



SPENCER J. COX  
Governor  
DEIDRE M. HENDERSON  
Lieutenant Governor

# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Division of Water Rights

JOEL FERRY      TERESA WILHELMSEN  
Executive Director      State Engineer/Division Director

## ORDER OF THE STATE ENGINEER

For Application to Appropriate Water Number 92-695 (A83862)

MAY 1 2024

Application to Appropriate Water Number 92-695 (A83862) in the name of Blackstone Minerals NV LLC was filed on July 17, 2023, to appropriate 19 cubic feet per second (cfs) of water from points located: (1) Well - South 797 feet and West 402 feet from the NE Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M (10-inch well, 8000-9000 feet deep); (2) Well - South 342 feet and West 162 feet from the NE Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M (10-inch well, 8000-9000 feet deep); (3) Well - South 1169 feet and West 234 feet from the NE Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M (10-inch well, 8000-9000 feet deep); (4) Well - North 963 feet and West 102 feet from the E $\frac{1}{4}$  Corner of Section 27, T21S, R16E, SLB&M (10-inch well, 8000-9000 feet deep); (5) Well - North 1225 feet and East 1028 feet from the S $\frac{1}{4}$  Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M (10-inch well, 8000-9000 feet deep); (6) Well - South 1205 feet and West 882 feet from the NE Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M (10-inch well, 8000-9000 feet deep). The water will be returned at the following points: (1) Return point - North 329 feet and East 1216 feet from the SW Corner of Section 14, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; (2) Return point - South 1481 feet and East 271 feet from the N $\frac{1}{4}$  Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; (3) Return point - South 205 feet and East 406 feet from the W $\frac{1}{4}$  Corner of Section 23, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; (4) Return point - South 1214 feet and East 246 feet from the NW Corner of Section 26, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; (5) Return point - North 150 feet and East 389 feet from the SW Corner of Section 14, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; (6) Return point - South 1193 feet and East 496 feet from the N $\frac{1}{4}$  Corner of Section 22, T21S, R16E, SLB&M. The water is to be used for the year-round purpose of lithium extraction. The water is to be used in all or portions of Sections 14, 22, 23, 26, & 27, T21S, R16E, SLB&M.

Notice of the application was published in the ETV News on August 16 and 23, 2023 and in The Moab Times-Independent on December 7 and 14, 2023, and protests were received from Holiday River Expeditions, Jeff & Trigg Gerber, Kelly Dunham, Trustee of the Nancy J. Dunham Trust, Gayna Salinas, Living Rivers and the Great Basin Water Network, and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). A hearing was held in Green River, Utah on November 14, 2023.

Protestants requested a second hearing but the nature of protests received after the November 14<sup>th</sup> hearing did not deviate significantly from those received and heard on the 14<sup>th</sup> and a second hearing was not held.

Action on change applications by the State Engineer is governed by the provisions of Utah Code § 73-3-3, which provides that change applications be limited and conditioned such that impairment of existing rights does not occur. Utah Code § 73-3-8(5)(a) requires the State Engineer follow the same procedures as provided for applications to appropriate water. The approval criteria for such applications are contained in Utah Code § 73-3-8(1), which states:

*(1) (a) It shall be the duty of the state engineer to approve an application if there is reason to believe that:*

*(i) for an application to appropriate, there is unappropriated water in the proposed source;*

*(ii) the proposed use will not impair existing rights or interfere with the more beneficial use of the water;*

*(iii) the proposed plan:*

*(A) is physically and economically feasible, unless the application is filed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation; and*

*(B) would not prove detrimental to the public welfare;*

*(iv) the applicant has the financial ability to complete the proposed works;*

*(v) the application was filed in good faith and not for purposes of speculation or monopoly; ...*

*(b) If the state engineer, because of information in the state engineer's possession obtained either by the state engineer's own investigation or otherwise, has reason to believe that an application will interfere with the water's more beneficial use for irrigation, municipal and industrial, domestic or culinary, stock watering, power or mining development, or manufacturing, or will unreasonably affect public recreation or the natural stream environment, or will prove detrimental to the public welfare, the state engineer shall withhold approval or rejection of the application until the state engineer has investigated the matter.*

*(c) If an application does not meet the requirements of this section, it shall be rejected.*

The State Engineer has reviewed the application, the information provided in the various submittals prepared in support and in protest of the proposed project, the information provided at the hearing, the written testimony submitted after the hearing, and has conducted additional investigation as directed by statute. The standard by which the State Engineer evaluates applications seeking approval is the "reason to believe standard" outlined in *Searle v. Milburn Irrigation Co.*, 2006 UT 16, 133 P.3d 382.

