
useApplet: True  
tmpImp2:  
DefaultMailSaveOptions: 1  
Query\_String:  
Subject: Vernal FO RFD  
Sign: 0  
ReturnReceipt: 0  
delTmpEncrypt:  
delTmpImportance:

InetSendTo: Karl\_Stein@blm.gov,  
InetCopyTo:  
\$StorageTo: 1,1,1  
\$Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 6.0.3 September 26, 2003

INetFrom: George\_Diwachak@blm.gov  
PostedDate: 03/01/2006 04:42:46 PM  
Encrypt:  
ZArchiveHandled: CN=LMNIM4/OU=BLM/O=DOI  
ZSTAGE: 2  
NAI101565: 1010300010246a4d  
RouteServers: CN=LMNTM4/OU=BLM/O=DOI.CN=LMORM4/OU=BLM/O=DOI

Categories:  
\$Revisions:  
\$MsgTrackFlags: 0  
DeliveredDate: 03/01/2006 04:42:47 PM

Food for thought!

I previously deleted the paragraph in the draft report dealing with the RFD for the Vernal RMP Revision because the proposed wells in the Penstemon region greatly exceeded the RFD for the subregions identified in the draft RMP (The mineral report was completed in 2002, well before the recent increase in activity and interest). I just received a recent update in the proposed projects in Vernal FO which changes weekly. There are additions that we had not originally considered. The projects are not mapped yet, but I was able to plot them on a map by hand. None appear to

intersect the Penstemon Units, although a couple are close. However, I just added up the estimated proposed wells for the various projects and the number exceed 6000. That was the maximum development anticipated for the entire FO boundary in the RFD. A sobering thought and I'm at a loss in how to address the fact that the entire area may be blanketed by oil and gas proposals.