

0001

1
2
3
4

MEETING MINUTES

6 FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
7 BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT
8 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
9 NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICES
10 SCOPING MEETING
11 HELD AT
12 BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT
13 1202 ELMWOOD PARK BOULEVARD
14 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70123
15 ON THE 19TH DAY OF JUNE, 2013
16 COMMENCING AT 1:00 P.M.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0002

1 MR. GOEKE:
2 Good afternoon, everyone. We appreciate
3 you coming out this afternoon for a discussion about an
4 upcoming Environmental Impact Statement that our agency
5 is creating. My name is Gary Goeke. I am the Chief of
6 the Environmental Assessment Section here with the
7 agency, and sitting up here this afternoon as well,
8 Mr. Trevis Olivier, who is one of the staff working hard
9 on the EIS as well.
10 What we wanted to do, the purpose of the
11 meeting this afternoon is to try and get some
12 preliminary thoughts from you and from the general
13 public and from other Federal and state agencies, and as
14 you can see, we've had a fairly ambiguous schedule here
15 the last week, week and a half. We started off in

16 Tampa. We've made our way all of the way to Galveston.
17 New Orleans is the last meeting for our local crew, but
18 we're having another meeting tomorrow in Silver Springs,
19 Maryland. So let's go ahead and get started if we can.

20 As most of you know, our agency is the
21 Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. We're a part of the
22 Department of the Interior, and one of the agency's
23 primary responsibility is on the Outer Continental
24 Shelf. The document that we're working on, the document
25 that we're going to be putting together, we have a

0003

1 co-lead with National Marine Fishery Service. National
2 Marine Fishery, as most of y'all are familiar with, has
3 responsibility for stewardship for marine animals on the
4 Outer Continental Shelf. BOEM's mandate -- BOEM has an
5 usual mandate amongst the Federal agencies. Our
6 responsibilities are for the expeditious and orderly
7 development of the Outer Continental Shelf with proper
8 and environmental safeguards.

9 The National Environmental Policy Act is
10 what we're here -- part of the reason that we're here
11 this afternoon. NEPA is a Federal umbrella law that
12 mandates the Federal government to do environmental
13 impact analysis of the various actions that it's going
14 to be taking. This is the framework that the federal
15 government put together, requires a lot of consultations
16 with other Federal agencies and requires opportunities
17 for the public to have input, and this is where we are
18 with this process.

19 The development of this EIS is going to
20 be a fairly long process. It will take a couple of
21 years for us to accomplish all of the steps that we need
22 to step through. As you can see, there are a lot of
23 different things, and in a moment, we will discuss a
24 little bit of these in just a few moments. But we talk
25 about the impact-producing factors, describe the

0004

1 existing environment, and we lay all of the
2 impact-producing factors up against the resources of the
3 Gulf of Mexico in our impact analysis.

4 The process that we step through that is
5 laid out by NEPA, which is a very orderly, very stepwise
6 fashion, and we are basically at the second step in

7 these scoping meetings that we are doing right now. We
8 published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS last
9 month, and we're doing the scoping now where we're
10 seeking comments from others, from the general public,
11 from other Federal agencies, from state agencies as
12 well. We will step through a process where we will
13 create a draft EIS, and then we'll have -- once we
14 publish that draft EIS, it will go public. We will ask
15 the public to review and comment, and we'll hold another
16 series of meetings just like we've been doing for the
17 scoping process. Once we incorporate the comments from
18 the public meetings, we will prepare a final EIS and
19 then a Record of Decision. So it's important to realize
20 that out of this EIS, this is a programmatic document.
21 It's looking at a large scale. There will be individual
22 permit actions that will take additional environmental
23 reviews after this EIS is accomplished.

24 The purpose of our scoping meetings, as
25 I mentioned, is primarily to receive input from the
0005

1 public, and we want your thoughts on a number of
2 different items, a number of different issues. We are
3 going to try and get comments from everybody as we move
4 through the process on a number of different issues, but
5 one of the important things that we all need to
6 recognize under NEPA, NEPA requires a great deal of
7 consultation with other Federal agencies. This is a
8 partial list of some of the milestones that we will step
9 through that we're creating the document. We deal with
10 Water Pollution, Marine Mammals, Coastal Zone and Clean
11 Air Act, Government-to-Government consultations.
12 There's a lot of different steps in the EIS, and this is
13 part of the reason that it takes as long as it does to
14 complete this process, but we're here to talk about
15 seismic surveys.

