



Linda Dansby

09/17/02 04:28 PM MDT

To: Ken McMullen/PAIS/NPS,

cc:

Subject: Suggested response to JF's comment re: Table 8

In response to Johnny French's comment beginning "Table 8, Comparative Summary of Impacts, pp. 34-38 -- The table's comparison of impacts from the "No Action " and "Proposed Action" alternatives presents a problem regarding cumulative impacts from future actions not yet proposed, but apparently considered reasonably likely to occur by those preparing the table. The problem is one of consistency...."

My suggested response:

Yes, we applied a different approach to assessing cumulative impacts on Nonfederal Oil and Gas Development compared to the remaining impact topics. Under this topic, we assessed the impact on the nation's domestic energy supply in addition to the economic impact on BNP. For the latter, we felt it relevant to assess the impact on BNP should a decision to not drill the wells resulted in not proceeding with future development under the NPS's reasonably foreseeable development (RFD) scenario. We do not view this as a problem.

Further in this paragraph, Johnny French states: "...cumulative impacts under the "No Action" alternative from future oil and gas operations are not mentioned here at all."

My suggested response:

Cumulative impacts are assessed for each state and federally protected species or group of species on pages 70-98, with a summary in Table 10 on pages 67-70. A synopsis of the impact analysis is provided for the impact topic "State and Federally Protected Species" in Table 8, on page 37.

Linda