| **Cmt #** | **Page #** | **Row # or Line #** | **Reviewer Name/ Agency** | **Comment** | **A/R/M1** | **Remarks / How Resolved *(Reviewers: Leave this column blank)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ES-3 | 12 | Martineau/  OPMP for State of Alaska | The State of Alaska supports BLM’s selection of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative because it is the only alternative that meets the requirements set forth in Public Law 115-97. We maintain that while BLM’s focus has been on meeting the 2,000-acre facility limit based on a hypothetical development scenario and corresponding analysis, the Tax Act also specifically directs that the Secretary shall offer for lease “not fewer than 400,000 acres area-wide in each lease sale; and those areas that have the highest potential for the discovery of hydrocarbons.” The Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program EIS must ensure that those criteria are met not only for the initial lease sale, which is scheduled to occur in 2019, but also for a minimum of one subsequent lease sale. BLM often requires field data collection using the best available technology or other approved method through lease stipulations and best management practices, either to ensure that assumptions made in its environmental analysis are accurate and/or to confirm that objectives are being met. Recognizing that there is a definitive lack of current data from exploratory seismic surveys and/or drilling, BLM can ensure that additional data is collected to support or revise current assumptions about which areas have the highest resource potential *in the future*. By offering the entire Coastal Plain (1,563,500 acres) for leasing, third parties will have the opportunity to collect field data through exploratory seismic surveys and/or drilling, which activities will require subsequent review and approval by BLM, throughout the area. This would not be possible under the other alternatives; pre-emptively closing areas to leasing would ensure that the true resource development potential of the Coastal Plain remains undetermined, contrary to Congressional intent. |  |  |
|  | 2-1 | 15-17 | Martineau/  OPMP for State of Alaska | The State of Alaska supports BLM’s selection of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative, as defined by offering the entire program area (1,563,500 acres) for lease and corresponding lease stipulations and required operating procedures, except as recommended for specific revision in our other comments. We strongly advise against selecting a different alternative and/or making the following changes to Alternative B:   1. Reducing the area available for leasing would also substantially alter Alternative B and would not reflect an appropriate range of alternatives for the purpose of NEPA; 2. Attaching more restrictive lease stipulations or required operating procedures, which are currently associated with Alternatives C, D1, and D2. The current series of accompanying lease stipulations, including no surface occupancy restrictions and timing limitations, are highly conservative and are likely to effectively avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential environmental impacts associated with activities enabled by the leasing program. The regulatory agencies, including BLM, can develop special conditions during project-specific permitting, commensurate to the scope and scale of the activity. BLM can also evaluate the need for conditions during subsequent NEPA analysis if/when development activities are proposed within the Coastal Plain, with assistance from cooperating agencies with special expertise or jurisdiction by law. |  |  |
|  | 2-3 | 15 | Martineau/  OPMP for State of Alaska | The State of Alaska supports BLM’s selection of Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative, as defined by offering the entire program area (1,563,500 acres) for lease and corresponding lease stipulations and required operating procedures, except as recommended for specific revision in our other comments. |  |  |
|  | 3-291 | 31 | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | The State’s comments on the DEIS clearly explain why the Wilderness Review conducted by the Service for the Arctic Refuge in 2015 is legally flawed. We incorporate those comments again by reference and reiterate our objection to the implication in the EIS and the response to SOA comments #19 and 20 that Section 304(g) of ANILCA granted the Service the authority to conduct a wilderness review and forward recommendations to Congress. We agree Section 304(g) of ANILCA directs the Service to identify and describe the special values of the refuge, including wilderness values, and the 2015 CCP identifies those values in section 4.1.3.5 Wilderness Qualities on page 4-14. We request the EIS replace the reference to the wilderness review “(2015c, Appendix H, Wilderness Review)” with a reference to the description of wilderness values in the CCP pursuant to 304(g) of ANILCA i.e., USFWSa, Section 4.1.3.5 Wilderness Qualities. |  |  |
