Letter 51

DEAR PROJECT COORDINATOR,

I AM VERY CONCERNED WITH GUNNISON ENERGY'S ADDITIONAL EIGHT WELL EXPLORATORY PROPOSAL.

51-1 IT SEEMS THE COMMUNITY VALUES FOR PUBLIC SAFETY, PROTECTION OF WATER SUPPLIES, AGRICULTURAL ENVIRONEMENT, TRUCK TRAFFIC ETC. ARE HARDLY CONSIDERED

51-2 AND THE FACT THAT G.E.C. LONG TERM 600 WELLS IS NOT EVEN MENTIONED IN THE E.A. IS ALARMING.

51-3 WE NEED A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY ON LONG TERM IMPACTS OF COAL BED METHANE DEVELOPEMENT! THE BLM AND FOREST SERVICE SHOULD ALSO

51-4 REQUIRE BONDS THAT COVER THE FULL COST OF DAMAGE AND RECLAMATION

51-5 THIS INDUSTRY'S TRACK RECORD IS VERY BAD AND WE NEED REGULATIONS IN PLACE TO PROTECT OUR FUTURE AND RIGOROUS ENFORCEMENT OF THESE REGULATIONS. DON'T JUST GIVE AWAY OUR PUBLIC LANDS.

SINCERELY,

MICHAEL MCKENNA

Letter 52

Project Manager
GEC Exploration Drilling Project
P.O. Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428

Dear Decision Maker:

52-1 I have been watching for several months this fight over water quality and pollution that will result from natural gas development. From reading the EA it seems there will be no impact on water which seems to confirm the applicant's water studies. With water no longer a concern, let this project go forward with all eight wells.

Sincerely,

Dana Ecklund
6648 Lakeview Drive
Boulder, CO 80303

Letter 53

Project Manager
GEC Exploration Drilling Project
P.O. Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428

Dear Forest Service Employees:

53-1 I think the Gunnison Energy application for eight exploratory wells is right for Colorado and right for America. We need more domestic supplies and we need lower natural gas prices.

I support the President's Energy plan and I support this project.

Please approve all eight wells.

Eric Aaholm
219 Galena
Frisco, Co 80443

Letter 54

"Cindy White"
<cwhitehorse76@hotmail.com>

06/20/2003 01:18 PM

To: lmattson@fs.fed.us
cc:
Subject: Attn: Project Manager GEC

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 0 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS LM
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
DA
BM/DBM ASST
CO
TIMBER

Project Manager

GEC Exploration Drilling Project

P.O. Box 1030

Paonia, CO 81428

Dear U.S. Forest Service:

I am worried about natural gas prices and the threat of yet another recession this winter brought on a lack of supply of natural gas.

Alan Greenspan said "you have to drill a well to find it". Let me just say it is time the Forest Service and BLM let Gunnison Energy drill the well.

54-1 I quickly reviewed the EA for possible impacts from the eight wells and found no real impacts. This seems like the ideal project for exploring for much need natural gas. Let the applicant go forward with as few obstacles as possible.

Sincerely,

Cindy White
June 20, 2003

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.
http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail

Letter 55

"vernann"
<mrsfriz@bresnan.net
>

06/20/2003 02:37 PM

To: <lmattson@fs.fed.us>
cc:
Subject: Drilling Project

Project Manager

GEC Exploration Drilling Project

P.O. Box 1030

Paonia, CO 81428

Dear Sirs,

55-1 Please register my support for approval of all eight wells proposed for exploration by Gunnison Energy.

Natural gas prices are on the rise and we need more supplies. This project meets President Bush's Energy Plan for more domestic supplies and I see no environmental impacts in the proposed EA.

Please approve all eight wells.

