

Administrative Final EIS, for BLM and Cooperating Agency Review**To BLM and Cooperating Agency Reviewers:**

The **Administrative Review Final EIS**, is intended for BLM and cooperating agency review. (Please do not distribute.)

- Please complete the MSWord comment matrix (provided at the end of these instructions) by saving this file with a new file name including your last name (for example, name your comment matrix “I40L6318F0003_AdminFinalEIS_BLM-agency-cmnts_20190722_HayesN.docx”), and then fill out your comments on the document.

How to Provide Valuable Feedback**Commenting:**

For each comment, please fill in the following information under the appropriate column heading in the matrix:

- ✓ Page number, line number, or table number on which you are commenting. **The page and line numbers in the PDF file MUST be used.**
- ✓ Your comments:
 - **Your comments must be specific and provide exact changes to the text.** Please be unambiguous, clear, and directive, with exact wording changes stated. Ambiguous comments, such as “What?,” “Poor,” or “Is this right?,” are not helpful and will not be considered.
 - If you have the same comment more than once, do not refer back to a previous comment number. Instead, please copy and paste your comment to a new row in the matrix and provide the specific page number, etc.
 - If you need additional space for comments, click in the table cell where you would like to comment, select the *Table* menu, *Insert*, and either *Rows Above* or *Rows Below*.
- ✓ Reviewers should keep this in mind, and constructive comments should focus on the following:
 - Adequacy of addressing the purpose and need.
 - Missing information, such as tribal, local and state planning documents or other readily-available data.
 - Inconsistencies between stipulations and required operating procedures in the alternatives.
 - Adequate illustrations of the alternatives in the maps.
 - Adequacy and appropriate level of direct, indirect, and cumulative impact analysis. Provide specific changes to improve analysis and note any gaps in logic.
 - Consistency of impact analysis between resource topic areas.

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
1.	3-55	42	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>ALLOCATING THE 2000 ACRES</p> <p>New language inserted by BLM: “The approach for allocating the 2,000 acres of allowable production and support facilities will would be described in the Detailed Statement of Sale accompanying the Notice of Sale for the first lease sale. Allocations will would be based on the sizes of similar North Slope developments.”</p> <p>COMMENT: At the time of the first lease sale prospective development size is not known. Only after exploratory and delineation drilling, several years later, will potential for development be understood. And at that time the lease owner will decide about development concept—which could be either legacy Prudhoe design (sprawling, cheaper, larger footprint, more gravel) or current NPRA design (tighter packed, like offshore platforms, more expensive, smaller footprint, less gravel). This new clarification by BLM does not address how orderly, competitive development of the resource will be assured in the granting of surface acres. If acres are granted too early in the leasing/planning/development process, especially if granted to oversized speculative development plans or to operators unwilling to bear the expense of small cramped pad development, there will be few acres among the 2,000-acre limit left for remaining development.</p>		
2.	S-6	22	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>RECLAIMING THE 2000 ACRES</p> <p>“...until reclaiming land with production and support facilities <u>is determined to be adequate</u>, the acreage of such facilities would continue to count against the 2,000-acre limit. Also, while it is true that once development occurs the land can never be returned to an undisturbed wilderness state, when production and support facilities are removed, and <u>land is fully reclaimed</u> it can once again contain wilderness values.”</p> <p>COMMENT: There is no standard referenced or articulated for either “adequate” reclamation or “fully</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**



BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				reclaimed” for lands previously covered by gravel. Also, these terms could be in conflict; “adequate” means good enough while “fully reclaimed” points to a higher standard. Without non-subjective clarity on reclamation, especially as the 2000 acres get fully subscribed and developers are looking towards the next round of recycled acreage, BLM cannot assure orderly and competitive development of the resource.		
3.	S-6	38	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>ELEVATED FACILITIES AND THE 2000 ACRES</p> <p>“...Section 20001(c)(3) of PL 115-97, which explicitly includes in the 2,000-acre limit ‘piers for support of pipelines.’ This demonstrates that Congress intended to count only those portions of elevated pipelines that touch the ground, that is the piers that hold up elevated pipelines. Had Congress intended to include the entire width and length comprising elevated pipelines, in Section 20001(c)(3) it would not have called out only a portion of elevated pipelines—the piers—as applying against the 2,000-acre limit. <u>By extension</u>, the BLM assumes that Congress would have given similar treatment to elevated structures, such as drill pads and processing facilities, had those been specifically addressed in Section 20001(c)(3); however, oil and gas operators no longer commonly use elevated structures on Alaska’s North Slope.”</p> <p>COMMENT: There is a significant difference between a single elevated arctic pipeline (Figure 1) and an elevated arctic piperack with a dozen or more closely spaced pipelines (Figure 2) or an elevated arctic building with no gravel pad below (Figure 3). A single elevated arctic pipeline is a long linear structure on piers touching the tundra in few places and casting a small line shadow on the tundra below. In contrast, an elevated arctic piperack and an elevated arctic building are both large areal extensive structures on piers touching the tundra and casting long and wide shadows on it. Page S-8 implies a recognition of this phenomenon: “[T]he 2,000-acre</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**


BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<p>limit is not intended apply to lands in the greater disturbance area that experience such indirect impacts from production and support facilities. Instead, the limit applies only to that portion of land comprising the facility footprint: that land experiencing a direct loss of habitat from being covered by the facility.” In light of the significant differences, the BLM should not assume by extension that Congress would have treated elevated structures in the same manner as elevated pipelines. To BLM’s last point about elevated structures no longer being used on the North Slope—as recently as the Alpine expansion project, extensive elevated base camp buildings and warehouses have been installed well past the edge of the base camp gravel pad directly impacting the tundra below.</p> <p>Figure 1 – single elevated arctic pipeline</p>  <p>Figure 2 – elevated arctic pipeline rack</p>  <p>Figure 3 – elevated arctic buildings with no gravel pad</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M ¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
						
4.	S-7	19	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>SNOW AND ICE FACILITIES</p> <p>BLM fails to address the piers that support snow fences which are installed on the tundra to prevent snow drifting on gravel pads and pipeline alignments. Snow fences can be hundreds of feet long and hundreds of feet away from roads and pipelines, so they are separate and distinct facilities with direct impact on the tundra.</p>		
5.	S-8	34	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>TRACKING AND ENFORCEMENT OF FACILITY ACREAGE</p> <p>“BLM authorizations for constructing production and support facilities <u>would contain acreage limits</u> for those facilities.”</p> <p>COMMENT: BLM does not say how it will determine “acreage limits” for facilities. If there are no arbitrator and rules, developers could submit the cheapest, most gravel-intensive designs possible, which would tie up the 2000-acre gravel inventory, preventing competitive orderly development of the resource.</p>		
6.	S-8	37	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>TRACKING AND ENFORCEMENT OF FACILITY ACREAGE</p> <p>BLM fails to address gravel footprint creep due to snow clearing and maintenance practices, which can push significant volumes of gravel out of the right of way and onto virgin tundra. BLM proposes to review as-built</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				information post-construction to verify acreage limits but does not propose a summer monitoring plan to address creep.		
