

**CHAPTER 7**  
**PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DEIS**



## Chapter 7 Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 7 Public Comments and Responses on the DEIS</b> .....	7-1
7.1 Public Comments.....	7-1
7.1.1 Introduction .....	7-1
7.1.2 Demographics .....	7-1
7.1.3 Comment Analysis .....	7-2
7.2 Comments and Responses.....	7-3
7.2.1 General Revisions to the FEIS .....	7-3
7.2.2 Public Comments and BLM Responses.....	7-4

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 7.1-1 Demographic Codes .....	7-2
Table 7.1-2 Comment Type Codes .....	7-2
Table 7.2-1 Comments and Response.....	7-5

### LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 7A DEIS Comments

This page intentionally left blank.

# Chapter 7 Public Comments and Responses on the DEIS

## 7.1 Public Comments

### 7.1.1 Introduction

The Notice of Availability for the Long Canyon Project draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published in the Federal Register on March 21, 2014 at which time the 45-day comment period commenced and ended on May 5, 2014. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) held three public comment meetings, one on Tuesday, April 15, 2014 at the Wendover Community Building, 112 South Moriah Avenue, Wendover, Utah; one on Wednesday, April 16, 2014 at the Elko Convention Center, 700 Moran Way, Elko Nevada; and one on Thursday, April 17, 2014 at the Wells City Hall, 525 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Wells, Nevada.

A total of 34 agencies, businesses, organizations, and interested parties provided comments on the DEIS via mail and email. All comments on the DEIS that were received were read and given careful consideration. Each comment was included in a comprehensive database, analyzed for its content, and appropriate responses were prepared. In some cases, the comments provided information or suggested changes that were incorporated into this Final EIS (FEIS).

### 7.1.2 Demographics

Demographic coding in the database helps to form an overall picture of who is submitting comments, where they live, their general affiliation with various organizations or government agencies, and the manner in which they respond. Demographic coding allows managers to identify specific areas of concern linked to respondent categories, geographic areas, and response types.

Although demographic information was captured and tracked in the comment database, it is important to note that the consideration of a public comment is not swayed by demographics. Every comment and suggestion has value, whether expressed by one or many respondents, and whether or not the comment originates from an address local to the project. All input was considered, and the analysis team attempted to capture all relevant public concerns in the analysis process.

As shown in Table 7.1-1, the majority of commenters (47 percent) are located in Elko County with an additional 20 percent originating elsewhere in Nevada, 9 percent from Utah, and 24 percent from other states or unknown locations.

Comments were received from various organizations and unaffiliated individuals. Commenters included a variety of local businesses, federal, state and local government agencies, mining industry representatives, as well as unaffiliated individuals and others.

**Table 7.1-1 Demographic Codes**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Geographic Area</b>	<b>Number of Commenters</b>
ELKNV	Elko County, Nevada	16
EURNV	Eureka County, Nevada	0
WPNV	White Pine County, Nevada	0
LANNV	Lander County, Nevada	0
OTHNV	Other Nevada, Nevada	7
UT	Utah	3
OTHER	Other	2
UNK	Unknown	6

The form of comments (letter and email) was also tracked. Letters represented 47 percent of all comments received while 53 percent were received via email.

The comments are provided electronically as Appendix 7A.

### 7.1.3 Comment Analysis

Each comment letter was reviewed, comments were identified, and a type code was assigned to each comment to indicate the associated resource or concern so that comments could be sorted and responded to by the appropriate resource specialists.

Table 7.1-2 contains a list of comment type codes that were used to indicate each comment's associated resource or concern.

**Table 7.1-2 Comment Type Codes**

<b>Code</b>	<b>General Issue Category</b>
ALT	Alternatives to Proposed Action (development or additional)
AQ	Air Quality
CE	Cumulative Effects
CR	Cultural Resources
ECO	General Ecological Resources
EJ	Environmental Justice
GEO	Geology and Minerals
H&S	Public Health and Safety
HAZ	Hazardous Materials and Waste
HRS	Wild Horses
INF	Request for additional information
LUA	Land Use and Access
MISC	Miscellaneous
MIT	Mitigation
NAC	Native American Concerns
NEG	General comment, negative, non-substantive

<b>Code</b>	<b>General Issue Category</b>
NS	Noise
OOS	Out of scope
P&N	Purpose of and Need for Project
PA	Proposed Action
PAL	Paleontological Resources
POS	General comment, positive, non-substantive
PRO	Process (comments referring to scoping or NEPA process)
PSP	Power Supply Pipeline
RCL	Reclamation
REC	Recreation
RNG	Range Resources
SD	Special Designations (including wilderness, WSAs, ACECs, DWMAs, etc.)
SOC	Socioeconomics
SOIL	Soil Resources
SSS	Special Status Species (plants and animals)
TRAN	Transportation
VEG	Vegetation (not including listed or special status species)
VR	Visual Resources
WET	Wetland and Riparian
WLF	Wildlife (not including listed or special status species) and Wildlife Habitat
WTR	Water Resources

## 7.2 Comments and Responses

### 7.2.1 General Revisions to the FEIS

Additions and revisions are reflected in this FEIS in response to comments received on the DEIS and are briefly discussed below.

Details regarding the use of the water from Big Spring, and the Cities' water supply well, and the mine production well were revised. This information in relationship to the groundwater modeling and impact analysis were updated.

Protections for groundwater beneath the pit were added.

Post-closure cover systems and management methods to prevent infiltration of water through the waste rock storage facility (WRSF), tailings storage facility (TSF), and heap leach facility were clarified and details regarding disposition of infiltration water were added.

Post-reclamation monitoring of groundwater and surface water was expanded.

Geochemistry Table 3.2-3 was updated and clarified.

The exploration acres were added into the Proposed Action.

A discussion of the socioeconomic benefits of hunting was added.

Additional environmental protection measures for visual resources and night skies were added.

The mule deer seasonal use map was updated with more recent data.

The right-of-way (ROW) widths used in the Power Supply Screening Study were revised.

Updates to the wildlife mitigation section for greater sage-grouse were completed.

Updates to the mitigation for the National Historic Trails were completed.

Updated wildfire mapping was used in the cumulative section and revisions based on the new mapping were completed throughout the cumulative section.

Additional Appendices were added to the FEIS to support the document. This includes the updated Power Supply Screening Study (Appendix 2B), Mitigation Plan (Appendix 2C), and Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy (Appendix 2D). Appendix 3F of the DEIS, the Supplemental National Trails System Information, was removed as this analysis will take place as part of the programmatic agreement.

### **7.2.2 Public Comments and BLM Responses**

Table 7.2-1 presents all of the specific comments that were received on the DEIS. It includes the comment letter number, commenter name, the specific comment, and the BLM's response to the comment. Commenters had the option of requesting anonymity; the names of those who requested it appear blacked out in the comment table. Of note, although some typos and spelling errors have been corrected, comments were generally transcribed verbatim in order to retain the originality of the comments received. Appendix 7A presents all of the comment letters or emails in their entirety.

In responding to comments, every effort was made to address all questions, concerns, and other points presented by the commenter. The "Response" provided by BLM, in many cases, refers to information already contained in the DEIS, and provides an explanation or clarification using this information to respond to the comment. Where the comment has resulted in a change in the FEIS narrative, this is indicated in the BLM response. The responses also note where statements are made that are not specific comments on the DEIS.

The Letter/Comment ID No. in Table 7.2-1 correspond to the comment number listed on the top of each original comment letter. These original comment letters are located in Appendix 7A.

