

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/30/2013 5:24:35 PM

First name: David

Last name: Smith

Organization: private citizen

Title:

Comments: Proposed operations and risks have been described. However, low-probability and high-risk scenarios (like those that result in water contamination) are still high enough probability to be catastrophic to the wildlife and human-life in the area. Another example is the incidence of fire resulting from human industrial activity in a wilderness area.

A proposed alternative is two-fold.

One, rather than pursue a greater number of smaller operations, directly address concerns identified with high-yield high-productivity solutions like ANWR or Bakken reserves. The issues with either of these options are not technical or practical, but rather emotional and political.

Two, continue research in renewable solutions (rather than non-renewable petroleum or gas based sources). In contrast, the actions being considered for the Pike and San Isabel National Forest areas perpetuate the existing non-renewable sources while simultaneously raising public ire.

My voice/vote is option "A" (no action) until a rational justification can be provided on why known, high-yield alternatives cannot be pursued.