16 This is a little cartoon image of a
17 seismic survey, and as you can imagine, the reality is
18 much more complex than this, but essentially, what you
19 have is a energy impulse that's released by an airgun or
20 some other device being towed behind a ship. The
21 impulse of energy goes down to the sea floor, penetrates
22 the various levels and bounces back to a set of
23 receivers. From these receivers, from these impulses of

24 energy, computers can interpolate, computers can figure
25 out what the sea floor looks like, both at the surface
0006

1 as well as beneath the sea floor depending on the tool
2 used.

3 G&G activities is sort of a nickname
4 that we're bumping all of these various activities
5 under. The G&G activities are used for a variety of
6 operations in the Gulf. They're used for oil and gas
7 operation, obviously. They're used for renewable
8 energies. If you're building a wind farm on the Outer
9 Continental Shelf somewhere, you need to feel confident
10 that you have a solid substrate beneath your towers, so
11 they will use this as a site assessment tool to make
12 sure that you have a good foundation, as well as
13 minerals. When we do re-nourishments of beaches, when
14 we follow up with hurricanes and we rebuild shorelines,
15 we need to know where the sand sources are, and so we
16 have an inventory of sand sources that are built up
17 using geological and geophysical tools. Likewise, we
18 have biological resources in the deep ocean. You can
19 use some of the seismic tools to see if there's a hard
20 bottom, to tell what types of communities are likely to
21 be encountered on the sea floor.

22 As I mentioned, there's a number of
23 different types of G&G survey tools, a number of
24 different ways that information can be gathered, can be
25 processed, and the EIS is going to address all of these
0007

1 and will step through them in a stepwise fashion to make
2 sure that we've covered all of these.

3 The area of interest, the EIS will look
4 at all of three planning areas in the Gulf of Mexico.
5 The BOEM has primary responsibilities in the Federal
6 waters offshore. NMFS, our co-lead on this project, has
7 responsibilities up into the State waters as well. So
8 between the two agencies, our goal here is to cover
9 everything from the deepest part of the Gulf up
10 basically to the shoreline to ensure that the NMFS has
11 the coverage that it needs.

12 The purpose of the Programmatic EIS, as
13 I said, is basically to step through to make sure that
14 we're addressing all of the potential impacts that can

15 be foreseen under the geological and geophysical with
16 the use of those tools.

17 The need for the Programmatic EIS, there
18 is -- BOEM has the responsibility to permit certain
19 types of activities on the Outer Continental Shelf. It
20 has been a while since we've done a programmatic -- a
21 large-scale overview of the potential impacts from G&G
22 in the Gulf of Mexico, so this is what we're going to be
23 doing. This is the need for our agency. NMFS needs
24 this information to create and meet its responsibilities
25 as far as the Endangered Species Act, The Marine Mammal

0008

1 Protection Act, so they can give the incidental take
2 authorizations that the industry will use throughout the
3 process.

4 As I mentioned, the way they do this is
5 in a stepwise fashion. These are the types of resources
6 that we routinely look at in an EIS in the Gulf of
7 Mexico. We go through these one at a time, and we have
8 a variety of experts, many of them in this room. We
9 have a variety of experts who are assigned to these
10 different specific resource topics, and what we're
11 looking for during this scoping process is input from
12 the Federal government, input from other agencies, State
13 agencies, non-governmental organizations, to tell us are
14 we missing anything, is there something else in here
15 that you can imagine that may potentially be impacted by
16 the G&G activities. So this is what we're going to
17 address, and the way we do this is by taking those
18 resources, describing them and then in a stepwise
19 fashion, take the various impacting factors and go
20 through and weigh the impacting factors up against the
21 resources that are going to be analyzed.

22 Again, what we're looking for is input
23 from any other interested parties, have we missed some
24 impacting factors, are there some potential issues or
25 topics out there that we've not addressed. These are

0009

1 the types of information that we're seeking for the
2 scoping process.