|  | 3-292 | 1-4 | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | The response to comments indicates that text in the EIS was modified to clarify that ANILCA Section 101(b) applies to the Act as a whole but rejects our request to include other provisions in Section 101 that reflect Congressional intent to balance national conservation interests and the economic and social interests of Alaska and its citizens on the basis that this section is specifically about wilderness character and the other subsections of Section 101 are not relevant. We disagree with that response (SOA comment #18) but suggest an alternative to incorporate the intent of Congress into this section of the EIS. ANILCA Section 707 states “**Except as otherwise expressly provided for this Act** wilderness designated by this Act shall be administered in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness….” [emphasis added]. Immediately following the end of the first sentence, please include the following: “ANILCA Section 707 directed agencies to manage congressionally designated wilderness in accordance with the Wilderness Act, except as provided in ANILCA. The exceptions in ANILCA apply equally to those lands designated by ANILCA as wilderness and undesignated lands that have wilderness-associated values.” |  |  |
|  | 3-292 | 9-11 | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | Thank you for including the sentence that recognizes the original range purposes are in effect, except in the event of a conflict, when provisions of ANILCA and ANCSA would prevail. Please also cite ANILCA Section 305 at the end of that sentence. |  |  |
|  | 3-291 | 1-5 | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | State comments on the DEIS clearly explain why the wild and scenic river review conducted by the Service is legally flawed and we incorporate those comments again by reference. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act only affords protections to rivers identified in a congressionally directed wild and scenic river study. ANILCA did not authorize the study conducted by the Service that resulted in several rivers within and outside the project area being recommended for designation in 2015 (i.e. found suitable). ANILCA Section 1326(b) specifically prohibits studies not authorized by ANILCA or a future Act of Congress. We reiterate our objection to applying protections to rivers found suitable in the Service’s agency directed study and request any protections, conditions, stipulations or other requirements attributed to protecting wild and scenic river-related characteristics or values be removed from the EIS. |  |  |
|  | 3-295 | 13-15 | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | Maintaining our stated objection to the WSR review and resulting recommendations for the reasons provided in the State’s comments on the DEIS, the statement under Alternative A that both eligible and suitable rivers would be managed to maintain their preliminary classification as wild rivers is inaccurate. Appendix F of the 2015 CCP only applies interim management to suitable river segments “while Congress reviews and considers a river for designation” (page I-F1). We request this sentence be revised to clarify that the CCP only applies interim management to the segment of the Hulahula river found suitable in the 2015 agency-directed WSR study conducted by the Service. Also provide clarification that while the CCP provides this direction, the WSRA only provides protections for congressionally directed study rivers recommended as suitable for designation. |  |  |
|  | 3-295-297 | 17-37  1-32  1-24 | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | See above comment(s). Please remove management intent in the EIS that states or implies the status and identified ORVs for rivers determined eligible by the Service in their agency-directed wild and scenic river review must be protected. This section also repeatedly refers to the agency-directed study rivers as “WSRs,” implying they have been designated by Congress, which is inaccurate. The discussion on lines 21-24 on page 3-295 also only considers a WSR’s classification under the WSRA and ignores provisions in ANILCA that allow for development within WSRs without distinguishing between classification. We reiterate that these rivers are not designated WSRs and should not be treated as such in the EIS. Protections in the WSRA only apply to designated rivers and congressionally authorized study rivers. |  |  |
|  | 3-297 | 31-38 | Magee/ OPMP-ANILCA | This section needs to recognize that PL 115-97 repealed the prohibition in ANILCA Section 1003 and revised the refuge’s purposes, which would affect management of the 1002 area. The current description reflects management direction in the outdated CCP. This comment also applies to page 3-43, lines 26-31, and elsewhere in the EIS where similar statements are made. |  |  |
|  |  |  | Magee/  OPMP-ANILCA | The Response to Comments section does not address the State’s comment that the Tax Act did not just nullify the wilderness recommendations; it also nullified the WSR recommendations (and as noted above, this applies to all river segments found eligible and/or suitable in the Services’ 2015 study). We incorporate our previous comments by reference and to further illustrate this continuing conflict in the EIS, we add that supporting documentation for the Hulahula River in Appendix I of the 2015 CCP clarifies that designation under the WSRA would preclude oil and gas development. “Oil and gas exploration and development in the Hulahula River corridor could be impacted as a result of designation. The Hulahula River is tentatively classified as wild, and, as such, would be withdrawn from appropriation under the mining and mineral leasing laws by Sections 9(a) and 15(2) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act” (page I-79). This intent clearly conflicts with the Tax Act. We reiterate our request to remove management actions intended to protect the associated ORVs and status of all river segments found eligible and/or suitable in the 2015 agency-directed WSR study. |  |  |