**Table 7.2-1 Comments and Response**

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
1	1.1	Jean Public	I am totally against any building of this gold mine project in Nevada. They use harshly toxic substances to get gold out of the ground. It is destruction for the area so that is cannot be lived in for 100 years for any other purpose. This destruction of American land needs to stop. This is national land and needs to be protected from this destruction. This comment is for the public record. Please receipt.	NEG	Comment noted.
2	2.1	Jean Public	This is a gold mine from Newmont which has been in trouble in other places in the world for pollution. I don't think this profiteer should be allowed to mine in America at any site at any time. I think a complete investigation should be made of the work this corporation has been doing in all sites and if there are pollution complaints, that corporation should not be allowed to work in the USA or anyplace at all. America has been too easy on polluters. Gold mining is horribly poisonous. It poisons the water so that nothing is ever usable for hundreds of years. This is not a good use of national land. This should not be permitted. BLM, as usual, is not operating in the best interests of this country in dealing with this polluter. I am definitely against this company operating in this site. I think the company itself should be investigated. This comment is for the public record. Please receipt.	NEG	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
3	3.1	Ashley Collins	<p>I know there are many views on Mining. I for one remember when Elko county and the surrounding counties were ranching as the main source of income. Times change, although mining and ranching go hand in hand these days, with Newmont also owning ranches! I believe it shows that Newmont also cares about the land and what the ranching means to Northeastern Nevada. I have seen the good that Newmont does for our communities, what they do to restore the land after the mining process. The fact that they provide jobs for many people. Also most people do not realize that Long Canyon will be in Elko County, compared to being in Eureka and Lander County. Long Canyon will continue to provide income for Elko County. If I have sent this to the wrong email could you please forward it as the address that was listed in the most current issue of the Elko Daily Free Press informed me it was invalid. Thank you for your time.</p>	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
4	4.1	Ron Richardson, Newmont Mining Corporation	<p>I am currently employed with Newmont Mining Corporation as a Senior Chemist. I have worked for Newmont for the past eight years. During my time with Newmont, I have been impressed with the Environmental Stewardship of the company. Newmont has a very well qualified group of individuals that work in our Environmental department and I have all the confidence in the world in them. I feel that the Long Canyon project should be approved to operate between Wells and Wendover Nevada. Why you ask, Newmont has a proven track record of outstanding exploration, operation, and closures in the state of Nevada winning numerous awards over the years because of their commitment to its people and the environment. Several other reasons to approve this DEIS would be the 400 to 500 added jobs this will create to this already weak economy with a mine life right now of 10 plus years. This new proposed mine site will be a clean site as there will not be any mercury emissions on site because all of the carbon processing will be done at the Carlin Nevada Gold Quarry Mine where they have a state of the art mercury emission system in place. The mine will not affect the deer migration as they will work with NDOW to make sure the migration corridor is in-tact. As for the sage grouse concerns, they will be at least four miles away from the proposed pit. As mentioned above, I would like to see Newmont continue to make a positive difference in this state by providing jobs and mining the way they have in the past. This is currently being done by maintaining a high level of social and environmental standards.</p>	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
5	5.1	Glen Wadsworth	Just a note as a follow up about the discussion we had on the fourteen (14') feet buffer zone between the water table and the pit bottom. Who will be assigned to monitor the maintaining of the fourteen feet horizon/elevation?	WTR/MIT	Newmont will use surveying equipment and machine mounted high precision GPS units to monitor ground elevations. GPS equipment to be used at Long Canyon will have centimeter accuracy. Special care will be taken while mining the 5700 bench to maintain the buffer. Continuous elevations will be known and tracked by Newmont's Mine Engineering Department. Static water levels will be measured quarterly on selected wells to monitor groundwater elevations in the vicinity of the pit.
5	5.2	Glen Wadsworth	How often are the elevations going to be taken to maintain the designated fourteen feet horizon/elevation?	WTR	See response to Comment 5.1.
5	5.3	Glen Wadsworth	Is there going to be a continuous stratigraphy (hard copy) profile that will show the fourteen feet horizon/elevation as ore is removed from the pit?	PA	See response to Comment 5.1.
5	5.4	Glen Wadsworth	What will be the deviation of the bottom profile after blasting, plus or minus yard/feet/inches?	PA	Newmont will use surveying equipment and machine mounted high precision GPS units to monitor ground elevations. GPS equipment to be used at Long Canyon will have centimeter accuracy. As mining activities near a buffer zone elevation, special care will be taken to maintain the established buffer. A one-foot +/- deviation would be expected following blasting and mining.
5	5.5	Glen Wadsworth	What will be the remediation/consequence, if any, if the buffer zone shrinks to less than the fourteen feet?	WTR	See responses to Comments 5.1 and 5.4.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
5	5.6	Glen Wadsworth	What will have to take place, when and if, they discover higher grade ore below the fourteen feet buffer?	OOS	Any changes or deviations from the approved PoO would require amendments to the PoO and State operating permits.
5	5.7	Glen Wadsworth	What is to prevent back fill using overburden to maintain the fourteen feet buffer thickness?	PA	See response to Comment 5.6.
5	5.8	Glen Wadsworth	Will an independent party have the right to inspect the integrity of the buffer zone?	MISC	State and Federal Agency personnel conduct routine compliance inspections during mining operations.
5	5.9	Glen Wadsworth	Will the Cities have access to printed data with respect to the buffer zone and elevations?	MISC	Upon written request, this information can be provided to the Cities.
5	5.10	Glen Wadsworth	What method(s) are the elevations going to be determined and what will be the accepted percent error?	PA	See response to Comment 5.1.
6	6.1	Charlie Myers	Elko County is in receipt of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Newmont Long Canyon Mine Project. Elko County is in full support of the Newmont proposed action as outlined in North Facilities Alternative as outlined in Section 2.3 and development of the proposed Power Supply Pipeline and route. Elko County encourages the BLM to support and implement the North Facilities action to the fullest extent possible to ensure that the Newmont Long Canyon Mine is authorized and is developed to its potential as outlined. Elko County is opposed to the Proposed Action as outlined in Section 2.2 and the No Action Alternative.	POS/ALT	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
6	6.2	Charlie Myers, Elko County Board of Commissioners	Elko County has developed an agreement with Newmont U.S.A. to maintain public access to adjacent public and private lands in perpetuity. Newmont U.S.A. has granted fee title easement along the existing Big Springs Ranch Road   Goshute Valley Road   Elko County Road 790 in exchange for temporary road closure through the proposed Long Canyon project. This partnership and Newmont USA's commitment to maintain and ensure multiple uses on federally managed public lands will assist Elko County with the acquisition of a formal easement crossing public lands assuring un-fragmented access to the California Trail and Hastings Cutoff.	TRAN	Comment noted.
6	6.3	Charlie Myers, Elko County Board of Commissioners	Elko County believes that Newmont has exceeded the requirements of NEPA and all other Federal, State and Local statutes and requirements with the development of the DEIS and should proceed as written to the Final Environmental Impact Statement and ultimately the Record of Decision granting the development of and production of the long Canyon Mine and facility.	POS	Comment noted.
7	7.1	Kem Kough, Pequop Ranch	I am writing in response to your letter 3809 (NVE0300) regarding the Long Canyon mine. I have long advocated protecting the beautiful Six Mile Canyon and its watershed and as such I am opposed to the development of the Long Canyon mine without a commitment to protect the Six Mile Canyon. Now obviously by now you are thinking this DEIS is about Long Canyon and not Six Mile, but I believe the two are linked. Agnico Eagle is doing exploration drilling in the very area I am talking about and the word is that they are finding pockets or ore but nothing worth establishing a separate mine. Here is my biggest fear Whitney: by failing to protect Six Mile Canyon now the logical progression would be for Newmont to acquire Agnicos claims and because the mill is in a place destroy a beautiful canyon for a few pockets of	NEG/OOS	Comment noted. Further development beyond the Proposed Action and what is discussed as reasonably foreseeable actions in the cumulative analysis is beyond the scope of this document.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>gold. I know that if there were a lot of gold in Six Mile there is no way we could protect it, but what if the proximity of Newmont's leach pads make what would be otherwise a marginal investment (mining Six Mile Canyon) a viable option. Again you are probably thinking, Ken this DEIS is about Long Canyon, but I can't help but think about the story about the camel that got his nose in the tent and how useless it would be to oppose that action later. I have inside information that Newmont would like to turn the Pequops into a mining district like Carlin and I am opposed to that. BLM's charter is to manage public lands and protect them. To me this is an opportunity to do both. We can oversee the development of the Long Canyon mine in an environmentally responsible way and protect adjacent lands for generations to come. The Newmont managers I have met seem to be responsible and sensitive to the community and the environment, however they also have a responsibly to their shareholders. Unless the BLM steps in to protect the surrounding land, I would expect them to mine the pockets of ore in six mile canyon even if the economic feasibility of the mine is dependent on the main trend in Long Canyon. Don Andersen, John Powell and Jeff White at Newmont know my feelings on this subject and I guess by now you do as well. Thank you.</p>		
8	8.1	Paul Bottari	<p>I am a local businessman in Wells, Nevada and I feel this project will be a very positive venture for our area. It will certainly provide jobs and help create a bit of growth in our town which has been needed for a long time. Please register these comments in support for the project.</p>	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
9	9.1	Doug McLennan	<p>My name is Doug McLennan and I live on the south side of Murdock Mountain which is north of the mine. My concerns about the mine are about the impacts on the air quality both with particulates and the night sky or light pollution. Both of these concerns impact what are some of the most important qualities that the upper great basin has to offer which is clean air and one of the best night skies left in the United States. From our place we cannot directly see where the pit is going to be because of a ridge but can see where the tailing piles and other parts of the project that are on the valley floor. I know there are minimum standards for air pollution but I would hope you would aim higher than that and put in your plan statements about conservation, fuel consumption and just having diesels idling all day. As you have probably already found out the roads in this part of the country turn into a very fine dust that is very light and will just blow away if it is not watered down or sealed. It also gets into machinery and air cleaners and causes maintenance problems.</p>	AQ	<p>The National Ambient Air Quality Standards provide limits on criteria pollutants, including particulates, to protect the public health of sensitive populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly. In addition, these standards provide public welfare protection, including protection against decreased visibility and damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings. The mine emissions have been shown to be below these limits using air dispersion modeling and the maximum potential to emit from all sources of pollution. There are permit requirements to keep fugitive emissions controlled on roadways. The mine will be required to water or seal roadways on a regular basis to meet this limit.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
9	9.2	Doug McLennan	Probably my biggest concerns are with light pollution. Nothing that I saw in your meeting addressed night sky lighting and I don't think Nevada requires it. As I drive across the state there are very few dark areas anymore and the mines that are all across the state look like they are small cities in the distance. I think that many have used night sky lighting but not down lighting so you can see their lights from miles away. Please make all lighting full cutout for night sky and down lighting so that it is less intrusive on your neighbors. There is supporting research that shows that wildlife need the darkness, that the dark sky seems to help cut the daytime pollution and if done correctly can save in operating cost. This type of lighting can be done at about the same cost if planned during the construction and still provide a safe working environment. Throw in the extra bonus of a higher quality of life when you can actually see the stars and it would seem that it would be worth it to all parties. I would hope that you spend some time on how you handle the lighting of this project and protect one of last places that has a night sky that we can brag about.	VR	Impacts on night sky resources, including dark skies and the ability to view stars, meteor shows, and other astronomical features or phenomena are described for the Proposed Action Alternative on page 4-132 of the DEIS. Impacts of light intrusion (unwanted lighting) in areas outside of the mine site are also addressed on this page for the Proposed Action Alternative. Impacts on night sky resources and light intrusion from the North Facilities Alternative are described on page 4-139 of the DEIS.
10	10.1	Owen Wright	I am a part owner of 40 acres, 8 to 10 miles due northeast of the proposed mine. I do not oppose the new operation in principle but I request safe guards against dust and light pollution be required. The operator's property rights end where mine begin, so to speak, and I do appreciate my starry nights on Murdock Mountain.	AQ/VR	Newmont has committed to environmental protection measures for dust and light pollution as outlined in Sections 2.2.18.1 and 2.2.18.13 of the DEIS.
11	11.1	Jeffrey Joyce	The alternate plan is better from my point of view. Better environmental protection and better public access to the southern end of the mountains.	ALT	Comment noted.
11	11.2	Jeffrey Joyce	Is there any way to allow access to the Big Springs during bird migrations for observation and photography?	LUP	Access will be restricted due to Mine Safety and Health Administration Regulation Requirements.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
12	12.1	Matthew Fein	I support the conclusions reached in the Long Canyon EIS and support a swift granting of all necessary permits to Newmont so that construction of the mine can begin as soon as possible.	POS	Comment noted.
13	13.1	Peter Turlington	I support the conclusions reached in the EIS. This operating site will have minimal environmental impact. The labor growth and successful sustainability of the gold mining industry in Nevada is dependent upon the development of this opportunity. I one hundred percent support the mine.	POS	Comment noted.
14	14.1	Lee Kreutzer, National Park Service	Appendix 3F, Section 1.1 of the DEIS provides the National Trail System Act's statement of purpose for national historic trails. However, the summary omits a key phrase from that statement: "the identification and protection of the historic route and its historic remnants and artifacts for public use and enjoyment." Please consider including that information, as it is a primary authority for federal protection of national historic trails.	CR	This appendix has been removed from the FEIS as the indirect effect analysis to cultural resources and the National Trail System will be completed separately as outlined in the programmatic agreement.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
14	14.2	Lee Kreutzer, National Park Service	The appendix also should note, here or in another appropriate section, that 1) the portion of the California NHT that transects the project area is designated as the Grantsville to Franklin River Crossing High Potential Segment (NHT) (NPS 1999:13); 2) that high potential segment is also part of the Bidwell-Bartleson route, followed by the first overland emigrant party to California; and 3) Big Springs is a designated high potential site on the Hastings Cutoff branch of the California NHT. The springs, though used by other emigrants, are of particular significance to the Bidwell-Bartleson party, which abandoned its wagons at that location before proceeding across Nevada on foot and without maps or guides in 1841. Big Springs is evaluated in the DEIS as a water resource but not as a cultural resource. Even though the springs might already be impacted by years of ranch-related development, they need to be documented and evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places; and if they are found eligible, any impacts or adverse effects to them need to be identified and analyzed.	CR	<p>This appendix has been removed from the FEIS as the indirect effect analysis to cultural resources and the National Trail System will be completed separately as outlined in the programmatic agreement.</p> <p>Additional information has been added to Chapters 3 and 4 to discuss the Big Springs site specifically.</p>
14	14.3	Lee Kreutzer, National Park Service	The DEIS states that the proponents will be required to reclaim and revegetate the project site in eight to ten years. Long-term drought conditions have rendered such efforts very difficult in recent years, and conditions could be even more difficult in ten years due to climate change. Please address what measures could be taken to help ensure the success of the revegetation effort, and what alternative measures might be employed if revegetation is not successful.	RCL	The revegetation is required to meet <i>Attachment B Guidelines for Successful Revegetation for the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, the Bureau of Land Management and the USDA. Forest Service</i> standards. The BLM will monitor the revegetation success and continued efforts will be taken until the BLM standards for successful revegetation have been met. Revegetation techniques and approaches will be altered depending on the conditions at the time of revegetation efforts.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
14	14.4	Lee Kreutzer, National Park Service	Finally, on page 4-118, the DEIS states that a regional mitigation plan will be developed for the purpose of determining appropriate mitigation costs, and that an MOU will be executed by BLM and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office to establish a board that will "manage the dispersal of funds," presumably by spending them on interpretation and education. Please identify what parties will or may be involved in developing the mitigation plan, elaborate on the proposed membership of the board and its responsibilities, and especially broaden the range of mitigation options. Interpretive and educational programs alone are not necessarily adequate mitigation for impacts to designated national historic trails. The Marys River Oil and Gas Exploration Environmental Assessment might serve as a good model for these discussions.	CR/MIT	Revision to this mitigation measure have been completed as suggested.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
15	15.1	[REDACTED]	<p>We look down the valley at the Long Canyon Mine Project from our home on Murdock Mountain. We realize that mining is a major industry in Nevada but want to make sure as landowners and residents our concerns are considered also. We did not choose to live here for availability of water, roads, services and other amenities. We live here for the quiet, clear air, and the dark skies at night with incredible views of stars. The Long Canyon Mine Project could immediately affect our quality of life with its lighting. We are counting on the BLM to represent our interests just as you have protected the deer, elk and other area residents. Please make sure mine lighting is held to the most up to date ways of protecting our dark skies. We already see a glow from Wendover and it is not even in the same valley as us. We are very concerned what the lighting on the mine will do to our starscape. There are few places left on earth that can offer what we have here in Elko County. Let's not lose this precious resource.</p>	VR	<p>Impacts on night sky resources, including dark skies and the ability to view stars, meteor shows, and other astronomical features or phenomena are described for the Proposed Action Alternative on page 4-132 of the DEIS. Impacts of light intrusion (unwanted lighting) in areas outside of the mine site are also addressed on this page for the Proposed Action Alternative. Impacts on night sky resources and light intrusion from the North Facilities Alternative are described on page 4-139 DEIS.</p>
16	16.1	Kyle Anderson	<p>This is a note supporting the conclusions reached in the DEIS and support the mine and its impact on the environment and surrounding community. Thank you for your consideration!</p>	POS	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
17	17.1	Dano McGinn	<p>Background and Public Support for Area 7 Deer within Project Area, not disclosed in DEIS.</p> <p>a. In June of 1999, BLM gave final approval for the Big Springs Land Exchange. This land exchange involved checkerboard lands within the project area with strong public support from several conservation organizations including the National Wildlife Federation, Nevada Wildlife Federation, Coalition for Nevada Wildlife, Nevada Mule Deer Foundation, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Sierra Club-Toiyabe Chapter, Trout Unlimited, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, Northeastern Nevada Naturalists and the Elko County Conservation Association, with NDOW aiding as the public trust. Major deer winter range (Long Canyon) and a small but increasing elk herd were identified on the exchange lands that are now located within the project area. This exchange added many square miles of critical game range to public land ownership administered by BLM with the clear desire to protect deer habitat and to allow public enjoyment of deer resource for current and future generations. Again, these lands are currently within the project area's. Two wildlife/safety overpasses were very recently completed with the objectives of public safety and improving mule deer migration success on Highway 93, north of Wells, Nevada. NDOW and NDOT provided large amounts of public funds for construction. The deer migrating over/under the highway are the very same deer using the project area for critical migration corridors and critical winter range – the Area 7 deer herd. The overpasses are part of a handful within North America. Preliminary planning is beginning for more overpasses/underpasses located on Pequop Summit providing for deer migration and public safety. These are exceptional efforts by public agencies with public support for the Area 7 deer herd's. Two wildlife/safety overpasses were very recently completed with the</p>	WLF	Comment noted, info taken into account in responses below.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			objectives of public safety and improving mule deer migration success on Highway 93, north of Wells, Nevada. NDOW and NDOT provided large amounts of public funds for construction. The deer migrating over/under the highway are the very same deer using the project area for critical migration corridors and critical winter range – the Area 7 deer herd. The overpasses are part of a handful within North America. Preliminary planning is beginning for more overpasses/underpasses located on Pequop Summit providing for deer migration and public safety. These are exceptional efforts by public agencies with public support for the Area 7 deer herd's. This project has enjoyed significant pre-project planning efforts from NDOW, BLM and Newmont. While there are still some needed improvements to the proposed project, the stage has been well set to develop a mining project that is balanced and reasonable for public resources. Thank you.		
17	17.2	Dano McGinn	I support the North Facilities Alternative (which the DEIS has identified as the preferred alternative) but with the following improvements to project planning and management for mule deer.	ALT/SUP	Comment noted.
17	17.3	Dano McGinn	DEIS inadequacies and needed improvements for mule deer. DEIS fails to provide a mule deer monitoring plan. I strongly request a Long Canyon Mule Deer Monitoring Plan based on Adaptive Management with clear objectives of successful deer migration and successful deer over-wintering within the project area. These objectives will drive monitoring efforts. Clearly stated trigger points requiring on the ground modifications/actions to accomplish deer monitoring plan objectives, needed. Adaptive management is essential as wildlife management is an inexact science requiring site specific monitoring and possible new mitigations.	WLF/MIT	Monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation for mule deer has been added as a part of the mitigation plan and is attached to the FEIS as Appendix 2C.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
17	17.4	Dano McGinn	Monitoring is not mitigation. It must be stressed monitoring is no substitute for mitigation. Monitoring identifies whether management objectives are being met. Mitigation requires a change in on the ground management to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce or eliminate impacts. This is clearly states in the DEIS on page 7-36.	MIT	Monitoring has been built into the mitigation plan as a component to determine the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation, but not as the mitigation itself. The monitoring plan is part of the Mitigation Plan and is attached to the FEIS as Appendix 2C.
17	17.5	Dano McGinn	The DEIS fails to disclose impacts to recreation. Public demand for hunting the Area 7 mule deer is far beyond present availability as demonstrated by the number of successful tag applicants versus unsuccessful tag applicants. Impacts from the proposed project have potential to greatly reduce overall population of Area 7 deer herd thereby further reducing hunting opportunities.	WLF/REC	Since there is no anticipated impact to the Area 7 mule deer herd from the analysis in the EIS there are no impacts to hunting to discuss in the recreation section of the EIS.
17	17.6	Dano McGinn	The DEIS fails to disclose economic benefits of Area 7 deer herd. Both national and state agencies provide specific economic benefit analysis useful to the DEIS for Area 7 deer impacted by the project. NDOW could easily provide this information. Deer in Elko County are economically important. Please disclose these values.	WLF/SOC	The socioeconomic value of hunting in Elko County have been added to the socioeconomic discussion in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.
17	17.7	Dano McGinn	Fencing within the Project must be wildlife friendly and allow unrestricted deer passage. ALL fencing within the project area must be originally constructed or altered to provide for free, unrestricted migration and daily movement. This must be disclosed and the DEIS does not. Refer to "Area 6 Mule Deer Working Group Habitat Management Practices, January 19, 2012" on page 17. This is nothing new and is essential to avoid migration impediment (DEIS page ES-11).	PA	Newmont has committed to a three-strand, 38-inch fence with the top and middle barbed in coordination with BLM and NDOW request to facilitate wildlife movement. This fencing is outlined in the environmental protection measures discussion in Section 2.2.18.15.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
17	17.8	Dano McGinn	<p>The DEIS fails to identify/disclose deer hunting/viewing as a Traditional Value in Elko County. Mule deer hunting and/or viewing in Elko County has been and continues to be the annual highlight for many deer enthusiasts. Area 7 deer hunting tag applicants throughout the Nation, State and County, demonstrate the keen desire to experience mule deer hunting in Elko County. The County itself traditionally demonstrates its love affair with its deer in many forms. Deer antlers/mounts are numerous displayed in business places and private homes. Annual contests awarding prizes for the largest deer, heaviest deer, etc. have been ongoing for several decades. The local Elko Daily Free Press provides/publishes an annual "Deer Hunting Edition" in its newspaper. Multi-generational families throughout the State and County consider deer hunting as a sacred family tradition. More deer hunters, deer guides/outfitters, work or hunt in Elko County than any other Nevada county. Many hunters of deer in Elko County derive a heightened level of life only gotten by the passionate and intense emotions experienced by being in the presence of the magnificent animals and their habitat. Clearly mule deer hunting/viewing in Elko County, which includes Area 7 deer depending on the project area for survival should be considered a local tradition and provided for in all applicable projects including the Long Canyon Mine project.</p>	REC	<p>Section 3.15.3.1 of the DEIS identifies big-game hunting for mule deer, as well as antelope and elk as historically being a major recreational activity within the hunt unit 78, which is part of Area 7. Potential impacts on mule deer populations and on hunting are addressed in Chapter 4 of the DEIS.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
17	17.9	Dano McGinn	Reasonably Foreseeable Impacts Due to recent experiences with Nevada mining operations it is reasonable and prudent to be extremely concerned regarding the following issues: Future Expansion of Mining Operations Beyond the Proposed Project Site Any mining expansion west into the Long Canyon drainage or south into the Spud Patch and/or Railroad Tunnel areas would be catastrophic to the Area 7 deer herd as these areas are the most crucial winter ranges for this herd.	CE	Comment noted. Further development beyond what the Proposed Action and what is discussed as reasonably foreseeable actions in the cumulative analysis is beyond the scope of this document.
17	17.10	Dano McGinn	DEIS mapping should be corrected to delineate these areas as crucial winter range with crucial migration corridors providing access.	WLF	Figure 3.8-3 in the FEIS has been updated with the most recent crucial mule deer winter range layer.
17	17.11	Dano McGinn	Noise and Activity levels may displace wintering deer in Long Canyon crucial wintering area. The DEIS on page ES-11 clearly states this is a very real possibility. An Adaptive Monitoring Plan is essential to effectively monitor this possible impact.	WLF/NS	A mule deer monitoring plan has been developed to monitor the effectiveness of the environmental protection measures and the mitigation measures. This monitoring plan is attached to the mitigation plan in Appendix 2C of the FEIS.
17	17.12	Dano McGinn	Lower deer migration corridor within the Project Area will be blocked by haul road. The haul road from open pit to waste rock storage site completely crosses and bisects the lower deer migration corridor within the Project area. Noise and activity levels created by heavy traffic use will most likely prove problematic to deer movement. Perhaps traffic patterns can be altered during migration periods in fall and spring. Modification of impediments to deer movement must be provided. Again the need for an Adaptive Monitoring Plan.	PA	A mule deer monitoring plan has been developed to monitor the effectiveness of the environmental protection measures, the mitigation measures, as well potential impacts to mule deer from the project. The monitoring plan includes an adaptive management approach depending on the results of the monitoring. This monitoring plan is attached to the mitigation plan in Appendix 2C of the FEIS.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
17	17.13	Dano McGinn	<p>If the overall objective of this Project is to provide for a large, successful mining operation while simultaneously providing for a large deer herd to successfully migrate and over-winter through and within the project area. (Please publicly disclose if my assumption is wrong). As such me DEIS comments make common sense to achieve a balanced and reasonable mining project on publicly owned land. The compromises are meaningful and fair. However, some mitigation may prove contentious. In these cases, I am genuinely requesting and humbly expecting BLM managers to provide strong leadership in all phases of this project to ensure no undue or unnecessary harm occurs to this superlative mule deer resource. The value of the Area 7 deer herd is immeasurable to current and future generations in a rapidly changing world.</p>	MTG	<p>A mitigation plan has been developed, including monitoring to determined the effectiveness of the mitigation for mule deer and is included as Appendix 2C of the FEIS.</p>
18	18.1	Pam Borda and Jason Ashby, Northeastern Nevada Regional Development Authority	<p>The Northeastern Nevada Regional Development Authority (NNRDA} formerly known as Elko County Economic Diversification Authority (ECEDA} is submitting this letter of support for Newmont's Long Canyon Mine Project. NNRDA is responsible for economic development in Elko County and each of the four cities within the county; Carlin, Elko, Wells, and West Wendover. The Long Canyon Mine Project will benefit the entire region. We applaud the BLM and Newmont with the approach taken to work collaboratively with regulatory agencies, communities, and other key stakeholders incorporating input from these stakeholders in the early stages of the design, engineering, and permitting. The fact that Newmont redesigned their initial plans to incorporate a deer migration corridor, and to move the processing facilities around at the request of the Wendover communities and to re-engineer their tailing storage facility to provide safety and security for sage grouse, demonstrates their commitment to responsible care for the environment</p>	POS	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>during mine life and also when mining is complete. Therefore, we support the North alternative as the best approach. We urge BLM to continue this collaborative engagement and expedited NEPA process. As described in the Plan of Operations and in discussions during a social impact analysis process, the Long Canyon Project will add much-needed stimulation to the local economy by increasing the tax base of Elko County. The construction phase of the project will generate employment for up to 400 construction workers for 18 to 24 months and the long-term effects will include 300 to 500 additional full-time jobs. The Long Canyon project is also a great addition for our mining support companies. Hundreds of companies have invested in the region and additional mining will provide sustainability and growth for these companies. The positive economic impact of this project on Wells and West Wendover in particular will bring much needed growth to those areas. For West Wendover, the project allows diversification from their primary industry of gaming and will spur growth in many other areas of need. For Wells, the project also spurs growth in other areas of need such as retail, health care, etc. and diversifies their economic base as well. This letter of support was approved by NNRDA's Board of Directors and Executive Committee at their April 23, 2014 meeting.</p>		

