



Candace Nachman - NOAA Federal <candace.nachman@noaa.gov>

RE: NMFS Effects of Oil and Gas Activities in the Arctic Ocean DEIS question

1 message

Alex Whiting <alex.whiting@qira.org>

Wed, Feb 15, 2012 at 6:13 PM

To: candace.nachman@noaa.gov

Hi Candace,

We appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and the team in Kotzebue last week, I hope the rest of your trip went well. I have a question on the alternatives that I failed to clarify last week. Alternative 2 with the level 1 activity is the option that we like for its smaller scale activity it allows, however we also like additional required time/area closures element included in Alternative 4. However Alternative 4 is tied to the Level 2 activity and not the lesser Level 1 which we prefer. So my question is whether it is only practically applicable to level 2 activity since level 1 activity would make the additional measures unnecessary because the allowable activity would not impact those areas by default? Or is it a quid pro quo for allowing Level 2 activity by having more restrictions in place on all exploration. If Level 1 activity is applicable to impacting the areas set aside under the additional required time/area closures then it would seem useful from our perspective to support level 1 activity with these additional required time/area closures? A mix and match approach. Please clarify if you can.

Thank you,

Alex Whiting
Environmental Specialist
Native Village of Kotzebue
P.O. Box 296
Kotzebue, Alaska 99752
907-442-5303 direct
alex.whiting@qira.org