

### Appendix C – Comments and Responses to Comments

The BLM received approximately 350 comment emails or letters to consider on the “draft” EA. All public comments received were made available on the project website on September 20, 2018. All comments the BLM received were reviewed and categorized. Although not required for an EA by regulation, an agency may respond to *substantive* and *timely* comments received (BLM 2008).

Substantive comments:

1. question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EA;
2. question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of, methodology for, or assumptions used for the environmental analysis;
3. present new information relevant to the analysis;
4. present reasonable alternatives other than those analyzed in the EA; and/or
5. cause changes or revisions in one or more of the alternatives.

No response is necessary for non-substantive comments (BLM 2008). Below is a representative list of comments and concerns on the project, and a summary of responses by the BLM. Not all comments received by the BLM have been responded to here. Duplicated comments are not repeated.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS	
#	Comment Summary
1	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that based on loading and hauling 24 hours per day, 4-7 days per week, would result in 336 [transport] trucks per day.
2	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that excessive transport truck traffic would deplete roads not designed for such traffic.
3	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that transport truck traffic would cause noise in residential areas.
4	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that there are two elementary schools, along with a fire department, located at the intersection of Iron Springs Road and Williams Valley Road.
5	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that braking mechanisms [such as “Jake brake”] would cause noise and disruption to residential and schools along Williamson Valley Road.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
6	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that congestion caused by haul trucks in school zones would create hazardous situations to trucks, parents, children etc. when unloading and loading schoolchildren.	The environmental assessment considered the impacts to public safety and noise at sensitive receptors along three proposed transportation routes (Sections 3.4 and 3.13).
7	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Brown). Stated that a cost analysis report should be prepared [by Kirkland Mining Company LLC] to determine if use of rail is feasible [from the Kirkland Rail Yard] given that the life of the mine would be 40-years.	The environmental assessment described that the use of the Kirkland Rail Yard is currently infeasible and consideration of it as a loading site is speculative (Section 2.3.2). During the life of the mine, the feasibility of the Kirkland Rail Yard could change. If this were to occur, any new loading facility may be subject to new environmental review. Route #2 identifies the transportation route ending at Hillside, where an existing rail facility exists (Figure 8).
8	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Simmons). Stated that the BLM should require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to use the least intrusive transportation route, and not allow Kirkland Mining Company LLC to use Route #3 (Iron Springs Road north to Prescott, then north to State Highway 89). The BLM must require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to only use Route #1 (Iron Springs Road south to State Route 89).	Once transport trucks leave the mine site (BLM-managed land), according to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, their direction of travel would be market-driven. Use of any of the three proposed transportation haul routes is outside the jurisdiction of the BLM and as such the BLM cannot require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to direct transport trucks onto one particular route. Although not subject to BLM jurisdiction, the use of transport trucks on any proposed transportation route would be subject to applicable State, county, and/or city laws, regulations, and/or ordinances. The BLM has considered the off-transportation impacts as both indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal.
9	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Simmons). Stated that the BLM must abate noise from the mine operation through a requirement that mining activities only occur between 7 am and 5 pm.	According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, mine operating hours would during daylight hours within a 10-hour shift, four to six days per week (Section 2.1.1). Loading and hauling of transport trucks could occur anytime during a 24-hour period (Section 2.1.1). According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, shifts will depend on variables including: weather, worker safety, customer demand, and trucking company schedules.
10	Yavapai Board of Supervisors (Simmons). Stated that the BLM must require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to develop a strong dust abatement plan for both the mining operation and transport haul trucks.	The BLM has assessed the potential impacts from dust in the Air Quality section (3.5.3) of the environmental assessment. Kirkland Mining Company LLC would operate under a General Permit by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in order to limit dust during mining operations (Table 1-1). The primary mechanism to limit dust during mining operations is through the application of water on haul roads and where active quarrying occurs. Off-site transport trucks would be regulated by the Arizona Department of Transportation in order to limit airborne dust that may occur during transport. The primary mechanism to limit dust during transport is through use of covers.
11	Environmental Protection Agency. Stated that the BLM should calculate and analyze emissions caused by off-site transportation, and that the BLM should consider greenhouse gas emissions.	The BLM calculated the amount of on-site emissions from equipment and on-site mine trucks. The calculations were of regulated pollutants (PM <sub>2.5</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> ) (Table 3-8). The Project Area, including the three proposed transportation routes, is in attainment for all regulated pollutants (Section 3.5.2). Equipment and mine trucks would contribute to other pollutants, commonly known as “greenhouse gases,” including carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide. The calculation of greenhouse gas emissions would not better inform the BLM in its decision-making process, nor result in additional mitigation measures that would not already occur under the General Permit by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. The BLM did not conduct calculations of regulated pollutants, or greenhouse gases, caused by the off-site transport trucks along three transportation haul routes. Calculating the emissions produced off-site would not have informed the BLM decision maker on which transportation route to use. As has been previously stated, all three proposed transportation routes are along State, county and/or city roads, and as such are outside the BLM’s jurisdiction. According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, the direction of travel by transport haul trucks would be market-driven.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
12	Environmental Protection Agency. Stated that the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> dismissed the need for a exclusive left turn lane on Iron Springs Road for ingress/egress onto the mine site.	The <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> and its findings were reviewed by the Yavapai County Public Works Department. There was no recommendation to construct an exclusive left turn lane on Iron Springs Road. Nothing precludes Yavapai County Public Works Department from doing so during the 40-year life of the mine. As Iron Springs Road is under the jurisdiction of the County, the BLM does not have the authority to require such turn lane.
13	Environmental Protection Agency. Stated that the BLM should clarify that the incremental increase in traffic is expected to exceed Arizona Department of Transportation's road classification [in 2040].	The BLM has clarified Section 3.4.3.2, that according to the Arizona Department of Transportation, Iron Springs Road would exceed the road classification by 2040 regardless the of proposal.
14	Environmental Protection Agency. The BLM should reconsider the measurement of incremental impacts to the aquifer, and what measures would prevent overdraft (that there would be a seven foot and three foot drawdown on the two proposed well sites).	The <i>Evaluation of Skull Valley Ranch Wells as a Water Supply</i> identified that there has been a draw down on the aquifer in the past. The removal of additional water for use in dust suppression, would add to a draw down over the life of the mine in the amount of up to two feet. This is not a significant amount of draw down on this aquifer.