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
19	19.1	Emily Carter, City of West Wendover	<p>The City of West Wendover would like to submit this letter as part of the Public Comment Period for the above noted Long Canyon Mine Project.</p> <p>The City of West Wendover considers the project to ultimately have positive long-term benefits to the community of West Wendover. Through the past several years, the City of West Wendover, Nevada; the City of Wendover, Utah; and Newmont USA have worked diligently to mitigate various issues related to the Long Canyon project, primarily related to water resources. Through this extensive process, Newmont USA remained a vigilant, open and collaborative partner with the communities ensuring that the best and most up-to-date science was used to assist us in creating proper parameters, procedures and ultimately achieving our common goals of protecting water resources while also providing an opportunity to develop the abundant mineral resources which are available in the area. The culmination of this collaborative work resulted in the execution of an agreement between the two cities and Newmont USA. This agreement titled the "Surplus Water Service Agreement" was executed in October of 2013 and provides for the necessary protection, development and mitigation of our water resources. The agreement was completed to the satisfaction of the Governing Board of the City of West Wendover which authorized its execution. As such, the City of West Wendover supports in full, the Long Canyon project and the positive benefits it will bring to our community, to Elko County and to the State of Nevada on whole. The addition of this significant diversified business activity in eastern Elko County and the resulting employment is a positive step forward in not only economic development but we believe, as well, with regard to appropriate and proper mineral resource development in eastern Elko County.</p>	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
20	20.1	Jim Butler, Parsons Behle & Latimer	Can you please mail a printed copy of the Long Canyon Draft EIS to: Jim Butler Parsons Behle & Latimer 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 Thank you very much.	MISC	Document has been sent, comment noted.
21	21.1	Kenny Huff, City of Wells	Please see below the comments provided by the City of Wells, Nevada: 1. The City of Wells has participated as a cooperating agency during the construction of this draft EIS and supports the project, however, as stated in the preparation process we still feel there needs to be more than one power alternative listed for the natural gas line placement. While we understand that this line will not be constructed immediately and that Wells Rural Electric Coop and Newmont Mining have had conversations about short term power supply, we feel the alternative to place the natural gas line from Montello into Long Canyon does not meet the goal of mining sustainability for the public. The location of natural gas at the City of Wells heavy industrial park could provide the needed infrastructure to entice anchor industries for which sustainability of the community could be achieved after mine closure. Furthermore, with natural gas into Wells and a co-generation plant in Wells, Long Canyon could still receive its required power needs and benefit the public of Wells with a secondary local source for electricity. This would eliminate the need for a "grid" which would be required with on-site power generation. These issues-secondary electricity and sustainability through diversification, the need for a grid, are not being weighted heavily enough by the BLM. The public benefit greatly outweighs the acres affected in alternative 1 versus 2. The proposed action (2.2.9) does not discuss alternative	PSP/ALT	Bringing a natural gas pipeline to the City of Wells for future economic development of the city is not part of the Purpose and Need for the project and is therefore out of scope of the environmental analysis of this EIS. The power supply for the project was selected as the most environmentally preferred method of supplying power.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>possibilities that may be more feasible when future/greater power supplies are needed. We strongly recommend the number one alternative is reconsidered as an alternative for planning purposes to include a pipeline route from the Ruby Pipeline south along State Route US93 to Wells. The existing Ruby Pipeline Project previously installed a gate valve for future lateral attachment near the US 93 location. The future needs of all the public should be evaluated beyond just the acres affected before this power alternative is approved.</p>		
22	22.1	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	<p>The Power Supply Screening Study is grossly inadequate for routing and siting a new power supply line and riddled with editing mistakes that indicate the document was hastily completed and did not receive the proper attention.</p> <p>One part of the Proposed Action included in the DEIS is the routing and construction of a new power supply pipeline from the Ruby Pipeline to the proposed Long Canyon Mine complex. Gas turbine generators will be installed at the Long Canyon Mine complex to provide enough power for all mining activities. The route for the power supply pipeline is analyzed with four other alternatives in the project-associated Power Supply Screening Study and the Proposed Action is identified. WREC feels that the Power Supply Screening Study is grossly inadequate for routing and siting a new power supply line.</p>	PSP	<p>Grammatical errors and formatting issues have been addressed in the document. This was intended to be a screening level study to help select the alternative to analyze fully in the EIS. This exercise was aimed at selecting the alternative that was environmentally reasonable as described in Section 2.3 of the EIS. The other alternatives discussed in this study were ruled out for detailed analysis in the EIS because they would cause more environmental impacts than the selected alternative.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
22	22.2	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	<p>The five alternatives analyzed include three alternative routes for a gas pipeline from the Ruby Pipeline to the Long Canyon Mine Complex; one gas pipeline from the Ruby Pipeline to Wells, Nevada with a new transmission line from Wells to the Long Canyon Mine complex; and one transmission line re-build from Jackpot, Nevada to the Long Canyon Mine complex. The Power Supply Screening Study does not represent the typical alternatives analysis for new transmission or pipeline routing. For example, the Ruby Pipeline Final Environmental Impact Statement is a major document comprising hundreds of pages of analysis for a multitude of topics. If the power supply for the Long Canyon Mine were its own individual project, the analysis would likely require an Environmental Impact Statement. However, in this instance the Power Supply Screening Study is completed in 15 pages and only considers wildlife, botanical, visual, and water resources. It should be noted that construction of the Proposed Action power supply pipeline will have similar construction impacts to those of the Ruby Pipeline.</p>	PSP/ALT	<p>As discussed in the response to comment 22.1 the purpose of Power Supply Screening Study was to evaluate readily available environmental resource information and determine which power supply alternative would be environmentally preferred with this information. The detailed environmental impact analysis of the selected pipeline route, as part of the Proposed Action, was evaluated in more detail within the DEIS. The BLM National Environmental Policy Act Handbook H-1790-1 was used as guidance for the Alternatives considered, but eliminated from detailed analysis. As described in Section 2.3 of the EIS, alternatives proposed for detailed analysis in the EIS met the following criteria. 1) The alternative meets the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action and addresses one or more significant issues; 2) The alternative satisfies the "rule of reason," with the alternative being in proportion to the significance of the environmental impacts related to the Proposed Action. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense; and 3) The alternative is environmentally reasonable, that is, would not be obviously environmentally inferior (i.e., cause more onerous environmental impacts) than other action alternatives.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
22	22.3	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	The Power Supply Screening Study is not attached to the DEIS as an appendix to be readily available to the public for review. The reader should have the opportunity to comment on how all aspects of the Proposed Action was formed, including how the power supply was chosen. Instead, the reader must recognize that another small analysis was completed by identifying the proper citation in the footnote of Table 2.5-1, then requesting the Power Supply Screening Study from the BLM. The Power Supply Screening Study is an important document which should be made readily available to the public as an appendix to the DEIS.	ALT	This document has been added as Appendix 2B of the FEIS.
22	22.4	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	To reiterate a major concern we have with the results of the LC-DEIS, if the power supply for Long Canyon Mine were its own individual project, the analysis would likely require a more comprehensive and definitive Environmental Impact Statement. This would necessitate additional public scoping meetings to allow the public to comment on the potential power supply options and the routes each might follow. After reviewing the Long Canyon Scoping Document provided with the DEIS, it is unclear if the public was provided adequate information to provide informed comments regarding the power supply options.	PRO	See response to Comment 22.2 above.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
22	22.5	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	<p>The Power Supply Screening Study and power supply section of the DEIS (Section 2.5.6) contain several errors throughout the document. Incorrect table references, figures with incorrect legends, incomplete sentences, and grammatical errors occur throughout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Section 1.2.2 sites Table 1 for details regarding data considered in the Power Supply Screening Study. Table 2 provides that information, not Table 1;</li> <li>- Grammatical error in Section 1.3.1 reads "...some resources were eliminated from further analysis because they very unlikely to cause...";</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Section 1.3.1 identifies the need for a 3-mile buffer surrounding greater sage-grouse leks, but provides no citation as to why a 3-mile buffer is applied;</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Section 1.3.1 states that the West Wide Energy Corridor and designated BLM ROW Corridors are included in the analysis but these two corridors are not mentioned again;</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Figure 1 does not provide a correct figure legend to identify each aspect of the map;</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Figure 2 legend indicates Alternative 2 is shown on the map when it is not;</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Figure 3 legend indicates Alternative 3 is shown on the map when it is not;</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Figure 4 legend indicates Alternative 4 is shown on the map when it is not;</li> <li>- Power Screening Supply Study Figure 5 legend indicates Alternative 5 is shown on the map when it is not.</li> <li>- DEIS Section 2.5.6 states that Economic Viability was considered for each potential power supply</li> </ul>	PSP/ALT	<p>a) Table reference in Section 1.2.2 was modified; b) Grammatical error in section 1.3.1 was fixed; c) A 3-mile buffer is a typical requirement for non-migratory Greater sage-grouse leks where sage-brush is not distributed uniformly. This sentence has been modified to be clearer, and the reference for the 3-mile buffer requirement was included in the text; d) The Power Supply Alternative Screening Analysis included the West Wide Regional Corridor and BLM designated corridors to show the alternatives in relation to those corridors. Section 1.3.1 was updated to be clearer on the intent of including the WWEC and BLM designated corridors on the Figure; e) Figure 1 was updated; f) Figure 2 was updated; g) Figure 3 was updated; h) Figure 4 was updated; i) Figure 5 was updated; j) The Alternative Screening Analysis was not intended to analyze economic feasibility. The study has been updated to clarify this. The Alternative Screening Analysis was intended to analyze environmental impacts resulting from the alternatives. Economic feasibility was taken into account internally by Newmont and is not part of the Alternative Screening Study; k) Economic feasibility was taken into account internally by Newmont. Economic feasibility was one of the factors used to select an alternative; however, it was not necessarily the deciding factor. As is shown in Table 5</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>alternative. Economic Viability is not addressed in the Power Supply Screening Study.</p> <p>- DEIS Section 2.5.6 states that Alternative 3 was selected as the Proposed Action due to the least environmental impacts and being the least expensive to construct. However, Table 2.5-1 indicates Alternative 4 has the least environmental impacts and is the shortest.</p> <p>These mistakes indicate that the Power Supply Screening Study, a document responsible for routing over 30 miles of new natural gas pipeline or 100 miles of transmission line re-build, was not reviewed to an adequate level prior to determining which of the five alternatives would be part of the Proposed Action. This last error bullet is a concern because it leads the reader to believe that cost of construction was the deciding factor in which power supply alternative was carried forward.</p>		<p>and Chart 1 of the Alternatives Screening Study, based on likely Environmental Issues, Alternative 4 would result in a higher percentage of likely environmental issues than Alternative 3 (45 percent compared to 44 percent).</p>
22	22.6	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	<p>All results of the Power Supply Screening Study are lumped in an inadequate summary table (Table 5 of the document). For the Power Supply Screening Study analysis, all environmental resources are classified into two categories: Environmental Issues or Potential Environmental Issues. For areas where Environmental Issues overlapped Potential Environmental Issues, the entire area is categorized as the more restrictive Environmental Issue category and included in the summary table. This practice could mask serious environmental impacts of each power supply alternative. It is unknown to the reader how many or what type of each environmental resource is impacted. For instance, if the buffered polygons surrounding an active greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>) lek incorporate several acres of wetland which may occur in the construction areas, the "potential" environmental impact to wetlands is not disclosed because the lek buffer is the more restrictive of the two.</p>	PSP/ALT	<p>The Power Supply Alternative Screening Study classified the areas of overlap between the Environmental Issues category and the Potential Environmental Issues category as the more restrictive of the two in order to provide a conservative estimate of likely environmental issues. For the alternative screening, it does not matter if the area of overlap would include wetland disturbance or greater sage-grouse lek disturbance. The grouping of these overlap areas as the more restrictive category actually reduces the potential for masking serious environmental consequences.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
22	22.7	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	Another example of the failure to identify all resources potentially impacted by each power supply alternative is indicated by the vague structure of Table 6 in the Power Supply Screening Study. This table identifies what environmental resources may be impacted by each alternative but fails to identify the full impacts of each alternative. For example, Table 6 identifies that each alternative has golden eagles ( <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i> ) nesting within two miles; however, Table 6 and the rest of the Power Supply Screening Study fails to identify how many golden eagles are nesting within two miles. This failure to disclose a quantifiable measurement for each resource does not allow the reader to truly determine impacts. Does Alternative 3 have two or 12 golden eagle nests within two miles? The reader does not receive this information for each alternative. Without the full and complete disclosure of all environmental impacts from each power supply alternative, the reader cannot justify why the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) chose Alternative 3 for the power supply alternative of the DEIS.	PSP/ALT	The Power Supply Alternative Screening Study was not intended to be a separate EIS analyzing environmental consequences in detail. It was intended to provide a general analysis to determine which power supply alternative would have the least environmental impacts to biological resources and should be carried forward for full analysis in the EIS. The environmental effects of the selected route were analyzed in more detail in the DEIS. The Power Supply Alternative Screening Study has been updated to more clearly explain the results.
22	22.8	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	The Power Supply Screening Study bases its conclusion regarding Alternative 5 on inaccurate information. Alternative 5 of the Power Supply Screening Study is the re-building of approximately 100 miles of an existing 138 kilovolt (kV) transmission line from Jackpot, Nevada to the Long Canyon Mine Complex. Alternative 5 states that the re-built transmission line will be sited 500 feet to either side of the current transmission line, then calculates that all areas within a 1,000-foot-wide corridor (500 feet either side of the existing line) will be disturbed. This assumption that all areas within the 1,000-foot-wide disturbance corridor will be disturbed is extremely inaccurate and will give readers the impression that all new transmission lines disturb far more acreage than they	PSP/ALT	The existing 138 kV line would be decommissioned and the old line would be removed. This would create additional disturbance not included in the comment's 250 acre calculation. Since no contractor has been selected to provide specific information regarding construction disturbance required, a general buffer was necessary to provide a conservative estimate of the potential environmental impacts. Typical National Electric Safety Code requirements for 138kV lines refer to a 90 to 100 foot easement. The model has been re-run to use a disturbance acreage of 100 feet for the transmission