The proposed project presents some unique circumstances, which has led to significant consideration and study of the issues outlined under the criteria in Utah Code § 73-3-8. The regulation and development of mineral extraction is heavily regulated under State and Federal law. The proposal raises questions related to water availability, impairment of existing water rights, project feasibility, public welfare, the Colorado River Storage Project, and the Green River Block Contract.

All of these issues, along with the State Engineer's analysis are summarized and discussed in the following subsections listed by the individual criterion cited in Utah Code § 73-3-8(1).

Some comments in the written protests and at the hearing were directed towards a possible future filing by the applicant for freshwater uses associated with this project. Because this application is only for the non-consumptive use of brine water for lithium extraction, no analysis or comment

will be made regarding issues related to a possible future filing on freshwater. Any additional applications will be considered based on its own merits. Many other concerns listed in the protests fall outside the jurisdictional authority of the State Engineer to address.

**Utah Code § 73-3-8 (1)(a)(i) Unappropriated Water in the Proposed Source**

The protests contend the Colorado River, including all its surface and underground tributaries, is over-allocated and over-appropriated, meaning that there is not sufficient unappropriated water in the proposed source to satisfy this application.

The concern of whether or not there is unappropriated water in a source can be raised regarding local water use, within a particular aquifer or drainage, or more broadly such as seen in these protests in regards to the volume of water that can be used by Utah appropriators under interstate compacts and agreements.

Locally, there are currently no water rights approved to use brine water from the geologic stratum identified at this location in this application. Therefore, it is the opinion of the State Engineer that there is unappropriated brine water available in this source.

More broadly, the Colorado River and its tributaries are managed and operated under compacts, federal laws, court decisions, decrees, contracts, and regulatory guidelines collectively known as the "Law of the River." The Colorado River Compact, 1922, apportioned water from the Colorado River basin limiting the amount of water each State can take based on depletion.<sup>1</sup>

The applicant has filed for non-consumptive use of brine water to be used for lithium extraction. The protests contend that other similar operations are not fully non-consumptive. The applicant states in response to the protest that they will be metering both the extraction and reinjection of the brine product to confirm the process is non-consumptive. The State Engineer has no reason to believe the applicant has misrepresented their intentions to return 100 percent of the brine to subsurface formations. The applicant is cautioned that if this application is not 100 percent non-consumptive, they may face enforcement action resulting in fines for unauthorized use of the water right. Because this application is non-consumptive, it means there is no depletion and would not be subject to restriction or curtailment under current compacts and agreements.

It is the opinion of the State Engineer that the information reviewed supports a reason to believe that there is currently unappropriated water available for use under this application.

**Utah Code § 73-3-8 (1)(a)(ii) Not Impair Existing Rights or Interfere with the More Beneficial Use of Water**

Protestants argue that withdrawing brine water in close proximity to the Green River may draw water from the Green River or the underlying aquifers upon which the Green River may be connected which could impair other existing water rights or interfere with the more beneficial use of water. The BOR also questioned whether this application would negatively impact the

---

<sup>1</sup> Colorado River Compact. (1922), <https://www.usbr.gov/lc/region/pao/pdfiles/crccompact.pdf>

Colorado River Storage Project's water supply. Protestants also questioned whether or not this application would impair federal reserved water rights.

As mentioned previously, there are no existing water rights established in this area drawing brine water from the location identified in this application that could be impaired. Although there are a few water rights established in the Green River area for the use of groundwater from shallow wells, there is very little actual use of groundwater because of existing water quality issues related to contamination from salts in the Mancos Shale layer which underlies much of the region. There are only a few water rights, primarily for agricultural purposes, located on the Green River several miles downstream from the points of diversion identified in this application.

