

STATE COUPLED PROGRAM RESOURCE ASSESSMENT TEAMS

ALASKA

Donald Turner
Robert Forbes
University of Alaska
Fairbanks

Ross Schaif
Alaska Division of
Geological and
Geophysical Surveys
Anchorage

J. Eric Schuster
Mike Korasec
Washington Department of
Natural Resources
Olympia

John Sonderogger
Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology
Butte

Ken Harris
North Dakota
Geological Survey
Grand Forks

Donald Hill
Joseph Riccio
Oregon Department of Geology
and Mineral Industries
Portland

John Mitchell
John Anderson
Idaho Department of
Water Resources
Boise

Edward Decker
Henry Haasler
University of Wyoming
Laramie

Burton Krakow
James Dunn
New York State Energy
Research & Development
Administration and Dunn
Geoscience
Albany

Dennis Trexler
Brian Koenig
Tom Flynn
Nevada Bureau of Mines
and Geology
Reno

William Gosnold
University of Nebraska-Omaha

Hydrothermal resources of the midwest are
being investigated by Gray Fedaral
Arlington, Va.

Roger Martin
California Division of
Mines and Geology
Sacramento

Wallace Gwynn
Peter Murphy
Utah Geological and
Mineral Survey
Salt Lake City

Duane Everett
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

East Coast Radiogenic Resources
are being assessed by:
Lynn Glover #
John Coatsin
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg

Richard Peart
Colorado Geological Survey
Denver

Donald Steeples
Kansas Geological Survey
Lawrence

Richard W. Fahman
Claudia Stone
James Witcher
Nile Jones
Arizona Bureau of Geology
and Mineral Technology
Tucson


Chandler Swanberg
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces

Gary Wilson
Geological Survey
of Alabama
University

HAWAII
Charles Holsley
Donald Thomas
Hawaii Institute of
Geophysics
Honolulu

Charles Woodruff
Texas Bureau of Economic Geology
Austin

Bob Roy
University of Texas-El Paso with
Texas Energy Advisory Commission
Austin




← timing →

| | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------|---|---------|-----------|------|
| AK | data to NOAA in a couple of mos(?) | 2 | | s | m? |
| AZ | ESL will review, no sel'n of data yet, unk. prog | | 3 (pub) | f(?) | h? |
| CA | | | 3 (pub) | f | m |
| CO | NOAA working on | 1 | | s | m |
| HAW | Data in Jan. | | 4 | s | e |
| ID | in press | 1 | | 5 (sci) f | — |
| KS | — | | | | — |
| MT | draft getting ready | 2 | | s | m |
| NB | — | | | | — |
| NEV | out | | | ✓ | — |
| N. DAK | — | | | | — |
| N. MX | draft under prep | | 1 (pub) | 4 (sci) f | e, m |
| OK | — | | | | — |
| ORE | out | | | ✓ | — |
| S. DAK | — | | | | — |
| TX | ? | | | 5 f | m |
| UT | | 1 | | 5 (sci) s | h |
| WA | | 2 | | f | m |
| WYO | | 2 | | s | m |

28 Sept.


STATE COUPLED PROGRAM



| | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| III | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| IIb | 0 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 40 |
| IIa | 50 | 55 | 35 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| I | 50 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |

8, 18 May 7

STATE COUPLED PROGRAM



| Category | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 |
|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| III | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| IIb | 0 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 40 |
| IIa | 50 | 55 | 35 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| I | 50 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |

To: Durum
From: Bevan

Re: Smart Coupled Project

4/23

Stav called today. He wanted to talk to you, but called for me. He had the following message from Bevan regarding the Smart Coupled Program:

1) In our attempts to guide the state keys in the right direction, we can't be too heavy handed.

2) Phase II studies should strongly emphasize relocation of users w/ resource

- Stan added that if a given state waits upon ignoring this Phase II message, a directive from DOE would be in order
- Stan will send you a copy of Bevan's message

UURI

EARTH SCIENCE LABORATORY
420 CHIPETA WAY, SUITE 120
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84108
TELEPHONE 801-581-5283

21 May, 1979

POTENTIAL DISCUSSION TOPICS

STATE COUPLED PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Foreward Program Planning

- graybeard group w/in each state
- relative emphasis of program elements thru FY 85 (see chart)
- ET-RA interface
- DGE selection criteria for Phase II sites
- ESL - Gruy Federal, etc. coordination routes, role definition
- new expertise in state teams - reservoir engineering, logging etc.
- emphasize water well data collection
- report writing

Other Topics

- NWFA - other meetings for geothermal awareness push?
- low-temperature update of Circular 790
- BLM roadless evaluation
- DGE letter encouraging GRC papers, discussion of map direction change
- timing of next assessment team meeting (October?)
- modifications in management document
- ESL status report
- monthly newsletter

Program Reviews

- specific questions for each state
 - commercialization
 - coordination with other DOE programs
 - follow-up letter