

PAPA WY Mail

Mr. Matt Anderson  
Bureau of Land Management, Pinedale Field Office P.O. Box 768 Pinedale, WY 82941

Dear Mr. Anderson,

As a citizen concerned about our energy future as well as birds and wildlife, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Pinedale Anticline Natural Gas Field. I strongly urge you to deny the mineral companies' request to increase development in the Pinedale Anticline Project Area (PAPA) described within Alternative B (Proposed Action Alternative). I support Alternative A (No Action Alternative), which requires additional environmental review when development within the PAPA reaches beyond levels specified in the PAPA Record of Decision.

The Pinedale Anticline is one of the largest strongholds for Greater Sage-Grouse and critical winter range and migration route for thousands of mule deer and pronghorn. The Upper Green River Valley (of which the proposed development is part) is the largest, publicly-owned block of big game winter range for the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Over 100,000 pronghorn antelope, mule deer, elk, and moose use the valley, especially as snow closes off the high country. As stated in the Executive Summary of the SEIS, "The Operators' proposal (Alternative B) could cause significant adverse impacts to the human and natural environments." The area's habitats and wildlife has been proven to be under significant threat from the current development actions: the most recent scientific studies have demonstrated tremendous negative effects from gas and oil development on the Greater Sage-Grouse and a 46% decline in mule deer populations in the area of development. Alternative B would only cause further decline of our precious western natural resources and wildlife. Any resource planning in this area should also include at least the minimum measures to protect the core survival areas for the species occurring in the area and distinct, concrete mitigation measures should be required. These lands and wildlife are already struggling to survive under the rapid pace of mineral development in the area.

We must balance our energy production with protection of our natural environment and cannot risk further reckless and environmentally unsound development practices to continue in this sensitive area. Therefore, I urge you to accept Alternative A -- No Action Alternative with the BMPs recommended by the National Audubon Society when managing the current and future development of the site that is within a critical population of Greater Sage-Grouse and other wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

W-1

FL-4-1

W-2

FL-4-2