

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/28/2018 12:00:00 AM

First name: Jared

Last name: Booms

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am studying Natural Resources Planning and Sustainable Energy at the University of Wisconsin Stevens Point. I am familiar with the NEPA documents and other policy tools that land managers utilize. I have looked over multiple EIS regarding pipelines, for example the Dakota Access Pipeline. Obviously, the situation in Idaho and Wyoming is different than what took place in the Dakotas. The Dakota pipeline crosses multiple main rivers and a large lake making the public concerned about the watershed. The fifty mile proposed pipeline between Bear Lake County and Afton in Wyoming crosses multiple watershed and the local community should be concerned about how it might impact their resources. Twenty miles of the proposed pipeline will be located on US Forest Service land, this is why I am concerned. As a US citizen that forest is my resource, along with all the benefits that it provides: recreational, aesthetic, ecosystem services, fish and wildlife. Locals also have a connection with this land and the private land that the pipeline will take place on. The land currently provides ecosystem service including water filtration, riparian zones, grazing and rangeland, habitat and improving air and water quality along with many others. These resources directly benefit the public and will be at higher risk if the pipeline goes through. As I mentioned before this land provides habitat, important habitat. As we know the increasing in grazing and use of rangeland the population of sage grouse has taken its toll. The twenty miles of land in US Forest Service possession is protected for the sage grouse. So much of the sage grouse habitat has already taken and destroyed, it is beyond me why we are trying to destroy more. To focus more on the gas pipeline, I am a Sustainable Energy minor and I have learned that gas is a finite resource. One day it will be gone and society will move on to more environmental way of living. The effects of this pipeline will still be in place centuries down the road, even if a spill does not occur. Building a pipeline when the end of gas is in sight is not economically sound even if it is saving money in the short term. The impact of this pipeline is long term. The damages on the environment inflicted by this proposed pipeline are not worth saving a billion dollar company more money.