7.	S-9	I	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>TRACKING AND ENFORCEMENT OF FACILITY ACREAGE</p> <p>“...on <u>completion of facility operations</u>, operators must submit for the BLM’s approval an abandonment and reclamation plan. The plan must contain steps to ensure ecosystem restoration of the land’s previous hydrological, vegetation, and habitat condition. After the BLM determines that <u>completed reclamation under an approved plan is adequate</u> and in compliance with the plan, it would subtract the associated facility acreage from the total cumulative footprint of all production and support facilities that count against the 2,000-acre limit.”</p> <p>COMMENT: BLM fails to define “completion of facility operations.” This completion could be reached as soon as a defined economic limit is reached for the facility or as late as the last single well remains producing (or suspended for evaluation). In the latter case, the operator is just keeping the “lights on” to defer a significant abandonment expense, thereby preventing efficient recycle of the 2000-acre gravel inventory. In addition, BLM fails to articulate non-subjective criteria for “adequate reclamation” which could occur as early as mere gravel removal or as late as validating through one full growing season that the ecosystem has been restored to the land’s previous hydrological, vegetation, and habitat condition.</p>		
8.	S-53	II	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>SPRAWLING NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT NOT DEPICTED</p> <p>“At the leasing stage it is unknown as to where leases will be issued, where exploration will occur, and, if oil and gas resources are discovered in economic quantities, where development would occur.</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				Accordingly, a spatial depiction could mislead the public into assuming the developments would occur in the depicted areas.” COMMENT: The EIS quantifies probable volumes of total hydrocarbons for the lease area, probable areas within the lease area of high, medium and low resource potential, probable acres of gravel mines, probable size and through-put for processing facilities, probable drainage areas for drill sites, etc. A probable spatial depiction of development is merely the stitching together of all the probable elements BLM has already outlined. BLM is applying a dual standard of concern about misleading the public until hydrocarbons are discovered if all the elements can be described but not the composite.		
9.	S-660	9	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	PROPOSED PRODUCTION LEVELS Original comment was that BLM presents only a single hypothetical development scenario consisting of three Anchor fields producing a minimum of 400 MMBO each. Mean and potential maximum production rates are not presented, nor are the mean and maximum number of corresponding Anchor fields. BLM responded that “Production rates in the timeline of this document are limited by the time it takes to construct infrastructure and bring wells on-line as wells as the 2000-acre surface disturbance cap. Total production amounts over the life of the fields in ANWR could easily reach estimates.” COMMENT: This response by BLM does not address the concern.		
10.	S-701	5	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	ELECTRICAL POWER LINES “Power will run on VSMs with pipelines so overhead power lines will not be installed.” COMMENT: Is this an assumption or a requirement? ROP 33, regarding as-built mapping requirements, envisions overhead powerlines being developed, “Roads, pipelines, and power lines may be represented as line features but must include ancillary data to denote such		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				data as width and number of pipes. Poles for power lines may be represented as point features.” Also, past North Slope practice has been to limit the capacity of power lines, strapped-on pipes, and VSM’s to 64 kV and below.		
11.	S-703	13	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>DEPICTING INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>“There is not enough information available to accurately predict development locations nor infrastructure at this time.”</p> <p>COMMENT: While it is true there is not enough information available at this time to accurately predict exact development locations, a depiction of the nature and scale of development infrastructure and its probable location is possible. The EIS quantifies probable volumes of total hydrocarbons for the lease area, probable areas within the lease area of high, medium and low resource potential, probable acres of gravel mines, probable size and through-put for processing facilities, probable drainage areas for drill sites, etc. A probable spatial depiction of development is merely the stitching together of all the probable elements BLM has already outlined and overlaying it in the identified area of most likely hydrocarbon reserves. The whole point of the RFD is “...to examine a maximum scenario for development to disclose the greatest impacts that might occur...” (S-705 Row 21).</p>		
12.	S-704	16	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>NEPA REVIEW REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>“Instead of the sketch [EIS Anchor Field schematic], geospatial modeling of roads, pipelines, facilities, and disturbance areas associated with full field development should have been presented.”</p> <p>BLM responds “At the leasing stage it is unknown as to where leases will be issued, where exploration will occur, and, if oil and gas resources are discovered in economic quantities, where development would occur. Accordingly, a spatial depiction could mislead the public into assuming the developments would occur in the depicted areas.”</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				COMMENT: While it is true there is not enough information available at this time to accurately predict exact development locations, a depiction of the nature and scale of development infrastructure and its probable location is possible. The EIS quantifies probable volumes of total hydrocarbons for the lease area, probable areas within the lease area of high, medium and low resource potential, probable acres of gravel mines, probable size and through-put for processing facilities, probable drainage areas for drill sites, etc. A probable spatial depiction of development is merely the stitching together of all the probable elements BLM has already outlined and overlaying it in the identified area of most likely hydrocarbon reserves.		