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>actually do.</p> <p>According to the Power Supply Screening Study, Alternative 5 will disturb 12,146 acres. This would not be the typical disturbance acreage associated with a 100 mile 138 kV transmission line. Construction of a transmission line requires a temporary work area around each new structure and pulling and tensioning sites to string the conductors. For a typical 138 kV transmission line on H-frame support structures, each temporary work area would encompass approximately 0.25 acre. There would be approximately eight structures per mile and a two acre pulling and tensioning site every four miles. Considering the approximate 100 mile length of Alternative 5, the actual temporary disturbance will be 200 acres of temporary work areas and an additional 50 acres of pulling and tensioning sites, for a total temporary disturbance of 250 acres. The 12,146 acres of disturbance reported for Alternative 5 in the Power Supply Screening Study is over 48 times the amount of temporary disturbance which would accompany the typical construction of a 138 kV transmission line.</p>		<p>line and 50 feet for the natural gas lines. Where the new line is next to the existing line that would be decommissioned an additional 100 feet for disturbance associated with the decommissioning of the existing line is included. The document has also disclosed that impacts from transmission lines are not solely based on disturbance acres but potential impacts to the biological resources which in some cases can be anywhere within line of sight of the line.</p>
22	22.9	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	<p>It should be noted that Alternative 5 will be a re-build of an existing transmission line. Because a line is currently in place along the proposed Alternative 5 route, many of the impacts to wildlife resources typically associated with a new transmission line would not occur. For instance, any greater sage-grouse lek identified within three miles of Alternative 5 would be acclimated to the existing line. Therefore a re-build of that existing line would not impact greater sage-grouse attending that lek. The same logic can be applied to golden eagle and other raptor nests.</p>	PSP	<p>Alternative 5 is a rebuild. However, the portion of the existing line would be decommissioned and a new line would be constructed 500 feet from the decommissioned line. This includes the same amount of disturbance and noise required for the construction of a new line. Greater sage-grouse may be accustomed to the existing powerline; however, construction of the new line would potentially impact sage-grouse leks within 3-miles just like any other construction activity. The same impacts would occur to golden eagle and raptor nests.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
22	22.10	Hank James, Wells Rural Electric Company	Alternative 1 of the Power Supply Screening Study incorporates a new transmission line for a portion of the power delivery. The transmission line associated with Alternative 1 was only given a disturbance corridor of 50 feet, not 1,000 feet.	PSP	See response to Comment 22.8 above.
23	23.1	James Young, Newmont Mining Corporation	I am writing to provide comments in support of Newmont's proposed Long Canyon Mine Project. I feel that the positive aspects of the project, including its effect on the community, far outweigh any potential risks. The impact of this project on the local economy cannot be ignored. This project is a great extension of Newmont's Carlin Operations and allows continued employment of thousands of Northern Nevadans. This project also offers the opportunity to extend employment opportunities in the Wells and Wendover communities. Newmont and its employees have been excellent community partners for years; there is every reason to believe this positive partnership will be continue and extend to Wells and Wendover. Newmont provides high quality jobs with excellent benefits and pay; additionally Newmont has significantly improved the quality of life in Northern Nevada since the company arrived on the Carlin Trend in the 1960's. Newmont has taken every step possible to ensure that the Long Canyon Project will have a minimal impact of the environment. Newmont continually receives awards for its environmental and reclamation stewardship. This history demonstrates Newmont is committed to being stewards of the environment wherever the company operates. Although the landscape at Long Canyon will be altered once operations are finished, I am confident it will be just as viable for wildlife and livestock as the pre-mine landscape. Because of Newmont's ability to follow through on its commitment to responsible mining and the benefits to those living in Northern Nevada, I urge the BLM team to approve this project and allow mining to move ahead as quickly as you can.	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.1	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above referenced document. Our review and comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) NEPA Implementation Regulations at 40 CFR 1500-1508, and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. We commend the Bureau of Land Management and Newmont Mining Corporation for developing an alternative to the originally proposed Long Canyon Mine project. It appears that the North Facilities Alternative, identified in the Draft EIS as the preferred alternative, would pose fewer and/or less adverse impacts to most environmental resources than would the Proposed Alternative. Nevertheless, we have some outstanding concerns regarding potential impacts to, and mitigation of, wetland/riparian resources, water quality, and air quality. For this reason, we have rated this Draft EIS as EC-2- Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information (see enclosed "Summary of Rating Definitions and Follow-Up Action"). We recommend that the Final EIS include a detailed wetland/riparian resources mitigation plan; provide additional information on the project's potential impacts to surface water, groundwater, and air quality; identify cover specifications for reclaiming mine facilities; and include additional information on monitoring. We appreciate the opportunity to review this Draft EIS. Per our Memorandum of Understanding with Nevada BLM for mining EIS's, we respectfully request a copy of the preliminary Final EIS prior to its publication. If you have questions, please call me at (415) 972-3521, or contact Jeanne Geselbracht at 415-972-3853 or geselbracht.jeanne@epa.gov. Enclosures: EPA's Summary of Rating Definitions and Follow-Up Action EPA's Detailed Comments</p>	GEN	Comment noted, specific comments as listed in the attachment to this letter are addressed below.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.2	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p><u>Wetland/Riparian Resources</u></p> <p>The Draft EIS (p. 4-31) indicates that the North Facilities Alternative would increase drawdown in the alluvial and carbonate aquifers and reduce flows in Hardy Creek and the Johnson Springs system, resulting in flow reductions of 300 to 500 gallons per minute at Big Springs. Flow rates at Big Springs have been as high as 2,053 gpm in November 2006 and as low as 400 gpm, under current drought conditions, in December 2013. The Draft EIS states that, because flows at Big Springs can naturally vary by as much as 1,000 gpm seasonally, the predicted 300-500 gpm reduction in flow under the proposed project could be indistinguishable from natural flow variation. EPA is concerned, however, that a flow reduction of 300-500 gpm in addition to reduced flows due to natural variation could, nonetheless, result in significant impacts to aquatic species, migratory birds, and reptiles and amphibians in these wetland/riparian areas, particularly in drought years. While the Draft EIS (p. 4-35) states that the potential reduction in wetlands does not meet BLM's policy of no net loss of wetland/riparian habitat or Elko County's Public Land Policy Plan, the Draft EIS also states that mitigation measures for wetland and riparian resources are not required. Please note that the NEPA regulations at 40 CFR 1502.14(f) and 1502.16(h) require the disclosure, in an EIS, of measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of a proposed action.</p> <p>The Draft EIS (p. 2-78) indicates that Mitigation Measure W-4, which would provide greater sage-grouse brood rearing habitat enhancement and restoration within the Hardy Creek corridor at a compensation ratio of 2:1, may also provide incidental mitigation for impacts to surface water resources at Hardy Creek. It is unclear, however, what functions and values this measure might</p>	WET/MIT	<p>Potential impacts to wetland and riparian resources would be limited to the private land owned by Newmont. Since there are no Endangered Species Act listed species present within these waters the BLM cannot require mitigation for impacts to wetland and riparian resources. In the case of the scenario that predicts flow reductions from Big Springs of 300 to 500 gallons per minute, the scenario is based on unlikely assumptions such as the cities abandoning their wells in Shafter and pumping all of their water from the new wells on the west side of the Goshute Basin. In addition, the maximum reduction would not occur until well after mine production ceases, strongly suggesting that the reduction is due to pumping on behalf of the Cities rather than pumping on behalf of the mine. The FEIS has been revised to clarify this.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>provide that would serve this purpose.  Recommendation: The Final EIS should discuss how the project's potential impacts to wetland/riparian resources, including values and functions, could be mitigated under both the proposed action and North Facilities Alternative. We strongly urge Newmont to commit to mitigating these impacts. We recommend that Newmont, BLM and the Nevada Division of Wildlife work together to develop a detailed plan that specifies monitoring requirements, action levels, and commitments to specific mitigation measures for impacts to wetland/riparian resources and each potentially affected species. We also recommend that specific commitments be made regarding Newmont's water use at various flow thresholds or resource conditions. In light of the uncertainty of groundwater pumping impacts to surface waters and wetlands, an adaptive management plan may provide an appropriate approach to mitigating impacts. The mitigation plan should be included in the Final EIS.</p>		