3 NEPA requires as we go through this
4 process that we look at the proposed action. It
5 requires that we look at a no action alternative, and it

6 suggests that there are many alternatives that may also
7 be reasonable that should be examined as well. This is
8 the type of information that we're looking at, what
9 we're looking for from our scoping meetings. We have a
10 no action alternative. We know what our proposed action
11 is, but there are a lot of other alternatives that may
12 make sense. There are a lot of alternatives that may be
13 unique combinations of mitigation measures and things
14 like that, and so this is the type of information that
15 we're seeking to get.

16 The mitigation measures that we're
17 looking at or that we're likely to look at in this
18 process that have already been identified is on this
19 slide here. We're looking at a ramp-up of acoustics.
20 We're looking at the possible exclusion zones. We're
21 looking at operation limits during high density times of
22 the year and things like that. This is what we want
23 your thoughts on. This is what we are seeking to have
24 people tell us, "This is all well and good, but, you
25 know, what about this?" "What about this?" "What about

0010

1 this and this," is what we'd like to hear this
2 afternoon.

3 The tentative schedule is for a Record
4 of Decision by mid to late 2015. As I said, this is
5 going to be a large process. It's going to take a while
6 to do all of the mandatory consultations, to look at all
7 of the resources, all of the impacting factors. And,
8 importantly, what we have highlighted in red are
9 opportunities for the public to give us their thoughts,
10 opportunities for people to give input into our process
11 to help us identify the topics that I've mentioned. We
12 will create a draft EIS and hope to get it published by
13 mid-2014. We'll incorporate the comments, but when we
14 do the draft EIS, we're going to have public meetings
15 just as we're doing now. That same schedule that I put
16 up earlier, we're probably going to touch base on all of
17 those sites again. We'll take the comments from the
18 public meeting, we'll work them into the final EIS by
19 mid to late -- by early to mid-2015, and then a Report
20 of Decision probably signed by the Secretary of Interior
21 by mid to late-2015.

22 So what we're going to do this

23 afternoon, the way this is set up, we have a microphone
24 here. We have a court reporter to take verbatim
25 transcripts of any comments that you may have. I know
0011

1 that we have four speakers who have signed up ahead of
2 time to give us their thoughts. The first speaker is
3 Elizabeth Cook.

4 Ms. Cook.

5 On our slide we say three minutes, but
6 in realty, we don't have a lot of speakers here this
7 afternoon, so we're not going to be pushing it for three
8 minutes.

9 Please.

10 MS. COOK:

11 Hi. My name is Elizabeth Cook. I'm a
12 Louisiana native, born and raised here. I'm from
13 Thibodaux. I have witnessed the effects of the BP oil
14 disaster at great length. The use of the -- the massive
15 use of the toxic dispersant, Corexit, on the oil that
16 made the oil potentially 52 times more toxic, and I know
17 that the oil industry is still relying on the Corexit to
18 fight oil spills. So the fact that you're proposing to
19 expand, potentially, drilling to Florida is quite
20 disturbing in light of this fact. We have a badly
21 damaged ecosystem in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. Many
22 people may not be aware that there is an unusual
23 mortality event going on and has been ongoing of
24 cetaceans of dolphins and whales who are dying --
25 especially the dolphins are dying by the hundreds and
0012

1 washing up on the beaches. They're dying because of the
2 toxicity of the chemicals that are in the Northern Gulf
3 of Mexico due to the oil and Corexit. If the Gulf of
4 Mexico waters are toxic to the dolphins, think
5 potentially they're also toxic to the people you're
6 currently utilizing in the Gulf of Mexico for
7 recreation, fishing, swimming, boating and commercial
8 fishing. You have not solved this issue. You are
9 intending to use Corexit again if there is another
10 spill. We know this because Corexit is stockpiled up
11 and down the Gulf Coast. We know this for a fact.

12 MR. GOEKE:

13 Ms. Cook, may I ask you a question? Do

14 you have comments on the seismic EIS?