Sincerely,

Vernann and Larry

Delta, Colorado

Letter 56

"Kathy Hall"
<kathy.hall10@attbi.com>

06/20/2003 05:45 PM

To: <lmattson@fs.fed.us>
cc:
Subject: Gunnison Energy eight exploratory wells

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 5 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS
RANGE
WILDLIFE
CDA

Liane Mattson
GMUG National Forest
P.O. Box 1030
Paonia, Co. 81428

This letter sent via email

Dear Ms. Mattson;

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments in support of allowing Gunnison Energy to exercise its exclusive right to explore or oil and gas resources on its federal oil and gas leases while minimizing effects on other resources.

56-1 I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment dated May 2003 and find that the eight wells are in compliance with the direction of the GMUG Land and Resource Management plan as amended by the Oil and Gas Leasing Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision. The objective of the Record of Decision is to encourage environmentally sound energy and mineral development and emphasizes oil and gas development outside of wilderness areas.

56-2 The project also complies with the direction of the BLM Uncompaghre Resource Management Plan that identifies oil and gas activities as part of the standard management practices.

56-3 I also understand that the Forest Supervisor has the opportunity to deny some or all of the proposed wells "only under very limited and specifcally legally binding circumstances" I find no items of concern in the draft EA that such conditions exist on any of the proposed wells - so all eight wells should receive approval.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments. This is a worthwhile exploratory project which is certainly consistent with our Country's energy needs as has been stated in the President's Energy Plan and recently highlighted by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan. I look forward to the projects approval.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hall
WS GOGA
743 Horizon Ct. Suite 100-C
Grand Junction, Co. 81506

Letter 57

June 21, 2003

Dear Project Manager,

In response to the EA on the GEC drilling project, I offer the following:

My family moved here from Evergreen, CO 10 years ago. We were in search of a quieter, more rural community when we traveled to the Western Slope with our two small sons in the spring of 1993. We weren't very impressed with Montrose and Delta and were ready to trek back to the Front Range to continue our search closer to family and friends. Our route
57-1 back brought us through Hotchkiss and Paonia. The views stopped us in our tracks and we fell instantly in love. I would have sold my soul in order to live here. We hadn't spoken to anyone and hadn't a clue what the community was like when we decided to move here simply on the value of the scenery. It was, of course, a big plus to discover a vibrant and diverse community.

I was adamant that we live where I could grow a garden, some fruit trees and perhaps have a few small animals. We bought the only house we could afford at the time in a rural area

05/30/2003 15:25 9705273871 PAONIA PUBLIC LIBRARY PAGE 01

Letter 57 Continued

a bit east of Paonia. It was a shack, really, with little or no charm but with about 2½ acres and a spring deeded to the property. My husband, recognizing the need for more income, worked very hard, got his master plumbing license, started his own business and hustled butt, a good deal of the time away from his growing sons, in order to provide the funds to improve our home. We have worked extremely hard, sometimes to the
57-1 point of exhaustion to rebuild our shack into our dream home. We are still struggling to finish the house, garage, landscaping and generally improving the lot. Naturally, we are greatly dismayed at the prospect of our endeavors ending with residency in a county where the views are horribly scarred, the roads are clogged with heavy truck traffic, ~~are~~ ~~are~~ is filled with dust and agriculture is threatened.

When reviewing these eight wells, you looked at the potential for damage that only they are likely to produce (the truck traffic from these
57-2 eight is alarming enough), but we all know that GEC, if drilling is successful, plans an all out production program. By analyzing the impact of just 8 wells, you miss the severity of the problems we could be facing. Why hasn't

05/30/2003 15:25 9705273871 PAONIA PUBLIC LIBRAR PAGE

Letter 57 Continued

57-2 the potential for coal bed methane drilling triggered an Environmental Impact Statement?

57-3 I want every angle thoroughly explored with the best technology available to assure me that this industry is compatable with the beauty of my adopted home. Can you guarantee

57-4 the safety of the water without a doubt? This is very important! I implore you to take every measure to protect what I love because the horror stories I hear about other places where this industry has settled are very frightening to me. I don't

57-5 expect GEC to be diligent about the environment so you have to be. I would much rather see more public lands used to harvest renewable energy than have them suffer the destruction caused by fossil fuel extraction.