13.	S-707	28	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>SERVICE CENTERS</p> <p>In response to the Tribes' comment that the BLM must consider the impact of industrial support centers, the BLM stated "It is unlikely that an industrial support center similar to Deadhorse would be constructed because the projected size of 1002 Area development will not be large enough to support this type of center and because Deadhorse is close enough to provide the required support. Other North Slope developments similar to probable Coastal Plain developments, such as Willow and Point Thomson, have not developed their own industrial support centers."</p> <p>COMMENT: North Slope Oil Field Service Centers include, 1) well service support facilities (eline, slickline, CTU, work over rigs, vac trucks, well service shops, etc.); 2) construction and maintenance equipment rentals (cranes, heaters, lights, front end loaders, etc); 3) valve and specialty turbine maintenance shops, and so on: and 4) base camps to house these specialty workers. All North Slope Oil fields require these services for field development. Point Thompson is a simple gas/condensate field and has only one drill pad and a handful of wells, so</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				its service needs are small and are combined with base operations. Thus, it is not a representative analogy. Willow has yet to be developed so Conoco's plans for service support have not been decided. Deadhorse is 60 miles to the east and not accessible by gravel road. BLM needs to 1) describe why it believes Deadhorse is close enough to provide economic year-round support, and 2) compare the projected size of development it believes would require a Service Center with the size and number of wells in its multiple Anchor Field scenario.		
14.	S-708	32	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>GAS FLARING</p> <p>BLM responded that "Flaring or venting would only occur in situations where an equipment failure prevents re-injection or there is danger of equipment becoming over-pressurized."</p> <p>COMMENT: All flare systems require pilot gas and a lit flare to be able to reliably flare large volumes of gas when called on. Therefore, BLM needs to be clear that at CPFs a flame will always be visible—just larger during a flaring event.</p>		
15.	S-709	39	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>SERVICE CENTERS</p> <p>The Alaska Department of Natural Resources commented that "One item that seems to be missing in the development scenario is the likely need for extensive support facilities and services necessary for successfully operating an oilfield. This oilfield supply complex (essentially a 'Deadhorse East') would likely include drilling contractors, equipment rental contractors, well testing, fuel storage, drilling mud storage, equipment maintenance facilities, and camp facilities. Additional pad space will be required for these facilities and operations."</p> <p>BLM's response "With a 2,000 acre limit for disturbance, support facilities of this magnitude are likely to be located outside of the Coastal Plain."</p> <p>COMMENT: BLM's response is unsupported. Nothing would prevent the first developer in line for a gravel</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				allotment from the 2000 total acres from including extra gravel pad needs for a service center.		
16.	S-714	54	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	GRAVEL PAD SIZES “The BLM uses development pad models and facilities based on the smaller footprint in NPR-A as well as CD pads at Alpine and proposals for Plikka and other State of Alaska projects.” COMMENT: What would prevent a developer from requesting gravel acres based on the historic larger footprint designs that use proven technology and are more inexpensive?		
17.	S-714	55	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	PROPOSED PRODUCTION LEVELS BLM stated “Within the timeframe of this document, the rate of production is limited by the rate at which wells and other infrastructure can be installed and the 2000 acre disturbance cap. Producing 10 BBO would take much longer and require more infrastructure than producing 1.5 BBO.” COMMENT: BLM fails to support this assertion with an actual production rate profile, and corresponding plot of gravel acres consumed, within the timeframe of the document.		
18.	S-368	10, 13	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	BLM has not changed the definition for “Cultural Resource” on page 4 of the Glossary chapter of the Preliminary Final EIS despite BLM saying they changed it in Rows 10 and 13 of the Cultural Resources Response table in Volume 3. Here are some definitions for “cultural resources” from guidance documents for federal agencies that BLM can use to update their definition: BLM (2017) <i>Handbook of Guidelines and Procedures for Inventory, Evaluation, and Mitigation of Cultural Resources</i> . Electronic document,		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<p>https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/uploads/Programs_Cultural_HeritageandPaleontology_WhatWeManage_Colorado_Handbookrevised03-2017.pdf, accessed July 24, 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Resource or Cultural Property: “a definite location of human activity, occupation, or use, normally greater than 50 years of age, identifiable through field inventory, historical documentation, or oral evidence. The term includes archaeological, historical, or architectural sites, structures, places, or sites or places with important public and scientific uses, and may include definite locations (sites or places) of traditional cultural or religious importance to specified social and/or cultural groups (cf. “traditional cultural property”). Cultural resources are concrete, material places and things that are located, classified, ranked, and managed through the system of identifying, protecting, and utilizing for public benefit described in laws, regulations, and the BLM Manuals” (BLM 2017:3). <p>Ball, David, Rosie, Clayburn, Roberta Cordero, Briece Edwards, Valerie Grussing, Janine Ledford, Robert McConnell, Rebekah Monette, Rober Steelquist, Eirik Thorsgard, and Jon Townsend. (2015) <i>A Guidance Document for Characterizing Tribal Cultural Landscapes</i>. US Department of the Interior, BOEM, Pacific OCS Region, Camarillo, CA. OCS Study BOEM 2015-047. http://www.boem.gov/2015-047/, accessed July 24, 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Resources: “broad array of stories, knowledge, people, places, structures, and objects, together with their associated environment, that contribute to the maintenance of cultural identity and/or reveal the historic and contemporary human interactions with an ecosystem” (Ball et al. 2015:28). 		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<p>US Fish & Wildlife Service (2016) 614 FW 1 <i>Overview of Managing Cultural Resources</i>. Natural and Cultural Resources Management, Part 614: Cultural Resources Management. Electronic document, https://www.fws.gov/policy/614fw1.html, accessed July 24, 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cultural Resources</u>. “Cultural resources is a general phrase that describes a wide variety of resources, including, but not limited to, archaeological sites, isolated artifacts, features, records, manuscripts, historical sites, and traditional cultural properties. Cultural resources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (1) Archaeological Resources. An archaeological resource is any material remains of past human life or activity more than 100 years old that is of archaeological interest (also see 43 CFR Part 7.3). ○ (2) Historic Property. Historic property is any significant or important cultural resource, prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places. This includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. ○ (3) Objects of Antiquity. An object of antiquity is any object of historic or archaeological interest protected by the Antiquities Act and 43 CFR Part 3. ○ (4) Cultural Items. Cultural items are Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony that can reasonably be associated with a Native American Indian tribe, Native Hawaiian, or Alaska native organization, or individual descendants of Native Americans. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 and its implementing regulations define cultural items. 		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (5) Traditional Cultural Property. Traditional cultural properties are properties that are associated with the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, arts, crafts, or social institutions of a living community. These properties are eligible for the National Register (see section 1.6H). ○ (6) Sacred Sites. A sacred site is any specific, discrete, narrowly delineated location on Federal land that is sacred by virtue of its established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion. A Native American tribe or an individual who is an appropriately authoritative representative of a Native American religion identifies these sites. ○ (7) Heritage Assets. A heritage asset is a collectible or non-collectible property with intrinsic historic, architectural, cultural, or archeological value. <p>(8) Cultural Landscapes. A cultural landscape is a geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources) associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. It can include historic sites, historic designed landscapes, vernacular landscapes, or ethnographic landscapes.”</p>		