15	City of Prescott. Resubmitted comments from the Mayor that were provided to the BLM during public scoping on July 26, 2017. Also submitted minutes that were created for a meeting held of August 28, 2018 between the Kirkland Mining Company LLC and the Prescott City Council. The BLM was not in attendance.	Noted, see responses to specific comments below.
16	City of Prescott. Stated that the addition of transport truck traffic would exacerbate existing traffic and public safety issues at/around Abia Judd Elementary School and Granite Mountain School (at/around the intersection of Iron Springs and Williamson Valley Roads).	The environmental assessment and <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> acknowledged that there would be a increase of transport truck traffic on three transportation haul routes. The BLM has revised Section 4.4.1.1 and included two new tables 4-2 and 4-3 that describe the incremental and cumulative increase in traffic along each proposed transportation haul route. Route #3 would experience a 2.9 to 10.7 percent increase in traffic in the first year of the mine operation. These incremental increases are not significant.
17	City of Prescott. Stated that the addition of transport truck traffic would place a burden on the City of Prescott's police department in enforcing traffic laws.	The BLM does not have jurisdiction on city, county, and/or State routes that are proposed for use by transport haul trucks. Public safety measures, such as the enforcement of speed laws, would be the responsibility of the State of Arizona, Yavapai County, and cities that are along the three proposed transportation haul routes.
18	City of Prescott. Stated that the transport of mined material, and the mine operations, would increase public health issues caused by increase in dust.	The mining operation would be subject to dust control measures under a General Permit by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. Transport haul trucks and their potential airborne dust, would be regulated by the Arizona Department of Transportation.
19	City of Prescott. Stated that the transport truck traffic will adversely affect the road system in the City of Prescott.	The <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> assessed the increase in transport truck traffic, along with employee traffic, along three transportation haul routes. The report and its findings were reviewed by the Yavapai County Public Works Department. The report did not identify for any changes needed to the three transportation haul routes at this time in order to accommodate the increased truck traffic.
20	City of Prescott. Stated that [Kirkland Mining Company LLC] should consider use of rail to transport mined material.	The environmental assessment described two potential links to rail for transportation of mined material: 1) the Kirkland Rail Yard (Section 2.3.2); and 2) Hillside (Section 2.1.9.2). As described, the Kirkland Rail Yard is not currently suited for loading of material onto rail at this location. This alternative was considered to be too speculative to analyze. The potential link to rail in Hillside was evaluated as a part of the Proposed Action, as Route #2.
21	Center for Biological Diversity. Referred to a August 29, 2018 press release and its characterization about the role of public commenting.	The BLM did not issue a press release on August 29, 2018. See comment #23 below regarding substantive comments.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
22	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that residents of the affected communities have not been heard by the BLM.	The BLM disagrees. The BLM conducted extensive outreach in 2017, with a 78-day scoping period. Approximately 1,659 residents were notified of the extended scoping period, in addition to announcements in four different newspapers. Approximately 140 people attended an open house at the Skull Valley Community Center on July 11, 2017. Approximately 989 emails or comment letter were received by the BLM to consider. For review of the draft environmental analysis, on June 29, 2018, approximately 1,519 postcards were mailed to residents, in addition to notification on July 6, 2018 to approximately 627 email addresses. Approximately 105 people attended the public meeting at the Kirkland Community Center on July 11, 2018. There was also considerable media coverage, with announcements in three different newspapers prior to the public meeting. Approximately 350 emails or comment letters were received by the BLM to consider.
23	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that the BLM is in error when it describes to the public that their comments need to be substantive.	The BLM NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1, Section 6.9.2.1) provides a definition of “substantive comments.” The Handbook also describes what types of comments are not substantive.
24	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that the BLM’s assessment of potential loss in property values was inadequate and that this will lead to litigation under the Arizona Private Property Rights Protection Act.	This act applies only to State and municipal governments and does not apply to the BLM. Any change in property values as a result of this project is speculative.
25	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that the BLM is following the interest of the mining proponent and not the affected public.	In processing an application, whether from a mining company, a utility company, or from a non-profit, the BLM’s responsibility is to consider the application and public’s interest in review of the proposal. The BLM has met and exceeded this obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act by providing an extensive public scoping period (78-days) in 2017, and 60-day public comment period on the draft environmental assessment in 2018. As the commenter acknowledges, the process does not involve an election and voting, but whether the proposal is consistent with the BLM’s multiple use mandate under the Federal Land Management and Policy Act.
26	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that the contractor preparing the environmental assessment (Westland Resources) is biased because it is paid for by Kirkland Mining Company LLC.	The standard practice within the BLM is for third-party contractors to prepare environmental documents, whether environmental assessments or environmental impact statements. It is the responsibility of the BLM, not the applicant nor their contractor(s), to ensure that documents prepared for the BLM for a proposal are fully compliant with the applicable federal environmental laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act. All baseline studies and reports were reviewed by BLM interdisciplinary team members who made their professional judgement when providing comments to the consultant that prepared the document, and whether the studies and/or reports meet appropriate standards/legal requirements.
