Errata Sheet for the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Lease Sales 259 and 261: Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Introduction

This document lists corrections (known as errata) to the *Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Lease Sales 259 and 261: Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* (GOM Lease Sales 259 and 261 Final Supplemental EIS). Errata are entered sequentially by chapter and page number from the GOM Lease Sales 259 and 261 Final Supplemental EIS. These changes were necessitated by corrections to the *Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Social Cost Analysis: Addendum to the Gulf of Mexico Lease Sales 259 and 261 Draft Supplemental EIS and Technical Report* (2022 Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Addendum). The 2022 Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Addendum has now been corrected and republished. All references to the 2022 Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Addendum in the Supplemental EIS now refer to the revised *Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Social Cost Analysis: Addendum to the Gulf of Mexico Lease Sales 259 and 261 Supplemental EIS and Technical Report – Corrected* (Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Corrected Addendum) that was corrected as of February 2023. The references to the Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Corrected Addendum are corrected via the Global Errata corrections section (see below). Additional specific errata for **Chapter 4.1** and **Appendix C** are noted below the Global Errata section.

Global Errata

For all instances within the GOM Lease Sales 259 and 261 Final Supplemental EIS:

Replace the reference below:

Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Social Cost Analysis: Addendum to the Gulf of Mexico Lease Sales 259 and 261 Draft Supplemental EIS and Technical Report (BOEM 2022c)

With the following:

Gulf of Mexico OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Social Cost Analysis: Addendum to the Gulf of Mexico Lease Sales 259 and 261 Supplemental EIS and Technical Report – Corrected (BOEM 2023)

For all instances within the GOM Lease Sales 259 and 261 Final Supplemental EIS:

Replace the reference below:

2022 Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Addendum (BOEM 2022c)

With the following:

Gulf of Mexico GHG Analysis Corrected Addendum (BOEM 2023)

Chapter 4.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis

Page 4-7, last two sentences of the last paragraph:

Replace the last two sentences:

In net, the life cycle analysis of domestic consumption and production shows that selection of the No Action Alternative results in very similar emissions to the emissions estimated under Alternative A, with slightly higher GHG emissions under the No Action Alternative than would be emitted under Alternative A. When the analysis is expanded to consider emissions from foreign energy markets, BOEM finds the No Action Alternative results in fewer global GHG emissions as there would be an additional 46.8 million metric tons of global emissions as a result of a lease sale under Alternative A.

With the following:

In net, the life cycle analysis of domestic consumption and production shows that with energy market substitutions considered, selection of the Alternative A results in slightly higher domestic emissions than the No Action Alternative. When the analysis is expanded to consider emissions from foreign energy markets, BOEM finds that there would be an additional 66.8 million metric tons of global emissions as a result of a lease sale under Alternative A.

Page 4-8, Table 4-1:

Replace Table 4-1:

Table 4-1. Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Mid-Activity Case (CO_2e, thousands of metric tons)			
	Domestic Production and Consumption Only		Foreign Only
	Upstream	Midstream and Downstream	Downstream (oil only)
Alternative A	21,183	243,141	46,769
No Action	44,888	225,047	N/A

Difference	(23,705)	18,094	46,769

Notes: Values rounded to nearest 1,000 metric tons.

For ease of comparison, BOEM provides combined totals of all three GHG emissions in CO_2 equivalent, or CO_2e. CH_4 and N_2O are converted to CO_2e using USEPA current Global Warming Potentials (USEPA 2021b).

With the following:

Table 4-1. Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Mid-Activity Case (CO_2e, thousands of metric tons)			
	Domestic Production and Consumption Only		Foreign Only
	Upstream	Midstream and Downstream	Downstream (oil only)
Alternative A	21,183	360,334	66,753
No Action	44,888	309,867	N/A
Difference	(23,705)	50,467	66,753

Notes: Values rounded to nearest 1,000 metric tons.

For ease of comparison, BOEM provides combined totals of all three GHG emissions in CO_2 equivalent, or CO_2e. CH_4 and N_2O are converted to CO_2e using USEPA current 100-year Global Warming Potentials (USEPA 2021b).