57-6 Please take my concerns seriously. These values are widespread among my friends and neighbors. We've all sacrificed something (less income, less services, less amenities, etc.) to live here but we make do willingly because of the fervor with which we value the beauty of the area and the serenity of our lifestyles. Please protect our interests!

Sincerely,
Patricia Walsh-Oeinck

Patricia Walsh-Oeinck
1424 4190 Ln.
Paonia, CO 81428

05/30/2003 15:25 9705273871 PAONIA PUBLIC LIBRAR PAGE 03

Letter 58

6/21/03

Dear Forest Service,

I am commenting on the proposed 8 coalbed methane wells. In Gunnison County, the commissioners asked GEC to do a baseline study of the water.

58-1 -GEC did not do the baseline study and said they didn't know they were supposed to do it. This is now in litigation but I believe they did not do it intentionally. If you don't have baseline data, then there is no way to prove the water has been affected in any way. We need to have baseline studies done by interests that do not conflict. I do not believe we should let GEC do the studies. It it obvious to me that this is a conflict of interest and the results cannot be trusted. There have definately been

58-2 problems with water in coalbed methane as evidenced by this article and many other voices from other counties. In the environmental assessment by the Forest Service, GEC's study through the Water Company says there are no risks to the water.

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 24 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
DA
DM/DBM ASST
FILE
NUMBER

Letter 58 Continued

58-2 Then the Forest Service says there are no expected risks. That doesn't mean there won't be problems.

58-3 We depend on Surface Creek water for our domestic water on Redlands Mesa as well as our orchard water in Cedaredge. We need to know that nothing will happen – not that nothing is expected to happen! There is a huge difference there! And we cannot risk something so valuable!

58-4 The impacts visually are not significantly addressed. The assessment maintains 25% of viewshed affected when in reality at least 38% of viewshed will be affected. Imagine the impacts for all the outdoor enthusiasts and access to trails will be a problem. 90 ft. tall structures!

58-5 Noise will be a problem! Fire will be a problem!

58-6 Truck traffic will be a problem! 350 truck round trips per well. 1400 round trips in 20 day period. Ten million pounds of equipment. What price will we all pay?

58-7 Water, quality of life, wildlife habitat, noise, fire, truck traffic, economic affects for the county. How can this be worth it?

Sincerely,
Patricia Lewis Groome

P.S. →

Letter 58 Continued

58-8 My husband is a fireman in Hotchkiss. He said GEC sent a check for $1500 with a spill kit. They sent it back. It was a ridiculous amount! That's how much GEC cares about our county. And remember how much they care about Gunnison County. They couldn't even follow through with the initial water baseline study. From the get go, they are not keeping their word. They have given me no reason to trust them. Why do you?

Thank you for your time.

Patricia Lewis Broome
1347 2700 Rd.
Hotchkiss, Co. 81419

(970) 835-3011
wgroome@msn.com

P.P.S. I will continue to fight this. It is just too darn important for all of us in Delta County!

Letter 59

June 21, 2003

Project Manager
GEC Exploration Drilling Project
P.O. Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428

Project Manager,

I received the Environmental Assessment of Gunnison Energy Corporation's Proposed Exploratory Gas Drilling Project Volumes I and II in May upon my return to Denver from a visit to Cedaredge. My heart sank.

59-1 The public outcry against such exploration that may open the door to extensive Coal Bed Methane gas drilling in the Grand Mesa area has been overwhelming. Public comment seems to be sought only to fulfill the requirements of the application process. Then it is promptly disregarded.

59-2 Many residents of Delta and Gunnison Counties are frightened by the threat that CBM development poses to their health, livelihoods and the beautiful areas that surround their homes. They have good reason for their fear. They have heard the horror stories of other CBM development sites and the resulting industrialization of once peaceful places complete with heavy truck traffic, the disappearance of wildlife, and depletion and contamination of water.

