

---

**From:** Hayes, Miriam (Nicole) <mnhayes@blm.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 13, 2019 4:01 PM  
**To:** coastalplainAR; Sean Cottle  
**Subject:** Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Support for "NO ACTION" Alternative, Comment for ANWR Draft EIS  
**Attachments:** ArcticRefugeDraftEISComment2.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**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:** Joe Ransdell-Green <[jeransdellgreen@alaska.edu](mailto:jeransdellgreen@alaska.edu)>  
**Date:** Wed, Mar 13, 2019 at 2:47 PM  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for "NO ACTION" Alternative, Comment for ANWR Draft EIS  
**To:** <[mnhayes@blm.gov](mailto:mnhayes@blm.gov)>  
**Cc:** <[ryan@northern.org](mailto:ryan@northern.org)>

Hi Ms. Hayes,

My name is Joseph Ransdell-Green. These are my comments on the Draft EIS for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Coastal Plain. I tried several times to use ePlanning to submit them, but I was unsuccessful because a "ULR Not Found" message. Thank you for considering my comments.

I'm writing in support of the "no action" alternative of EIS for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge coastal plain. First, I'd like to request that the deadline for public input to be extended. The public should get adequate time to comment on the EIS. The BLM should have public hearings where local people can voice their concerns, and not use the "Open House" format where people have a harder time communicating these concerns. The BLM did a terrible job of making sure the public had time to prepare for the hearing. The BLM only released the EIS five days before the first "Open House". I know that the Trump Administration wants to speed up the process, but the amount of time made available for preparation is unjust.

Gwich'in people have the most to lose with drilling leasing at the calving grounds. Their livelihood and cultural survival dependences on a healthy Porcupine caribou herd. Oil leasing will affect the movements and the calve survival of this herd. For the Gwich'in Nation, the coastal plain is sacred and should not be used for disruptive actions such as oil and gas drilling. Oil drilling will be particularly disturbing for calving cow caribou, but it will also impact caribou access to insect-relief areas on the coast. The Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge has very few predators and offers a safe place for

cows to give birth. Caribou displacement (which the BLM has acknowledged will happen) will increase mortality for the calves.

Oil leasing and drilling would also cause significant disturbance to polar bears. Seventy-seven percent of the program area is critical denning habitat for “threatened” polar bears. Your DEIS states that “the potential for injury or mortality could be high when developing new oil and gas projects in polar bear habitat.”. This high mortality must be addressed, especially since polar bears are on the Endangered Species list and because the Southern Beaufort Sea polar bear population has declined by 30% in the last 50 years. Human development on the coastal plains attracts predatory birds and other carnivores that prey on nesting birds in the vicinity. Bird nesting productivity will likely be impacted.

Wilderness is one of the purposes of the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Wilderness quality of the entire 1002 area would be impacted under the alternatives. Most of the oil and gas development would be visible for those floating the six coastal rivers. This development would completely transform the wilderness quality of the region. In 1990s, my father went on a backpacking trip along the Hulahula River on the coastal plain. He witnessed species such as grizzly bears, red fox, muskoxen, birds and grayling, and he saw no people or signs of human “development”. It saddens me to think that wilderness experiences like my father’s on the Hulahula will be lost to future generations of Americans. Leasing the coastal plain of the refuge to private companies would deprive the public of experiencing the awe and humility that comes from immersing oneself in wildness. I’m supporting the “No Action Alternative” for the EIS.

Sincerely,

Joseph Ransdell-Green

Fairbanks, AK

607 Bullion Dr

99712

Hi Ms. Hayes,

These are my comments on the Draft EIS for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I tried several times to use ePlanning to submit them, but I was unsuccessful because a "ULR Not Found" message. Thank you for considering my comments.

I'm writing in support of the "no action" alternative of EIS for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge coastal plain. First, I'd like to request that the deadline for public input to be extended. The public should get adequate time to comment on the EIS. The BLM should have public hearings where local people can voice their concerns, and not use the "Open House" format where people have a harder time communicating these concerns. The BLM did a terrible job of making sure the public had time to prepare for the hearing. The BLM only released the EIS five days before the first "Open House". I know that the Trump Administration wants to speed up the process, but the amount of time made available for preparation is unjust.

Gwich'in people have the most to lose with drilling leasing at the calving grounds. Their livelihood and cultural survival dependences on a healthy Porcupine caribou herd. Oil leasing will affect the movements and the calve survival of this herd. For the Gwich'in Nation, the coastal plain is sacred and should not be used for disruptive actions such as oil and gas drilling. Oil drilling will be particularly disturbing for calving cow caribou, but it will also impact caribou access to insect-relief areas on the coast. The Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge has very few predators and offers a safe place for cows to give birth. Caribou displacement (which the BLM has acknowledged will happen) will increase mortality for the calves.

Oil leasing and drilling would also cause significant disturbance to polar bears. Seventy-seven percent of the program area is critical denning habitat for "threatened" polar bears. Your DEIS states that "the potential for injury or mortality could be high when developing new oil and gas projects in polar bear habitat.". This high mortality must be addressed, especially since polar bears are on the Endangered Species list and because the Southern Beaufort Sea polar bear population has declined by 30% in the last 50 years. Human development on the coastal plains attracts predatory birds and other carnivores that prey on nesting birds in the vicinity. Bird nesting productivity will likely be impacted.

Wilderness is one of the purposes of the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Wilderness quality of the entire 1002 area would be impacted under the alternatives. Most of the oil and gas development would be visible for those floating the six coastal rivers. This development would completely transform the wilderness quality of the region. In 1990s, my father went on a backpacking trip along the Hulahula River on the coastal plain. He witnessed species such as grizzly bears, red fox, muskoxen, birds and grayling, and he saw no people or signs of human "development". It saddens me to think that wilderness experiences like my father's on the Hulahula will be lost to future generations of Americans. Leasing the coastal plain of the refuge to private companies would deprive the public of experiencing the awe and humility that comes from immersing oneself in wildness. I'm supporting the "No Action Alternative" for the EIS.

Sincerely,

Joseph Ransdell-Green

Fairbanks, AK

607 Bullion Dr

99712