Impairment of existing water rights would only occur if water was in short supply on the Green River and use of the proposed extraction wells caused a drawdown of surface water into the subsurface aquifers and away from downstream users. The applicant submitted a letter from Drummond "Dusty" Earley III, Ph.D., P.G., with D3 Geochemistry, LLC citing a 1982 USGS geologic study<sup>2</sup> and also a 1999 Utah Geological Survey study<sup>3</sup> which provides information that impermeable evaporite (salt) beds, shales, and siltstones, having a total thickness of hundreds of feet, hydraulically confine the deep, brine bearing Paradox clastic beds and separate the Mesozoic and Paleozoic aquifers such that there is no movement of groundwater from one aquifer to the other.

The protests did not offer any explanation of how this application may interfere with federal reserved water rights and because this application is non-consumptive, the State Engineer is of the opinion that no federal reserved water rights will be impaired by this application.

The State Engineer has reason to believe that using wells to withdraw brine water from a depth of 9,000 feet below the ground surface will not impair existing rights or interfere with a more beneficial use of water or negatively affect the CRSP's water supply.

**Utah Code § 73-3-8 (1)(a)(iii) Physically and Economically Feasible**

Some of the protests revolve around the physical and economic feasibility of the proposed project. The protests are summarized into two general areas of concern which are required permitting and economic feasibility.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) submitted a letter of concern stating that the applicant has not received approval to conduct any mineral exploration on BLM-managed public lands, and for the two points of return listed in the application, the applicant has not applied for nor received any land use authorization from the BLM. In response to the BLM's concerns, the applicant submitted a letter on October 24, 2023, amending their application by removing the point of diversion located North 963 feet and West 102 feet from the E<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> Corner of Section 27, T21S, R16E, SLB&M and also removing the points of rediversion located South 205 feet and

<sup>2</sup> USGS. (1982), <https://pubs.usgs.gov/publication/ofr82107>

<sup>3</sup> UGS. (1999), <https://ugspub.nr.utah.gov/publications/circular/c-99.pdf>

East 406 feet from the W¼ Corner of Section 23, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; and South 1214 feet and East 246 feet from the NW Corner of Section 26, T21S, R16E, SLB&M. The remaining points of diversion and rediversion are located on private land.

Several concerns were raised in protest regarding the danger of drilling wells into the Paradox Formation given the high pressures found at depth; concerns related to potential contamination related to leaks, spills or explosions; and concerns related to previous use of the property as an industrial site with existing contamination issues.

The applicant cites a Definitive Feasibility Study (DFS) which contains information that proponents and investors can use to evaluate the viability of the project and whether it is worthwhile to invest more capital in said project. A summary of the DFS<sup>4</sup> has a section related to required permitting for this project. It lists many of the required permits including permits from Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining, Utah Division of Air Quality, Utah Division of Water Quality, Grand County, Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (now Trust Lands Administration), and the BLM. Many of the concerns raised in protest to this application fall under the primary jurisdiction of one of these other entities. The Protestants are directed to work with these other entities that have primary jurisdiction and administrative rules governing such activities to address their concerns. No information was presented by the Protestants that conclusively prohibited the applicant from pursuing this project to completion provided they work through the various regulatory requirements for each agency having jurisdiction over this project.

The applicant presented information stating the demand for lithium is strong worldwide. They cite information in the DFS stating that this project proposes producing 13,074 tonnes per annum of high purity Lithium Carbonate over an initial 10-year project life. They also state that historical data for the Paradox Lithium Project area is more robust than many lithium exploration targets due to the long history of oil and gas exploration in the region. The Utah Geological Survey cited a resource estimate for the Paradox Basin reporting there is about 397 million brine tons at 98 ppm lithium, which equates to 205,500 recoverable tons of lithium carbonate equivalent plus byproduct bromine, boron, and iodine.<sup>5</sup> Anson Resources provided a more detailed and updated assessment to the Utah State Legislature in 2023.<sup>6</sup>