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.3	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p><u>Water Quality Protection</u>In a discussion about cover/growth medium for the waste rock storage facility (WRSF), heap leach facility, and tailings storage facility (TSF), the Draft EIS (p. 4-20) states that Newmont's proposal calls for "approximately one foot of growth medium on top of and as part of the cover." The discussion includes some findings from two infiltration/drainage studies, including a finding in Long Canyon Waste Rock Storage and Heap Leach Facilities: Assessment of Cover Performance (SRK, 2013b) that the cover was estimated to reduce the average infiltration from 22 percent to one percent of mean annual precipitation (MAP). That finding was based on a three-foot cover thickness, however, rather than a one-foot cover thickness. Furthermore, in Geochemical Characterization and Predictive Modeling for the Long Canyon Project, Nevada (2013a), SRK also reported:"The results show that for the average infiltration rates for the two-foot and three-foot cover scenarios (i.e., one percent and two percent of MAP), none of the parameters are predicted to be elevated above NDEP [Nevada Division of Environmental Protection] reference values in the groundwater underlying the WRSF. This demonstrates that limiting infiltration to less than one percent to two percent of MAP should be sufficient to prevent degradation of groundwater under the facility. For higher infiltration scenarios, mercury concentrations are predicted to increase and are predicted to be slightly elevated above NDEP reference values under the maximum infiltration rates for the two-foot and three-foot cover scenarios (i.e., six percent and eleven percent of MAP)."The Draft EIS states, on page 4-23, that the geochemical modeling, which assumes attenuation of contaminants of concern in the top 30 feet of alluvium beneath the WRSF, is based on infiltration of three percent of MAP. The discussion on pages 4-</p>	WTR	Additional information from the memo "Long Canyon Tentative Plan for Permanent Closure" submitted to NDEP in March 2014 and additional information from the Plan of Operation, has been added to the FEIS to support the conclusion for cover thickness of the facilities.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			<p>19 and 4-20 of the Draft EIS, however, makes no connections between the studies' findings and a conclusion that Newmont's proposed one foot of cover material would provide sufficient reduction of meteoric water infiltration to prevent degradation of groundwater under the facilities after closure. In fact, a one foot cover appears to conflict with the findings in the SRK reports. Additional information is needed in the Final EIS to support the above conclusion, and this information will be needed to assess the availability and cost of the specified cover material for reclamation purposes. Recommendations: The Final EIS should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss the closure objectives of the WRSF, heap leach facility, and TSF in terms of concentration limits for contaminants of concern seeping into groundwater, draining to the TSF, or being used for agricultural applications;</li> <li>• Identify, for each facility, the maximum allowable infiltration rates, thickness, composition, and other cover specifications needed to meet the closure objectives;</li> <li>• Discuss consistency of these specifications with the findings from the cover evaluations conducted for this mine; and</li> <li>• Include commitments to contingency measures to be implemented in the event that the modeling proves to be incorrect.</li> </ul>		