59-3 The environmental impact record of coal bed methane gas drilling similar to the project proposed in Delta and Gunnison Counties *is* frightening. The Powder River Basin project in Wyoming and the drilling in Garfield County, Colorado, are two of many examples of permanently scarred landscapes, water depletion and contamination and loss of livelihood and quality of life due to coal bed methane drilling. The counties' residents were not inventing causes for worry when they raised the the 158 points of public concern listed in the EA.

59-4 The cover letter included with the EA states "The EA discloses the environmental effects of drilling eight (8) proposed natural gas exploration;loration wells..." It would be more accurate to say "estimates" or "guesses at" the environmental effects rather that "discloses" which makes it sound as though we already know what the effects on the environment will be. We don't. Evidence of this surfaces even in the EA. For example in many of the geologic cross section schematics in Volume II it

59-5 is noted: "THICKNESSES OF ROLLINS AND DEEPER BEDS ARE ESTIMATED FROM PROJECTIONS OF SCATTERED AND SOMETIMES CONTRADICTORY DATA". We are guessing at the environmental impacts. The trouble is that many of them will be irreversible.

59-6 My parents moved to Cedaredge from the Front Range because it is peaceful and is surrounded by natural beauty. They delight in the abundant wildlife that lives on their property and Surface Creek that runs through it. They frequent the Grand Mesa to cross country ski, hike and bike. They relish the quiet. If CBM technologies are "fully developed" they face 24-hour truck traffic on narrow winding roads and industrialization of the peaceful Mesa at best and methane in their drinking water at worst. No wonder the public review and comment is "No Coal Bed Methane Drilling in Delta and Gunnison Counties!" Please do not disregard it.

Patricia J. Pipkin

Patricia Pipkin
2465 W. Caithness Place
Denver, CO 80211

pjppipkin@aol.com

RANGER DISTRICT
DATE
2 3 2003

Letter 60

Subj: **Eight CBM Wells**
Date: 6/21/03 11:46:37 AM Mountain Daylight Time
From: Townsndcr
To: lmattson@fs.fed.us

Dear Ms. Mattson,

Once again we write with concerns over the drilling of eight test wells on Forest Service/BLM lands; lands we understand to belong to all, the taxpayers of the United States therefore lands which we have a right to a say in their future use. First, let us thank you for the time involved in preparing the EA for these wells. It has meant many hours of involved reading but worthwhile in presenting again legitimate concerns for the citizens of the North Fork and Surface Creek Valley areas and by extension those living nearby and visiting.

60-1 In our opinion, this EA is a very accomodating study that minimizes annd ignores the long range effects of subsequent full scale production from an increased well population.

60-2 Beginning with truck traffic: we are near terrorized when we consider that each well will require a minimum of 350 truck round trips carrying a total of 9,750,000 pounds of materiel in a 20day period (Table 2-5) in the Surface Creek Valley alone. Further stated in EA the Forest service is not required to propose mitigation for what it call "off site impacts." What kind of lunacy is this? What about the safety of our children, senior citizens, visitors? Road Damage? Inaccessibility to Grand Mesa due to constant truck traffic? Additionally, while identifying the significant need for new road construction, it blatantly omits information regarding financial responsibility for these roads. Once again, will the taxpayer bear this burden?

60-3 Water: Why has this EA used hydrology reports from Wright Water Engineers' were hired and paid by Gunnison Energy? At the least a severe conflict of interest; at the most an attempt to justify Gunnison Energy's advertising that there will be "no risk" to water from the drilling of these exploratory wells. In fact the Forest Service itself seems unsure (Page 3; 4-19) while saying there will be not effect and sometimes saying effects are not expected. Is our water supply, the lifeline of this valley, not important enough to the Forest Service to take the time to access information from a responsible independent authority which can state unequivocally that our water will not be compromised by these test wells and that this valley will not experience the travesties from other coalbed methane drilling areas which subsequenly depleted and/or contanimated their water supplies.