27	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that approval of this project would contradict the BLM’s own mission (“sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations”).	The BLM’s mission is derived from the Federal Land Management and Policy Act, which mandates a multiple use mission for the BLM. A mineral resource under the General Mining Law of 1872 has been located within the Project Area and Kirkland Mining Company LLC has submitted a request to mine the material. The BLM is processing the application under the appropriate federal environmental laws. This is consistent with this mission statement and the mandates under the Federal Land Management and Policy Act.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
28	<p>Center for Biological Diversity. Made to comments regarding the purview of the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disagrees that these deposits of pozzolan fall under the General Mining Law of 1872; and</li> <li>2. Reminded the BLM that the Center of Biological Diversity submitted a Freedom of Information Act request for the “Burch Report” in August 2017.</li> </ol>	<p>The BLM provides the following responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The comment expresses the opinion that the BLM does not have the legal authority to process the Mining and Reclamation Plan of Operations under 43 CFR 3809. This comment is related only to the BLM’s legal authority and does not identify questions about the adequacy, methodology, or assumptions in the environmental assessment or present new information relevant to the analysis to the analysis of environmental effects. Consequently, the BLM has not made any changes to the analysis contained in the environmental assessment in response to this opinion; and</li> <li>2. With regards to the release under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) of the “Burch Report,” on September 26, 2018 the BLM provided the Center for Biological Diversity and one other FOIA requestor, a redacted version of the report.</li> </ol>
29	<p>Center for Biological Diversity. Provided the BLM a number of questions with regards to the uncommon variety determination that should be answered in the EA, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the Kirkland tuff exceed other comparable deposits in pozzolanic performance?</li> <li>• What are the unique properties of the Kirkland tuff for which there are no readily available substitutes?</li> <li>• What is the distinct and special value of the Kirkland tuff that exceeds ASTM standards and thus demands a higher market price?</li> <li>• What is the distinct and special value of the Kirkland tuff that will lead to its use for purposes for which ordinary varieties of the mineral may be used?</li> <li>• What evidence is there that a higher market price has been offered for the Kirkland tuff?</li> </ul>	<p>These questions are not within the scope of the environmental assessment. The BLM is processing a Mining and Reclamation Plan of Operations. As a part of the National Environmental Policy Act, the BLM has required the appropriate baseline studies for the 88-acre proposal including: cultural and biological inventories; wells and traffic studies for off-site activities; and the BLM voluntarily completed on-site sampling for the presence certain of carcinogens including erionite.</p>
30	<p>Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that an environmental impact statement is required for this project because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential effects of the proposal are likely to be highly controversial; and</li> <li>• The potential effects are likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.</li> </ul>	<p>The commenter referred to a Finding of No Significant Impact statement, specifically questions #4 and #5: “The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.” and “The degree to which possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For response to “highly controversial” see response to comment #31 below.</li> <li>• With regards to potential effects that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks-</li> </ul> <p>The commenter stated that the BLM and Kirkland Mining Company LLC’s findings [based on voluntary sampling conducted in the Project Area], that erionite is not present is in error, and there are additional methods available to validate whether erionite is present raises uncertainty about the effects of the proposal. See response to comment #35 below.</p> <p>The commenter stated that because purchasers have not been identified by Kirkland Mining Company LLC, and there is uncertainty about the effects of the proposal because the off-site transportation by haul trucks is uncertain. See response to comment #36 below.</p> <p>Overall the risks of the proposal are lower than typical mining operations because of the lack of use of chemicals for processing, lack of blasting, availability of truck route networks, limited and predictable use of groundwater, and predictable ore distribution creating a static pit design and impacts to resources over the life of the mine.</p>

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
31	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted the effects are highly controversial because the public and local governments are overwhelmingly against the proposal.	The commenter referred to a Finding of No Significant Impact statement, specifically question #4: “The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.” The courts have rejected the suggestion that the term “controversial” means “opposition.” See <i>River Road Alliance, Inc. v. Corps of Engineers</i> , supra; <i>Town of Orangetown v. Gorsuch</i> , 718 F.2d 29, 39 (2d Cir. 1983); <i>Rucker v. Willis</i> , 484 F.2d 158, 162 (4th Cir. 1973). The existence of public opposition cannot be the element to topple the balance in favor of preparing an environmental impact statement. <i>River Road Alliance, Inc. v. Corps of Engineers</i> , supra. The term “controversial” refers to cases where a substantial dispute exists as to the size, nature, or effect of the action. <i>Rucker v. Willis</i> , supra. Broad assertions are not sufficient to establish controversy about the BLM’s analysis of potential impacts from the proposal.
32	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that the BLM’s characterization of past mining activities at the site is an exaggeration.	Section 3.10.2.1 of the environmental assessment stated a “portion” of the Project Area has been subject to past mining activities.
33	Center for Biological Diversity. Proposed a new alternative, one that would limit mining to the 15-acres where recent (1980s) mining activities occurred.	The BLM has revised Section 2.3 (“Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Detailed Analysis”) and considered this as a new alternative and provides rationale why it was not fully analyzed.
34	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that the BLM eliminated “other alternatives but did not disclose them.”	It is unclear what “other alternatives” the commenter refers to. Prior to release of the “draft” environmental assessment in July 2018, the BLM had included one “Alternative Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis” which was the use of blasting as a component of the mining operation. Blasting had not been proposed in any early version of the Mining and Reclamation Plan of Operations and the BLM removed this component from the administrative “draft” environmental assessment. No “other alternatives” were considered prior to release to the public of the draft environmental assessment in July 2018.
35	Center for Biological Diversity. Asserted that the methodology and accuracy of the BLM and Kirkland Mining Company LLC’s erionite tests were flawed and that there are additional testing methods available that the BLM and Kirkland Mining Company LLC did not follow.	<p>The BLM voluntarily conducted 12 samples for erionite in the Project Area and described the results in the <i>Geochemical Assay Testing for the Possible Presence of Airborne Carcinogens at the Proposed Kirkland High Quality Mine, Yavapai County, Arizona</i>. Kirkland Mining Company LLC had also voluntarily taken its own samples between 2015 and 2017. None of the samples taken from the Project Area showed the presence of airborne carcinogens. The commenter appears to refer to statements from a member of the public, that other tests are available in order to determine whether erionite is present.</p> <p>The BLM disagrees that X-ray diffraction is not the best analytical method to detect the presence of erionite in tuffs, where the alteration can be too fine-grained to detect using other analytical methods. XRD is recommended and identified as an equivalent method to energy dispersive x-ray spectroscopy (EDS) when paired with scanning electron microscopy (SEM) in guidelines from the North Dakota Department of Health published in 2007 through 2012, including “Overview of Erionite Sampling Guidelines”, “Erionite Sampling Guidelines”, and “Erionite Sampling Checklist”. The BLM’s voluntary sampling program was vetted by professionals at the U.S.G.S., the EPA, the ADEQ Air Quality Division, and ASU’s Department of School and Earth Exploration. XRD is the preferred analytical method in most major peer-reviewed erionite publications, included all three of those forwarded by the CBD to the BLM regarding this project. Refer to the analytic methods discussion on pages 10-14 of Eyde and Irvin, 1979; page 4 of Sheppard, 1996; and page 427 of Van Gosen et al, 2013. The latter of which specifically states that “all electron beam techniques should be complimented with x-ray diffraction when possible” for because of the extreme electron beam sensitivity of erionite and related zeolites. Kirkland Mining Company LLC has voluntarily committed to continue sampling in the Project Area.</p>

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
36	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that because purchasers of the pozzolan have not been identified, the final transportation haul routes have not been identified.	The BLM disagrees that the “final transportation haul routes” have not been identified. The environmental assessment analyzed the use of three proposed transportation haul routes (Table 3-12 and Figure 11). Kirkland Mining Company LLC cannot describe to what extent each of the three proposed transportation haul routes would be used by the 160 transport haul truck trips per day. As a result, the BLM evaluated the indirect and cumulative impacts for each route under a worst-case scenario (100 percent of the transport haul trucks on each route) (Section 3.4.1). The BLM acknowledged that actual transportation use would be divided between the three proposed routes as it will be market-driven. The BLM has revised Section 4.4.1.1 and included two new tables 4-2 and 4-3 that describe the incremental and cumulative increase in traffic along each proposed transportation haul route.
