

---

**From:** Hayes, Miriam (Nicole) <mnhayes@blm.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 14, 2019 8:47 AM  
**To:** coastalplainAR; Sean Cottle  
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program EIS

**Nicole Hayes**

Project Coordinator  
Bureau of Land Management  
222 W. 7th Avenue #13  
Anchorage, Alaska 99513  
Desk: (907) 271-4354  
Cell: (907) 290-0179

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **John Hechtel** <[john.hechtel@gmail.com](mailto:john.hechtel@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Mar 13, 2019 at 9:06 PM  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program EIS  
To: <[mnhayes@blm.gov](mailto:mnhayes@blm.gov)>

I am writing to express my concerns with the rushed public process for ANWR Leasing. This is an important decision with major implications to the wildlife, wilderness, cultural and subsistence resources of the North Slope. I have lived in Alaska since the late 1970s. I am a certified wildlife biologist who has worked on human-bear conflicts and who has seen the impacts of industrial development on grizzly and polar bears. There are already large areas of the North Slope open to oil and gas and new developments are spreading to the west of Prudhoe and Kuparuk in NPR-A. The Arctic Refuge has unique features due to the compressed coastal plain, the importance of the calving grounds, and the incredible wilderness values of the area as well. The potential impacts of opening the 1002 area to drilling and production are huge. I noticed that attempts are being made to not include what by any reasonable standards are truly surface developments (this is unacceptable... you must count such things as elevated pipelines and gravel mines as part of the footprint of any development).

The documents are large and tough to get through to provide as substantive comments as I would like. The process should be extended, in my opinion. The oil and gas aren't going anywhere and I think it's important to leave some such resource decisions to our children and grandchildren, rather than acting like we have to develop everything right now. I have major concerns about the impacts on the caribou, especially disturbances to calving herds. I think the potential for disturbance, and direct mortality of grizzly bears, and for bears to become food-conditioned is something that cannot be ignored or downplayed.

I support a No Action alternative for now, or at least a delay on any action until a more thorough process can be completed.

As someone who has worked in the most remote and wild parts of the Alaska North Slope, and who also has worked on bears around oilfield developed areas in the greater Prudhoe Bay area, I can tell you this is a critical decision that will have serious consequences on wildlife, wilderness and humans. This is not a time to be short-sighted and to ignore the negative consequences of developing the coastal plain to provide short-term economic gains in spite of major ecological problems. The USA is producing major amount of oil right now, and it's not an emergency need to push this though right now.

I wish I had more time to review this document and provide more detailed comments on the actual substance. I know the political pressure is to push this regardless, but unless the real trade-offs are carefully evaluated, I cannot support proceeding at this time.

Sincerely,

John Hechtel

John Hechtel  
PO Box 84535  
Fairbanks, AK 99708

907-978-4527 mobile  
907-457-2032