60-4 Noise: the effect of noise to the surrounding communities will be overwhelmingly transmitted through the effects of downslope winds created by cooling air temperatures especially at night. The constant deafening drone of compressors, generators and high volume truck traffic has been sorely diminshed if not totally ignored in this EA. Suggest Forest Service personel take the time to visit Rifle for the hands on experience and then reconsider their responsibilty to the local citizens.

60-5 Future Impacts: there is not time limit to this study indicating that any future well applications could be grandfathered under this study. Forest Service Comment is crucial on this issue.

60-6 Viewshed: the impact of viewshed of and one the Grand Mesa will be so impacted as to be of crushing historic consequence. The totals taken from pages 3; 10-5 to 3;10-7 are in conflict with those in Table 3;10-2 on page 3;10-4 and warrent future study and comment.

More concerns exist. Citizens are spending inordinate amounts of time away from family and daily existence trying to keep up with all of this threatened destruction. Please hear us and consider our comments in the next stage of study.

Thank you,

Carl D. Townsend
Ruth A. Townsend
2038 2075 Drive
Cedaredge, CO 81413
970-856-4018

Carl D. Townsend
Ruth A. Townsend

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 3 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS ✓
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
FA
FM/DBM ASST
ID
TIMBER

Letter 61

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT 6/22/03
ACTION DATE

JUN 2 4 2003

DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
CDA
FIRE/AVIATION
REC
TIMBER

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to express my opposition to the decision by the Forest Service to permit the 8 gas wells requested by Gunnison Energy Corp. just because the F.S. is not required to mitigate "off site impacts" doesn't mean that the public will not hold you (& Halliburton) responsible for the huge increase heavy truck traffic, with its attendant noise, hazards, etc. As for impacts on our water, it appears that the F.S. is willing to gamble with our most important resource. You say in the E.A. that effects are "not expected" beyond 500'. That's not good enough, and sounds like you're hedging your bets. Besides, we don't yet have necessary baseline data to compare future water data with after the hydrofracturing is done. You are supposed to be an agency that serves the public, but it appears you are more responsive to the wishes and needs of a large corporation. Whether or not you care about the aesthetics of scenery, a lot of us certainly do, and to have our "viewshed" ruined just adds a large emotional component to the equation. People value these intangibles dearly, and will feel as devastated as the forest will look. Don't let them do this to our forest!

61-1
61-2
61-3
61-4
61-5

Sincerely,
Mike Kobrin
1344 2700 Rd.
Hotchkiss, CO 81419

Letter 62

Patricia Starr
1237-2640 Road
Hotchkiss, CO 81419

June 22, 2003

Project Coordinator
P. O. Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428

Comments to the Project Coordinator:

62-1 I am writing to express my growing concern regarding the development of Coal Bed Methane in Delta Country. What I see rapidly taking place is a scenario which will dramatically change the quality of life in this county for the worse.

62-2 Not only will our economy and land values be negatively impacted by the coal bed methane industry, but the experience of citizens in other areas where this type of development has taken place indicates our water supplies will very likely become contaminated and potentially destroyed, our air will become polluted, the noise and traffic will grow to intolerable levels, the views we are known for will be damaged and our unique heritage will disappear.

62-3 What will be gained in exchange? Nothing of lasting value! We are facing a lose/lose situation with our quality of life and economic strength on the auction block, not to mention our land values. Please give this issue more careful consideration before allowing the sell-out of our agreed upon land-use priorities and rich heritage.

Thank-you for anything you can do to protect our quality of life in Delta County.

