

The following section supplements a portion of the Affected Environment found in [Chapter Three, Section 3.15 - Minerals and Energy: Fluid Minerals](#) of the Draft EIS located on page 3.260, “Oil and Gas Potential in SJPL”.

GOTHIC SHALE GAS PLAY OCCURRENCE POTENTIAL

The Pennsylvanian GSGP of the Paradox Basin has been designated as an area with high potential for the occurrence of hydrocarbons. “High” hydrocarbon occurrence potential areas are characterized by the presence of proven source and reservoir-quality rocks that have experienced a favorable thermal maturation history for the generation and trapping of substantial oil and/or natural gas accumulations. The discovery of shale-gas reserves in the GSGP in two exploratory wildcat wells drilled in 2006 and 2007, and the subsequent production of three horizontal GSGP wells to a major interstate pipeline system since that time proves that commercial quantities of hydrocarbons are present within the trend. The GSGP interval is itself the source, the reservoir, and the seal for organic material which was buried at depth, thermally matured in situ, and accumulated as natural gas in the rock. The recent drilling and production success in the trend demonstrates that there is a high chance of encountering potentially productive hydrocarbon-bearing traps in the GSGP area.

IMPACTS TO OIL AND GAS LEASING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

As presented in Chapter Two of this Supplement, the projections for development are increased by the GSGP. The addition of the GSGP significantly increases our projection of the amount of gas produced from the public lands. The 2009 RFD Addendum suggests that on federal, private, and state lands, the GSGP could have the potential to produce 2.7 trillion cubic feet of gas (TCGF) over the next 15 years. Chapter Two and the introduction to Chapter Three provide development assumptions for wells, well pads, roads and acres of disturbance by alternative, on federal leased and unleased lands, as well as state and private lands.

While production could increase, there is no change to the alternatives, management areas or resource protection measures that were analyzed in the Draft EIS. In other words, the designation of lands as withdrawn or proposed for withdrawal or administratively not available, or lands with NSO - all of which could affect the opportunity for lessee’s to fully develop the gas resource - are the same as they were in the Draft EIS. Consequently, the land allocations and areas available for lease and stipulated and the resulting impact to mineral development potential are the same as identified in the Draft EIS.