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.4	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p>The residual draindown from the TSF and heap leach facility (totaling approximately 42 gpm) after closure would be managed through evaporation, infiltration and/or agricultural applications. The Draft EIS (pp. 4-21, 22) indicates that spent ore may leach arsenic, antimony, thallium, and mercury. It is unclear whether and how long it may take for concentrations of parameters in TSF and heap leach draindown solutions to be reduced to below levels of concern, or how this volume of solution could be treated or otherwise managed over a period longer than the projected "active" draindown/recirculation period of six years and one year, respectively. It is understood that modeling will be refined as additional information is gathered throughout mine life, and that closure plans, mitigation measures, long-term costs, etc., may need to be revised accordingly based on better understanding of water management needs later in project life, and as the closure plan is developed in more detail. This does not, however, obviate the need for information in the EIS regarding the potential foreseeable closure/post-closure facilities such as evaporation ponds, evapotranspiration (ET) cells, infiltration basins, and wildlife protection measures, as well as monitoring of these facilities and solutions. This information will also be needed to calculate reclamation, closure, and potentially post-closure costs.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Final EIS should describe the draindown solution management facilities that are being considered, including sizes and potential locations of ponds, ET cells, and infiltration basins; monitoring needs; and discuss any post-closure financial assurance needs to cover the cost of solution management over the long term.</p>	RCL	See the response to comment 24.3 for a description of the post-closure draindown and infiltration management in the heap leach facility and the cover system for the tailings storage facility. Reclamation bonding would be through the NDEP BMRR permitting.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.5	Kathleen Martyn Goforth. United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p>Table 3.2-3 highlights that waste rock subjected to the Meteoric Water Mobility Procedure only exceeded NDEP Profile 1 values for arsenic, antimony, and mercury, but samples also exceeded the Nevada aquatic life standards for copper, lead, and selenium, which are more stringent than Profile 1 values.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Final EIS should include a detailed discussion of the potential for arsenic, antimony, mercury, copper, lead, and selenium to contaminate surface water and groundwater that daylight, as well as water exposed to pit surfaces, especially in light of the proximity of the pit and other mine facilities to the range front fault system, Big Springs complex, and shallow groundwater. The discussion should specifically address attenuation capacity for these contaminants, should they reach surface waters, in the context of the aquatic life standards.</p>	WTR	<p>Aquatic life standards would only be applicable to surface water. For the North Facilities Alternative, which is the Preferred Alternative, all facilities except the pit would be north of the springs and other surface water features. As the potentiometric map for the basin fill aquifer shows (Figure 3.2-12), there are no surface water features downgradient that would intercept or receive groundwater from any of the mine facilities. The only exception would be the potential for groundwater under the mine pit.</p> <p>Copper, lead and selenium were never measured at detectable concentrations in any of the MWMP tests (i.e., all concentrations were below the laboratory detection limits). The NDEP Profile II reference values used in the geochemical characterization study were selected to provide an appropriate reference point to evaluate the potential to impact groundwater and are not applicable to surface water. In response to the EPA's comment regarding the potential for groundwater to daylight and for constituents to contaminate surface waters in the Big Springs complex, the predicted groundwater chemistry under the pit has been compared to Nevada Cold Water Aquatic Life Criteria (NAC 445A.1236) (Table 2), although these criteria are not directly comparable to groundwater concentrations. This comparison demonstrates that all modeled constituents are below the</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
					<p>relevant aquatic criteria in groundwater, including arsenic, antimony, mercury and selenium. As such, these constituents are not expected to be elevated above the aquatic criteria in any groundwater that may daylight at the Big Springs complex. For cadmium, copper, lead and silver, the analytical detection limit is higher than the aquatic guideline. Therefore, a true assessment of groundwater that could daylight at the spring cannot be made with respect to the aquatic standards for these parameters. According to NAC 445A.1236(1)(c), if the water quality standard "...is less than the detection limit of a method that is acceptable to the Division, laboratory results which show that the substance was not detected [below detection limit] will be deemed to show compliance with the standard unless other information indicates that the substance may be present." A review of the MWMP and HCT data indicates that cadmium, copper, lead and silver are consistently below the analytical detection limit and are not likely to be present based on the mineralogy of the deposit. Based on this evidence, the predicted groundwater chemistry meets the aquatic standards and groundwater that could potentially daylight at the spring would also meet these standards.</p> <p>For the pit, the model used oxidation products from the walls and floor and assumed that the bedrock was permeable (per observation) and would</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
					<p>readily transmit water from the floor of the pit to groundwater. Groundwater velocities of 0.2 feet per day were used, based on Golder Associates findings (2013) that the observed velocity was 0.2 to 2 feet per day. The results show that under the base case (i.e., most likely scenario) all constituents are predicted to be below NDEP reference values in the groundwater below the pit. (SRK, 2013). Comparing Nevada aquatic life standards (NAC 445A.1236) to the six parameters noted in the comment, lead, copper, and selenium would be below their detection limits of 0.003, 0.01, and 0.005 mg/L. Arsenic, antimony, and mercury would be at detectable levels but still well below Nevada aquatic life standards. This is based on a hardness value of 85 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.</p> <p>The results for the WRSF show that for the base case cover scenarios none of the parameters are predicted to be elevated above the NDEP reference values in the groundwater underlying the WRSF. These results demonstrate that limiting infiltration to less than one percent to two percent of MAP should be sufficient to prevent degradation of groundwater under the facility.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.6	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p><u>Monitoring</u>  The Draft EIS (p. 2-71) states that surface water and groundwater wells would be monitored quarterly during operations, and wells would be monitored for three to five years after reclamation for the TSF and heap leach facility is complete, or as required by NDEP. It does not appear that surface waters would continue to be monitored after reclamation is complete, but they should be. We are concerned that three to five years of surface water and groundwater monitoring may not be sufficient to ensure that closure and reclamation measures are effectively protecting water quality, and that TSF and heap leach facility draindown solution management activities are working as designed over the long-term. Recommendation: We recommend that water quality in both wells and surface water monitoring locations be monitored for significantly longer than five years after mine closure, as it may take decades to ensure that closure and reclamation of all mine facilities are effectively protecting water quality, and that TSF and heap leach facility draindown solution management is working as designed over the long-term. The TSF, leach pad, and WRSF should be regularly inspected throughout mine life and after closure for seeps, particularly after storms; and solution ponds, ET cells, and any seepage and/or mine drainage should be sampled so this information can be used to inform development of appropriate mitigation measures, if needed. The Final EIS should discuss the financial assurance needed to cover the costs of monitoring during, and potentially after, mine closure.</p>	WTR	<p>Newmont's reclamation plan that was submitted to the State for review and approval included surface and groundwater monitoring during closure and 5 years post-closure. Sampling frequencies and duration will be detailed in the NDEP-BMRR issued Water Pollution Control Permit. Long term monitoring beyond post-closure will be covered in a long term trust. In the "Long Canyon Project DRAFT Fluid Management System Operating Plan" submitted in March, 2014 to NDEP BMRR as part of the company's application for a water pollution control permit (Newmont 2014) Table 5.1 shows that surface water sites at Big Springs (LC-BS) and North Springs (LC-NS) will be monitored for NDEP Profile I parameters taken quarterly and reported quarterly and annually. The table also lists five wells for groundwater monitoring (LCMW-06, LCMW-08, LCMW-17, LCMW-24, LCMW-25) that will be sampled for the same parameters and at the same frequency, with additional monitoring for depth to water and elevation.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.7	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p><u>Air Quality</u>  The DEIS does not include the projected emissions from commute and delivery traffic to and from the mine. Because these emissions will result from the existence of operations at Long Canyon, they are part of the emissions budget for the mine. Furthermore, it does not appear that the dispersion modeling accounted for emissions from the support and delivery vehicles on the project site, from ore and carbon column hauling to and from the Carlin processing facilities, or from commute and delivery traffic to and from the mine. Recommendation: Dispersion modeling should account for emissions from support and delivery vehicles on the project site, ore and carbon column hauling to and from the Carlin processing facilities, and commute and delivery traffic to and from the mine. The Final EIS should discuss how the new model-predicted maximum impacts could affect Prevention of Significant Deterioration increments.</p>	AQ	<p>The DEIS does not include emissions from the commute and delivery traffic as there are too many unknowns at this time to accurately calculate the emissions. These emissions would exist on the public highway that was designed to accommodate this level of commuter traffic. The air dispersion model accounts for all onsite emissions, including the support and delivery vehicles. The model accounts for the commuter and delivery traffic once it is off the publicly accessible roads and calculates the impacts of all emission sources on areas accessible to the public. The Air Resources section in Chapter 4 includes a discussion of the emissions expected from ore and carbon hauling to and from the Carlin processing facility. The air dispersion modeling analysis accounts for the support and delivery vehicles onsite and they are included as volume sources along the roadways of the mine. Ore and carbon hauling to and from the Carlin processing facility along with commute and delivery traffic cannot be analyzed with an air dispersion model due to limitations on the size of the model and the fact that these emissions would occur on a publicly accessible roadway. The air dispersion model predicts impacts to publically accessible areas, such as roadways, from sources located in a confined area and using meteorological data to determine the plume direction and concentration on the local</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
					<p>topography. The EIS document discusses the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) increments in both Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. Chapter 3 discusses the surrounding areas and determines that there are no PSD areas, Class I or Class II, within a reasonable distance for analysis. Chapter 4 uses the PSD increment levels as a surrogate to describe the predicted impacts from the air dispersion model. Minor impacts are those predicted impacts that are less than the Class I PSD Significant Impact Level (SIL), moderate impacts are when they exceed the SIL but are less than the EPA and Nevada ambient air quality standards, and major impacts are when the predicted impacts exceed the ambient air quality standards.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
24	24.8	Kathleen Martyn Goforth, United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX	<p>We commend Newmont for providing buses and vanpools for employee commuting at its operations, which helps to reduce off-site vehicle emissions and traffic. In addition to the on-site fugitive emissions reduction measures (e.g., water and/or chemical dust suppressants) identified in the Draft EIS, additional measures can be used to control diesel particulate matter (DPM) and other criteria pollutants from fugitive sources at the mine.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend the following additional emissions reduction measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use particle traps and other appropriate controls to reduce emissions of DPM and other air pollutants. Traps control approximately 80 percent of DPM, and specialized catalytic converters (oxidation catalysts) control approximately 20 percent of DPM, 40 percent of carbon monoxide emissions, and 50 percent of hydrocarbon emissions;</li> <li>• Lease or buy newer, cleaner equipment (1996 or newer model);</li> <li>• Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained at all times and does not unnecessarily idle, is tuned to manufacturer's specifications, and is not modified to increase horsepower except in accordance with established specifications.</li> </ul>	AQ	<p>Vehicles and generators will comply with the applicable regulations for such sources. The regulations dictate the maximum allowable emissions and how the manufacturers recommended maintenance schedule must be followed and recorded. Older engines are required to be tested by the regulating agency if they are used for any purpose other than emergencies. Testing confirms if the source is in compliance with the limits. Newer engines are certified by the manufacturer to guarantee emissions are in compliance with the limits. The regulating agency also imposes opacity limits on the exhaust to control particulate matter emissions.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
25	25.1	Pamela Zaga	<p>I am writing this letter in support of the proposed Long Canyon project in Elko County, Nevada. The Newmont endorsed, North Facilities Alternative, disturbs a smaller footprint over the proposed project. Compared to the Proposed Project, this smaller footprint minimizes the impact on cultural resources; moves processing and mine facilities further from municipal water and surface water sources; and lessens environmental impact to the Sage Grouse, deer migration, and Big Springs/Johnson Spring wetland system. This project provides Elko County with the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nevada Net Proceeds Tax;</li> <li>• Approximately 300 jobs during construction of the site;</li> <li>• Approximately 300-500 new mine related job opportunities to county residents with bussing to/from Wells, West Wendover, and Elko;</li> <li>• Over ten years of mine life currently projected;</li> <li>• Plan of Operations includes a broad range of environmental protection activities such as: - Concurrent reclamation minimizes the disturbance of a significant deer migration corridor. Additionally, all BLM/NDOW compensation for deer mitigation should be directed habitat restoration and enhancement of the Long Canyon area. - Establishing a riparian corridor as mitigation and preservation of wetlands that also allows for domestic ranching. The wetlands will provide valued habitat for all wildlife, including Sage Grouse, as well as restoring hydrologic functions and values. - Re-vegetation efforts should complement wildlife habitat, fire management, and domestic livestock objectives. - Excavation and preservation of cultural resources within the mine disturbance area. Please approve the advancement of this well-studied and beneficial project.</li> </ul>	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
26	26.1	Skip Canfield, Nevada Division of State Lands & State Land Use Planning Agency	Please consider the cumulative visual impacts from development activities ( <b>temporary and permanent</b> ). Some notable activities include proliferation of new roads, poorly-sited and designed structures, lack of co-location of infrastructure and improper lighting, to name a few.	VR/CE	The visual impacts from temporary and permanent past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are described in Sections 5.16.2 and 5.16.3 of the DEIS. Specifically, Section 5.16.2 describes existing development, infrastructure, and roads, and the impact that they have had on visual resources in the cumulative effects study area. Section 5.16.3 describes activities which are reasonably foreseeable in the cumulative effects study area, which includes additional mineral exploration and mining and the Wild Horse Eco Sanctuary.
26	26.2	Skip Canfield, Nevada Division of State Lands & State Land Use Planning Agency	The following mitigation measures should be required: Utilize appropriate lighting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize consistent lighting mitigation measures that follow “Dark Sky” lighting practices.</li> <li>• Effective lighting should have screens that do not allow the bulb to shine up or out. All proposed lighting shall be located to avoid light pollution onto any adjacent lands as viewed from a distance. All lighting fixtures shall be hooded and shielded, face downward, located within soffits and directed on to the pertinent site only, and away from adjacent parcels or areas.</li> <li>• A lighting plan should be submitted indicating the types of lighting and fixtures, the locations of fixtures, lumens of lighting, and the areas illuminated by the lighting plan.</li> <li>• Any required FAA lighting should be consolidated and minimized wherever possible.</li> </ul>	MIT/VR	The environmental protection measures for visual resources discussed in Section 2.18.13 of the FEIS have been updated to reflect these suggestions.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
26	26.3	Skip Canfield, Nevada Division of State Lands & State Land Use Planning Agency	In addition, the following mitigation measures should be employed. Utilize building materials, colors and site placement that are compatible with the natural environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize consistent mitigation measures that address logical placement of improvements and use of appropriate screening and structure colors. Existing utility corridors, roads and areas of disturbed land should be utilized wherever possible. Proliferation of new roads should be avoided.</li> <li>For example, the use of compatible paint colors on structures reduces the visual impacts of the built environment. Using screening, careful site placement, and cognitive use of earth-tone colors/materials that match the environment improve the user experience for others who might have different values than what is fostered by built environment activities.</li> <li>Federal agencies should require these mitigation measures as conditions of approval for all permanent and temporary applications.</li> </ul>	MIT/VR	The environmental protection measures for visual resources discussed in Section 2.18.13 of the FEIS have been updated to reflect these suggestions.
27	27.1	Joanne Sherwood, Nevada Department of Transportation	I see several potential problems at first glance, including impacting three material sites. Proposed pipeline route: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed pipeline appears to be within the NDOT ROW on SR-233 from Montello to the south side of IR-80 (based on included maps and previous conversation with Newmont's landman). SR-233 ROW is 100' each side of centerline for that entire length. Possible permitting issues: UPR crossing, IR-80, BLM right-of-way grant areas, private owners where we have an easement only, our own environmental, etc. Longitudinal long-haul permits must show a public benefit for the utility to be in the NDOT ROW.</li> <li>NDOT has a comm. facility ("Loray") within the NDOT ROW at MP EL-13.45 adjacent to Material Site NEV054650.</li> </ol>	LUP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed pipeline is within the SR-233 ROW. Newmont and/or the proposed pipeline contractor would coordinate with all ROW/easement holders that may be affected (including NDOT and UPRR) prior to construction to limit impacts to existing land use authorizations. Large truck traffic would only be required during construction of the pipeline and for maintenance operations;</li> <li>The pipeline ROW is 50 feet, and would not interfere with the NDOT "Loray" communication facility.</li> <li>The proposed pipeline would not affect existing operations at the material sites authorized in NEV054650 and NEV054649. NDOT operations are</li> </ol>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			3. NDOT has two material sites on this portion of SR-233 which will be impacted if the pipeline is out of the NDOT ROW: NEV054650 (no EL number) and NEV054649 (EL35-01). The easterly portions of both are currently used but they both extend to the westerly side of the highway as well.		currently occurring on the easterly portions of those authorizations. The pipeline is proposed to be within the SR233 ROW, so if NDOT needed to expand operations to the westerly portion of the authorizations, there would still be room outside of the pipeline ROW to do this. The pipeline contractor would coordinate with NDOT prior to and during construction to prevent impacts to the two authorizations.
27	27.2	Joanne Sherwood, Nevada Department of Transportation	NDOT also has a material source on the south side of IR-80 just east of the Oasis interchange, NVN 000958, which is adjacent to the west edge of the actual project area. Closing County Road 790 south of IR-80 (as previously proposed) would cut off our access to this material source. Note: we may or may not have legal access to this pit.	LUP	No mine facilities would affect NVN000958. With the consent of Elko County and the BLM, the Proposed Action would upgrade County Road 790 from Exit 378 on I-80 into the Long Canyon surface facilities. These improvements would not prevent NDOT from accessing the material pit (NVN000958). Newmont would coordinate with NDOT prior to constructing improvements on County Road 790.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
28	28.1	P. Luke Opperman, Nevada Division of Water Resources	<p>Proposal supported as written.</p> <p>Any person proposing to alter a dam in this state shall, before constructing, reconstructing or altering in any way any dam, notify the State Engineer and must submit to the State Engineer in triplicate plans and specifications thereof for his approval in accordance with Nevada Revised Statue Chapter 535 and Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 535 prior to construction is to begin.</p> <p>All waters of the State belong to the public and may be appropriated for beneficial use pursuant to the provisions of Chapters 533 and 534 of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), and not otherwise. Any water used on the described project for construction, dust control, or maintenance should be provided by an established utility or under a permit.</p> <p>Any water wells or monitor wells that are proposed to be drilled within the described lands are the ultimate responsibility of the entity allowing the drilling to occur and must be plugged and abandoned as required in Chapter 534 of the Nevada Administrative Code.</p>	POS	Comment noted.
28	28.2	P. Luke Opperman, Nevada Division of Water Resources	<p>A search of water rights in the proposed mining area revealed that Fronteer Development (USA) Inc., Elko Land and Livestock Company, the City of West Wendover Nevada and the City of Wendover Utah, Wendover Project and Star Living Trust, are listed as owner of record of active Permitted water rights.</p>	WTR	<p>Newmont has worked with the Cities of Wendover and West Wendover with respect to water rights and water delivery. Water rights in the name of Fronteer Development and Elko Land and Livestock Company are under the control of Newmont (Newmont acquired Fronteer and owns the Elko Land and Livestock Company, which owns the Big Springs Ranch). The purpose of the water rights section was to demonstrate that Newmont had ample water rights for the project. Wendover Project and Star Living Trust is listed as one of the two owners of irrigation rights in the basin (page 3-48).</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
29	29.1	Jim Balderson, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Please be aware that the proposed Long Canyon Mine potable water system will need to become permitted as a public drinking water system. Plans and specifications for the drinking water system will need to be submitted to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), Bureau of Safe Drinking Water (BSDW), for review and approval prior to construction.	WTR	Comment noted.
29	29.2	Jim Balderson, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Additionally, any alternative water supply (drinking water wells and associated infrastructure) provided by Newmont to replace a portion of West Wendover's current water supply which comes primarily from the Big Springs will also need to have the plans and specifications submitted to the BSDW for review and approval prior to construction.	WTR	Comment noted.
30	30.1	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Proposed development must include provisions for complying with the Clean Water Act through a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that includes mitigation for, but is not limited to; track out onto highways, drainage onto or through State Right of Way, and any other impacts, either direct or indirect.	WTR	Newmont has prepared a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix 4A of the DEIS) for the site.
30	30.2	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Proposed development must include provisions to mitigate and manage noxious weeds caused to be in State Highway Right of Ways from the proposed development.	VEG	The proponent has committed to manage noxious weeds as listed in the Environmental Protection Measures discussed in Section 2.2.18.12 of the DEIS.
30	30.3	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Proposed development must provide written use agreements with any permittee for existing permitted accesses.	LUP	Comment noted. Newmont will provide NDOT the written use agreement for existing permitted access on County Road 790, as well as any other access agreements. However, this is not necessary for inclusion in the EIS, and can be done in coordination with NDOT prior to project implementation.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
30	30.4	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Proposed development must perform a Traffic Study to adequately assess the impact of highway use caused by the development. Results of the study may require the developer to provide and follow a Transportation Safety Management Plan. A Transportation Safety Management Plan may include, but is not limited to, mitigation of traffic impacts by Traffic Control Plans, flaggers, truck crossings, warning signs, etc. that meet the requirements of the MUTCD and NDOT. All such plans shall be submitted for approval to the District III office.	TRAN	A Traffic Study will be performed by Newmont independently of the EIS analysis. Additional information from the 2012 annual traffic report for Elko County has been included in the EIS and incorporated into the analysis.
30	30.5	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Subsequent analysis of operations and impacts on State Highways will be performed by the Nevada Department of Transportation. Results of any such analysis by NDOT may cause additional limitations of operations including, but not limited to, reduced weight limits and route changes. Results of any analysis may require repairs and/or improvements to the Highway System to mitigate damage or safety.	TRAN	Comment noted.
30	30.6	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Highway routes in Nevada may become subject to Frost Law's at any time. Frost Law reduces legal load weights due to critically sensitive roadbeds during cold and wet seasons. Haul routes may be impacted.	TRAN	Comment noted.
30	30.7	Boyd Ratliff, Nevada Department of Transportation	Use of development proposed borrow material sites that are adjacent to NDOT designated material sources shall not encroach or impact use of NDOT designated sources by NDOT. This includes, but is not limited to, access, environment, or materials.	LUP	Comment noted. Newmont will work with NDOT to make sure that NDOT's existing material sites and sources are not adversely impacted by project activities., including access, environment, or materials.
31	31.1	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Greater Sage Grouse: Does the impacted acreage (2,785) include public and private? Please show the acreage separated into these categories. (page ES-13)	SSS	The public and private portions of this habitat have been broken out in the FEIS.
31	31.2	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Both the Murdock and West Cobre leks were active in 2014 per Scott Roberts, NDOW. Previous information suggested that in 2009 the Murdock lek no birds were observed. (page 3-155)	SSS	The EIS has been updated with this new lek information.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
31	31.3	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Range Resources: - There should be a description of what significant range improvements have been or will be implemented to facilitate an increase of AUMs in the associated allotments. - There should also be a description of the range management objectives that will need to be attained prior to the sizable increases in AUMs.	OOS	The increase of AUMs for these allotments is part of a previously approved grazing decision and is out of scope of this analysis.
31	31.4	Nevada Department of Wildlife	There has been conversations as to the use of private lands within the East Big Springs Allotment to mitigate for the proposed disturbances to GSG habitat. It is unclear as to how increasing AUMs within the allotment will aid in restoring and/or protecting the limited priority habitat within and near the project area. (pages 3-161 through 3-162)	OOS	The increase of AUMs for these allotments is part of a previously approved grazing decision and is out of scope of this analysis.
31	31.5	Nevada Department of Wildlife	The document indicates under mitigation measure #4 that development of a conservation easement "would" include. It is our view that "would" should be changed to "could" or "may". There is no guarantee that we will come to agreement on the goals and objectives for a conservation easement on the Big Springs Ranch. (page 4-94)	MIT	Additional coordination and work has taken place on this mitigation measure between the parties which is reflected in the FEIS as well as in the Mitigation Plan attached as Appendix 2C to the FEIS.
31	31.6	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Mitigation Measure #4. We are still somewhat uncomfortable with the provision of a credit for long term assurances for habitat protection on private land. While we understand in concept as identified in the Mining MOU, however the idea that habitat losses will occur on public lands and to compensate for these losses we will be enhancing and/or protecting habitat on private land owned by the proponent is somewhat bothersome. Furthermore in conversation with NDOW Reno staff how this credit would be applied is in question. We need to seek clarification from our perspective State offices whether the credit is provided before or after we apply the 3:1, 2:1 compensation. (page 4-94)	MIT	Additional coordination and work has taken place on this mitigation measure between the parties which is reflected in the FEIS as well as in the Mitigation Plan attached as Appendix 2C to the FEIS.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
31	31.7	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Mitigation Measure #4. We need to identify that all offsite habitat enhancement projects as a result of mitigation for sage-grouse will occur within the East Valley PMU or an adjacent PMU. (page 4-94)	MIT	This mitigation measure has been re-written.
31	31.8	Nevada Department of Wildlife	We need to identify the concept that should no agreement be reached on the goals and objectives of a conservation easement on Newmont owned private land, mitigation for loss of sage-grouse habitat on public lands would default to the off-site mitigation ratios of 3:1 for PPH and 2:1 for PGH and that an off site mitigation account would be developed under MOU between Newmont, BLM and NDOW. (page 4-94)	MIT	Additional coordination and work has taken place on this mitigation measure between the parties which is reflected in the FEIS as well as in the Mitigation Plan attached as Appendix 2C to the FEIS.
31	31.9	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Will the wording of the development of Eagle conservation plan be changed since USFWS has decided that wind energy is a priority? (page 4-95)	MIT	This Mitigation has been updated to indicate the Bird and Bat conservation Plan would be developed and implemented in coordination with BLM and NDOW.
31	31.10	Nevada Department of Wildlife	Comments provided for sage-grouse mitigation measures specific to the proposed action also apply to the North Alternative. (page 4-102)	MIT	The mitigation for sage-grouse has been updated to reflect the updates incorporated into the mitigation section for the Proposed Action.
31	31.11	Nevada Department of Wildlife	The mule deer seasonal distribution map needs to be updated to reflect appropriate crucial mule deer winter range into the South Pequops.	WLF	Figure 3.8-3 in the EIS has been updated with the most recent crucial mule deer winter range layer.
31	3.12	Nevada Department of Wildlife	NDOW would like to see a representation of the socioeconomics of Area 7 mule deer herd and the economic impact recreation use of this herd provides to the surrounding communities. USFWS puts a census out depicting monetary values for hunting in Nevada. Please use this source for information and reference this census from 2011 in the EIS.	WLF/SOC	The socioeconomic values of hunting in Elko County have been added to the socioeconomic discussion in Chapter 3. Since there is no anticipated impact to the Area 7 mule deer herd from the analysis in the EIS there are no impact to hunting to discuss in the socioeconomics or recreation sections of the EIS.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
31	31.13	Nevada Department of Wildlife	At some place in the EIS we need to discuss the development of a monitoring plan which provides the specifics of the mule deer collaring program and the potential for adaptive management as an outgrowth of this monitoring effort. Adaptive management strategies could include adjustments to berm location, lay down fence locations, as well as potential travel management restrictions during the key hours of the day during the migration season. While we understand that haul truck traffic most likely cannot be affected by such restrictions we should look at the basic human presence in the migratory corridor to see what actions we can take to facilitate ease of deer movement through the project area during migration periods. The WWG, previously developed, could address any potential issues and adaptive management strategies specific to this monitoring effort. NDOW has previously provided a draft mule deer monitoring plan and we have attached the plan for reference.	WLF/SOC	Monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation for mule deer has been added as a part of the Mitigation Plan and is attached to the FEIS as Appendix 2C.
31	31.14	Nevada Department of Wildlife	The recreational aspect of hunting Area 7 isn't truly depicted, along with what the impacts of the road closure on accessing the South Pequops for hunting/trapping and other forms of recreation.	REC	Section 3.15.3.1 of the DEIS identifies big-game hunting, including mule deer as well as antelope and elk hunting, as historically being a major recreational activity within hunt unit 78, and describes County Road 790 as being the access route often used by hunters. This section also discusses the number of tags sold and the hunter success. Section 2.2.18.7 of the DEIS describes signs that would be posted notifying the public that although County Road 790 can no longer be used to access Goshute Valley, access to the valley is provided from the Shafter exit on Interstate 80. The signs would include a map to the exit. The network of roads beginning at the Shafter exit provide

