



CoastalPlain\_EIS, BLM\_AK &lt;blm\_ak\_coastalplain\_eis@blm.gov&gt;

---

**[EXTERNAL] Coastal Plain EIS**

1 message

---

**russtrish** <russtrish@gmail.com>  
To: blm\_ak\_coastalplain\_EIS@blm.gov

Fri, Jun 15, 2018 at 9:46 PM

Please consider the following comments on the proposal to consider oil and gas leasing on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

**Need:** There is a worldwide transition ongoing to move away from the use of fossil fuels toward renewable forms of energy. In addition, more efficient methods of extracting oil and gas have dramatically increased our nation's reserves of oil and gas. These factors in addition to improvements in vehicle gas mileage and heating efficiency make the leasing proposal unnecessary.

**Effects:** The effects of leasing and development activities could only have negative effects on the wildlife and ecosystems of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. These include noise, erosion and other forms of habitat alteration, changes in animal behavior, effects on the well being of listed species, and the degradation of air and water quality. Leasing and development activities would also be detrimental to the values that Native People have always held for the proposed lease area. In addition, if oil and gas development on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge were to occur it could only have a negative effect on the price of oil and gas elsewhere which is already adversely affecting the industry. It would also preclude the availability of that resource if a National emergency requiring the use of oil and gas were to occur in the future.

**Alternatives:** The EIS should specifically consider a no action alternative. This would preclude the negative effects on National Wildlife Refuge lands and species, would avoid further contributing to the worldwide threats of climate change, and would recognize and honor the values that Native People have for the proposed lease area. In the event that BLM believes that by law leases must be selected for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge lands, the decision document should specifically state that while successful leasees may be identified they would not be allowed to proceed with exploration and development activities based on adverse effects identified in the environmental review process.

Thank you for your consideration of the above comments.

Russell Peterson

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy Tablet