Research completed by the State Engineer shows demand for lithium tripled between 2017 and 2022 while global battery demand for clean energy production increased by two-thirds in 2022.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Anson Resources. (2022), <https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02565661.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Utah Geological Survey. (2020), <https://geology.utah.gov/map-pub/survey-notes/energy-news/energy-news-increased-battery-demand-spurs-interest-in-utahs-metallic-resources/>

<sup>6</sup> Anson Resources. (2023), <https://le.utah.gov/interim/2023/pdf/00004804.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> International Energy Agency. (2023), <https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/afc35261-41b2-47d4-86d6-d5d77fc259be/CriticalMineralsMarketReview2023.pdf>



Anson cites existing infrastructure including a national rail network, interstate road system, gas and electrical power, and access to the Green River as key components in the feasibility of the Green River site.<sup>8</sup>

Based on the information presented by the applicant and research completed by the State Engineer, there is sufficient reason to believe the applicant is aware of the physical and economic challenges associated with this project, believes there is an existing and future demand for the product, and has sufficient knowledge, resources, and technical expertise to advance this project.

**Utah Code § 73-3-8 (1)(a)(iv) Financial Ability to Complete the Proposed Works**

The application is protested on the grounds that the applicant does not have the financial ability to complete the proposed works.

The applicant provided information stating that they are a wholly-owned subsidiary of Anson Resources, Ltd., a publicly traded Australian company<sup>9</sup> with a current market capitalization of \$180 million AUD. Information from the company's 2023 Annual Report shows that during that financial year the company completed a capital raise of \$50 million to support the development of this project.<sup>10</sup> Anson reported that in September 2023 they had \$31.1 million cash on hand.<sup>11</sup>

The applicant stated that they are working with China-based Sunresin New Materials Company to support the development of the project. Information accessed online from Sunresin's website shows that they are an established company with a broad range of interests and products.<sup>12</sup> They are listed on the Shenzhen Stock Exchange.<sup>13</sup> Sunresin reports that they are a major Direct Lithium Extraction (DLE) sorbent producer with three existing DLE plants, one under construction and are contracted to build another five DLE plants.<sup>14</sup>

The applicant has provided sufficient information to provide a reason to believe that they have the financial ability and expertise to advance this project.

**Utah Code § 73-3-8 (1)(a)(v) Filed in Good Faith, Not for Speculation or Monopoly**

The application is protested on whether or not the application was filed in good faith and not for speculation.

It was reported that the applicant through its parent company, Anson, has paid \$2.4 million to purchase approximately 140 acres in the Green River project area with the intent to construct a

---

<sup>8</sup> Anson Resources. (2023), <https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02711031.pdf>  
<https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02753393.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Australian Securities & Investments Commission. (2023), [https://connectonline.asic.gov.au/RegistrySearch/faces/landing/SearchRegisters.jspx?\\_adf.ctrl-state=k7xvdmdb\\_4](https://connectonline.asic.gov.au/RegistrySearch/faces/landing/SearchRegisters.jspx?_adf.ctrl-state=k7xvdmdb_4)

<sup>10</sup> Anson Resources. (2023), <https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02718370.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> Anson Resources. (2023), <https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02732532.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> Sunresin. (2024), <https://www.seplite.com/>

<sup>13</sup> Sunresin (2024), <https://www.seplite.com/company/>

<sup>14</sup> Sunresin. (2024), <https://www.seplite.com/direct-lithium-extraction/>

lithium extraction and production facility. Information online with Grand County and Emery County shows 98.33 acres owned by Blackstone at or around the place of use listed on this application.<sup>15</sup> The purchase also supposedly included 1,251 BLM placer claims.<sup>16</sup> Anson reports that they have started design and engineering studies at the site and are currently carrying out environmental, archaeological and land surveys to re-enter three oil wells to sample the brines at a depth of around 10,000 feet.<sup>17</sup> The applicant has three test well applications submitted to the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining, one of which has been approved for drilling. The applicant has submitted an Underground Injection Control (UIC) Technical Report for a UIC Class 5 Spent Brine Return well.<sup>18</sup> A report from Anson in March 2023 states that the company expended \$1.1 million on exploration and evaluation costs for the Paradox Lithium Project.<sup>19</sup>

Sufficient information has been submitted by the applicant to show significant effort and investment has been applied to provide a reason to believe the applicant is diligently working towards the construction of this project and the application was filed in good faith.