Sincerely,

Patricia Starr

Patricia Starr

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 4 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS ✓
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
FIRE/AFF
FOA
RECREATION ASST
TEC
SUPERVISOR

Letter 63

Project Manager
GEC Exploration Drilling Project
PO Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428

Dear Project Manager:

63-1 I am writing in regard to the proposed coal bed methane drilling and development on Forest Service land that is proposed. I have grave concerns in regard to this. According to the Environmental Assessment (EA) each well will require a minimum of 350 truck round trips carrying a total of 9,750,000 pounds of equipment and material in a 20 day period. This amounts to 700 round trips for the two approved wells and an additional 700 trips for the two proposed well. That is a **minimum** of 1400 round trips through Cedaredge. I live close to Highway 65 and hear large trucks on the highway. The noise, congestion and safety hazards for this type of truck traffic are staggering. Yet this is just the start. The EA failed to

63-2 consider the long term scenario of 600 or more wells that are in Gunnison Energy's plans. The Forest Service seems to not consider the effects to those who are daily negatively impacted by these impacts to those who will daily live with the noise, pollution, safety hazards and road damage this industrial traffic will cause. The cumulative impacts of approving this project are almost entirely overlooked.

63-3 Regarding water the EA states that "groundwater resources in the Mesaverde Formation would not be impacted b drilling or hydrofracturing except within 500 feet of the well bore." Yet it goes on to say that impacts depend largely on the structural grain of the rocks being hydrofractured and the stress field operating on the rocks at the time of the hdrofracturing. Neither of these factors are known for the Mesaverde Formation in the project area. But the report states that impacts beyond 500 feet are not expected ((page 3.4-19). This is pulling a conclusion out of thin air. Dumping hundreds of thousands of gallons of a chemical cocktail into the ground at each drill site with unknown impacts is irresponsible for an agency charged with protecting the public lands and discharge from public lands to affect citizens close by. What immediate monitoring and penalties would result if there were negative impacts? Who is mandated to take immediate action, and pay for remediation of damage to our water supplies? This was not apparent in the EA.

63-4 Putting roads into previously unroaded areas introduces noxious weeds. This is particularly harmful for organic farmers. These weeds would then have routes into the crops.

63-5 According to the EA ground disturbed by the eight well sites will effect 113,727 acres of the total view shed of 448,750 acres--that's 25%. The tall structures for drilling and flare stacks increase the view shed affected to 169,195 acres, 38% of the total view shed (pages 3.10-5 through 3:10-7. These figures are different that those found in Table 3.10-2 n page 3:10-4. Also these figures do not include Leon Lade #2 and private land. The actual view effect will be much more. In addition the awaiting 600 wells will produce infringement on far more view shed.

63-6 The effect to recreation, agriculture and tourism will be especially deleterious.
The Forest Service holds the sacred trust of protecting our public lands for the present and future generations. Please take this seriously and refuse drilling permits that have a high likelihood of rendering the above mentioned damage.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Pipkin

Marilyn Pipkin
310 N.E. Fourth St.
Cedaredge, CO 81413
970-856-8741

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 4 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERALS ✓
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
CDA
ADMIN ASST
CLK
TIMBER

Letter 64

June 22, 2003

To Whom It May Concern:

We are concerned about the approval of the proposed exploratory gas project of 8 wells in Delta County.

Our concerns are similar to our concerns before the Environment Assessment was prepared.

64-1 After looking over the EA we understand the contaminate of water is still a concern. We don't want to gamble with our water supply.

64-2 Traffic is our second concern, we will be affected by the traffic on Hwy. 133 and Stephens Gulch. It will be terrible. We recently have seen a decrease of trucks transporting coal on Hwy.133 and it's very nice to have fewer trucks on the Hwy. Now this will increase truck traffic horribly.

64-3 Our third concern is about the beauty and peace the forest enjoys now and how that will be lost with the first 8 wells. The EA doesn't seem to address this enough as far as we are concerned. Our views and over all beauty will be sadly affected.

64-4 Because of these concerns we want you to consider not letting these wells start up. Stop them now. Save our North Fork Valley and the Grand Mesa.