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
					<p>access to areas of Goshute Valley and the Pequop Mountains south of the mine site. Additionally, the closure of County Road 790 would begin at the mine fence, which is just south of the intersection of the County Road 790 and Six Mile Road. Thus, Six Mile Road would remain open to the public throughout the project. Six Mile Road and secondary unpaved roads branching from it may be used to access the higher elevations of the Pequop Mountains, including the upper portion of Long Canyon, outside of the mine perimeter fence. The combination of Six Mile Road and the roads accessible from the Shafter exit would provide access to the areas of the Pequop Mountains and Goshute Valley outside of the mine fence. Areas within the mine fence would be closed to hunting, regardless of the closure of County Road 790.</p>
32	32.1	Gerald S. Heston, Pilot Gold USA, Inc.	<p>Pilot Gold (USA) Inc. fully supports the North Facilities Alternative for the Long Canyon Mine Project in Elko County, Nevada. Pilot Gold believes the North Facilities Alternative will benefit Elko County and the State of Nevada with enhanced environmental protection measures, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced protection of wetland and riparian zones</li> <li>• Expanded wildlife migration corridors</li> <li>• Mining and facilities positioned above the groundwater table</li> <li>• Better public access to the California Trail Hastings Cutoff via county easement</li> </ul>	POS	Comment noted.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
33	33.1	Mike Crawford, City of Wendover	The City of Wendover, Utah would like to thank you for taking the time to present for discussions the Long Canyon Mine Project. It is very helpful for our Citizens and City Representatives to be able to communicate freely and openly with Newmont and The Bureau of Land Management with regards to the Long Canyon Mine Project. The City of Wendover, Utah in conjunction with West Wendover have had the opportunity to meet with Newmont representatives numerous times and discuss the concerns with respect to water and the impact(s) the projected surface mine may have on the communities as well. Therefore, the City of Wendover, Utah sustains the Long Canyon Mine project and the benefits it may bring to the communities.	POS	Comment noted.
34	34.1	Chris J. Johnson, City of Elko	The City of Elko has reviewed the Long Canyon Mine Project's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and has prepared this letter of comment. The letter addresses only those areas that might impact Elko as discussed in the Executive Summary and in Section 3.16, Socioeconomics. The mission statement for the City of Elko includes the term "enabling economic development". We believe it is appropriate to provide comments on this important regional project. With regard to the Executive Summary, it is noted that the project will "strain the currently available temporary and long-term housing resources in Elko County, especially in Elko." However, the City of Elko has significantly increased long-term housing resources over the past two (2) years. In Calendar Years 2012 and 2013, 214 single-family and multi-family residential units were completed. Additionally, four (4) single-family subdivisions and one (1) large multifamily apartment complex are currently under construction. Plans for additional subdivisions, multi-family residential projects, and hotels have been approved and are pending construction.	POS	The information in Section 3.16.3.1 and 4.16.2 of the FEIS has been updated with the housing information provided in your letter.