**Utah Code § 73-3-8 (1)(b)(i) Public Welfare / Recreation / Natural Stream Environment**

Some of the protests raise concerns related to public health and safety, possible impacts to recreation and the natural stream environment including concerns related to the Green River Endangered Species protections.

Public health and safety concerns related to well construction, including high pressures at depth, and contamination issues, including water quality issues related to leaks or blowouts, are regulated by the Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, and Utah Division of Water Quality.

The applicant states in response to the protest that they will be completing a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis which will analyze and address the full range of potential environmental impacts and apply appropriate mitigation measures to identified environmental concerns. This would include any potential impacts to endangered fish in the Green River.

While the public safety concerns regarding well construction and prevention of contamination due to industrial processes are significant, the State Engineer does not have primary jurisdiction

---

<sup>15</sup> Grand County. (2024), <http://tax.grandcountyutah.net/grandcountyutah/taxroll/05-0022-0053.pdf> & <http://tax.grandcountyutah.net/grandcountyutah/taxroll/05-0022-0052.pdf>

Emery County. (2024), <https://emerycounty.com/home/offices/recorder/plat-map/plat-search/>

<sup>16</sup> Anson Resources. (2023), <https://www.mining-technology.com/news/anson-acquires-land-us/?cf-view>

<sup>17</sup> Anson Resources. (2024), <https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02769157.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> Utah Division of Water Quality. (2023) <https://documents.deq.utah.gov/water-quality/ground-water-protection/underground-injection-control/class-v/DWO-2023-124900.pdf> & <https://documents.deq.utah.gov/water-quality/ground-water-protection/underground-injection-control/class-v/DWO-2023-124885.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> Anson Resources. (2023), <https://wcsecure.weblink.com.au/pdf/ASN/02659869.pdf>

over these issues. There is reason to believe that this project, constructed under the laws, rules and regulations of the state and federal agencies, which have primary jurisdiction to address the concerns raised by the Protestants, will not be detrimental to the public welfare.

Because this application is non-consumptive and is isolated from the Green River, The State Engineer considers it unlikely that this application will cause negative impacts to recreation.

**Other Concern Raised in Protest – Green River Block Contract**

The BOR stated in their protest the concern that this appropriation may require a contract with the United States or State of Utah for water defined under the Green River Block Contract.

The Green River Block Contract<sup>20</sup> referenced by the BOR is a contract entered into in 2019 by the State of Utah and the United States of America, acting through BOR, for use of 447,500 acre-feet with 158,890 acre-feet of depletion from Application to Appropriate A30414d (Water Right Number 41-3479) or its segregated portions. This new Application to Appropriate is not a segregated portion of Water Right Number 41-3479 and therefore the provisions of the Green River Block Contract do not apply.

**Other Concern Raised in Protest – Current Appropriation Policy for Area 92**

The application was protested on the concern that the current appropriation policy for Area 92 does not allow for the filing of non-consumptive use applications without restrictions on the volume of water being appropriated. The current policy for Area 92 does allow for such a filing. It is the opinion of the State Engineer that this application can be approved without adversely affecting prior rights. The applicant is put on notice that diligence must be shown in pursuing the development of this application which can be demonstrated by the completion of the project as proposed in the application.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** and Application to Appropriate Water Number 92-695 (A83862) is hereby **APPROVED** subject to prior rights and the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant shall install and maintain measuring and totalizing recording devices to meter all water diverted from all sources pertaining to this application and all water reinjected into the subsurface formations, and **shall annually report this data to the Division of Water Rights Water Use Program.**
  
- 2) The point of diversion located North 963 feet and West 102 feet from the E¼ Corner of Section 27, T21S, R16E, SLB&M and the points of redirection located South 205 feet and East 406 feet from the W¼ Corner of Section 23, T21S, R16E, SLB&M; and South 1214 feet and East 246 feet from the NW Corner of Section 26, T21S, R16E, SLB&M are removed from this application.