Thank you,

Laurene and Roger Bissell
1366 4150 Rd
Paonia, CO 81428

Laurene H. Bissell
Roger Bissell

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 4 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERIALS
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
GDA
DEPUTY A S/T
S&D
TIMBER

Letter 65

Project Manager
GEC Exploration Drilling Project
P.O. Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428

To Whom It May Concern:

65-1 I believe our Country is in dire need of more exploration and development of domestic supplies of energy, especially natural gas.

I have reviewed the EA for the eight exploratory wells, it is very thorough and clearly deals with impacts and I believe this project should be approved without further mitigation.

Thank you for your consideration

Suzanna Vinder
PO Box 2552
Frisco, CO 80443

06/22/2003 21:42 9706586036 SHANNA KOENIGPPGJTMM PAGE 02

Letter 66

Chrisan Creations

Creative Meals for Your Lifestyle

Chrisan Creations
101 Forest, Unit G
Frisco, CO 80443
Phone:(970)668-3192

Project Manager
GEC Exploration Drilling Project
PO Box 1030
Paonia, CO 81428
(970)527-4151

66-1 I feel it's time for our country to support more natural gas exploration. Our President has been calling for implementation of his Energy Plan since the summer of 2001.

I hope the Forest Service will approve the Gunnison Energy application for eight exploratory wells to help America Meet its energy needs.

Thank you for allowing me to comment,

Johna Chrisan

Johna Chrisan
Chrisan Creations
101 Forest, Unit G
Frisco, CO 80443
(970)668-3192

06/22/2003 22:15 9706686036 SHANNA KOENIGPPGJTMM PAGE 01

Letter 67

Gene
<ggoffin@earthlink.net>

06/22/2003 07:19 PM
Please respond to
ggoffin

To: lmattson@fs.fed.us
cc:
Subject: GEC wells

Dear Mr. Mattson:

67-1 I am opposed to the granting of the permits sought by Gunnison Energy. I believe a complete EIS needs to be done because of the extreme impacts of CBM in other areas—there may be serious effect to ground and surface water, wildlife, noise pollution, destruction of delicate habitat, the end of hunting and tourism in the area, dust from numerous truck trips, the dividing of the forest into small plots because of the well pads, roads and compressor stations plus pipelines.

67-2 Major bonds must be required because of the history of the oil and gas industry is to leave destruction behind with shell, uncapitalized corporations owning the leases.

67-3 The company says they want 600 wells. In other areas, companies propose 1/2 to 1/5 of the wells they actually, eventually drill, or attempt to drill. An EIS must look at the long term and comprehensive impacts of all the wells GEC says they want to drill plus the potential for many times more.

67-4 As stewards for the forest, I believe it is your responsibility to hold the company to the highest standards on behalf for all Americans, the owners of the forest. The Bush administration is temporary—the forest, hopefully, will outlast it.

Gene Goffin
3750 A 75 Road
Crawford, Colorado 81415
(970) 921-5100

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 3 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERIALS
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
GDA
DBM/DBM ASST
LEO
TIMBER

Letter 68

"mike chamness"
<m_chamness@hotmail.com>
06/22/2003 04:06 PM

To: lmattson@fs.fed.us
cc:
Subject: Gunnison Energy Co comments

June 22, 2003

US Forest Service Management Staff,

The following points should be considered before weighing in on the current application by the Gunnison Energy Company's proposal to establish 8 exploratory gas drilling wells on USFS lands:

68-1 * The long term, cumulative impacts and effects these and all future wells will have on water quality, air quality, and wildlife calving and migration habitat must be studied before any approvals are considered. Additionally, a full EIS must be initiated on this proposal to gauge such impacts.
68-2

68-3 * Full mitigation for the potential impacts expected by this proposed and all future drilling wells must be required as well.

68-4 * The USFS and EPA should require bonds to cover the full costs of reclamation at this and future drilling sites.