15 MS. COOK:

16 I am for the no alternative.

17 MR. GOEKE:

18 Okay. Thank you.

19 MS. COOK:

20 And that's what I'm speaking to.

21 MR. GOEKE:

22 Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. COOK:

24 You say that the National Environmental
25 Policy Act, NEPA, provides the framework for protecting

0013

1 the environment. Well, it sure didn't protect the
2 environment during the BP oil disaster. Thousands of
3 people became ill from the Corexit. Thousands. People
4 were -- the caps on medical benefits for the settlement
5 is \$69,000, believe it or not. If you became ill from
6 the Corexit or the chemicals, the cap on the medical
7 benefits is \$69,000. Families have lost everything.
8 They've had to mortgage boats, homes, move in with
9 grandparents, to deal with their medical issues, so I
10 say no action.

11 MR. GOEKE:

12 Thank you.

13 MS. COOK:

14 I'm not finished. I'm sorry. You said
15 I could potentially have more than three minutes. I'm
16 not leaving until I'm finished.

17 MR. GOEKE:

18 Yes, but can you wrap it up, please.

19 MS. COOK:

20 Okay.

21 This is a profoundly undemocratic
22 process. You have already decided you're going to
23 drill. Okay? The deal is done. We know that BOEM is
24 controlled by the oil and gas industry. We know this
25 already. You're going to drill. You're going to expand

0014

1 your drilling no matter what the consequences because
2 you did already. You're doing it off the Coast of
3 Louisiana no matter what the consequences. So what's so
4 profoundly undemocratic about this process is we're

5 asked to come here and speak for three minutes or a
6 little longer. He's been very generous. We should have
7 roundtable discussions and town hall meetings in every
8 community. The public should be involved in every
9 community speaking out on these issues that directly
10 impact their communities. What I'm hoping for is that
11 by the year 2015 the democracy revives itself in this
12 country and takes democratic control of its natural
13 resources rather than leaving it to folks like you who
14 are willing to sell out to the oil and gas industry
15 because you want to keep your jobs. Let's be honest.
16 You like your careers.

17 MR. GOEKE:

18 Can you wrap up, please?

19 MS. COOK:

20 I'm finished. Thank you very much.

21 MR. GOEKE:

22 Thank you.

23 Our second speaker, Cynthia Sarthou.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. SARTHOU:

0015

1 Hello. My name is Cynthia Sarthou, and
2 I'm Executive Director of the Gulf Restoration Network.
3 We are a group of nonprofit individuals in communities
4 across the Gulf that work to protect the resources of
5 the Gulf of Mexico.

6 The Federal register notice indicates
7 that the PEIS is being prepared cooperatively with NMFS
8 to serve as a required environmental analysis for a
9 proposed rulemaking regarding incidental take under the
10 MMPA and the ESA. We strongly support the programmatic
11 rulemaking move forward now and that mitigation measures
12 under that rulemaking be considered as an act of
13 alternative in this PEIS.

14 We believe the agency must adopt
15 mitigation and monitoring measures at this stage of
16 analysis for the following reasons: The oil industry
17 routinely conduct dozens of seismic surveys each year,
18 many of them involving high-intensity airgun arrays and
19 running for weeks or months. Recent analysis conducted
20 by NOAA shows that chronic noise levels from airguns
21 alone are approaching 120 decibels through much of the

22 northern Gulf.
23 G&G activity has a huge environmental
24 footprint. Airgun noise is loud enough to mask whale
25 calls over literally thousands of miles destroying their
0016

1 capacity to communicate and breed and it can drive
2 whales to abandon their habitat and cease foraging,
3 again, over large areas of ocean. BOEM's own funded
4 research published in 2009 found that Gulf sperm whales
5 subjected to even moderate amounts of airgun energy
6 appeared to lose about 20 percent of their foraging
7 ability, a result that could well explain why the
8 population hasn't recovered from whaling.

9 The industry's activities are hitting
10 marine animals already compromised by the Deepwater
11 Disaster, and these populations include coastal
12 bottlenose dolphins, which are undergoing an usual
13 mortality event; the population of Brydes' whales, which
14 there are less than 33; and it's unrecovered population
15 of sperm whales, which have a nursery in the Mississippi
16 Canyon, which was ground zero for the disaster.

17 It is just as essential that BOEM adopt
18 and develop ways to reduce the cumulative, chronic
19 exposure of vulnerable species at this programmatic
20 stage of review in order to manage this problem at a
21 scale appropriate to the biology, the industry and the
22 mitigation and monitoring solutions available.

