

## ATTACHMENT B

### Comments from Group Discussion and Individual Stickers on Energy and Minerals (February 16 NWCOS Meeting)

[Facilitator's Note: This is not a consensus document.]

#### Energy and Minerals

Comments from the general NWCOS discussion on the 1989 RMP objective for energy and minerals:

- Perhaps use the word “balance” instead of “maximize” when referring to development of resources
- Need to separate the discussion into two separate categories: identifying the opportunity of how much oil and gas there is to development; and the desire of how much oil and gas should be developed.
- Global warming issues should be addressed.
- Development was maximized in the past. Should ensure this doesn't happen going forward
- New technologies should be encouraged.
- Split estate issues should be addressed.
- We need to appreciate the broader societal role that these resources provide
- We need to develop a bridge to the other resource approaches.

NWCOS commented on the following areas of concern for energy and minerals:

- Minimal impact on the surface
- How to determine the impacts of full development vs. exploration
- Need to clarify the differences between technical recoverable and economically recoverable.
- Need to think about habitat and open space impacts

The following reflect the individual comments that NWCOS members posted on the flipcharts at the back of the room. (In some cases it was necessary to do a bit of interpreting of handwriting. My apologies if I didn't accurately capture everything.).

- **Goals for This Resource**
  - Goals [one sticky]
    - Create a balance between development and protection
    - For wells drilled in LSRA, use local workers
    - Have companies relocate to towns in LSRA if they are going to do business here
    - Create a reasonable RMP that reflects the communities desire for development
    - Enforce better reclamation – more investment, more intensive
  - Don't think we should be “maximizing” energy development so much as “balancing” it with other uses

## ATTACHMENT B

- 2 concerns related to oil and gas development:
  - 1) direct habitat loss from locating drilling rigs, pads, etc. (easily mitigated in COAs and stips)
  - 2) habitat loss/degradation from fragmentation caused by drilling infrastructure (roads, etc.) (best addressed at RMP level)
- [referring to previous; looks like same handwriting] 1<sup>st</sup> bullet under each of these: shouldn't these read "...within the parameters of multiple uses and the other goals of the RMP (natural resource protection, etc.)
- Goals for Energy and Minerals
  - Minimize or eliminate impacts to unique natural resources
- Goals for Energy Resources [one sticky]
  - 1) Seek to find maximum access and development within overall goals and criteria of RMP
  - 2) Have, without fail, a goal that activates process to detect fragile eco areas that cannot sustain any or little energy devp.
- **Areas of Concern**
  - Energy Area of Concern
    - Be prepared for unexpected consequences – thus, AM projects set up on areas of varying O/G use density are needed.
  - The amount of existing operating and abandoned wells proves both the existing historic usage and the overall strategic importance for America
  - Concerns
    - Plan needs to distinguish between economically and technologically recoverable
  - DEIS/Plan needs to take into account what full impacts would be if recoverable gas resources are discovered and full field development ensues
  - Areas of Concerns
    - Development given preference over protection
    - Mitigation in important wildlife areas (or lack of it)
    - Vermillion Basin
    - Social problems that accompany development (drugs, dom. Violence, cost of infrastructure improvements, etc)
    - Impacts on T and E species
  - Areas of Concern
    - Weeds
    - Impacts to/loss of
      - Greater sage grouse
      - Rare plant species occurrences
    - In 50 years of production at Piceance or Power River densities, sensitive species like greater sage grouse (and others) could disappear from the area even if habitat is restored
  - Areas of Concern
    - Sage grouse
    - Columbian sharp-tail grouse
    - [referring to both of the above] breeding areas and habitat

## ATTACHMENT B

- rare plant occurrences (specific places)
- white tail prairie-dog areas of density
- Concerns
  - How to require Best Management Practices to actually be used?
  - Lease stipulations are often waived, so are not often a good indicator of on-the-ground impacts
  - Very concerned about impacts of energy development on fish, wildlife and endangered species
- **Areas of Desire**
  - Energy Explore Credits for Energy companies that develop outside the Box minimal impact techniques
  - Will the new RMP try to anticipate the possibilities of coal bed methane development and even oil shale development, even though these activities are not happening yet? It seems that it should...
- **Ideas re: Alternatives BU**
  - Alternatives – Energy and Minerals
    - 1) One alternative to incorporate science (or absence of science) on subsurface effects of emptied, thus shifting, cavities and affected aquifer
    - 2) One alternative on whether 10 to 100 years of active, increasing development will permanently affect or eliminate another use or species
    - 3) One alternative that considers reasons for replacing some subsurface development with energy conservation or alternative energies, especially if to do so would be long-term helpful or sustainable for communities
- **Ideas for Workgroup**
  - 89 Goals are fine
  - Split Estate Issues should not a part of RMP
  - We need to have Science base. When we make statements such as oil and gas destroys habitat for the sensitive species we have to science based.
  - What type of land types were Dinosaur National Monument and Brown Park Wildlife Refuge made from [attached sticky says:] It is hard to believe the numbers of 0% Protected BLM lands
  - Subcomm. Should focus on pragmatism. Is Moffat Cty. nat gas competitive on world market? Competitive with growing LNG supply? What happens if large scale price drop – effect on competitiveness. Economically feasible vs. technically feasible must be studied. Not all companies are as mindful of shareholders and Julander (think Enron!).

**These stickies (all from the same writer) fell out when I unrolled the pile; they seem to go under Energy and Minerals, though I'm not sure where. Guessing "Areas of Concern".**

- 1) The vastness of the area and the potential for it to provide feed and forage for Wild and domestic animals

## **ATTACHMENT B**

- the use of the land has been maintained for multiple use with no detriment to the ecosystem.
- We have learned you can harvest grass and produce minerals and oil from the same land and have recreation too.
- The ability to work together to solve a problem.