37	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that the proposal would destroy geologic features, scenery and habitat for wildlife.	The environmental assessment analyzed the potential direct, indirect and cumulative effects to the Project Area including visual resources, wildlife and their associated habitats, and geology. As depicted in Figure 16, a visual simulation of the west side of the Project Area from Iron Springs Road, there would be no changes to the unique hoodoos- they would remain intact (Figure 16).
38	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that there are approximately 24 archeological or historic sites in the mine area, and that even ineligible sites would be destroyed.	<p>It is unclear what the commenter refers to. Table 3-2 stated the following with regards to cultural resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A class III cultural resources survey was conducted of the 165-acre Project Area;</li> <li>• Four sites within the 165-acre Project Area were determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP);</li> <li>• As a result of project design changes, there would be “no adverse effect” to any of the eligible sites within the Project Area; and</li> <li>• The State Historic Preservation Office concurred with this determination.</li> </ul> <p>There is no legal obligation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for the BLM to “protect” sites that have been evaluated and determined <i>not</i> eligible for listing on the NRHP. A copy of the BLM’s determination and SHPOs concurrence of “no adverse effect” had been made available to the public (SHPO 2018).</p>
39	Center for Biological Diversity. Stated that isolating a “few key cultural sites” is not reasonable.	The SHPO concurred that the project would have “no adverse effect” to eligible cultural sites (SHPO 2018). The BLM fulfilled its obligations under the NHPA.
40	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the comment process imposed an undue burden on the public.	The BLM disagrees. In total, there were 138 days for public commenting, as previously responded to in comment #22, the BLM conducted an extensive scoping and public review process. Approximately 989 comment emails or letters were submitted during public scoping, and approximately 350 comment emails or letters were submitted during review of the draft analysis. Approximately 245 people attended the two public open house/meetings.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
41	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> had been prepared after public scoping, and as such was not subjected to public scrutiny.	<p>According to 40 CFR 1501.7, ““There shall be an early and open process solicits internal and external input on the for determining the scope of issues to be issues, impacts, and potential alternatives that addressed and for identifying the will be addressed in an EIS or EA as well as significant issues related to a proposed the extent to which those issues and impacts action. This process shall be termed will be analyzed in the NEPA document as scoping.” According to 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 46.305 “Public Involvement in the Environmental Assessment Process:”</p> <p>“(a) The bureau must, <i>to the extent practicable</i>, provide for public notification and public involvement when an environmental assessment is being prepared. However, the methods for providing public notification and opportunities for public involvement are at the discretion of the Responsible Official.</p> <p>(a) (2) Although scoping is not required, the bureau <i>may apply a scoping process to an environmental assessment.</i>” [emphasis added].</p> <p>There is no legal requirement to complete baseline studies and make them available during public scoping. Baseline studies were completed in the winter 2017/18.</p> <p>Despite not being required to do so, and outside any formal public comment/review period, the BLM released the baseline studies or reports on April 3, 2018 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Geochemical Assay Testing for the Possible Presence of Airborne Carcinogens at the Proposed Kirkland High Quality Pozzolan Mine.</i></li> <li>• <i>Evaluation of Potentially Jurisdictional Waters Within the Kirkland Analysis Area.</i></li> <li>• <i>Evaluation of Skull Valley Ranch Wells as a Water Supply for the Kirkland Mine.</i></li> <li>• <i>Traffic Impact Statement.</i></li> <li>• <i>Supplemental Traffic Analysis.</i></li> </ul> <p>An announcement of the publication of these studies was made by news release, including publication in <i>The Yellow Sheet</i> on April 4, 2018. Notification was made to approximately 627 individuals on the Project mailing list by email on April 3, 2018. Articles were also published in the <i>Wickenburg Sun</i> on April 18, 2018, and in the <i>Prescott Courier</i> on May 21, 2018.</p>
42	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the BLM’s explanation of the No Action Alternative (which this group supports) is irrational.	<p>The BLM disagrees. The No Action Alternative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does not meet the project purpose and need described in Section 1.3;</li> <li>2. There would be no impacts associated with mining because the proposal would not be authorized; and</li> <li>3. The BLM-land would continue to be subject to land uses under the Federal Land and Policy Management Act and other regulations.</li> </ol>
43	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the BLM should “fully mitigate” the proposal.	<p>In April 2017 the BLM determined the Project is regulated under the General Mining Act of 1872 (“3809” regulations). In accordance with Section 302 (b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976, the BLM would ensure that approval of the Project would not cause any unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands. A number of measures have been included in order to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project design changes to avoid impacts to eligible cultural sites; and</li> <li>• Include a condition that vegetation clearing would not occur between March 1 and August 1 (migratory bird nesting season), or a clearance surveys would be required to ensure that active nests would be avoided.</li> </ul>

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
44	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the BLM should prohibit transport of mined material on the transportation network while school and church is in session.	The regulation of transport haul truck traffic on State, county or city roads is outside the jurisdiction of the BLM. Public safety measures, such any regulation of hours that transport haul trucks could operate on State, county or city roads, would be the responsibility of the State of Arizona, Yavapai County, and cities that are along the three proposed transportation haul routes.
45	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the number of samples for erionite taken (incorrectly three) is inadequate.	The BLM voluntarily conducted 12 samples for erionite in the Project Area and described the results in the <i>Geochemical Assay Testing for the Possible Presence of Airborne Carcinogens at the Proposed Kirkland High Quality Mine, Yavapai County, Arizona</i> . Kirkland Mining Company LLC had voluntarily taken its own samples between 2015 and 2017. None of the samples taken from the Project Area showed the presence of erionite.
46	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the BLM failed to assess impacts to air quality in the Sycamore Wilderness Area (44 miles away).	The environmental assessment included quantitative emissions calculations from on-site mining activities and haul trucks, and qualitative assessment of off-site transport haul trucks. The BLM has removed the reference to the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness in Section 3.5.3 as there would be no impact to that Class I area, which is 44 miles from the Project Area.
47	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the BLM must fully analyze an alternative for use of the Kirkland Rail Yard.	See previous comment #21 for response regarding use of the Kirkland Rail Yard.