23 Turning to the scope of the analysis
24 covered in the noticed PEIS, the agencies must fully
25 analyze all potentially available alternative
0017

1 technologies that would allow exploration for oil and
2 gas reserves at different sound levels than those used
3 by current seismic technologies; the impact of all
4 aspects of seismic exploration on all 29 species of
5 protected marine mammals listed in our written comments,
6 which I have provided. Many of the studies and comments
7 made by the agency reflect only studies of bottlenose
8 dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins may have a different
9 sound sensitivity than other dolphins, so all different
10 species should be considered; the additive effect of
11 continuing seismic exploration on species within the
12 footprint and thus impacted by the BP oil disaster; the

13 indirect secondary and cumulative impacts on the marine
14 environment of all activities of the oil and gas
15 industry in the geographic area covered by the EIS.
16 Cumulative impact analysis must include a review of the
17 overall impacts of seismic in addition to an estimated
18 potential removal of structures in the Gulf per year, at
19 one point estimated to be 100 per year, which is what
20 y'all were saying should be done. Other activities
21 associated with oil and gas exploration and development
22 that produce noise, military activities (such as
23 precision airstrike activities and vessel sonar
24 testing), and non-BOEM regulated activities (such as
25 marine transporting and fishing); the effectiveness of
0018

1 current mitigation measures in reducing the threat of
2 protected species, and additional reductions in impact
3 that could be achieved by use of alternatives
4 technologies or addition mitigation measures beyond
5 those currently employed by the industry.

6 Thank you, and I will submit more
7 substantial comments.

8 MR. GOEKE:

9 Thank you. Appreciate it.

10 The third speaker we have who pre-signed
11 is Matthew Basnight. Thank you.

12 MR. BASNIGHT:

13 My name is Matt Basnight. I'm with
14 FairfieldNodal. I'm here representing IAGC today.

15 On behalf of IAGC, I'd like to express
16 our appreciation for the opportunity to make the
17 following comments, which I have supplemented with
18 written comments as well:

19 IAGC is the international trade
20 association representing the industry that provides
21 geophysical acquisition, processing and other services
22 to the energy industry, including both conventional and
23 renewable energy sectors. IAGC member companies play an
24 integral role in the successful exploration and
25 development of offshore oil and natural gas resources
0019

1 through the acquisition and processing of geophysical
2 data.

3 Geophysical surveys are key tools used

4 in oil and natural gas exploration and siting of
5 renewable energy facilities. Our services are critical
6 to the development of hydrocarbon resources and one of
7 the very first tools used in the exploration process
8 aiding E&P companies in their analysis and
9 identification of the most perspective areas of oil and
10 natural gas exploration.

11 Geophysical data is also critical for
12 the development of renewable energy. High resolution
13 geophysical data and geotechnical borings aid in the
14 site and renewable energy facilities.

15 Geophysical data is valuable to the
16 Federal government, and even to state governments. BOEM
17 utilizes the data to assess the resources potential of
18 the OCS and ensure that the Federal government receives
19 their fair market value for the resource. Having modern
20 geophysical data prior to a lease sale allows the
21 industry to make more informed bids resulting in more
22 bids and higher bids promoting greater competition and
23 greater accessibility to the Gulf of Mexico market.
24 Modern geophysical imaging reduces the risk both
25 economic with exploration and production, but also

0020

1 associated with safety and environmental risks, reduces
2 the number of wells that need to be drilled in any given
3 area, thus reducing the overall exploration, development
4 and production footprint. Modern geophysical imaging of
5 today is being used more and more to reduce the number
6 of drilling risks that can be better managed or even
7 eliminated.

8 The geophysical industry has over 50
9 years of experience working in the Gulf of Mexico,
10 planning, acquiring and processing geophysical data in
11 an environmentally responsible manner. During that
12 time, there has been no scientific evidence that our
13 surveys have resulted in auditory or physical injury to
14 any marine mammal where it adversely impacted the marine
15 mammal populations. Nevertheless, the industry employs
16 a number of robust mitigation measures to further reduce
17 the negligible risk of harm to marine mammals. It's
18 important to remember that seismic surveys are temporary
19 and transitory and uses a low-frequency, short duration
20 source signal.