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
34	34.2	Chris J. Johnson, City of Elko	<p>The DEIS estimates employment during construction will average 350 workers for 18 months. The study further estimates that 40 percent will be hired from the local workforce. Section 3.16 correctly identifies the temporary housing resources in the surrounding communities that could easily accommodate a construction labor force of this size. The City of Elko alone has 31 motels with 1890 rooms, and 7 RV Parks with 518 available spaces. In the event that the construction labor force resides in Elko, we do not anticipate any negative impacts associated with this project. Our hotel, motel, RV Park owners, and local businesses would welcome this additional business and the City would welcome the room tax revenue it generates. After construction, the DEIS estimates 360 permanent jobs at the Long Canyon Mine Project. Since Newmont Mining Corporation maintains a regional office and a large contingent of employees in Elko, we anticipate a significant portion of these permanent employees will reside in Elko and commute to the mine site. Elko has experienced significant growth in the private sector from mining and other natural resources, transportation, energy, and regional warehousing. In 2011, the City completed a major update of its Master Plan and is well prepared for future growth. There is developable land within the City limits, ample water supply and sewage infrastructure, a class one regional landfill, a regional airport serviced by daily flights, and a philosophy that welcomes planned growth, new citizens, and new businesses. We do not see any major impacts if a significant portion of Long Canyon's work force choose to live in Elko. The sales and property taxes these new residents would add would help mitigate the cost of additional services the City provides. The DEIS also assumes some indirect employment will be created. Elko is the regional retail, industrial, transportation, entertainment, and</p>	POS	<p>The information in Section 3.16.3.1 and 4.16.2 of the FEIS has been updated with the temporary housing information provided in your letter.</p>

Letter ID No.	Comment ID No.	Name/Entity	Comment	Comment Code	Response
			post-secondary education hub for Northeastern Nevada. This added business will have a favorable impact on direct and indirect employment, sales and property taxes, and business fees.		

This page intentionally left blank