48	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the transportation analysis did not distinguish between cars and trucks.	Section 3.4 provides a consolidation of changes to traffic volume from the addition of 160 transport haul trucks, and 50 vehicles for employees including water trucks for dust suppression. Section 3.7 describes impacts to sensitive noise receptors from transport haul trucks. Section 3.13 describes transport truck traffic at the mine entry point on Iron Springs Road.
49	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the cumulative effects study area for the transportation network was too narrow and did not include assessment (for Route #3) impacts to Chino Valley, or five roundabouts; nor does the assessment for Route #1 adequately assess the impacts to Yarnell, People’s Valley, and Congress.	The cumulative effects study area for transportation was depicted on Figure 8 which included Yarnell, People’s Valley and Congress on Route #1, and Iron Springs Road/Pioneer Parkway to State Route 89 on Route #3. Section 4.4.1.1 has been revised and includes Tables 4-2 and 4-3 describing the incremental and cumulative increase in traffic from the project.
50	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that the BLM must explicitly address public and governmental comments.	According to Section 6.9.2 of the BLM NEPA Handbook (2008): “The requirements for BLM responses to comments differ between EAs and EISs (see section 8.2, Public Involvement, and section 9.6.1, Comments Received Following Issue of the Final EIS). When an EA and unsigned FONSI are made available for public comment, <i>we recommend that you respond to all substantive and timely comments</i> . You may respond to substantive, timely comments in the EA or in the decision record. If a substantive and timely comment does not lead to changes in the EA or decision, you may reply directly to the commenter, and we recommend that you document the reply in either the EA or the decision record...” [emphasis added]. Although not required by regulation, Appendix C serves as the BLMs response to substantive and other comments received from the public and other governmental agencies during public review of the “draft” environmental analysis. Similar to post-public scoping, although not required by regulation, on September 20, 2018 the BLM published all public and other comments received on the project website.
51	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated that federal highway funds have been used for some of the road system, and that needs to be analyzed.	The funding of the State, county, and/or city roads that may be a part of the three transportation haul routes is outside the scoping of this environmental assessment.
52	Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. Stated the BLM failed to analyze how drivers will react to the increase in slow moving trucks on the three transportation haul routes.	How individuals will react to transport haul trucks is speculative. All drivers have a responsibility to comply with appropriate State, county, and/or city laws and regulations for public safety such as obeying speed limits, knowing when it is legal and safe to pass etc.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
53	<p>Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. The BLM should require the following for the transport haul trucks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Require trucks to pull over when 3 or more vehicles are behind them (State law says 5);</li> <li>b) Require no passing on County Road 10 for at least one mile north and south of the mine access road, including all school bus stops on the truck routes;</li> <li>c) Require no truck traffic while school buses are active on transportation haul routes;</li> <li>d) Require an analysis of restricting times of truck operation - perhaps to evening hours only - to reduce impacts on the community;</li> <li>e) Require the mine operator to provide and control transportation to the customer site;</li> <li>f) The Yarnell Hill route is steep, one-lane, and there are no emergency escape ramps for trucks. This should be evaluated. The mine may need to construct escape ramps for public safety; and</li> <li>g) Left and right turn lanes, and acceleration lanes, should be required on Route 10 for the mine access road, at the expense of the mine operator, for both safety and to minimize the impact on the Skull Valley community.</li> </ul>	<p>The BLM provides the following responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Items a-c and f-g are outside the jurisdiction of the BLM. While the BLM has analyzed the indirect and cumulative impacts of transportation haul trucks along three proposed transportation haul routes, the BLM does not have legal authority to impose or enforce traffic laws on these routes.</li> <li>• Item d, according to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, loading and hauling operations could occur 24-hours per day, 4-7 days per week.</li> <li>• Item e, the BLM cannot impose a requirement on the proponent to purchase their own transport trucks.</li> </ul>
54	<p>Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. The BLM should require a cash bond.</p>	<p>As stated in Section 2.1.10, a reclamation cost estimate would be submitted in accordance with 43 CFR 3809.401(d): “Reclamation cost estimate. At a time specified by BLM, you must submit an estimate of the cost to fully reclaim your operations as required by § 3809.552. BLM will review your reclamation cost estimate and notify you of any deficiencies or additional information that must be submitted in order to determine a final reclamation cost. BLM will notify you when we have determined the final amount for which you must provide financial assurance.”</p>
55	<p>Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. The BLM should require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to carry liability insurance.</p>	<p>The requirement to carry liability insurance is outside the jurisdiction of the BLM and not within the scope of the environmental analysis.</p>
56	<p>Sierra Club – Yavapai Group. The BLM should require Kirkland Mining Company LLC provide it with evidence of financial ability.</p>	<p>There is no legal requirement for an applicant to provide evidence of financial ability to the BLM. As described in response to comment #54, a reclamation bond is required.</p>
57	<p>Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated the BLM failed to fully address impacts on humans and safety including traffic, noise, air quality, water usage, health, and property values incurred not only at the mine site but in the adjacent and surrounding communities.</p>	<p>The environmental assessment analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed mine operations and transportation haul routes. A change property values is speculative and not included in the Socioeconomics analysis.</p>
58	<p>Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. The BLM should permit this proposal as if it is a quarry, that the BLM has considerable discretion how a quarry operation takes place.</p>	<p>It is unclear what the commenter intended. The project is regulated under the “3809” regulations which ensure that approval of the Project would not cause any unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands. See response to comment #43 regarding measures that have been incorporated into the project design features in order to avoid or minimize impacts.</p>
59	<p>Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. The BLM should investigate the potential operator of the mine for financial, environmental problems that have occurred elsewhere. The BLM should require a bond for reclamation.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of the environmental analysis.</p>

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
60	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. The BLM failed to consider that noise levels decreases property values.	A potential change in property values associated with noise is speculative and was not included in the Socioeconomics analysis.
61	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated that both the BLM and Kirkland Mining Company LLC could be liable under the Arizona Private Property Rights Protection Act.	This act applies only to State and municipal governments and does not apply to the BLM.
62	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> is inadequate because it did not describe the baseline of current truck traffic on the proposed transportation haul routes.	The <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> utilized data from Arizona Department of Transportation and Yavapai County. The tables in the report included the breakdown of vehicle use classification in Tables 3, 5 et al as: “Pas. Veh”-passenger vehicles; “Bus/SU Trucks” – buses and sport utility trucks; “Tractor/Trailer” - ; “Multi-Trailer” - . The environmental assessment (Section 3.4.3) provided a summary of total traffic volume and did not break the numbers down by classification type. The BLM did consider the current volume of truck traffic on the three proposed transportation haul routes.