21 Though additional information is needed
22 in some areas, there is a significant amount of
23 scientific information available, many of it funded by
24 government agencies regarding the potential results of
25 potential effects of E&P activities on the marine

0021

1 environment. This is the information and data from that
2 scientific literature and not speculation, which should
3 be used when assessing potential impacts of G&G
4 activities on the environment.

5 The alternatives considered in the PEIS
6 should only be based on science and observed effects and
7 therefore not include overly-restricted mitigation
8 measures, such as unnecessary shutdowns for dolphins
9 that enters the exclusion zone, seasonal closures or
10 large arbitrary separation distances between geophysical
11 surveys. These are cautionary mitigation measures and
12 not necessary to protect the mammals and are not based
13 on science.

14 In the past, BOEM has relied on models
15 and the methodology that estimate numbers of marine
16 mammals incidental takes has resulted in highly
17 exaggerated estimates, especially considering the lack
18 of any observable injuries, mortalities or population
19 level behavioral effects. Compounding this problem, the
20 agency's previous take number estimates, which are only
21 achievable by using acoustic threshold criteria based on
22 obsolete data that does not meet the NEPA requirement to
23 use the best available science.

24 We strongly believe that the DPEIS
25 should be based on the best available science, make

0022

1 appropriate use of models and methodologies to estimate
2 incidental takes and fully consider the environmental
3 context when making any determination of environmental
4 consequences.

5 The IAGC values the stakeholders process
6 and are committed to participating in a dialogue with
7 all stakeholders to explain what we do, how we do it and
8 the measures we take to protect the environment.

9 I brought several educational items in
10 the back of the room if anybody wants them.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. GOEKE:

13 Thank you. Appreciate it.

14 Ben Gordon.

15 MR. GORDON:

16 My name's Ben Gordon. I work with Pax
17 Christi, a Natural Habitat Peace Organization, but we do
18 very often work with many of the environmental groups.
19 A big part of our policy is Christian responsible,
20 Christians being responsible stewardship for the
21 environment.

22 I wasn't aware when I came today that
23 our comments were supposed to be just on the seismic
24 activity.

25 MR. GOEKE:

0023

1 The purpose of the meeting is for
2 seismic comments -- G&G. Excuse me.

3 MR. GORDON:

4 Right. Okay. I wasn't aware of that
5 until I got here, unfortunately, but since I'm here, I
6 would like to make a comment. I would like to echo some
7 of the fears that Betsy Cook and Cynthia Sarthou
8 expressed before. No sense in going into it again, but
9 I would like to ask a question, and this may not be the
10 proper place to do it, but there was supposed to be --
11 after the BP 2010 oil spill, there was talk by many of
12 the environmental groups, like Louisiana Environmental
13 Action Network, LEAN, the Sierra Club and NGR about a
14 assistance to oversight board. And this would be
15 consistent not just people from environmental groups,
16 but people who were affected by the oil spill themselves
17 who lived in the area where the oil came ashore and were
18 directly affected and a part of the decisionmaking
19 process. I don't know whatever happened to that.

20 Cynthia, I don't want to put you on the
21 spot, but do you know what happened to that?

22 MS. SARTHOU:

23 -- the agency and the government never
24 moved forward.

25 MR. GORDON:

0024

1 Okay. That's exactly what I figured.

2 So I think it's a serious problem for

3 people who were affected by the environmental spill of
4 2010. And the ones previous to that are not in the
5 decisionmaking process ahead of time, other than
6 comments like this.

7 MR. GOEKE:

8 Thank you.

9 MR. GORDON:

10 Thank you.

11 MR. GOEKE:

12 Okay. That's all of the speakers that

13 we had signed up beforehand, and I have one more, Mac
14 Mackenzie.

15 MS. MACKENZIE:

16 As he said, I'm Mac Mackenzie. I echo

17 so many of the comments that came before me. And he had
18 a great point that actually is related to this, if there
19 was a Regional Citizens' Advisory Council -- not
20 committee -- similar to the one in Alaska post Exxon
21 Valdez, I think that would be a very, very strong voice
22 in opposition probably of this right now, and there
23 would also be money available and studies available on
24 an independent basis to check out the results that our
25 friend says don't exist.