19.	S-369	15	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>In their comments on the DEIS, the Tribes stated, “Excluding locations with Indigenous place names is a significant data gap that the BLM must address. For example, one Gwich'in place name in the Program Area is Sallute (Point Collinson).” In Row 15 of the Cultural Resources Response table in Volume 3, BLM responded:</p> <p>“The alternatives in the EIS were developed in collaboration with cooperating agencies, and through cultural data shared during public and/or government-to-governments meetings. For example. Lease Stipulation 1, is designed in part to protect traditional use areas, camping locations, etc., however, the specific sites are not provided in a map.”</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<p>BLM's response does not address our comment that the EIS does not include locations with Indigenous place names in the analysis. Appendix L tabulates the cultural resources in the Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (AHRS) and Traditional Land Use Inventory (TLUI). BLM needs to tabulate the known locations with Indigenous place names in the Program Area. The US Army Corps of Engineers was able to tabulate and incorporate place name data into their EIS for the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project; there is no reason BLM cannot include known place name data in this EIS. Failing to include locations with Indigenous place names doesn't meet EIS methodology and scientific accuracy (40 CFR 1502.24) since the regulations state that "Agencies shall insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements." As the U.S Army (2017:27)* states in regard to EIS methodology and scientific accuracy, "All analyses must use accepted scientific approaches, using an exact, objective, factual, and systematic or methodological basis. Again, the analysis should be objective, systematic, accurate, precise, and consistent." Relying on limited data is not "accurate, precise, and consistent" which raises scientific accuracy concerns.</p> <p>* US Army (2017) <i>Guide to Environmental Impact Analysis</i>. Electronic document, https://www.dau.mil/cop/armyesoh/DAU%20Sponsored%20Documents/Guide%20to%20Environmental%20Impact%20Analysis%20-%202017.pdf, accessed January 29, 2019.</p>		
20.	S-872 to S-873	81-83	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>In their comments on the DEIS, the Tribes stated:</p> <p>"[T]he BLM must assess impacts equally to all communities that rely on these migratory animals. This means assessing the twenty-two Alaska communities and</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<p>seven Canadian communities reliant on the PCH using the same methods with comparable data. Having equal analyses relies on having comparable data sets. The DEIS, by its own acknowledgement, lacks comparable subsistence data for Arctic Village.”</p> <p>In Rows 82 and 83 of the Subsistence Comment Response table in Volume 4, BLM responded, “This leasing EIS utilizes the best available information.” The term “best available information” does not appear in the implementing regulations NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508) or in statute (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347). NEPA regulations do state “The information must be of high quality. Accurate scientific analysis, expert agency comments, and public scrutiny are essential to implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500.1(b)).” BLM (pages 3-248 – 3-249) states repeatedly subsistence data are “limited” for Arctic Village and Venetie. BLM also deleted footnote 43 (page 3-249), which stated “ADFG, the primary repository for subsistence harvest data in Alaska, removed these data from their Community Subsistence Information System due to data quality issues.” Upon deleting footnote 43, BLM include the subsistence data with “quality issues” in the agency’s analysis. BLM using “limited” subsistence data and subsistence data with “quality issues” does not meet the “information must be of high quality” (40 CFR 1500.1(b)) standard in NEPA. BLM must conduct subsistence “baseline studies” now to inform this EIS process instead of waiting for “on-the-ground activities [requiring] additional NEPA analysis to ... determine which baseline studies may be necessary (Preliminary FEIS Vol 4 Subsistence Comment Response Table Rows 82 and 83).</p>		
21.	3-226	23-24	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: “Issuance of oil and gas leases . . . would have no direct impacts on the environment because by itself a lease does not authorize any on the ground oil and		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				gas activities.” This fails to consider the long-term and cumulative impacts of leasing.		
22.	3-227	24	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS repeatedly uses the term “Native corporations” in reference to ANCSA corporations. This term is legally inaccurate and highly inappropriate. Corporations chartered pursuant to the ANCSA are not <i>native</i> corporations. They are not chartered under tribal law, they are not chartered by tribal governments, and they are not owned by tribal governments. ANCSA corporations are not tribes. They are federally chartered corporations, incorporated under Alaska state law. The EIS must be revised to correct every instance of “Native corporation” to “ANCSA corporation.”		
23.	3-229	37-38	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Why would the BLM authorize seismic testing in areas of the Program Area that are unavailable to lease sales? Is this out of spite to those opposed to the oil and gas program? What is the utility of this?		
24.	3-230	11-13	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>The EIS states: “. . . associated with several indigenous groups including the Inuit groups (Inupiat in Alaska and Inuvialuit in Canada) as well as the Athabaskan group of the Gwich'in people.” This statement must be revised as follows:</p> <p>“. . . associated with several indigenous groups, including Inuit (Inupiat in Alaska and Inuvialuit in Canada) and Gwich'in (in both Alaska and Canada).”</p> <p>Athabascans are not a group of the Gwich'in; Gwich'in are a group of Athabascans. Furthermore, the use of the term “as well as” implies that the Gwich'in cultural connection to the Program Area is not as strong as the Inuit connection.</p>		
25.	3-230	14-15	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: “The Kaktovikmiut (i.e., Inupiat of Kaktovik) are the current indigenous inhabitants of the program area.” While this statement is true, it serves as a means to undercut the Gwich'in connection to the		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				Program Area. This statement is unnecessary in this paragraph, and in the EIS's analysis, as physical proximity to an undertaking has no bearing on a tribe's connection to the area or its rights under NEPA/NHPA. See 36 C.F.R. § 800.2(c)(2)(ii). An additional statement must be included after this sentence acknowledging the Gwich'in's (particularly Arctic Village and Venetie) connection to the Program Area, otherwise, this statement is highly misleading and, like the rest of the EIS, implies the Gwich'in connection to the Program Area is secondary and less important.		
