

July 15, 2024

Kelly Lamborn  
Kemmerer Field Office  
430 US-189  
Kemmerer, WY 83101

Maura Bradshaw  
Rock Springs Field Office  
280 US Highway 191  
Rock Spring, WY 82901

*Submitted via eplanning.gov and electronic mail*

**RE: SW Wyoming Carbon Dioxide Sequestration, DOI-BLM-WY-D090-2023-0010-EA**

Dear Ms. Lamborn and Ms. Bradshaw:

On behalf of our millions of members located across Wyoming, the West, and the United States, we write to urgently request a 30-60 day extension of the July 30, 2024, comment deadline on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) regarding the “Southwest Wyoming Carbon Dioxide Sequestration” project currently under review by the Kemmerer Field Office. The scale and complexity of this project and the lack of information regarding the project’s operation require substantially more time for interested parties to adequately provide meaningful feedback to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prior to the closure of the current comment period.

In brief, the reasons for this request include:

- The amount of information related to this project proposal is severely lacking and therefore it will take more time for stakeholders to compile their responses. For example:
  - The project proponent, Moxa Carbon Solutions, LLC, seems to be spun off from Tallgrass. Meanwhile, a division of Tallgrass continues to pursue a different CO<sub>2</sub> storage project in Southeastern Wyoming under the project name “Eastern Wyoming Sequestration Hub” and/or the “Tallgrass Southeast CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration Project.” Media reporting suggests that the company is based in Leawood, Kansas. However, a search of the Kansas Secretary of State database does not turn up a company by this name, and it appears instead that Moxa Carbon Solutions, LLC may not be an independent corporate entity, as Tallgrass has corporate offices also located in Leawood (though Tallgrass’s headquarters are in Denver, Colorado). Regardless of who may eventually own or control this project, the public needs more information to fully understand the participants, and in the absence of such information, more time to ascertain the reasons for and purpose of this proposal.

- There are no existing CO<sub>2</sub> pipelines that appear to serve the area proposed for carbon dioxide injection, suggesting this project is in such an early developmental stage, that consideration of a right-of-way permit for use of pore space is extremely premature. Pipelines in relatively close proximity are currently proposed to serve other CO<sub>2</sub> injection well projects, suggesting the need for significant, non-existent surface infrastructure to be built prior to this project ever becoming operational. More time is needed for interested stakeholders to better ascertain this project's viability and future development potential, as these factors may significantly affect BLM-managed resources.
- Proposed carbon capture projects that may provide the CO<sub>2</sub> to be injected into this project remain in the proposal stages and are highly speculative because of their dependence on global commodity prices. More time is needed for interested stakeholders to survey the range of possible CO<sub>2</sub> sources and transportation routes to this project to fully understand the implications of this ROW permit request.
- There is no information regarding the volume, quality, injection depth, monitoring plan, etc. of CO<sub>2</sub> that could be or that will be injected or the time period for injection. These factors will have a profound impact on the eventual magnitude of surface-disturbing activities, and are of direct relevance to the pore space ROW permit being requested. In the absence of this information, stakeholders will need to undertake a time-consuming analysis of possible scenarios to provide meaningful responses to the BLM's draft EA.
- The BLM provided only a short two-paragraph notice on April 18, 2023, that it would "plan to open the public scoping period" for this project sometime thereafter. It turns out that the BLM immediately opened that scoping process on April 26, 2023 and received only 12 comments, despite the fact that this project may represent one of the largest CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration sites in the country. The lack of public awareness should have signaled to the BLM that its requests for public engagement did not adequately reach interested parties. Therefore, the BLM should provide more time now for stakeholder outreach and meaningful public participation.
- Despite this stage of project development not including information on or review of surface-disturbing activities, the sheer number of acres underlying this area and the need to consider possible surface-level effects necessitates more than 30 days (in the middle of summer) for interested stakeholders to adequately consider not only the information the BLM has compiled in its draft EA, but also what additional information may be relevant for the BLM to consider as it continues its review of this proposal.
- The BLM's eplanning website and media releases relating to this project contain conflicting information about which Field Office is conducting the review and which BLM staff are serving as primary contacts for questions and comments.

The BLM recently granted a similar comment period extension request regarding its review of the Snowy River CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration Project located in Eastern Montana. We hope that you will

similarly grant this request as stakeholders continue to grapple with these first-of-their-kind applications on BLM-managed lands and pore spaces.

We thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Joshua Axelrod  
**Natural Resources Defense Council**

Morgan O'Grady  
**Western Environmental Law Center**

Sarah Hunkins  
**Western Organization of Resource  
Councils**

Victoria Bogdan Tejeda  
**Center for Biological Diversity**

Gusty Catherin-Sauer  
**Northern Plains Resource Council**

Dagny Signorelli  
**Western Watersheds Project**