63	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated the BLM failed to adequately assess the impacts to pedestrian, horse or bicycle traffic.	Section 3.4 has been revised to describe that the transportation types considered were not exclusive to motorized vehicles.
64	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated that the BLM should require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to use rail from the Kirkland Rail Yard.	See previous comment #21 for response regarding use of the Kirkland Rail Yard.
65	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated that the BLM did not provide rationale on the methodology used in conducting sampling erionite. Stated seven samples is not enough, at least 20 are needed.	The BLM voluntarily conducted 12 samples for erionite in the Project Area and described the results in the <i>Geochemical Assay Testing for the Possible Presence of Airborne Carcinogens at the Proposed Kirkland High Quality Mine, Yavapai County, Arizona</i> . Kirkland Mining Company LLC had voluntarily taken its own sampling between 2015 and 2017. None of the samples taken from the Project Area showed the presence of erionite. As explained in the referenced report, the sampling was meant to be a spot check to supplement the confidential analyses the operator had provided to ADEQ. The 12 samples included bulk testing of the stockpiled material, testing of outcrops of each major geologic unit, and testing of each major geologic unit or alteration captured in the current drill core data, to compare to testing of the nearest known erionite locality in Peeples Valley. Twenty is a speculative number and probably an underestimate. The operator conducts systemic wholesale testing of the material as part of the QA/QC quality control on the product, which cannot be produced or sold if it contains airborne carcinogens. The fugitive dust produced by this operation would be monitored by the ADEQ. As described in H 3809-1 Surface Management Handbook, the BLM retains the right to conduct periodic or random spot checks of the material as it is exposed or produced to ensure compliance with all applicable regulations.
66	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated the BLM must complete an environmental impact statement because the proposal is “very controversial.”	See previous response to comment #31 regarding highly or “very controversial.”
67	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. Stated that the BLM eliminated alternatives without notification to the public.	See previous response to comment #34.
68	Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter et al. The BLM should schedule a public field trip to the proposed mine site.	See previous response to comment #22 on the extent of public involvement on this proposal.
69	Arizona Game and Fish Department. Recommended increasing the buffer around potential Waters of the U.S. from 50 to 100 feet.	According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, the buffer around the drainages in most areas is 100 feet or more.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
70	Arizona Game and Fish Department. Recommended a decontamination wash station to ensure that equipment and vehicles leaving the mine site do not transport invasive species off-site.	According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, the pozzolan material itself must be maintained as clean and free of organic material, including during transport from the mine to off-site secondary processing at a grinding mill or cement plant. Transport haul trucks would be traveling on paved highways and there is a low potential for these trucks to carry invasive species into the mine site. The staging area within the mine site will be maintained as weed-free. Kirkland Mining Company LLC would require contractors that use equipment at other locations to clean any equipment prior to arriving at the mine site.
71	Arizona Game and Fish Department. Recommended the BLM require Kirkland Mining Company LLC to develop a vegetation restoration plan and revegetation monitoring plan.	Revegetation was described in Section 2.1.10.3.
72	Public commenter. Stated that the description in the environmental assessment that shipment of mined material would occur across all three transportation haul routes is incorrect, and based on economic feasibility, most of the transport would occur on Route #3.	As responded to in comment #8 above, Kirkland Mining Company LLC cannot provide the BLM with the specific number of transport haul trucks on each on the individual routes. As a result, the BLM in the environmental assessment considered the worst-case scenario for each route- that 100 percent or 160 transport haul truck trips per day would use each route. Therefore the BLM has considered the worst-case scenario for Route #3, although Kirkland Mining Company LLC has stated that it is unlikely that 100 percent would use Route #3.
73	Public commenter. Stated that the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> disclosed water usage for dust suppression as 14,000 gallons per day (page 6), whereas the environmental assessment stated in Section 2.1.3 “maximum water demand 35,000 gallons per day (gpd) and an average demand of 28,800 gpd.”	There was a difference between the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> and the environmental assessment in gallons per day use for dust suppression activities. The environmental assessment described the maximum, or worst-case scenario for water use. In September 2017 Kirkland Mining Company LLC collected a bulk sample from the site (under Notice AZA-36808). Based on the analysis of that bulk sample material, the more likely range of water use would be between 14,000 to 18,000 gallons per day.
74	Public commenter. Stated that in the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> that the number of water trucks per day was not included in the traffic estimates.	As stated in Section 2.1.9.2 of the environmental assessment, the amount of employee traffic (50 vehicles per day) <i>included</i> water trucks, therefore water trucks was included in the total amount of mine-related traffic per day of 210. Kirkland Mining Company LLC intends on using trucks with a 4,000 gallon capacity. At a maximum usage of 35,000 gallons per day, this would equate to nine truck trips per day. At the more likely range is 14,000 to 18,000 gallons per day, this would equate to three to five truck trips per day.
75	Public commenter. Stated that there would be nighttime illumination associated with 24-hour loading and hauling operations, that could impact light-sensitive wildlife species.	According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, mine operating hours would during daylight hours within a 10-hour shift, four to six days per week (Section 2.1.1). Loading and hauling of transport trucks could occur anytime during a 24-hour period (Section 2.1.1). The BLM has revised Section 2.1.1 to describe light sources that would be introduced due to mining activities. The BLM has also revised Section 2.1.9.2 to describe light sources that would be introduced by trucks and employee traffic and their potential impacts to wildlife (Section 3.9.3.1).
76	Public commenter. Asserted that Kirkland Mining Company LLC has been removing vegetation from the existing stockpile, modifying roads etc. These should be reclaimed.	On-going work in the Project Area by Kirkland Mining Company LLC is under a Notice-level activity (AZA-36808), and as such is outside the scope of this proposal.
77	Public commenter. Stated that the BLM incorrectly cited “Walker [pg 53, line 1] and Everett 1987” as that literature applied to Alaskan tundra and does not apply to low humidity conditions that exist in Arizona.	While the environmental setting is different, the literature cited was used in characterizing the spatial extent of potential impacts from dust generated along the proposed transportation haul routes as was appropriately used.
78	Public commenter. Stated that prime or unique farmlands occur within Skull Valley and would be adversely impacted by fugitive dust.	The BLM considered whether this resource was within its jurisdiction, there are no prime or unique farmlands on BLM-lands within the Project Area.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
79	Public commenter. Stated that Kirkland Mining Company LLC recently purchased a ranch north of Skull Valley known as “Ben Balow Training Stables.” Stated that this location was not described in the baseline study ( <i>Evaluation of Skull Valley Ranch Wells as a Water Supply for the Kirkland Mine</i> ) nor the environmental assessment, and the potential impacts to traffic from this new location. A different commenter labeled this parcel as “accessor parcel number 300-07-012.”	The <i>Evaluation of Skull Valley Ranch Wells as a Water Supply for the Kirkland Mine</i> was supplemented with the identification of a third well site location. The BLM has revised Section 3.6.2.1 and Figure 10c describing the three potential well sites that may be used as source of water for dust suppression. The analysis with regards to potential groundwater impacts is unchanged because the overall volume of draft would not change, and all three well site locations are within the same aquifer.
80	Public commenter. Stated that at the July 11, 2018 public meeting, a BLM representative stated that Route #2 was not an option.	If any such statement was made, it was in error as Route #2 was analyzed along with two other transportation haul routes.
81	Public commenter. Stated that the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> was incomplete and additional traffic surveys were needed during the summer.	The report described that a traffic survey of Iron Springs Road occurred in December 2017 and that assumptions were used to convey what other seasonal would traffic consists.
82	Public commenter. Stated that the estimated workforce for the mine was 27, a change from previous numbers.	The current estimate of workforce provided by Kirkland Mining Company LLC is 12 (Section 3.11.3.1).
83	Public commenter. Provided a list of sensitive receptors that were not included in Figure 3-11 and Tables 3-11 and 3-12 of the environmental assessment.	The BLM has revised Figure 3-11 and Tables 3-4, 3-11 and 3-12 to include three additional sensitive receptors along the proposed transportation haul routes. The figure and tables were not intended to be an exclusive list.
84	Public commenter. Stated that the environmental assessment incorrectly states that the transportation network only consists of paved roads as there would be unpaved roads used by water trucks from the well sites.	Access to the three likely well sites would be on paved roads.
85	Public commenter. Requested the buffer between mining operations and potential Waters of the U.S. be increased to 500 feet.	See response to previous comment #69.
86	Public commenter. Stated that stream gauge data needs to be collected for the Copper Basin Wash.	The description of the stream gauge data for the Kirkland Creek provides a basis for the characterization of impacts in Section 3.6.3.1.
87	Public commenter. Stated that in the <i>Evaluation of Skull Valley Ranch Wells as a Water Supply for the Kirkland Mine</i> field surveys were not conducted for springs in Skull Valley.	The report provided the baseline conditions to assess the impacts of the project within the aquifer.
88	Public commenter. Stated the process used to identify Waters of the U.S. was inadequate and that a field study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Agency is needed.	A jurisdictional determination of Waters of the U.S. does not need to be completed while processing this proposal. The Environmental Protection Agency is not involved in permitting this type of proposal. This is the typical approach for these types and proposals.
89	Public commenter. Stated that there are no “blue lines” on Figure 2 of the <i>Evaluation of Potentially Jurisdictional Waters Within the Kirkland Analysis Area</i> .	This was an error. The reference to Figure 2 stated there were ‘blue lines,’ and this has been corrected and a revised report referencing red lines is available on the project website.
90	Public commenter. Stated that that yellow-billed cuckoo does exist in Skull Valley and there could be potential nesting west of the proposed mine site. A different commenter stated that a yellow-billed cuckoo was seen in Skull Valley in July- that the June 2018 survey for yellow-billed cuckoo was too early and a protocol-level survey is needed.	Based on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol-level surveys conducted in the summer of 2018, and professional judgement of BLM’s wildlife biologist, the project would have “no effect” to the yellow-billed cuckoo. While they may be present in the vicinity, they are not know to reside in the Project Area and adjacent riparian areas would not be included in surface disturbing activities of the mine.

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
91	<p>Public commenter. Stated that the surveys included in the <i>Kirkland Mine Biological Resources Survey Report</i> (EPG 2017) and the <i>Supplemental Special-Status Species Screening Analysis</i> (Westland 2018) for threatened or endangered species, and BLM sensitive species were inadequate. Reasons included surveys during winter and early spring, and that 43 species were improperly excluded from analysis. Stated that an environmental impact statement is needed in order to correct this.</p> <p>Stated that additional surveys are needed for BLM sensitive plant species because the BLM is in error that they do not occur in the Project Area.</p> <p>Stated that a number of BLM sensitive species occur in the Project Area even though the baseline reports state they “may” occur etc.</p>	<p>The standard approach in biological reviews is to screen for species that are not likely to occur in a particular area due to the lack of suitable habitat. This approach is followed up by reconnaissance level surveys in the Project Area. Those species with potential to be present were reviewed by two consulting firms, plus the professional judgement of the BLM’s wildlife biologist and knowledge of the Project Area based on site visits.</p>
92	<p>Public commenter. Stated that the noise analysis did not take into account the nighttime loading and hauling operations and the difference in noise impacts versus impacts during daylight hours.</p>	<p>According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, mine operating hours would be during daylight hours within a 10-hour shift, four to six days per week (Section 2.1.1). Loading and hauling of transport trucks could occur anytime during a 24-hour period (Section 2.1.1). The BLM has revised Section 2.1.1 to describe light sources that would be introduced due to mining activities. The BLM has revised Section 2.1.9.2 to describe light sources that would be introduced by trucks and employee traffic and their potential impacts to wildlife (Section 3.9.3.1).</p>
93	<p>Public commenter. Stated that the Lands and Realty analysis was inadequate.</p>	<p>To clarify why the resource is “not present.” The BLM determined that there were no existing BLM authorizations, such as rights-of-ways for roads or utility lines, within the 165-acre mine area.</p>
94	<p>Public commenter. Stated that the taxpayer shouldn’t be paying for the environmental assessment nor the monitoring of the project.</p>	<p>The allocation of funds for BLM programs, whether recreation, mining, livestock grazing or others is made by the U.S. Congress. Under the procedures for processing a project under the General Mining Act of 1872 and due to insufficient BLM staff, applicants routinely hire various consultants to prepare baseline surveys, studies and reports. In this case, Kirkland Mining Company LLC funded various consultants to prepare baseline studies and the environmental assessment. Funding provided by the U.S. Congress paid for BLM time to review these studies and the environmental analysis in order to ensure they comply with the appropriate federal laws involved in permitting this type of project.</p>

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
95	<p>Public commenter. Raised a number of concerns about the format and materials presented during the July 11, 2018 public meeting including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The weather (rain) impacted the ability of the public to drive to the meeting;</li> <li>2. The change in the venue location (Skull Valley Community Center to Kirkland Community Center) was confusing to the public;</li> <li>3. There was inadequate seating provided;</li> <li>4. The format wasn't a question and answer session;</li> <li>5. The BLM presentations weren't focused on the project;</li> <li>6. There was inadequate notification (only three days) prior to the public meeting;</li> <li>7. There have been multiple versions of the draft Mining and Reclamation Plan released to the public creating confusion;</li> <li>8. The commenter during the public meeting heard many complaints from other attendees about the inadequacy of the baseline studies; and</li> <li>9. BLM specialists were not adequately prepared for the meeting.</li> </ol>	<p>The BLM responds as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Despite unplanned inclement weather in the area, approximately 105 people were in attendance of the public meeting;</li> <li>2. The change in venue was because at the July 11, 2017 open house, there was inadequate air conditioning in the facility and the facility was filled to standing room only for the approximately 140 people that showed up;</li> <li>3. The BLM anticipated between 200-300 people in attendance, chairs were provided for those this accessibility concerns, otherwise given the size of the facility, it would not have accommodated 300 chairs with 300 people;</li> <li>4. The BLM did not advertise that the public meeting would be for three hours as a question and answer meeting;</li> <li>5. The BLM provided an overview of the project from various resources including wildlife, cultural resources, and transportation;</li> <li>6. The BLM initiated public notification on June 29, 2018, not on July 6, 2018, so there was more than one week notice provided;</li> <li>7. The BLM had continued to work with Kirkland Mining Company LLC to modify the mine operation to minimize impacts, the greatest revision was to alter a portion of the mine area in order to avoid impacts to three sites eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;</li> <li>8. Several baseline studies for the project were released on April 2, 2018 and the BLM extended outreach to the public through notification to local media of the studies availability; and</li> <li>9. The BLM had a range of specialists available for the presentations, and for one-on-one at six different resource stations. Staff was prepared to provide the public with basic answers on the project and to direct the public to the available reports and studies on the project website for review over the following seven weeks.</li> </ol>
96	<p>Public comment. Stated that the increase in transport truck traffic on Route #3 of a 1-2 percent increase in daily vehicles is inaccurate.</p>	<p>The BLM does not know the source of the information the commenter refers to. The BLM had included in the PowerPoint presentation during the July 11, 2018 and available on the project website, the incremental increases for all three routes in percentage (rather than Table 3-5 of the environmental assessment which relied on traffic numbers). The BLM has revised Section 4.4.1.1 and included two new tables 4-2 and 4-3 that describe the incremental and cumulative increase in traffic along each proposed transportation haul route. Route #3 would experience a 2.9 to 10.7 percent increase in traffic in the first year of the mine operation.</p>
97	<p>Public comment. Stated the traffic estimates failed to take into account fuel deliveries to the mine site.</p>	<p>Fuel delivery trucks were a part of the 160 truck trips per day, the maximum or worst-case scenario, that was analyzed in the environmental assessment. According to Kirkland Mining Company LLC, at maximum production, fuel consumption for all equipment, would be 700 gallons of diesel fuel per day. The proposal includes a 10,000 gallon double-walled diesel fuel tank. Fuel delivery would be anticipated once during a two-week period.</p>
98	<p>Public comment. Stated that transport haul trucks would increase by 485 percent. The commenter later states the amount of truck traffic would increase by 82 percent.</p>	<p>The BLM does not know the source of the information the commenter refers to. The BLM has revised Section 4.4.1.1 and included two new tables 4-2 and 4-3 that describe the incremental and cumulative increase in traffic along each proposed transportation haul route. The projected traffic volume for 2040 would be an increase of 15.9 percent.</p>

#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
99	Public comment. Stated that the <i>Traffic Impact Statement</i> did not adjust for increased seasonal traffic.	See previous response to comment #81.
100	Public comment. Stated that no mitigation (pull-outs, passing lanes, speed limits etc.) were proposed for the three transportation haul routes.	See previous comment #2.
101	Public comment. Referred to a “report” that the pozzolan material is 75 percent silica.	The BLM does not know the source of the information the commenter refers to. The BLM has revised the <i>Geochemical Assay Testing for the Possible Presence of Airborne Carcinogens at the Proposed Kirkland High Quality Mine, Yavapai County, Arizona</i> . The composition of the tuff is predominantly rhyodacitic volcanic pumice and ash which typically ranges from 20 to 60 percent amorphous silica by definition.
102	Public comment. Asserted that the BLM’s sampling for erionite within the Project Area was based on “budgetary restrictions.”	See response to comment #35.
103	Public comment. Stated that the BLM did not explain who determined that use of rail from the Kirkland Rail Yard is not economically feasible.	The environmental assessment is not a feasibility study. A reasonable alternative is one that is “technically and economically” feasible. Kirkland Mining Company, LLC has made the determination of what form of transportation is economically feasible.
104	Public comment. Stated that the methodology to assess noise impacts, by use of A-weighted sound levels underestimates the perceived loudness.	A-weighting is the standard measure used by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Environmental Protection Agency, and Federal Aviation Administration. The FHWA Traffic Noise Model was relied upon to support the assessment of noise impacts from the proposal.
GENERAL COMMENTS		
#	Comment Summary	BLM Response
105	Public commenters. Expressed general statement of concern/opposition to the proposal due to potential impacts, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Groundwater</li> <li>b. Transportation</li> <li>c. Noise</li> <li>d. Air Quality</li> <li>e. Quality of life</li> <li>f. Property values</li> <li>g. Public safety</li> <li>h. Wildlife habitat</li> </ul>	The purpose of the environmental assessment was the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Describe potential direct, indirect and cumulative effects from the proposal and No Action Alternative;</li> <li>2. Describe impacts as short-term and long-term; and</li> <li>3. Describe impacts as beneficial or adverse.</li> </ol> Through this analysis, the Authorized Official had considered public input at multiple stages of the project development to assist in making an informed decision on the proposal.
106	Public commenters. Expressed support for the No Action Alternative.	Comments noted.
107	Public commenters. Expressed general statement of interest/support in use of rail as an alternative to hauling mined material along three transportation haul routes.	See previous response to comment #20.
108	Public commenters. Expressed support for the Proposed Action.	Comments noted.
109	Public commenters. Stated that the BLM is rushing approval of the project.	The BLM disagrees. The project was formally introduced to the public in June 2017. Two extensive outreach efforts were conducted in June-September 2017, and July-September 2018. With the approval of this project in December 2018, the processing of the application will have taken approximately 19-months. Under new administration policy set in August 2018, new environmental assessments will be completed in 6-months.