26.	3-230	15-24	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Despite the Tribes providing the BLM with extensive source materials, including ethnographic interview transcripts, the BLM refuses to acknowledge any of these sources as informing its evaluation of impacts to cultural resources. This is not surprising, however, as this section's analysis demonstrates that the BLM did not actually consider any of the information the Tribes provided.		
27.	3-230	28-34	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM fails to include Indian Sacred Sites, Executive Order No. 13,007, 61 Fed. Reg. 26,771 (May 24, 2019), in its list of laws and EOs relevant to cultural resource management. The BLM is well aware that the Gwich'in view the Program Area as sacred and that this EO is therefore relevant.		
28.	3-232	9	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The Tribes approve of the BLM's removal of the phrase "by coastal people," as the Gwich'in traditionally and historically traveled, traded, and hunted within the Coastal Plain. These Tent Ring complexes may also indicate Gwich'in trading camps. This must be reflected in the EIS.		
29.	3-232	18-20	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM has not consulted with the Tribes regarding any DOE evaluations for historic properties within the Program Area, as required by 36 C.F.R. § 800.4(c)-(d); it		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				is therefore hard to understand how the BLM is making these DOEs.		
30.	3-232	27-28	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The Tribes have submitted extensive documentation of their traditional and historic use, occupation, and travel with the Coastal Plain. The EIS must reflect this historical fact.		
31.	3-233	3-4	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Graves cannot be presumed to be Kaktovikmiut, as the Gwich'in historically traveled extensively within the Coastal Plain. This statement must be revised accordingly.		
32.	3-235	23-26	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The Section 106 process has not involved consultation to identify and document "ethnographic resources" or to apply the adverse effects criteria. This statement that they will be addressed in accordance with the 106 process is false. Since they have not been addressed thus far, the BLM has failed in its obligation to undertake a legally sufficient Section 106 process. The BLM <i>must</i> consider the programmatic effects of the leasing program and landscape wide resources, including cultural landscapes, and this analysis must inform the development and selection of alternatives. See 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.1 (c), 800.6(a). This never happened.		
33.	3-236	2-13	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Coastal erosion exacerbated by climate change is not the only climate change-caused impact to cultural resources that will occur in the Program Area. The Tribes have identified the PCH itself is a cultural resource as well as a contributing element to the Sacred Place Where Life Begins cultural landscape. As such, climate change impacts (exacerbated by the oil and gas program) will directly impact the PCH and these cultural resources, by changing migratory patterns, access to calving grounds habitat, and availability of food. If the PCH is affected by these, or other climate change-related impacts, the Gwich'in will experience impacts to their cultural resources.		
34.	3-236	15-16	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: "Issuance of oil and gas leases . . . would have no direct impacts on the environment because by itself a lease does not authorize any on the ground oil and		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				gas activities.” This narrow analysis is legally inaccurate. Direct effects to historic properties include those that are long term, farther removed, and cumulative. 36 C.F.R. § 800.5(a)(1). Furthermore, direct effects do not have to physically impact a resource for them to be direct. See ACHP, <i>Court Rules on Definitions; Informs Agencies on Determining Effects</i> (June 10, 2019), https://www.achp.gov/news/court-rules-definitions-informs-agencies-determining-effects ; <i>National Parks Conservation Association v. Semonite</i> , 916 F.3d 1075 (D.C. Cir. 2019). The Program Area is sacred, therefore, the knowledge that Sacred Place Where Life Beings is being leases is a direct impact on the cultural resource as it is a desecration of a sacred place.		
35.	3-237	40-41	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	This is a significant, fundamental failing of the BLM in the Section 106 process. These resources <i>must</i> have been documented and considered at this point in the process. “When a “management plan” commits the agency to a decision regarding the use of resources or the location of a project, the agency has restricted the availability of alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects. In other words, the “management planning” constitutes an undertaking with the potential to affect historic properties that must be preceded by Section 106 compliance.” ACHP, <i>When Do Project Planning Activities Trigger a Section 106 Review?</i> (June 28, 2019), https://www.achp.gov/digital-library-section-106-landing/when-do-project-planning-activities-trigger-section-106-review		
36.	3-238	12-14	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The fact that the BLM states consultation “ <i>will occur</i> ” demonstrates that the BLM has not fulfilled its Section 106 obligations.		
37.	3-238	9-12	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: “[G]iven the information currently available and the undetermined location and nature of development in the program area, potential impacts on		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				traditional belief systems/religious practices and other ethnographic cultural resources, such as TCPs and cultural landscapes, particularly for the Gwich'in people, would be adverse, regional, and long term." This statement is deeply disturbing, and should have informed better how the BLM undertook this process. The BLM's acknowledgment of these impacts in light of its continued disregard for them is deeply troubling.		
38.	3-242	12	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS fails to acknowledge that the PCH itself is a cultural resource as well as a contributing resource to the Sacred Place Where Life Begins cultural landscape. The EIS fails to analyze impacts to the PHC has impacts to cultural resources—this is a significant failure.		
39.	3-243	41	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: "Kaktovik residents are the primary subsistence users of the program area." This is not true. The PCH is the primary subsistence resources for the Gwich'in of Arctic Village and Venetie. That they are located outside of the Program Area does not mean it is any less important or that they are not subsistence users of the program area. The BLM's insistence of marginalizing the Gwich'ins' reliance on the Program Area and the PCH as subsistence (as well as cultural) resources is shameful and a blatant attempt to minimize its analysis of the oil and gas program's impacts on Arctic Village and Venetie.		
40.	3-247	18	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Arctic Village residents and the Gwich'in do not only "consider" caribou to be their most important substance resource, it is their most important subsistence resources. Again, the BLM is attempting to minimize the Gwich'ins' reliance on the PCH and the Program Area in an attempt to avoid taking a hard look at the oil and gas program's impacts on the Tribes.		
41.	3-249	13-14	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM is well aware of the importance of caribou and the reliance Arctic Village has on the PHC has their primary subsistence resource. The fact that ADF&G does not have complete subsistence data for Arctic Village		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				does not excuse the BLM from analyzing subsistence impacts on the community. The BLM should have, in consultation with the tribes, obtained the data from the community in order to actually develop an informed analysis of the impacts. Simply stating, "we can't find any data, so we don't have to do any analysis" is grossly inappropriate. At a minimum it violates NEPA, as well as the BLM's trust responsibility to the Tribe. The BLM was obligated to procure this data for the EIS.		