---

<sup>20</sup> Contract for Exchange of Water, Green River Block. (2019),  
[https://www.waterrights.utah.gov/wrinfo/policy/GRB\\_655executed.pdf](https://www.waterrights.utah.gov/wrinfo/policy/GRB_655executed.pdf)



This application is also approved according to the conditions of the current appropriation policy guidelines for the Colorado River Drainage, adopted March 7, 1990.

The applicant is strongly cautioned that other permits may be required before any development of this application can begin and it is the responsibility of the applicant to determine the applicability of and acquisition of such permits. Once all other permits have been acquired, this is your authority to develop the water under the above referenced application which under Utah Code § 73-3-10 and 73-3-12 must be diligently prosecuted to completion. The water must be put to beneficial use and proof must be filed on or before May 31, 2031, or a request for extension of time must be acceptably filed; otherwise the application will be lapsed. This approval is limited to the rights to divert and beneficially use water and does not grant any rights of access to, or use of land or facilities not owned by the applicant.

As noted, this approval is granted subject to prior rights. The applicant shall be liable to mitigate or provide compensation for any impairment of or interference with prior rights as such may be stipulated among parties or decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Proof of beneficial use is evidence to the State Engineer that the water has been fully placed to its intended beneficial use. By law, it must be prepared by a registered engineer or land surveyor, who will certify to the location, uses and extent of your water right.

Upon the submission of proof as required by Utah Code § 73-3-16 for this application, the applicant must identify every source of water used under this application and the amount of water used from that source. The proof must also show the capacity of the sources of supply and demonstrate that each source can provide the water claimed to be diverted under this right as well as all other water rights which may be approved to be diverted from those sources.

Failure on your part to comply with the requirements of the applicable statutes may result in the lapsing of this Application to Appropriate Water.

**It is the applicant's responsibility to maintain a current address with this office and to update ownership of their water right. Please notify this office immediately of any change of address or for assistance in updating ownership. Additionally, if ownership of this water right or the property with which it is associated changes, the records of the Division of Water Rights should be updated. For assistance in updating title to the water right please contact the Division at the phone number below.**


Your contact with this office, should you need it, is with the Southeastern Regional Office. The telephone number is 435-613-3750.

This Order is subject to the provisions of Utah Admin. Code R655-6-17 of the Division of Water Rights and to Utah Code §§ 63G-4-302, 63G-4-402, and 73-3-14 which provide for filing either a Request for Reconsideration with the State Engineer or for judicial review with the appropriate

ORDER OF THE STATE ENGINEER  
Application to Appropriate Water Number  
92-695 (A83862)  
Page 10

District Court. A Request for Reconsideration must be filed in writing with the State Engineer within 20 days of the date of this Order. The written request shall be filed in-person, by mail, or electronically. If the request is filed electronically it shall be submitted to: [waterrights@utah.gov](mailto:waterrights@utah.gov), which is the authorized general email for the Division. However, a Request for Reconsideration is not a prerequisite to filing for judicial review. A petition for judicial review must be filed within 30 days after the date of this Order or, if a Request for Reconsideration has been filed, within 30 days after the date the Request for Reconsideration is denied. A Request for Reconsideration is considered denied when no action is taken 20 days after the Request is filed.

Dated this 1 day of May, 2024.

  
Teresa Wilhelmsen, P.E., State Engineer

Mailed a copy of the foregoing Order this 1 day of May, 2024 to:

Blackstone Minerals NV LLC  
712 Proud Eagle Lane  
Las Vegas, NV 89144

Trustee Nancy J. Dunham Trust  
c/o Kelly Dunham  
PO Box 451  
Green River, UT 84525


John Wood (Holiday River Expeditions)  
544 E 3900 S  
SLC, UT 84107

Gayna Salinas  
PO Box 129  
Green River, Utah 84525

Jeff & Trigg Gerber  
PO Box 1214  
Bowie, TX 76230

Bureau of Reclamation  
302 East Lakeview Parkway  
Provo, Utah, 84606-7317

John Weisheit  
c/o Living Rivers and Great Basin Water  
Network  
PO Box 466  
Moab, UT 84532

BY:   
Doralee Cannon, Applications/Records Secretary