

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/22/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Blake

Last name: Mamich

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Selecting Alternative One, the No Action Alternative and denying the SUPO and SUP Amendment for the proposed Northern Extension Pipeline and Horizontal Drilling project is the best course of action for the USFS to take.

Continued fragmentation of habitat in the HD Mountains is unacceptable. Given recent emphasis on the importance of migration corridors and winter range by Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW), as shown in the CPW publication "2020 Status Report: Big Game Winter Range and Migration Corridors" it is surprising the draft EA is recommending a FONSI in this matter. With elk herds below management objectives in the area, the USFS should be focused on habitat improvement, not degradation and disturbance. Multiple use doctrine is important but so is contiguous habitat that supports a renewable wildlife resource.

Further, it is a fallacy to suggest in the Draft EA that "based on the project's emissions relative to overall GHG emissions in the region, the project's contribution to atmospheric GHGs, although additive, would be a tiny fraction and be nearly unnoticeable." as a reason for FONSI. Obviously, this project is not going to make a measurable difference in impact from GHG emissions. This can be said about almost any CBM project. The problem is cumulative and continuing to approve extractive activities based on individual project impact does not address the problem.

Finally, given the current pandemic and impending economic uncertainty, it is hard to envision a situation where the USFS has the resources to monitor the project and ensure proper compliance or Petrox Resources Inc. follows through with all mitigation efforts and ultimately reclamation. Alternative 1 is the correct course of action.