42.	3-250	19	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	As with Arctic Village, the BLM was obligated to collect the subsistence data it needed to conduct a thorough and meaningful analysis of subsistence impacts on Venetie. ADF&G's lack of data is not an excuse for the BLM to avoid taking a hard look at these impacts.		
43.	3-252	35	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	These impacts also affect the PCH as a cultural resource.		
44.	3-254	29-30	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Kaktovik is not the only primary subsistence user of the Program Area. Again, the BLM is attempting to minimize the Gwich'ins' reliance on the PCH and the Program Area in an attempt to avoid taking a hard look at the oil and gas program's impacts on the Tribes.		
45.	3-354	35-36	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM was obligated to obtain this information in order to undertake a meaningful analysis of the impacts.		
46.	1-2	7-8	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	BLM should delete this statement or specifically explain how the alternatives account for the other purposes of the Refuge. The BLM's assertion that the alternatives were designed to account for all purposes of the Refuge is not supportable in light of the development-focused alternatives that fail to provide meaningful protections for wildlife and other ecological resources.		
47.	1-8	20	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM should include information about the timeline and delays associated with the translation of the DEIS. Because of the delay in funding, the Tribes were unable to translate the entire DEIS, and the translation of selected sections of the DEIS was not available until March 10, 2018—three days before the DEIS comment deadline.		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				The Tribes requested that the BLM extend the comment period to provide sufficient time to produce an accurate and understandable translation. The Tribes also informed the BLM that not extending the comment period to provide sufficient time for translation would severely hinder the participation of tribal members and other Gwich'in people who speak Gwich'in as their first and often only language. The BLM ignored the Tribes' requests. By excluding information about delays in funding, the EIS provides an incomplete and misleading account of the translation efforts.		
48.	2-1	16-18	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>The BLM should reconsider its selection of Alternative B as its preferred alternative. Alternative B makes the most acres available for lease and provides the least protection for biological and ecological resources. The BLM's selection of Alternative B reflects its disregard for the concerns raised by the Tribes throughout the NEPA process. The Tribes have raised with the BLM the critical importance of the Coastal Plain to the Porcupine Caribou Herd for calving and post-calving. The Tribes have also explained the significant adverse impacts development in the Coastal Plain would have on the herd and the Tribes. Yet the BLM failed to consider an alternative that provided meaningful protection for the calving and post-calving habitat. Now, the BLM has identified the least protective of these inadequate alternatives as the preferred alternative. Selecting Alternative B sends a clear message that BLM views consultation with the Tribes' as a mere box-checking exercise and has no intention of meaningfully considering the Tribes' comments and concerns.</p> <p>BLM should also reconsider selecting Alternative B, an alternative with no conservation value, in light of the conservation purposes of the Refuge. An oil and gas</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				leasing program must be consistent with the Refuge's preexisting purposes. Though the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (Tax Act) added the purpose of an oil and gas leasing program, the statute did not prioritize the oil and gas purpose over the existing Refuge purposes. See Pub. L. No. 115-97, § 20001(b)(2)(b). Identifying Alternative B as the preferred alternative is antithetical to the Refuge's conservation purposes and reflects BLM's refusal to substantively address the Refuge's other purposes in the development of the oil and gas program.		
49.	2-49	14-15	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	BLM states that "There are several lease stipulations and required operating procedures that do not allow waivers, modifications, or exceptions." The BLM should specifically identify the stipulations and required operating procedures that do not allow waivers, modifications, or exceptions. And the BLM should consider including a table that identifies whether each stipulations and required operating procedure allows waivers, modifications, or exceptions.		
50.	3-305	23-26	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM should not delete the statement, "Because of the particular spiritual and cultural importance of the coastal plain and PCH calving grounds to the people of Arctic Village and Venetie, any disruption to that herd or contamination or degradation of calving grounds in the program area would have potential sociocultural impacts on the Gwich'in people, in terms of their belief systems and cultural identity." This statement was deleted in response to a comment received from Voice of the Arctic Inupiat during the public comment period, stating "This statement seems to suggest that the Gwich'in people of Arctic Village and Venetie have more of a spiritual and cultural claim to the Coastal Plain than the Kaktovikmiut. VOICE hopes that the BLM will realize the cultural insensitivity of such statements, of which there are many		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				in the EIS, and work to correct it for the Final EIS. As has been stated ad nauseam elsewhere, the Kaktovikmiut are the actual residents of the Program Area and, as stated in the DEIS, can trace their roots to this area back 14,000 years. You cannot rewrite this history and the primary importance of this land to the people of Kaktovik; it is insulting, irresponsi-ble, and colonialist. The EIS must be based on subjective facts, not objectivity.” (S-494 Row 20). In the record, there is extensive published anthropological research demonstrating the Gwich’in people’s cultural and historical reliance on the Coastal Plain. The deletion of this statement does not reflect proper reasoned decision-making based on the record before the agency. Instead, BLM’s deletion of this statement reflects decision-making based on political pressure.		
51.	3-306	32-34	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM should explain the statement “Alternatives D1 and D2 would include additional design features meant to address impacts on subsistence resources and users, and more consultation with tribal governments on design features, timing, development methods, and access (see ROP 34 for example).” BLM provides ROP 34 as an example but ROP does not address consultation with tribal governments. ROP 34 provides that “Proposed aircraft use plans would be reviewed by the appropriate Alaska Native or subsistence organization.” This should be revised to include tribal governments. When an action will affect a tribe, including impacts on tribal members’ subsistence activities, the federal government has an obligation to consult with the tribe on a government-to-government basis. The statement that “more consultation” will occur under some alternatives disregards the sovereign status of tribes, the federal government’s obligations to tribes, and the unique relationship between the federal government and tribes.		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				This statement should be revised to make clear that the amount of government-to-government consultation does not change based on the selected alternative.		
