



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

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

1 message

Candace Nachman <candace.nachman@noaa.gov>

Thu, Feb 16, 2012 at 9:38 AM

To: Alex Whiting <alex.whiting@qira.org>

Cc: Michael Payne <michael.payne@noaa.gov>

Alex,

We also appreciated the time you took to meet with us last week and that you had already put so much time and effort into reading and reviewing the DEIS. We realize it is a large document and not one that is easy to get through.

In response to your question, as currently written, the requirement for those time/area closures are based on the Level 2 for activity. However, under Alternative 2, which considers the Level 1 activity, those same time/area closures are contemplated as mitigation measures but would not necessarily be required in every case. So, as currently written, they would not be required every time under the Level 1 activity level. However, your exact question and thought is something that we would like to see in your comment letter. There is the potential for some mixing and matching in the Final EIS of what was contained in the DEIS, especially if public comments reflect the fact that we should do so.

Thanks,
Candace

On Wed, Feb 15, 2012 at 6:13 PM, Alex Whiting <alex.whiting@qira.org> wrote:

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](tel:907-442-5303) direct
alex.whiting@qira.org