

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/3/2012 10:06:09 PM

First name: Mike

Last name: Barnes

Organization:

Title:

Comments: More public comment...

Dear Sirs,

I hope that this is the appropriate forum and time to make further comment on your Oil and Gas EIS. If this is not the proper forum, please write me back with the proper address to which my comments should be directed.

First, having just spent several hours reading the EIS, I commend you and your Staff for the clarity and depth of the writing in this document and for the obvious time commitment involved.

I was left with a couple of niggling worries that I hope you may address. All of the document focuses on the impacts to the lands and environment of the WRNF as is understandable. As a person who owns property immediately adjacent to the WRNF I have "neighbor" concerns regarding the proposed activities. My concerns center on whether the the lease changes are likely to be detrimental to the health of my family.

While sharing and appreciating your concern for minimizing the impacts on the WRNF could you also consider placing a NSO designation on all land within a mile of an existing residence or permitted water source? Your document refers to concerns about how much surface disturbance would occur within a 1/2 mile of certain Toads and I'd feel comfortable being afforded about twice that consideration. If you could modify Alternative C to include this "safety zone" I would support your preferred alternative.

If it is not possible to provide this type of protection to your neighbors then I'd urge you to make plan B (no new leasing) the preferred alternative as it is my judgement from looking at your maps that there would be less chance of well pads showing up next to a residence with plan B. Furthermore, as you will be aware, a preliminary study from the University of Colorado School of Public Health had suggested that there ARE expected ill-effects of residences being located near wells.

You may think that since your document applies mostly to the LEASING of these lands (as you emphasize with your before and after photos in the document) that my request could be better be addressed at a later stage in the overall process. I would argue that now, in the Environmental Impact Statement, is the ideal time to recognize that the Forest Service has neighbors and is concerned that the neighbor's health will be safeguarded throughout the process. I submit that the best way for you to safeguard your neighbors would to surround us with a "no-go zone" (my words for your NSO).

Thanks,

Mike Barnes, MS (Environmental Health), MD