52.	3-308	1-2	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>BLM should not delete the statement “the action alternatives would constitute a disproportionate, adverse impact on the environmental justice communities of Arctic Village and Venetie.” BLM deleted this statement in response to comments asking it to clarify its findings, address why other communities were not included in this finding, explain how the finding was consistent with the ANILCA 810 evaluation, and provide mitigation measures consistent with CEQ guidelines. (S-496 Row 23; S-497 Row 26; S-500 Row 35; S-501 Row 36). Rather than address the disproportionate impacts on other communities and provide mitigation measures consistent with CEQ guidance, BLM simply deleted its finding of a disproportionate adverse impact on Arctic Village and Venetie. This deletion disregards the extensive information that the Tribes have provided to the BLM about the importance of caribou to the Tribes and their members.</p> <p>The BLM states that the environmental justice finding was corrected to make it consistent with the ANILCA 810 evaluation. (S-496 Row 23; S-497 Row 26; S-500 Row 35; S-501 Row 36). The environmental justice finding should not be changed to comport with this flawed analysis or the unsupportable conclusion that there will be no significant restriction on subsistence uses for the communities of Arctic Village and Venetie. Instead, the BLM should revise its subsistence analysis and ANILCA 810 evaluation, as the Tribes requested in their comments on the DEIS.</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				The CEQ's guidance on environmental justice analysis under NEPA directs agencies to undertake the analysis in a manner that recognizes and respects the sovereign status of tribes and the unique relationship between tribes and the federal government. Specifically, the guidance states that "Agencies should seek tribal representation in the process in a manner that is consistent with the government-to-government relationship between the United States and tribal governments, the federal government's trust responsibility to federally-recognized tribes, and any treaty rights." Council on Environmental Quality, Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act 9 (1997). The guidance also states that "Where environments of Indian tribes may be affected, agencies must consider pertinent treaty, statutory, or executive order rights and consult with tribal governments in a manner consistent with the government-to-government relationship." <i>Id.</i> at 14. The BLM's environmental justice analysis fails to adhere to this guidance. The BLM's continued failure to meaningfully address concerns raised by the Tribes or incorporate information provided by the Tribes reflects the agency's disregard for the Tribes' sovereign status. The BLM's deletion of a statement about the cultural and spiritual importance of caribou to the people of Arctic Village and Venetie (FEIS at 3-305), in response to a comment received during the public comment period (FEIS S-494), is a telling example of BLM's disregard for the government-to-government relationship in its environmental justice analysis and the overarching NEPA process.		
53.	3-320	25-29	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	BLM should clarify and provide rationale for the statement that "While executive or administrative enabling actions for existing units of the Arctic Refuge		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				<p>system are still in effect, in the event of a conflict, the provisions of ANILCA and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act prevail. As such, there are limits to the applicability of the original Arctic Refuge purposes, especially in relation to the new refuge purpose to establish oil and gas leasing in the Coastal Plain.” The BLM should make clear that the Tax Act did not prioritize the oil and gas purpose over the Refuge’s preexisting purposes. Though there is tension between the new oil and gas purpose and the preexisting purposes, the oil and gas purpose must be undertaken in a manner that accounts for the Refuge’s preexisting purposes. The BLM cannot manufacture conflict to improperly prioritize the oil and gas program.</p> <p>BLM’s use of the language “especially in relation to the new refuge purpose to establish oil and gas leasing” suggests that the applicability of the original purposes established in Public Land Order 2214 is somehow particularly limited in relation to the oil and gas purpose. The BLM should clarify and explain why the oil and gas purpose would be treated differently in relation to the original purposes than other purposes established in ANILCA.</p>		
54.	3-348	5-7	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	<p>Instead of pointing readers to another section, the BLM should describe the potential economic impacts associated with the impacts on subsistence activities. Excluding a discussion of the economic dimensions of the impacts on subsistence in Economics subchapter contributes to the subchapter’s overemphasis on the potential beneficial economic impacts of oil and gas development and the underrepresentation of the potential adverse economic impacts.</p>		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
55.	3-348	7-8	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM should remove “likewise” from the beginning of the sentence “Likewise, potential impacts on recreational resources could have impacts on businesses that provide recreational activities in the area.” This sentence is immediately preceded by a description of potential impacts on subsistence. The word “likewise” inappropriately comports impacts to subsistence activities with impacts on recreation.		
56.	3-348	10-12	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM’s should include a more detailed description of the impacts to the non-use and passive values of the Coastal Plain, and its other ecosystem services values. Though the BLM recognizes that the ecosystem values of the Coastal Plain would be diminished by oil and gas leasing and development activities, the agency makes no attempt to describe how these values would be diminished or the level of impact on these values.		
57.	3-358	17-23	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Arctic Village, Venetie, and other communities that depend on the Porcupine Caribou Herd should be included in the discussions on food security and food sharing. Though the BLM acknowledges that Arctic Village and Venetie consider caribou a primary food source, both communities are excluded from the discussions about food security and food sharing.		
58.	3-364 3-368	17-19 13-16	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM should provide more analysis of the potential public health impacts to the communities outside the program area that harvest migratory species that rely on the program area. In the Public Health subchapter, the few references to communities outside the program area that harvest migratory species are brief and downplay the likely impacts to these communities. The BLM should address the public health impacts associated with adverse impacts to migratory species, including increased stress and anxiety about food security and contamination of wild		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				foods. The BLM should also address the public health impacts to these communities associated with leasing and development in the Coastal Plain, including stress and fear for their way of life and cultural identity.		
59.	3-370	22-23	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Throughout the EIS, the BLM refers readers to other EISs for a more complete discussion of potential impacts or effects. Instead, the BLM should fully describe and analyze the impacts in the EIS. Excluding this detailed information from the EIS provides an incomplete and misleading picture of the potential impacts of oil and gas activities.		
60.	S-368	9	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	In response to the Tribes' comment that the Section 106 process has not informed BLM's development, evaluation, and selection of alternatives, the BLM stated that it "considered means to protect all key resources, including cultural resources. A primary component of alternatives development was providing for protection of the area the Gwich'in identify as Iizhik Gwats'an Gwandaii Goodlit through protection of the caribou calving and post-calving areas." The BLM's own development of protections is not a substitute for using the Section 106 process to inform the development, evaluation, and selection of alternatives. Furthermore, the BLM has not provided meaningful protections for calving and post-calving habitat, an issue that the Tribes have repeatedly raised with the BLM.		