68-5 * Rigerous enforcement of current environmental laws and standards must be applied to this and all future drilling proposals. Past examples have proven that the industry is not capable of regulating itself to the letter of the law and full satisfaction of the public.

Thank you,

Mike Chamness
708 3rd St.
Paonia, Co 81428

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE*

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 3 2003
DISTRICT RANGER
MINERIALS
LANDS/ENG
RANGE
WILDLIFE
GDA
DSM/DSM ASST
LEO
TIMBER

Letter 69

"John D. English"
<soilman@frontier.net
>

06/22/2003 01:44 PM
Please respond to
"John D. English"

To: <lmattson@fs.fed.us>
cc:
Subject: GEC drilling on Grand Mesa

Project Director,

69-1 The public has not been given enough time to comment on this proposal.

69-2 Sustainable management of our resources is imperative. CBM development is not sustainable. It is merely destructive of our sustainable (soil, water, vegetation, wildlife) resource base. Unless you can prove that CBM development will not harm our other resources on which many, many local livelihoods depend, **I urge you to deny any requests for CBM development.**

Thank you for your vigilant stewardship of our heritage and our children's inheritance.

John English

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE

JUN 2 3 2003

DISTRICT RANGER_____
MINERIALS_____
LANDS/ENG_____
RANGE_____
WILDLIFE_____
GDA_____
DBM/DBM ASST_____
LEO_____
TIMBER_____

Letter 70

Disnerr@aol.com
06/22/2003 01:02 PM

To: lmattson@fs.fed.us
cc:
Subject: GEC EA comments

Thank you for accepting these comments via email. They are Inserted below.
Richard H. Disner, 2097 2500 Drive, Cedaredge, CO 81413 (970-856-4783)

June 22, 2003
Project Manager, GEC Exploration Drilling Project
P.O. Box 1030, Paonia, CO 81428
My thanks to the Forest Service for furnishing me a copy of the EA for review.
GEC appears to have met the current requirements necessary for approval.
70-1 However, I believe that the requirements need to be much more stringent when coal bed methane is anticipated. I would ask the Forest Service, the BLM, the COGCC and any other entity having authority to revise the requirements so as to address environmental and local concerns and to also address the non-quantitative effects on
70-2 the quality of life for residents in the areas.
70-3 By looking at the relative thickness of the pay zones and the completion techniques, these appear to be primarily CBM wells with tight sand thrown in. Both zones require fracing and could be termed unconventional reservoirs. The EA leads me to believe the anticipated production is from the coal bed.
I strongly believe the public is being misled orally and in the print and airwave media by using conventional gas well terms for these wells. The rigid BLM CBM definition is a convenient way to avoid the controversial CBM terminology.
70-4 I am very concerned about truck traffic on 2500 Drive where my wife and I live. Three of the currently proposed wells are uphill from me. The noise of heavily loaded trucks pulling up the grade and trucks having to use engine and exhaust brakes when going down grade will very definitely affect the tranquility of our home. The steepness of the road also raises safety issues.
70-5 And if coal bed methane is found in commercial quantities, we will be faced with the ongoing transport of the saline water.
70-6 I still question the long-term wisdom of allowing projects of this nature in a special place where people retreat to get away from the stresses of the modern world or where families invest in a move to enjoy the quiet beauty of the rural environment. Domestic and agricultural watersheds should not be subjected to even a calculated risk.
Thank you, Richard H. Disner, (retired engineer-Public Service Company of Colorado and Pan American Petroleum) 2097 2500 Drive, Cedaredge, CO 81413 (970-856-4783)
Email disnerr@aol.com

PAONIA RANGER DISTRICT
ACTION DATE
JUN 2 3 2003
DISTRICT RANGER_____
MINERIALS_____
LANDS/ENG_____
RANGE_____
WILDLIFE_____
GDA_____
DBM/DBM ASST_____
LEO_____
TIMBER_____