Page 4-8, second and third sentences in the paragraph between Tables 4-1 and 4-2:

Replace the second and third sentences:

At a 3 percent discount rate and an average level of statistical damages, having a lease sale under Alternative A would result in savings of $440 million when considering domestically produced or consumed OCS oil, natural gas, and their substitutes alone. The social cost due to increased foreign emissions under Alternative A (3%, average statistical damages) is $2.04 billion.

With the following:

At a 3 percent discount rate and an average level of statistical damages, having a lease sale under Alternative A would result in social costs of $990 million when considering GHG emissions from domestically produced or consumed OCS oil, natural gas, and their substitutes alone. The social cost due to increased foreign emissions under Alternative A (3%, average statistical damages) is $2.91 billion.

Page 4-8, Table 4-2:

Replace Table 4-2:

Table 4-2. Total Social Cost of Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Mid-Activity Case (billion 2022 $)					
Discount Rate	Damages Statistic	Domestic Production and Consumption			Foreign Downstream Emissions from Oil
		Alternative A	No Action Alternative	Difference	
5.0%	Average	$2.87	$3.07	($0.21)	$0.50
3.0%	Average	$11.58	$12.03	($0.44)	$2.04
2.5%	Average	$17.79	$18.33	($0.55)	$3.13
3.0%	95th Percentile	$35.26	$36.33	($1.07)	$6.21

Notes: Values rounded to nearest $10 million. A positive value is a cost. A negative value is a benefit. The incremental social cost of greenhouse gases represents the difference between Alternative A and the No Action Alternative. Therefore, a negative incremental value suggests that costs are higher under the No Action Alternative or lower under Alternative A.

With the following:

Table 4-2. Total Social Cost of Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Mid-Activity Case (billion 2022 $)					
Discount Rate	Damages Statistic	Domestic Production and Consumption			Foreign Downstream Emissions from Oil
		Alternative A	No Action Alternative	Difference	
5.0%	Average	$4.16	$4.01	$0.15	$0.71
3.0%	Average	$16.77	$15.78	$0.99	$2.91
2.5%	Average	$25.72	$24.07	$1.65	$4.47
3.0%	95th Percentile	$51.00	$47.72	$3.28	$8.87

Notes: Values rounded to nearest $10 million. A positive value is a cost. A negative value is a benefit. The incremental social cost of greenhouse gases represents the difference between Alternative A and the No Action Alternative. Therefore, a positive incremental value (Difference column) suggests that costs are higher under Alternative A or lower under the No Action Alternative.

Page 4-9, second and third sentences in the first paragraph:

Replace the second and third sentences:

As shown in **Table 4-1**, there are slightly higher emissions from substitutes under the No Action Alternative above those of Alternative A. However, when considering the higher GHG emissions estimated from an increase in foreign oil consumption under Alternative A (as presented in **Table 4-1**), BOEM finds that global GHG emissions under the No Action Alternative are estimated to be slightly lower when compared to those under Alternative A.

With the following:

Both Alternative A and the No Action Alternative result in emissions as a result of either the lease sale or the energy market substitutions. However, as presented in **Table 4-1**, the modeling suggests that domestic emissions from Alternative A will be slightly higher than emissions from substitutes under the No Action Alternative. Further, the model suggests that additional GHGs will be emitted because of an increase in foreign oil consumption under Alternative A (as presented in **Table 4-1**), resulting in an even higher level of global GHG emissions under Alternative A compared with emissions under the No Action Alternative.

Appendix C – Response to Comments

Pages C-80 to C-81, second sentence of the response to Earthjustice et al., comment ID BOEM-2022-0048-28951:

Replace the second sentence:

The analysis shows that leasing has a smaller impact on the domestic GHG budget when compared to energy substitutes in the absence of leasing.

With the following:

The analysis shows that leasing has a larger impact on the domestic GHG budget when compared to energy substitutes in the absence of leasing.