61.	S-370	21	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The Tribes disagree with the BLM's assertion that "All statutory obligations have been met, and will continue to be met through the EIS process." The Tribes have repeatedly raised with the BLM specific instances where it is failing to live up to its obligations under the NHPA and NEPA.		
62.	S-372	27	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	In response to the Tribes' comment that the BLM must analyze previously documented sites as contributing		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				features to districts and landscapes, the BLM stated that “environmental baseline will be preserved throughout the lease sale process. Any on-the-ground activities will require additional NEPA analysis. At that time, BLM will determine which baseline studies may be necessary.” The BLM’s response does not address the concern raised in the Tribes’ comment, which relates to evaluating existing information, not conducting additional baseline studies.		
63.	3-260	26-31	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	It is good to know that the BLM does not value traditional knowledge. The BLM must do more that acknowledge what the traditional knowledge is, but incorporate it into its analysis. It is patronizing, condescending, and ethnocentric to value “Western” “scientific” observations and analysis over the centuries of observation and analysis by Alaska Natives.		
64.	3-263	20	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Impacts to subsistence resources would also affect public health (mental and physical) as well as food security and village economies. The BLM’s failure to acknowledge this indicates its resistance to taking a hard look at the actual impacts of development on Gwich’in communities.		
65.	3-280	27	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	No one is “enrolled” in an ANCSA corporation. They are not tribes; therefore, it is impossible for anyone to be enrolled in them. People are <i>shareholders</i> . These are very different things. This must be revised. The BLM’s lack of understanding about the differences between tribes, native corporations, and ANCSA corporates is disappointing.		
66.	3-271	9-11	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: “The Inupiat of Kaktovik (Kaktovikmiut) are the primary users of the program area and have a strong cultural and subsistence ties to the area, considering themselves the stewards of the program area.” This statement is grossly inappropriate and either needs to be removed or modified to acknowledge the Gwich’in		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				peoples' connection to and use of the Program Area. The BLM's attempt to minimize the Gwich'in's connection to the Program Area and reliance on it and its resources is shameful and an attempt to avoid taking a hard look at the impacts of oil and gas development on Arctic Village and Venetie. This, and other statements like it, are not supported by the record and reflect efforts by the BLM to kowtow to political pressure and censor references to and analysis of impacts on Gwich'in communities. The Tribes have repeatedly provided the BLM with documentation of the connection to and reliance on the Program Area, making its exclusion of the Gwich'in arbitrary and capricious.		
67.	3-271	11-12	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS states: "Thus, the Inupiat are most likely to experience sociocultural impacts associated with development of the program area." This is false. The Gwich'in of Arctic Village and Venetie will face cataclysmic sociocultural impacts from development within the Program Area. The BLM's refusal to acknowledge this is further evidence of its efforts to suppress any analysis or acknowledgement of these impacts. The BLM's refusal to take a hard look at the sociocultural impacts to the Gwich'in of Arctic Village and Venetie is arbitrary and capricious and indicative of the political agenda driving this analysis.		
68.	3-271	13	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The Gwich'in will face <i>direct</i> , as well as indirect and cumulative, effects from development.		
69.	3-275	4	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The BLM's contempt for the Gwich'in is further evidenced by the fact that it spends less than a page documenting the history of the Gwich'in, while the BLM spends over 3.5 pages documenting the history of the Inupiaq and Inuvialuit. Additionally, the BLM's discussion of Gwich'in history fails to discuss the Gwich'in's historic and traditional use of, occupation, and travel through the Coastal Plain, despite the anthropological, historical, and oral tradition sources the Tribes provided to the BLM on		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
				this subject. The BLM's refusal to acknowledge this history is indicative of its broader attempts to minimize the Gwich'in's connection to and reliance upon the Program Area in an effort to avoid having to take a hard look at development's impact on Arctic Village and Venetie.		
70.	3-279	23	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Again, the BLM fails to acknowledge how the Gwich'in were semi-nomadic people prior to settlement in the modern-day villages of Arctic Village and Venetie. The BLM also fails to acknowledge the vast historic territory of the Gwich'in, which encompassed the Coastal Plain. This, despite the Tribes repeatedly submitting sources detailing this history to the BLM. The BLM's refusal to acknowledge this history is indicative of its broader attempts to minimize the Gwich'in's connection to and reliance upon the Program Area in an effort to avoid having to take a hard look at development.		
71.	3-281	2-3	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The Tribes are not "members" of the Gwich'in Steering Committee. The Gwich'in Steering Committee is not a membership organization or a tribal consortium. This statement must be removed from the EIS.		
72.	3-287	1-14	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	The EIS improperly implies that these beliefs are part of the past, thereby devaluing their importance and relevance today.		
73.	3-289	16-17	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	It is not true that the "majority of sociocultural effects" would affect Kaktovik. Any negative impact to the PCH would devastate the sociocultural systems in Arctic Village and Venetie. The EIS's insistence on downplaying these effects on Arctic Village and Venetie is indicative of the BLM's broader attempts to minimize the Gwich'in's connection to and reliance upon the Program Area in an effort to avoid having to take a hard look at development.		
74.	3-291	14-16	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Reduced harvests and increased reliance on store-bought food would mean higher rates of food insecurity, greater public health (physical and mental) impacts, and economic hardship.		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified

**COASTAL PLAIN OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

BLM and Cooperating Agency Comments on Administrative Final Review EIS

Cmt #	Page #	Row # or Line #	Reviewer Name/ Agency	Comment	A/R/M¹	Remarks / How Resolved (Reviewers: Leave this column blank)
75.	3-294	17-19	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Again, the BLM attempts to minimize impacts to Arctic Village and Venetie by insisting that only Kaktovik will be impacted by development. The Program Area is of "particular importance . . . to their cultural identity and subsistence livelihood."		
76.	3-298	4-5	AVC-NVVTG-VVC	Development in the Program Area will not result in "strong local economies" for Arctic Village and Venetie. The EIS must acknowledge that there will be no economic benefit to these communities, and not portray all Native villages as the same. To the contrary, development has the potentially to destroy the local subsistence economies in Arctic Village and Venetie.		

¹ A = Comment accepted; R = Comment rejected with explanation; M = Comment-response modified