0025

1 But let's be clear, like "unintentional

2 marine mammal take" is defined as "hunt, harass, capture
3 or kill." Let's not call it "take". That's like a
4 sugar-coated take; right? This is a take; right
5 (indicating)? This is a take (indicating). These are
6 pictures probably as a result of the BP oil spill of
7 which we have had hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of
8 dolphins wash up. There's estimates that say there's 10
9 times more than that that just drowned at sea. I'm not
10 willing to take that risk with the ones that are left.

11 A little bit over a year ago, NOLA halted
12 deep-penetrating seismic surveys because they emit
13 sounds that could disrupt mother and calf bonding and
14 mask important acoustic cues. What's changed?

15 Thank you.

16 Even quoting, "They can even cause them
17 to lose their hearing," which we all know is very
18 important. It changes whale's migration patterns.

19 MS. COOK:

20 What is the Navy doing?

21 MR. GOEKE:

22 Please let her finish her comment.

23 MS. MACKENZIE:

24 So these blasts have been said to be

25 100,000 times more intense than a jet engine. Let's all

0026

1 go stand out on an airport tarmac and stand right next

2 to one and then imagine 100,000 times worse.

3 Nine-hundred -- now, specific proof I don't know what's

4 been scientifically shown, but 900 dolphins died in Peru

5 with signs of ear damage following seismic surveys.

6 MS. COOK:

7 Thank you.

8 MS. MACKENZIE:

9 You're welcome.

10 Bottom line, I'm not willing to take

11 that risk, and I don't think any of you -- including

12 you, sir -- should be wanting to take that risk either.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. GOEKE:

15 Thank you.

16 Those are the speakers who have signed

17 up. Do we have anyone in the audience that wishes to

18 speak now?

19 (No response.)

20 We have a couple of slides here that --

21 MS. COOK:

22 I have more, if I could.

23 MR. GOEKE:

24 Okay. Give me one moment, please.

25 We have a couple of slides here that we

0027

1 want to make sure that we cover.

2 There are numerous ways to comment and

3 submit ideas and topics during this scoping process.

4 One -- the simplest is probably just an e-mail address

5 that we've had at the bottom of each slide and at the

6 top of this slide here, GOM -- for Gulf of Mexico --

7 ggeis@boem.gov. We have other ways as well. One is

8 called Regulations.gov, where you can go and submit

9 comments, or the old fashioned way, you can send in

10 regular mail to the address on the screen. And if you

11 have a desire to learn more about what we're talking
12 about here, we have -- our staff has created quite a bit
13 of information and put it on our website, and you can go
14 get a lot of additional information on the G&G
15 activities. And if you're interested, there's another
16 website down at the bottom where you can get on our mail
17 list so that you can track and keep up with everything
18 that we produce. I just wanted to get that in.

19 Thank you.

20 Would you care to come up and give us
21 your name?

22 MS. BREAUX:

23 I can raise my question or concern or my
24 fear, either way.

25 MR. GOEKE:

0028

1 If you do it this way, give us your
2 name, please. I would appreciate it. That way, we can
3 get a copy of it for the transcript.

4 MS. BREAUX:

5 Yes. My name is Christine Breaux, and
6 I'm a citizen/resident of New Orleans and have been for
7 over a decade and went through the BP oil spill.

8 One of my concerns in reference to this
9 is basically when we're talking about seismic
10 activity -- and it's simply a question because I didn't
11 know what the scope of the hearing was going to be, but
12 what kind of monitoring -- when it comes to seismic
13 activities, specifically in relationship to the very
14 potentially fragile nature of the crust in the Earth,
15 does BOEM or one of the agencies within the jurisdiction
16 of the Federal government, what kind of monitoring goes
17 on? I mean, we are talking about a seismic issue, and
18 we're also talking about a health and safety issue of
19 clearly rate significance in the event of an earthquake
20 while offshore oil and drilling is ongoing, and I would
21 appreciate it if you could tell me to whom to address
22 that issue.