|  | 1-3 | 5 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | Regarding Map Plate 1, the state concurs with the depiction of the Coastal Plain offshore boundary at Camden Bay; the state does not agree with the depiction of the offshore boundary at Brownlow Point. |  |  |
|  | 1-3 | 5-8 | Martineau/  OPMP for State of Alaska | We appreciate that BLM added this language in response to the State’s comments regarding the disputed area, which is subject to the cases currently pending before the IBLA; however, this clarification has not been carried over into Appendix A: Maps and Figures. Please clarify by identifying the disputed area as subject to State entitlement. We have provided comments identifying which figures require edits. Additionally, revisions to Pages 40-77, Maps 3-23 thru Map 3-60, Page 97/504, Map B-1; Page 109, Map B-2; Page 195, Map E-1 may be warranted. |  |  |
|  | 27/556 |  | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | The state received TA to certain townships excluding PLO No. 2214; therefore, the State is entitled to receive the area of dispute. The area of dispute must be shown on all maps and must not be leased without the state’s consent. |  |  |
|  | 9/504 | Map 1-1 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point.  Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 10/504 | Map 2-1 | DMLW / Surveys | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 2-14 (clean version) |  | Winters/  ADF&G | Lease Stipulations 7- Porcupine Caribou Primary Calving Habitat Area, Alternative B. Within the Requirement/Standard, the language states construction activities would be suspended within the Porcupine Caribou Herd primary calving habitat area from May 20 through June 20. It continues saying 'the lessee **should** submit with the development proposal a stop work plan...We recommend **should** be changed to **shall** as the word 'should' indicates submission of a plan is not mandatory, yet the point of this stipulation is in part to develop a plan to mitigate effects to calving caribou if they arrive during this time frame or earlier. Within sub paragraph a.i., **should** also needs to be changed to **shall** for the development of a vehicle use plan, vehicle use monitoring plan, and traffic speed limits. |  |  |
|  | 2-23 (clean version) |  | Winters/  ADF&G | Required Operating Procedure 9. Under the Requirement/Standard for Winter Water Use, paragraph d states: "In lakes where unfrozen water and ice aggregate are both removed, the total use would not exceed the respective 15 percent, 20 percent, or 30 percent volume calculations above, unless recharge calculations, river overbank flooding, or a connection to a stream or river indicate recharge will replenish withdrawal amounts above these limits." This requirement should be changed to: "In lakes where unfrozen water and ice aggregate are both removed, the total use would not exceed the respective 15 percent, 20 percent, or 30 percent volume calculations above, unless recharge calculations, river overbank flooding, or a connection to a stream or river indicate recharge will replenish full water withdrawal plus additional ice aggregate withdrawal amounts above these limits."  This change will avoid potential misinterpretation of this requirement whereby an operator assumes that with excess recharge potential, one could withdraw amounts of water beyond the limits if some ice aggregate is added to the withdrawal mix. |  |  |
|  | 2-30 (clean version) |  | Winters/  ADF&G | Required Operating Procedure 22. Under Requirement/Standard b., change "... developed by the USFWS Alaska Fish Passage Program (McDonald &Associates 1994)..." to "...developed by the USFWS Alaska Fish Passage Program, McDonald & Associates (1994),..." as these are two completely different references. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 53 |  | Gary Mendivil/ ADEC | New item (e) this page refers to Aqueous fire-fighting foams (AFFF) and notes that all spill must be reported to ADEC. Please modify this to have spills reported to ADEC Spill Response Division, Contaminated Sites Program. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 65 | ROP 21 | Mendivil/ ADEC | This ROP requires the use of “approved impermeable liners under gravel infrastructure to minimize the potential for hydrocarbons and other hazardous material spills to migrate to underlying ground or adjacent water resources.” While it is possible that an impermeable liner could minimize the potential for spills to migrate to underlying ground, it is not clear how an impermeable liner would prevent spills from migrating to adjacent water sources. The gravel infrastructure would be a topographic high and any spill would travel to lower ground and adjacent water sources by gravity. Please explain how an impermeable liner could prevent the migration off pad or road or remove the reference to adjacent water resources from the sentence. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 93 |  | Edwards/ ADEC | It would be helpful if this section could include a statement earlier in the section that states that more detailed air quality modeling/impact analyses will take place if/when there are actions on future projects. This may just be a question of moving the discussion to an earlier part of the section or summarizing it early in the section. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 194 | Line 18 | Mendivil/ ADEC | Discussion on this page notes that gravel may be mined in water bodies and directly adjacent to floodplains, which would alter aquatic habitats. It should also be noted that gravel mining in water bodies could also create turbidity and be subject to ADEC’s water quality standards and potentially wastewater discharge permit requirements. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 198 | Line 27 | Mendivil/ ADEC | The conclusion in the second part of the sentence regarding impacts does not follow from the setback information provided in the first part of the sentence. Please re-write to make it clearer how a lack of setbacks would lead to more pronounced impact in those areas. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 200 | Line 21 | Mendivil/ ADEC | The conclusion in the second part of the sentence regarding impacts does not follow from the forecast of increased Prudhoe Bay infrastructure. Please re-write to make it clearer how increases in Prudhoe Bay infrastructure would lead to impacts to fish and aquatics in the coastal plain area. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: PDF page 216 | 29 | Mendivil/ ADEC | This discussion proposes an impacted footprint 8.8 times larger than the total project footprint. It is not clear how the 328 feet figure was arrived at and it is also not clear what the intensity of the impacts would be at the farthest reaches of the footprint. A one-size-fits-all footprint does not make sense when addressing impact as varied as dust fallout, thermokarsting and impoundments, especially if the impacts vary by intensity. |  |  |
|  | Vol II: Appendix B PDF page 104 |  | Mendivil/ ADEC | Paragraph five mentions a “rounded groomer”. Please define. |  |  |
|  | Vol II: Appendix F PDF page 206 |  | Mendivil/ ADEC | This page includes a discussion of the social cost of carbon. Inclusion of this topic appears to conflict with the present administration’s removal of social cost of carbon through Executive Order and the June 21, 2019 CEQ draft guidance clarifying the treatment of greenhouse gas emissions under NEPA. Please explain why these directives are being ignored or modify to remove language. |  |  |
|  | Vol II: Appendix F, PDF page 213 |  | Mendivil/ ADEC | Lines 10-24 on this page mentions both the Alaska LNG project and the Alaska Standalone Project (ASAP) in the context of reasonably foreseeable future actions. It should be noted in the text that both projects would not be built because they are alternatives, so only one project would create potential impacts. |  |  |
|  | Vol II: Appendix Q, PDF page 438 |  |  | The answer to Q.R.1 on this page regarding climate and meteorology does not make sense. We are told that climate data is a gap and it is relevant to potentially significant effects, but then we are told there is no data gap. Please revise for consistency. |  |  |
|  | 3-10 |  | Martineau/  OPMP for State of Alaska | The Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Air Quality, has regulatory authority under the Clean Air Act for air quality permitting. DEC is the primary air quality permitting entity for the Coastal Plain. While BLM has performed a qualitative analysis of potential future air quality impacts associated with oil and gas leasing for the purpose of NEPA, more detailed analyses will be conducted during project-specific permitting. The following comments identify a few technical issues with BLM’s current discussion of air quality impacts, which includes conclusions that may lack adequate support or explanation in the record, so that those items can be resolved either through revision or removal of the identified language |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: Page 93  (3-11) | 31 | Trost /ADEC | Should identify that Fairbanks is nonattainment for the “24 hour averaged” PM2.5 NAAQS |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: Page 93  (3-11)  And  94 ( 3-12) | 41 and Table 3-6 | Trost /ADEC | Using the average pollutant concentration is not how data are compared to the NAAQS/AAAQS. BLM should instead use the form of the standard to calculate the pollutant value for background concentrations and the percent of NAAQS. Also the most recent data should be included, if available. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 94 ( 3-12) | 1 | Trost /ADEC | ADEC does not “report” these monitoring data, these are data from industry monitoring efforts. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 94 (3-12) | 5 | Trost /ADEC | ‘resident population’ should be replaced by “locally produced emissions” |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 95 (3-13) | 26-28 | Trost /ADEC | Four data points are insufficient to determine a data trend for regional haze. Also, since the discussion is regarding Class I area in this section, it would be good to add the trends for Denali National Park. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 96 (3-14) | 1 | Trost /ADEC | NADP stands for National Atmospheric Deposition Program, not ‘Acid’ |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 96 (3-14) | 16 | Trost /ADEC | This section should mention long range transport of pollution. Arctic Haze is a well-known phenomenon that is observed on the North Slope. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 96 (3-14) | 25 | Trost /ADEC | General Comment on Impact analysis: ‘… leases… have no direct impact….however, a lease does grant the lessee certain rights to drill…..”  Later page 3-19 the discussion on Alternatives B-D, includes information about (4) CPFs and satellite pads. Because the impacts depend on the location and relative location of all these large emissions sources, the question arises how BLM would handle the lease sale to avoid cumulative impacts prior to granting the lessee the rights to drill without having assessed if restriction on leases should be instituted. In other words, how does BLM know that adjacent or nearby leases will not result in potential development that could impact air resources without an analysis? |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 96 (3-14) | 41 | Trost /ADEC | Suggest adding a statement at the end of the paragraph that quantitative analysis may be required once a project has been proposed. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 97 (3-15) | 33 | Trost /ADEC | Include pad construction, this is a major source of PM. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 97 (3-15) | 40 | Trost /ADEC | Define short-term. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 98 (3-16) | 3 | Trost /ADEC | Include PM in primary emissions. GMT-1 and GMT-2 modeling analysis estimated concentrations of PM. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 98 (3-16) | 27 | Trost /ADEC | Explain how the scenarios for Coastal Plain compare to what was modeled in BOEM study. BOEM specifically did not study RFPs for Coastal Plain. This paragraph only discusses seismic surveys, but not exploratory drilling, development and routine operations. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 99  ( 3-17) | 1 | Trost /ADEC | PM emissions will be an issue from gravel roads during operations, not only during construction |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 99 ( 3-17) | 14-22 | Trost /ADEC | These air analyses quoted in the paragraph are not scalable to infer impacts, especially because they do not include the anticipated development in the Coastal Plain. Additionally monitoring data cannot be used to predict impacts, monitoring data is only useable to document existing conditions at a single location. The statement ‘…. It is not anticipated….’ Is not supported by these analyses or data. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 101  (3-19) | 1-4 | Trost /ADEC | The detail provided in this paragraph combined with the emissions inventory information and meteorology from the BOEM model appear to provide enough inputs to conduct a quantities analysis of low, medium and high impacts. (See ADEC comment 21.) |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 101  (3-19) | 11 | Trost /ADEC | Because BLM repeatedly mentions the BOEM model, a discussion should be included on how these clusters compare to emission sources analyzed in the BOEM model. There is no discussion of how the BOEM study relates to the proposed Coastal Plain development. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 101  (3-19) | 11 | Trost /ADEC | Add a more detailed discussion of how the emissions for three action alternatives were estimated. |  |  |
|  | 102  (3-20) | 11 | Trost /ADEC | Monitoring data is not predictive and cannot be used to infer impacts. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 102  (3-20) | 17 | Trost /ADEC | The statement: ‘… given that the Canadian border is in a non-predominant wind direction….’ is incorrect. The wind rose from Barter Island shows a bimodal wind flow regime. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 102  (3-20) | 32 | Trost /ADEC | The GMT2 SEIS cannot be used to inform cumulative impacts because GMT2 did not include a CPF, which is a major emission source. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 102  (3-20)-  103 | 38 to  12 | Trost /ADEC | This paragraph is misleading. Impacts are not scalable, and the discussion implies that the modeled impacts in the GMT2 SEIS can be compared to the Coastal Plain.  Specifically the statement: ‘Future individual development proposals on the Coastal Plain are anticipated to be similar to the scope of GMT2 project…’ is incorrect. GMT2 did not include a CPF which is a major emission source. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 103  (3-21) | 13 | Trost /ADEC | BLM cannot use the BOEM study to infer cumulative impacts, since they specifically note that study did not include any development of the Coastal Plain, as is mentioned starting line 31. The way this is written could lead the reader believe that there is an understanding of the air quality impacts. Without a quantitative analysis this may mislead the reader. |  |  |
|  | Vol 1: 103  (3-21) | 18 -24 | Trost /ADEC | The high modeled values in Utqiagvik for both the annual and 24-hour PM2.5 standard and the 24-hour PM10 standard in the BOEM study suggest that there are issues with the model that need further evaluation. While it is not unlikely that the gravel roads lead to PM10 exceedances, the modeled PM2.5 levels are alarmingly high and seem inconsistent with empirical information. Without further model review and verification, ADEC recommends removing this section from the document. |  |  |
|  | 2-6 | Table 2-3, Row 1, column Alternative D | Noel/  DNR | Item f., vii.: Change Angunwill River to Angun River; there is no Angunwill River in Alaska. |  |  |
|  | 2-24-25 | Table 2.3 | Noel/  DNR | ROP 10, item d: Distinguish ringed seal measures from polar bear measures. Before item d. add Ringed seal mitigation measures for nearshore activities. |  |  |
|  | B-19 | Lines 34-35 | Noel/  DNR | Neither gas pipeline project being pursued by the State of Alaska would transport liquid natural gas. The pipeline from the North Slope would transport natural gas in a gaseous state. Remove “liquid” as a modifier to natural gas transport pipeline. Gas would be liquified in a Liquid Natural Gas facility in southcentral Alaska for potential export to Asian markets. |  |  |
|  | ES-4 | Line 27 and line 30 | Frank/  DNR | Oil and gas resource estimates presented in the executive summary are mean values and should be described as such. Please make the following corrections:  Line 27: The program area contains an estimated mean of 7.687 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil and 7.04 trillion cubic feet (TCF) of technically recoverable natural gas (Attanasi 2005). [insert “mean of” before “7.6.87 billion barrels”] Line 30: The US Energy Information Administration estimated that a total mean of approximately 3.4 billion barrels of oil (BBO) would be produced in the Arctic Refuge by 2050 (Van Wagner 2018). [insert “mean” after “total”] |  |  |
|  | 19 |  | Henry Brooks/  DNR | Saline water would not be used on this area as most vegetation is not used to it; so it would be fresh water from de-salination that would be used for building ice roads and pads. |  |  |
|  | 19 |  | Henry Brooks/  DNR | More consideration needs to be given to water reservoir like constructs such as abandoned gravel mines or actual man-made water reservoirs. |  |  |
|  | 10/504 | Map 2-1 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 11/504 | Map 2-2 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 12/504 | Map 2-3 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 13/504 | Map 2-4 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 14 | Map 2/5 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 15 | Map 2-6 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 16 | Map 2-7 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 17 | Map 2-8 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 18 | Map 3-1 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 19 | Map 3-2 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 20 | Map 3-3 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 21 | Map 3-4 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 22 | Map 3-5 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 23 | Map 3-6 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 24 | Map 3-7 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 25 | Map 3-8 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 26 | Map 3-9 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 27 | Map 3-10 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 28 | Map 3-11 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 29 | Map 3-11 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 30 | Map 3-13 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 31 | Map 3-14 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 32 | Map 3-15 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 33 | Map 3-16 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 34 | Map 3-17 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 35 | Map 3-18 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 36 | Map 3-19 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 37 | Map 3-20 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 38 | Map 3-21 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | 39 | Map 3-22 | Orange-Posma  /DMLW | SOA disagrees with the depiction of the offshore Coastal Plain boundary at Camden Bay at Konganevik Point and at Brownlow Point. The area depicted as “subject to only standard terms and conditions” at Brownlow Point is currently leased by the state. Negotiations for an administrative lease line must occur between BLM and SOA prior to lease sale. The area of dispute referencing IBLA 2016-109 and IBLA 2017-55 must be depicted and labeled as state land. |  |  |
|  | --- | --- | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Appendix S: Public Comments and BLM Response attributes all comments submitted by an organization to a single individual, presumably the signatory of the comment letter. It would be more accurate to use the first and last name fields only for members of the public representing only themselves, and to use the organization name fields for entities that provided a collective response based on the collaborative effort of many individuals. |  |  |
|  | S-17 | 19 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-44 | 50 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-51 | 65 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-86 | 127 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-86 | 128 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-137 | 288 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-170 | 413 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-170 | 414 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-170 | 415 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-170 | 416 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-170 | 417 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-170 | 418 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-171 | 419 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-171 | 420 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-171 | 421 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-172 | 422 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-172 | 423 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-172 | 424 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-172 | 425 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-172 | 426 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-172 | 427 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-173 | 428 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-173 | 429 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-173 | 430 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-173 | 431 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-173 | 432 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-173 | 433 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-223 | 30 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-224 | 31 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-224 | 32 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-224 | 33 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-224 | 34 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-258 | 87 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-326 | 126 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-326 | 127 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-327 | 128 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-337 | 161 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-363 | 9 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-363 | 10 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-436 | 150 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-489 | 8 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-510 | 19 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-510 | 20 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-510 | 21 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-510 | 22 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-510 | 23 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-511 | 24 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-529 | 13 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-538 | 6 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-628 | 11 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-630 | 18 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-652 | 67 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-655 | 2 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-663 | 22 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-663 | 23 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-663 | 24 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-709 | 38 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-709 | 39 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-729 | 15 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-735 | 46 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-752 | 42 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-776 | 68 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-796 | 10 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-834 | 61 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-838 | 72 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-838 | 73 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-839 | 74 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-840 | 75 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-841 | 76 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-842 | 77 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-843 | 78 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-844 | 79 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-845 | 80 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-848 | 96 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-884 | 128 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-961 | 254 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-961 | 255 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-961 | 256 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-961 | 257 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-961 | 258 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  | S-1045 | 88 | Martineau/  OPMP for  State of Alaska | Request all entries that are currently attributed to Faith Martineau/Alaska Department of Natural Resources be corrected to show State of Alaska as the commenting entity. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | END |  |  |