



CoastalPlain_EIS, BLM_AK <blm_ak_coastalplain_eis@blm.gov>

[EXTERNAL] More comments, 6/8/18

1 message

Jan Bronson <bronson@gci.net>
To: blm_ak_coastalplain_EIS@blm.gov

Fri, Jun 8, 2018 at 10:43 PM

Please include a National Security Analysis as part of the scoping process for this EIS.

Points to consider:

(1) In the specific case of P.L. 115-97, there is no requirement that oil and gas taken from the Coastal Plain be used domestically. Fossil fuels from the Coastal Plain could be sold internationally. Please consider that it may be global markets more than “national security” or “US energy independence” that would determine who would use that oil. Don’t automatically buy into the lawmakers’ claims otherwise.

(2) Meanwhile, the kinds of energy development that WOULD make us more secure—renewable energy systems that can be more local in nature, and policies that would support greater energy efficiency such as the CAFE standards for automobiles—are being underfunded or rolled back. Also, large intact ecosystems can be protective for humanity, not just for wildlife.

(3) Climate change is deeply harmful to national security. The Center for Naval Analysis in 2007 deemed climate change “a threat multiplier for instability for the most volatile regions in the world,” because it increases/worsens human migrations, public health problems, interstate tension, and conflicts over shrinking, less dependable “resources” with heightened food insecurity. Climate change also affects global ocean flows and weather patterns, bringing greater droughts and greater floods. There will be more “failed states” —along the lines of Somalia—as a result. Because fossil fuel use is a leading cause of greenhouse gas emissions, you must analyze whether continuing to develop new oil and gas fields will contribute to “business as usual”—and therefore a greater than 2 degrees Celsius global average temperature rise, and therefore more of the problems listed in this paragraph.

(4) I am a lifelong Alaskan, born here in 1959. The Arctic is one of the most volatile places in the world climate-wise, in the sense that it is warming twice as fast as much of the rest of the world. In Alaska, climate change is already affecting local villages and towns. You know the list: melting ice and permafrost, rising seas, eroding lands, less predictable and less successful hunts, more environmental allergies, oceans that are becoming more acidic, several of our cod fisheries that collapsed this year because the juvenile cod died in the warm-water blob, and on and on!

Further warming of the global climate, while reducing our homeland’s capacity for self-renewal, is a risk to national security. A full national security analysis taking the fullness of such matters into account must be part of the coastal plain EIS. as well as national security risk.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jan Bronson

Anchorage AK

2 attachments



BLM Coastal Plain 6818.doc
29K



ATT00001
1K

Please include a National Security Analysis as part of the scoping process for this EIS.

Points to consider:

(1) In the specific case of P.L. 115-97, there is no requirement that oil and gas taken from the Coastal Plain be used domestically. Fossil fuels from the Coastal Plain could be sold internationally. Please consider that it may be global markets more than “national security” or “US energy independence” that would determine who would use that oil. Don’t automatically buy into the lawmakers’ claims otherwise.

(2) Meanwhile, the kinds of energy development that WOULD make us more secure—renewable energy systems that can be more local in nature, and policies that would support greater energy efficiency such as the CAFE standards for automobiles—are being underfunded or rolled back. Also, large intact ecosystems can be protective for humanity, not just for wildlife.

(3) Climate change is deeply harmful to national security. The Center for Naval Analysis in 2007 deemed climate change “a threat multiplier for instability for the most volatile regions in the world,” because it increases/worsens human migrations, public health problems, interstate tension, and conflicts over shrinking, less dependable “resources” with heightened food insecurity. Climate change also affects global ocean flows and weather patterns, bringing greater droughts and greater floods. There will be more “failed states” –along the lines of Somalia—as a result. Because fossil fuel use is a leading cause of greenhouse gas emissions, you must analyze whether continuing to develop new oil and gas fields will contribute to “business as usual”—and therefore a greater than 2 degrees Celsius global average temperature rise, and therefore more of the problems listed in this paragraph.

(4) I am a lifelong Alaskan, born here in 1959. The Arctic is one of the most volatile places in the world climate-wise, in the sense that it is warming twice as fast as much of the rest of the world. In Alaska, climate change is already affecting local villages and towns. You know the list: melting ice and permafrost, rising seas, eroding lands, less predictable and less successful hunts, more environmental allergies, oceans that are becoming more acidic, several of our cod fisheries that collapsed this year because the juvenile cod died in the warm-water blob, and on and on!

Further warming of the global climate, while reducing our homeland’s capacity for self-renewal, is a risk to national security. A full national security analysis taking the fullness of such matters into account must be part of the coastal plain EIS. as well as national security risk.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jan Bronson
Anchorage AK