23 MR. GOEKE:

24 Let me make a suggestion, we're about to
25 take a break, and we've got several people in the room

0029

1 who may be able to give you some additional information

2 during the break. Okay?

3 MS. BREAUX:

4 Great. Thank you.

5 MR. GOEKE:

6 Anyone else who wanted to speak?

7 MS. COOK:

8 Could we add to our comment?

9 MR. GOEKE:

10 We are going to take a 15-minute break,
11 and then you may, yes.

12 Is there anyone else in the room who
13 wanted to make a comment?

14 (No response.)

15 We are going off the record for 15
16 minutes, and then we'll open it back up.

17 Thank you.

18 (A recess was taken.)

19 MR. GOEKE:

20 During the break there were not any new
21 attendees that came in, so I'll ask if there's anybody
22 who did not speak before or who would like to give us
23 their comments and give us their thoughts, anyone who
24 did not speak before?

25 (No response.)

0030

1 Seeing none, is there anybody who has
2 already spoken who would like to amend their comments?

3 Yes, ma'am. Would you identify
4 yourself, please, when you get to the microphone?

5 MS. COOK:

6 Sure.

7 MR. GOEKE:

8 And if you could keep it focused on the
9 G&G activities, that would be best.

10 MS. COOK:

11 Yes, it is on G&G activities, but you
12 list the reasons for the G&G activities, and one of them
13 you list is oil and gas exploration -- potential oil and
14 gas exploration, so I think it is quite relevant what
15 oil and gas exploration has meant to the people of
16 Louisiana in recent years --

17 MR. GOEKE:

18 The Environmental --

19 MS. COOK:
20 -- during the BP oil disaster.

21 MR. GOEKE:
22 The Environmental Impact Statement is
23 going to weigh the potential impacts from geological to
24 geophysical activities.

25 MS. COOK:

0031

1 Also, it's somewhat absurd to talk about
2 sonar damage to dolphins, to mammals in the Gulf when
3 the Navy is doing the same thing. I mean, if we don't
4 stop the Navy, you know, it's going to continue -- in
5 other words, the damage is already being done to mammals
6 through the Navy testing.

7 MR. GOEKE:

8 Yes, ma'am. We have nothing whatsoever
9 to do with that.

10 MS. COOK:

11 Okay. Well, that's the problem is that
12 the agencies aren't working together to solve these
13 issues. Everything is divided up. And, you know, you
14 have this process and then you have five years another
15 process or two years or one year, and the
16 interconnectedness of everything is not seen, which
17 represents the interconnectedness of every ecosystem.
18 If you do one thing in the Louisiana ecosystem, it
19 affects the ecosystem of the Florida Gulf, the Alabama
20 Gulf, Texas. Everything is connected. Okay? And the
21 way that this is all divided up so that I can't speak to
22 the environmental harm done through oil and gas
23 exploration speaks to how you divide up these issues,
24 and so you mitigate -- you mitigate the harm in that
25 way, by looking at it in that way.

0032

1 Thank you.

2 MR. GOEKE:

3 Thank you.

4 Is there anyone else who wanted to add
5 to the comments that they've already given?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. GOEKE:

8 Seeing none, we're going to conclude the
9 hearing.

10 Thank you all very much for coming out.

11 Appreciate your cooperation.

12 (Hearing concludes at 1:34 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0033

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE:

2

3 I, ELICIA H. WOODWORTH, Certified Court

4 Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, as the

5 officer before whom this hearing for the Bureau of Ocean

6 Energy Management (BOEM), do hereby certify that this

7 proces verbal was reported by me in the stenotype

8 reporting method, was prepared and transcribed by me or

9 under my personal direction and supervision, and is a

10 true and correct transcript to the best of my ability

11 and understanding;

12 That the transcript has been prepared in

13 compliance with transcript format required by statute or

14 by rules of the board, that I have acted in compliance

15 with the prohibition on contractual relationships, as

16 defined by Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Article

17 1434 and in rules and advisory opinions of the board;

18 That I am not related to counsel or to the

19 parties herein, nor am I otherwise interested in the

20 outcome of this matter.

21

22 Dated this 10th day of July, 2013.

23

24 _____
ELICIA H. WOODWORTH, CCR

25 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER